

**Calendar No. 145**

104TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session*

SENATE

{ REPORT  
104-112

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996**

**REPORT**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1026]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

—————  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES SENATE



JULY 12 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1995.—Ordered to be printed

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996**

**Calendar No. 145**

104TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
104-112 }

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996**

**REPORT**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1026]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

---

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES SENATE



JULY 12 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1995.—Ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

92-111

WASHINGTON : 1995

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(104th Congress, 1st Session)

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, *Chairman*

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia

WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

TRENT LOTT, Mississippi

DAN COATS, Indiana

BOB SMITH, New Hampshire

DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Idaho

KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma

RICK SANTORUM, Pennsylvania

SAM NUNN, Georgia

J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska

CARL LEVIN, Michigan

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico

JOHN GLENN, Ohio

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia

JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut

RICHARD H. BRYAN, Nevada

RICHARD L. REYNARD, *Staff Director*

ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director for the Minority*

(II)

# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Purpose of the bill .....	1
Committee overview and recommendations .....	2
Explanation of funding summary .....	3
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	
Title I—Procurement .....	11
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	12
Section 107. Chemical demilitarization program .....	12
Use of unobligated fiscal year 1994 and 1995 funds .....	13
Transportation of the unitary stockpile .....	13
Subtitle B—Army Programs .....	14
Section 111. AH-64D Longbow Apache attack helicopter .....	26
Section 112. OH-58D AHIP Scout helicopter .....	26
Section 113. Hydra 70 rocket .....	26
Other Army Programs .....	27
Army aircraft .....	27
C-XX mid-range turbofan aircraft .....	27
UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter .....	27
Army Missile .....	27
Hellfire missile .....	27
Javelin medium anti-tank weapon .....	27
TOW missile .....	28
Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) .....	28
Army tactical missile system (ATACMS) .....	28
Stinger missile modifications .....	29
Weapons and tracked combat vehicles .....	29
M113 family of vehicles (FOV) .....	29
Bradley fighting vehicle .....	29
Improved recovery vehicle (IRV) .....	30
M1A2 tank upgrades .....	30
Small arms programs .....	31
7.62 millimeter medium machine gun .....	31
Army ammunition .....	31
Army ammunition .....	31
Selectable lightweight attack munition XM94 .....	32
Procurement of M-795 artillery projectile .....	32
Armament retooling and manufacturing support (ARMS) .....	32
Other Army procurement .....	32
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) .....	32
Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV) .....	33
Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV) .....	33
Medium truck extended service program (ESP) .....	34
Communications and intelligence systems .....	35
Army data distribution system (ADDS) .....	35
Single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS) .....	35
Commanders tactical terminal .....	35
Forward area air defense-ground based sensor (FAAD-GBS) .....	35
Night vision devices .....	36
Tactical quiet generators .....	36
Subtitle C—Navy Programs .....	37
Section 121. Seawolf and new attack submarine programs .....	55
Section 124. Split funding for construction of naval vessels .....	59
Other Navy Programs .....	61
Navy aircraft .....	61

IV

	Page
Title I—Procurement—Continued	
Other Navy Programs—Continued	
Navy aircraft—Continued	
AV-8B remanufacture .....	61
Additional F/A-18C/D strike fighters .....	61
CH-53E helicopters .....	62
F-14 Forward looking infrared (FLIR)/Laser .....	62
Thermal imaging modifications for USMC aircraft .....	62
AN/APR-39A(V)-2 radar warning receiver .....	63
Undergraduate NFO training .....	63
Navy weapons .....	63
Tomahawk missile .....	63
Direct broadcast service .....	63
Navy shipbuilding and conversion .....	64
Amphibious lift .....	64
LCAC service life extension program .....	65
Shipbuilding contract retentions .....	65
Other Navy procurement .....	66
Submarine navigation sets .....	66
AN/SLQ-32 electronic warfare system .....	66
Integrated communications for aircraft carriers .....	67
Challenge Athena .....	67
Sonobuoy procurement .....	68
Electro-optical sight/weapons director .....	68
Vertical launch system .....	69
Forklift trucks .....	69
Marine Corps ammunition .....	69
Marine Corps ammunition .....	69
Marine Corps .....	69
M1A1 tank modifications .....	69
Operational enhancements .....	70
PSC-5 radios .....	70
Advanced field artillery tactical data systems (AFATDS) .....	70
Night vision devices (NVD) .....	70
Computer upgrades .....	71
Trailers .....	71
Water purification and support equipment .....	71
Training simulators .....	71
Air Force programs .....	72
Air Force aircraft .....	84
Strategic airlift .....	84
C-17 Spares .....	84
Air Force ammunition .....	84
Air Force ammunition .....	84
Air Force missile .....	84
Defense support program procurement .....	84
Minuteman guidance replacement program .....	84
Global positioning system block IIF advanced procurement .....	85
Space boosters .....	85
Defense satellite communications system .....	85
Other Air Force procurement .....	85
Avionics support equipment .....	85
Subtitle D—Other programs .....	86
Section 131. Tier II predator unmanned aerial vehicle program .....	86
Section 132. Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle program .....	86
Defense-Wide procurement .....	88
Mark V special operations craft .....	92
Rigid hull inflatable boat (RHIB) .....	92
National Guard and Reserve equipment .....	92
National Guard artillery modernization .....	93
High capacity air ambulances .....	94
Naval Reserve C-9B aircraft .....	94
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) .....	95
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations .....	95
Section 211. A/F117X long-range, medium attack aircraft .....	95
Risk reduction—current program .....	96
Risk reduction—additional program scope .....	96

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E)—Continued	
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations—Continued	
Section 212. Navy mine countermeasures program .....	97
Section 213. Marine Corps shore fire support .....	98
Section 214. Space and missile tracking system program .....	99
Section 215. Precision guided munitions .....	101
Interim PGM .....	101
Section 216. Defense Nuclear Agency programs .....	102
DNA mission .....	102
DNA budget request .....	103
Electro-thermal chemical (ETC) gun program .....	103
Thermionics .....	104
Section 217. Counterproliferation support program .....	104
Biological detection .....	105
Special Operations Forces .....	105
Underground and deep underground structures .....	105
Cruise Missile proliferation .....	106
Proliferation of space technology .....	106
Emergency preparedness and response .....	107
Transfer authority .....	107
Report to Congress .....	107
Section 218. Nonlethal weapons program .....	108
Section 219. Federally funded research and development centers .....	109
Section 220. States eligible for assistance under Defense Experimental Program To Stimulate Competitive Research .....	109
Section 221. National defense technology and industrial base, defense reinvestment, and conversion .....	110
Section 222. Revisions of manufacturing of science and technology programs .....	111
Section 223. Preparedness of the Department of Defense to respond to military and civil defense emergencies resulting from a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack .....	112
Subtitle C—Missile Defense .....	113
Sections 231 through 241 .....	113
Missile Defense Act of 1995 .....	113
Theater missile defense architecture .....	113
National missile defense architecture .....	117
Cruise missile defense initiative .....	119
Policy regarding the ABM Treaty .....	119
Development, testing and deployment of non-ABM systems .....	120
Ballistic Missile Defense Program elements .....	121
Ballistic missile defense funding .....	121
Core theater missile defense programs .....	122
Other theater missile defense activities .....	122
National missile defense .....	123
Support technologies .....	124
Cruise missile defense funding .....	124
Other Programs .....	126
Army .....	126
High modulus polycrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber .....	131
Army technology base programs .....	131
Environmental Policy Simulation Laboratory (EPSL) .....	131
Funding for medical total access programs (telemedicine) .....	132
Wave net technology .....	132
Acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) .....	133
Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) enhancements .....	133
Objective individual combat weapon (OICW) .....	133
Advanced artillery propellant development .....	133
Armored systems modernization (ASM) .....	134
Small arms common module fire control system (SACMFS) .....	134
Command and control centers .....	134
Comanche helicopter .....	134
Medium tactical truck extended service program (ESP) .....	135
Heavy tactical vehicles .....	135
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) .....	135
Laser warning component-suite of survivability enhancements ....	136

## VI

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E)—Continued	
Other Programs—Continued	
Army—Continued	
Mark-19 universal bracket .....	136
High energy laser systems test facility .....	136
Nautilus/Tactical High Energy Laser Program .....	136
Army field artillery tactical data system (AFATDS) .....	137
Stinger missile modifications .....	137
Communications enhancements .....	137
Navy .....	138
Defense research sciences (Navy) .....	143
Power electronics building block .....	143
Parametric airborne dipping sonar .....	143
Air Systems and Weapons Advanced Technology .....	144
Intercooled recuperated gas turbine .....	144
Remote minehunting vehicle .....	144
Advanced armored amphibious vehicle (AAAV) .....	144
Lightweight 155mm howitzer .....	145
Cooperative engagement capability .....	145
Naval surface fire support .....	145
S-3B Project Gray Wolf .....	146
V-22 Osprey .....	147
Airborne electronic warfare .....	147
Infrared search and track .....	149
BARAK 1—ship self defense .....	149
Medium tactical vehicle remanufacture (MTVR) .....	150
Crash attenuating seats for helicopters .....	150
Plasma Electric Waste Converter Program .....	150
Air Force .....	151
Adaptive optics .....	157
Defense research sciences (Air Force) .....	157
Human systems technology .....	157
Thermally stable jet fuels .....	157
Range tracking and safety .....	157
Micro-satellite development program .....	157
Polar satellite communications .....	157
National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System .....	158
Reentry vehicle applications .....	158
Interim precision guided munitions (PGM) .....	158
F-22 Program .....	159
Sensor Fuzed Weapon Improvement Program .....	161
Ultra-high frequency satellite communications .....	162
RC-135 Re-engining .....	162
Joint air-to-surface standoff missile (JASSM) .....	162
Standoff land attack missile extended response .....	162
Rivet Joint technology transfer program .....	162
Information systems security .....	163
Defense Support Program .....	163
Fighter data links .....	163
Defense-Wide .....	165
Combat readiness research .....	169
DODDS Director's fund for science, mathematics, and engineering .....	169
University research initiatives .....	170
Medical Free Electron Laser Program .....	170
Software reuse .....	170
Tactical landing system .....	170
Diamond substrates .....	170
High temperature superconductivity .....	171
Pulsed fast neutron analysis (PFNA) technology .....	171
Thermophotovoltaics .....	171
Large millimeter wave telescope .....	172
Rapid acquisition of manufactured parts .....	172
Advanced electronics technologies .....	172
Semiconductor manufacturing technology (SEMATECH) .....	172
ATD-111 non-acoustic sensor technology .....	173

VII

	Page
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E)—Continued	
Other Programs—Continued	
Defense-Wide—Continued	
NATO research and development program .....	173
Fuel cells .....	174
Special Operations Forces counterproliferation support .....	174
Technical studies, support and analysis .....	174
Technical assistance and SBIR administration .....	174
U-2 Signals intelligence (SIGINT) sensor upgrades .....	174
U-2 defensive system upgrade .....	175
Maritime unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) .....	175
Advanced SEAL delivery system (ASDS) .....	175
Rigid hull inflatable boat (RHIB) .....	176
Expertise on defense trade and international technology .....	176
RDT&E infrastructure .....	176
Individual lift vehicle development .....	177
Defense developmental test and evaluation .....	177
Environmental technology .....	177
Title III—Operation and Maintenance .....	179
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	209
Section 303. Armed Forces retirement home .....	209
Section 304. Transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund .....	209
Subtitle B—Depot-level Maintenance and Repair .....	209
Section 311. Policy regarding performance of depot-level maintenance and repair for the Department of Defense .....	209
Section 312. Extension of authority for aviation depots and naval shipyards to engage in defense-related production and services .....	210
Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions .....	210
Section 321. Revision of requirements for agreements for services under environmental restoration program .....	210
Section 322. Discharges from vessels of the Armed Forces .....	211
Section 323. Revision of authorities relating to restoration advisory boards .....	211
Subtitle D—Civilian Employees .....	212
Section 331. Minimum number of military reserve technicians .....	212
Section 332. Exemption of Department of Defense from personnel ceilings for civilian personnel .....	212
Section 333. Wearing of uniform by National Guard technicians .....	213
Section 334. Extension of temporary authority to pay civilian employees with respect to the evacuation from Guantanamo, Cuba .....	213
Section 335. Sharing of personnel of Department of Defense domestic dependent schools and Defense Dependents' Education System .....	214
Section 336. Revision of authority for appointments of involuntarily separated military reserve technicians .....	214
Section 337. Cost of continuing health insurance coverage for employees voluntarily separated from positions to be eliminated in a reduction in force .....	214
Section 338. Elimination of 120-day limitation on details of certain employees .....	214
Section 339. Repeal of requirement for part-time career opportunity employment reports .....	214
Section 340. Authority of civilian employees of Department of Defense to participate voluntarily in reductions in force .....	215
Section 341. Authority to pay severance payments in lump sums .....	215
Section 342. Holidays for employees whose basic workweek is other than Monday through Friday .....	215
Section 343. Coverage of nonappropriated fund employees under authority for flexible and compressed work schedules .....	215
Subtitle E—Defense Financial Management .....	215
Section 351. Financial management training .....	215
Section 352. Limitation on opening of new centers for Defense Finance and Accounting Service .....	216
Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Assistance .....	216
Section 361. Department of Defense funding for National Guard participation in joint disaster and emergency assistance exercises .....	216
Section 362. Office of Civil-Military Programs .....	216

VIII

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued	
Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Assistance—Continued	
Section 363. Revision of authority for Civil-Military Cooperative Action Program .....	216
Section 364. Office of Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs .....	216
Subtitle G—Operation of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Funds .....	217
Section 371. Disposition of excess morale, welfare, and recreation funds .....	217
Section 372. Elimination of certain restrictions on purchases and sales of items by exchange stores and other morale, welfare, and recreation facilities .....	217
Section 373. Repeal of requirement to convert ships' stores to nonappropriated fund instrumentalities .....	217
Subtitle H—Other Matters .....	217
Section 381. National Defense Sealift Fund: availability for Ready Reserve component of the Ready Reserve Fleet .....	217
Section 382. Limitation on contracting with same contractor for construction of additional new sealift ships .....	217
Section 383. Availability of recovered losses resulting from contractor fraud .....	218
Section 384. Permanent authority for use of proceeds from the sale of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed property .....	218
Section 385. Sale of military clothing and subsistence and other supplies of the Navy and Marine Corps .....	219
Section 386. Conversion of Civilian Marksmanship Program to nonappropriated fund instrumentality and activities under program. ....	219
Section 387. Report on contracting out certain functions of Department of Defense .....	219
Section 390. Impact aid .....	219
Other items of interest .....	219
Army .....	219
Army reimbursable positions .....	219
Historically black colleges and universities fellowships .....	219
National Science Center .....	220
Navy .....	220
Nimitz Center .....	220
Active and Reserve P-3 squadrons .....	220
Yard tugboat service .....	221
Marine Corps .....	221
Marine Corps extended cold weather clothing system (ECWCS) ...	221
Air Force .....	221
Civil Air Patrol .....	221
Civilian personnel policy .....	222
Modernization and regionalization of civilian personnel management functions .....	222
Defense-Wide .....	222
Multi-technology automated reader card (MARC) .....	222
SR-71 .....	223
Museums .....	223
Spending for non-military missions .....	223
International peacekeeping .....	224
Humanitarian assistance and foreign disaster assistance .....	224
Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps .....	224
Civilian personnel levels .....	225
Federal Energy Management Program .....	225
Homeless support initiative .....	225
Civil-military/youth outreach programs .....	225
United Services Organization .....	226
Revolving funds .....	226
National defense features .....	226
Maritime prepositioning ship leases .....	227
Maritime prepositioning ship enhancement .....	228
Defense environment .....	229
Defense environmental compliance .....	229
Legacy resource management program .....	229
Environmental management .....	230

## IX

	Page
Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued	
Other items of interest—Continued	
Defense environment—Continued	
Cleanup of National Presto Industries Plant, Eau Claire, Wisconsin .....	230
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations .....	231
Subtitle A—Active Forces .....	231
Section 401. End strengths for active forces .....	231
Section 402. Temporary variation in DOPMA authorized end strength limitations for active duty Air Force and Navy officers in certain grades .....	232
Section 403. Certain general and flag officers awaiting retirement not to be counted .....	233
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces .....	233
Section 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve .....	233
Section 412. End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves .....	234
Section 414. Reserves on active duty in support of cooperative threat reduction programs not to be counted .....	235
Section 415. Reserves on active duty for military-to-military contacts and comparable activities not to be counted .....	236
Subtitle C—Military Training Student Loads .....	236
Section 421. Authorization of training student loads .....	236
Title V—Military Personnel Policy .....	237
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy .....	237
Section 501. Joint officer management .....	237
Section 502. Revision of service obligation for graduates of the service academies .....	238
Section 503. Qualifications for appointment as Surgeon General of an Armed Force .....	238
Section 504. Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Air Force .....	238
Section 505. Retiring general and flag officers: applicability of uniform criteria and procedures for retiring in highest grade in which served .....	238
Section 506. Extension of certain reserve officer management authorities .....	239
Section 507. Restrictions on wearing insignia for higher grade before promotion .....	239
Section 508. Director of Admissions, United States Military Academy: retirement for years of service .....	240
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Reserve Components .....	240
Section 511. Mobilization income insurance program for members of Ready Reserve .....	240
Section 512. Eligibility of dentists to receive assistance under the financial assistance program for health care professionals in reserve components .....	241
Section 513. Leave for members of reserve components performing public safety duty .....	241
Subtitle C—Uniform Code of Military Justice .....	241
Section 522. Definitions .....	241
Section 523. Article 32 investigations .....	241
Section 524. Refusal to testify before court-martial .....	241
Section 525. Commitment of accused to treatment facility by reason of lack of mental capacity or mental responsibility .....	242
Section 527. Deferment of confinement .....	242
Section 528. Submission of matters to the convening authority for consideration .....	242
Section 529. Proceedings in revision .....	243
Section 530. Appeal by the United States .....	243
Section 531. Flight from apprehension .....	243
Section 532. Carnal knowledge .....	243
Section 533. Time after accession for initial instruction in the Uniform Code of Military Justice .....	243
Section 535. Permanent authority concerning temporary vacancies on the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces .....	244
Section 536. Advisory panel on UCMJ jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces in time of armed conflict .....	244

	Page
Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued	
Subtitle D—Decorations and Awards .....	244
Section 541. Award of Purple Heart to certain former prisoners of war .....	244
Section 542. Meritorious and valorous service during Vietnam era: review and awards .....	245
Section 543. Military intelligence personnel prevented by secrecy from being considered for decorations and awards .....	245
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	245
Section 551. Determination of whereabouts and status of missing persons .....	245
Section 552. Service not creditable for periods of unavailability or incapacity due to misconduct .....	245
Section 553. Separation in cases involving extended confinement .....	245
Section 526. Forfeiture of pay and allowances and reduction in grade .....	245
Section 554. Duration of field training or practice cruise required under the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program .....	246
Section 555. Correction of military records .....	246
Section 556. Limitation on reductions in medical personnel .....	247
Section 557. Repeal of requirement for athletic director and nonappropriated fund account for the athletics programs at the service academies .....	247
Section 558. Prohibition on use of funds for service academy preparatory school test program .....	247
Section 559. Centralized judicial review of Department of Defense personnel actions .....	247
Other Items of Interest .....	248
Capstone course for new general and flag officers .....	248
Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act (ROPMA) .....	248
Reserve officers not on the active duty list .....	249
Service academy directives .....	249
Tuition assistance program .....	250
Quality of life while on independent duty .....	250
Recoupment .....	251
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits .....	253
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances .....	253
Section 601. Military pay raise for fiscal year 1996 .....	253
Section 602. Election of basic allowance for quarters instead of assignment to inadequate quarters .....	253
Section 603. Payment of basic allowance for quarters to members of the uniformed services in pay grade E-6 who are assigned to sea duty .....	253
Section 604. Limitation on reduction of variable housing allowance for certain members .....	254
Section 605. Clarification of limitation on eligibility for family separation allowance .....	254
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays .....	254
Section 611. Extension of certain bonuses for reserve forces .....	254
Section 612. Extension of certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists .....	254
Section 613. Extension of authority relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays .....	254
Section 614. Hazardous duty incentive pay for warrant officers and enlisted members serving as air weapons controllers .....	255
Section 615. Aviation career incentive pay .....	255
Section 616. Clarification of authority to provide special pay for nurses .....	255
Section 617. Continuous entitlement to career sea pay for crew members of ships designated as tenders .....	256
Section 618. Increase in maximum rate of special duty assignment pay for enlisted members serving as recruiters .....	256
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances .....	
Section 621. Calculation on basis of mileage tables of Secretary of Defense: repeal .....	256
Section 622. Departure allowances .....	256
Section 623. Dislocation allowance for moves resulting from a base closure or realignment .....	256

	Page
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued	
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances —Continued	
Section 624. Transportation of nondependent child from sponsor's station overseas after loss of dependent status while overseas .....	256
Subtitle D—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities .	257
Section 631. Use of commissary stores by members of the Ready Reserve .....	257
Section 632. Use of commissary stores by retired Reserves under age 60 and their survivors .....	257
Section 633. Use of morale, welfare, and recreation facilities by members of reserve components and dependents: clarification of entitlement .....	257
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	257
Section 641. Cost-of-living increases for retired pay .....	257
Section 642. Eligibility for retired pay for non-regular service denied for members receiving certain sentences in courts-martial .....	257
Section 643. Recoupment of administrative expenses in garnishment actions .....	257
Section 644. Automatic maximum coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance .....	258
Section 645. Termination of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for members of the Ready Reserve who fail to pay premiums .....	258
Section 646. Report on extending to junior noncommissioned officers privileges provided for senior noncommissioned officers .....	258
Section 647. Payment to survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services for all leave accrued .....	258
Section 648. Annuities for certain military surviving spouses .....	258
Section 649. Transitional compensation for dependents of members of the Armed Forces separated for dependent abuse: clarification of entitlement .....	259
Other Item of Interest .....	259
Title VII—Health Care .....	261
Tricare .....	261
Subtitle A—Health Care Services .....	264
Section 701. Medical care for surviving dependents of retired Reserves who die before age 60 .....	264
Section 702. Dental insurance for members of the Selected Reserve ...	264
Section 703. Modification of requirements regarding routine physical examinations and immunizations under CHAMPUS .....	264
Section 704. Permanent authority to carry out specialized treatment facility program .....	265
Section 705. Waiver of medicare part B late enrollment penalty and establishment of special enrollment period for certain military retirees and dependents .....	265
Subtitle B—Tricare Program .....	265
Section 712. Provision of TRICARE uniform benefits by uniformed services treatment facilities .....	265
Section 713. Sense of Senate on access of medicare eligible beneficiaries of CHAMPUS to health care under TRICARE .....	265
Section 714. Pilot program of individualized residential mental health services .....	265
Subtitle C—Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities .....	266
Section 721. Delay of termination of status of certain facilities as uniformed services treatment facilities .....	266
Section 722. Applicability of Federal Acquisition Regulation to participation agreements with uniformed services treatment facilities .	266
Section 723. Amount payable by uniformed services treatment facilities for health care services provided outside the catchment areas of the facilities .....	266
Subtitle D—Other Changes to Existing Laws Regarding Health Care Management .....	266
Section 731. Investment incentive for managed health care in medical treatment facilities .....	266
Section 732. Revision and codification of limitations on physician payments under CHAMPUS .....	267
Section 733. Personal services contracts for medical treatment facilities of the Coast Guard .....	267

	Page
Title VII—Health Care—Continued	
Subtitle D—Other Changes to Existing Laws Regarding Health Care Management—Continued	
Section 734. Disclosure of information in Medicare and Medicaid coverage data bank to improve collection from responsible parties for health care services furnished under CHAMPUS .....	267
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	267
Section 741. TriService nursing research .....	267
Section 742. Fisher House trust funds .....	267
Section 744. Applicability of limitation on prices of pharmaceuticals procured for Coast Guard .....	267
Other Item of Interest .....	268
Telemedicine .....	268
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters	269
Subtitle A—Acquisition Reform .....	269
Section 801. Waivers from cancellation of funds .....	269
Section 802. Procurement notice posting thresholds .....	269
Section 803. Prompt resolution of audit recommendations .....	269
Section 804. Test program for negotiation of comprehensive subcontracting plans .....	269
Section 805. Naval salvage facilities .....	270
Section 806. Authority to delegate contracting authority .....	270
Section 807. Coordination and communication of defense research activities .....	270
Section 808. Procurement of items for experimental or test purposes ..	270
Section 809. Quality control in procurements of critical aircraft and ship spare parts .....	270
Section 810. Use of funds for acquisition of rights to use designs, processes, technical data and computer software .....	270
Section 811. Independent cost estimates for major defense acquisition programs .....	270
Section 812. Fees for certain testing services .....	271
Section 813. Construction, repair, alteration, furnishing, and equipping of naval vessels .....	271
Section 814. Civil Reserve Air Fleet .....	271
Subtitle B—Other Matters .....	271
Section 821. Procurement technical assistance programs .....	271
Section 822. Treatment of Department of Defense cable television franchise agreements .....	271
Other Items of Interest .....	271
Ship propellers .....	271
Worker's compensation coverage on overseas contracts .....	272
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management .....	275
Section 901. Redesignation of the position of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy .....	275
Other Matters .....	275
Joint Exercise, Training, and Doctrine Command .....	275
Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense .....	275
Title X—General Provisions .....	279
Subtitle A—Financial Matters .....	279
Section 1002. Disbursing and certifying officials .....	279
Section 1003. Defense modernization account .....	279
Section 1004. Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1995 .....	280
Section 1005. Limitation on use of authority to pay for emergency and extraordinary expenses .....	280
Section 1006. Transfer authority regarding funds available for foreign currency fluctuations .....	280
Section 1007. Report on budget submission regarding reserve components .....	281
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels .....	281
Section 1011. Iowa class battleships .....	281
Section 1012. Transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries ..	281
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities .....	282
Section 1021. Revision and clarification of authority for Federal support of drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the National Guard .....	282

XIII

	Page
Title X—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities—Continued	
Section 1022. National Drug Intelligence Center .....	282
Section 1023. Assistance to Customs Service .....	282
Subtitle D—Department of Defense Education Programs .....	284
Section 1031. Continuation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences .....	284
Section 1032. Additional graduate schools and programs at the Uni- formed Services University of the Health Sciences .....	284
Section 1033. Funding for basic adult education programs for mili- tary personnel and dependents outside the United States .....	284
Section 1034. Scope of education programs of Community College of the Air Force .....	284
Section 1035. Date for annual report on Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Program .....	284
Subtitle E—Cooperative Threat Reduction With States of the Former Soviet Union .....	284
Section 1041. Cooperative threat reduction programs defined .....	284
Section 1042. Funding matters .....	284
Section 1043. Limitation relating to offensive biological warfare pro- gram of Russia .....	284
Subtitle F—Matters Relating to Other Nations .....	285
Section 1051. Cooperative research and development agreements with NATO organizations .....	285
Section 1052. National security implications of United States export control policy .....	285
Review of export licenses for biological pathogens .....	286
Section 1053. Defense export loan guarantees .....	286
Section 1054. Landmine clearing assistance program .....	287
Landmine Convention .....	287
Section 1055. Strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel .....	288
Section 1056. Support services for the Navy at the Port of Haifa, Israel .....	288
Section 1057. Prohibition on assistance to terrorist countries .....	289
Section 1058. International military education and training .....	289
Section 1060. Implementation of arms control agreements .....	289
Section 1061. Sense of Congress on limiting the placing of United States forces under United Nations Command or Control .....	290
Subtitle G—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements .....	291
Reduction of reporting requirements .....	291
Subtitle H—Other Matters .....	291
Section 1081. Global positioning system .....	291
Section 1082. Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems .....	292
Section 1083. National Guard Civilian Youth Opportunities Pilot Pro- gram .....	294
Section 1084. Report on Department of Defense boards and commis- sions .....	294
Section 1085. Revision of authority for providing Army support for the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics ...	295
Section 1086. Authority to suspend or terminate collection actions against deceased members .....	295
Section 1087. Damage or loss to personal property due to emergency evacuation or extraordinary circumstances .....	295
Section 1088. Check cashing and exchange transactions for depend- ents of United States Government personnel .....	295
Section 1089. Travel of disabled veterans on military aircraft .....	296
Section 1090. Transportation of crippled children in Pacific rim re- gion to Hawaii for medical care .....	296
Section 1091. Student information for recruiting purposes .....	296
Section 1092. State recognition of military advance medical direc- tives .....	296
Section 1093. Report on personnel requirements for control of trans- fer of certain weapons .....	297
Section 1094. Extension of period of Vietnam era .....	297
Other Items of Interest .....	297

XIV

	Page
Title X—General Provisions—Continued	
Other Items of Interest—Continued	
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) .....	297
Department of Defense space management and organization .....	297
Joint military intelligence program .....	298
Reusable launch vehicles .....	299
Chinese military developments .....	300
Private contracting for military assistance to Newly Independent De- mocracies of Eastern Europe .....	300
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS	
Committee Action .....	301
Base closure and realignment accounts .....	317
Title XXII—Navy .....	323
Section 2205. Authorization of appropriations .....	323
Section 2206. Authority to carry out land acquisition project, Norfolk Naval Base, Virginia .....	323
Section 2207. Acquisition of land, Henderson Hall, Arlington, Vir- ginia .....	323
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies .....	325
Chemical munitions disposal facilities .....	325
Title XXVIII—General Provisions .....	327
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing	327
Section 2801. Special threshold for unspecified minor construction projects to correct life, health, or safety deficiencies .....	327
Section 2802. Clarification of scope of unspecified minor construction authority .....	327
Section 2803. Temporary waiver of net floor area limitation for family housing acquired in lieu of construction .....	327
Section 2804. Reestablishment of authority to waive net floor area limitation on acquisition by purchase of certain military family housing .....	327
Section 2805. Temporary waiver of limitations on space by pay grade for military family housing units .....	327
Section 2806. Increase in number of family housing units subject to foreign country maximum lease amount .....	328
Section 2807. Expansion of authority for limited partnerships for development of military family housing .....	328
Section 2809. Authority to convey damaged or deteriorated military family housing .....	328
Section 2810. Energy and water conservation savings for the Depart- ment of Defense .....	328
Section 2811. Alternative authority for construction and improvement of military housing .....	328
Section 2812. Permanent authority to enter into leases of land for special operations activities .....	329
Section 2813. Authority to use funds for certain educational pur- poses .....	329
Subtitle B—Defense Base Closure and Realignment .....	329
Section 2821. In-kind consideration for leases at installations to be closed or realigned .....	329
Section 2822. Clarification of authority regarding contracts for com- munity services at installations being closed .....	330
Section 2823. Clarification of funding for environmental restoration at installations approved for closure or realignment in 1995 .....	330
Section 2824. Authority to lease property requiring environmental remediation at installations approved for closure .....	330
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances .....	330
Section 2831. Land acquisition or exchange, Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina .....	330
Section 2832. Authority for Port Authority of State of Mississippi to use certain Navy property in Gulfport, Mississippi .....	330
Section 2833. Conveyance of resource recovery facility, Fort Dix, New Jersey .....	331
Section 2834. Conveyance of water and wastewater treatment plants, Fort Gordon, Georgia .....	331

	Page
Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued	
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances—Continued	
Section 2835. Conveyance of water treatment plant, Fort Pickett, Virginia .....	331
Section 2836. Conveyance of electric power distribution system, Fort Irwin, California .....	331
Section 2837. Land exchange, Fort Lewis, Washington .....	331
Subtitle D—Transfer of Jurisdiction and Establishment of MIDEWIN National Tallgrass Prairie .....	332
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	332
Section 2861. Department of Defense laboratory revitalization demonstration program .....	332
Section 2862. Prohibition on joint civil aviation use of Miramar Naval Air Station, California .....	333
Section 2863. Report on agreement relating to conveyance of land, Fort Belvoir, Virginia .....	333
Other Items of Interest .....	333
Planning and design .....	334
Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center, Fort Lawton, Washington .....	334
Fire fighting training system, Department of the Army .....	334
Repair of unsafe bridges .....	334
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs .....	335
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations .....	368
Section 3101. Weapons activities .....	368
Congressional Guidance on Stockpile Stewardship .....	368
Stockpile Confidence Concerns .....	368
Stockpile Confidence Strategy .....	369
Stockpile Confidence: Testing Strategy .....	369
Maintaining Integrity of Test Readiness Capability .....	369
Reemphasis on Maintaining the Stockpile is Required .....	369
Conclusion from the Nuclear Posture Review .....	370
Tritium Production Strategy .....	370
Human Resources for the Weapons Activity Mission .....	370
Technology Partnerships .....	370
Inertial Confinement Fusion .....	371
National Ignition Facility .....	371
Stockpile Management .....	372
Section 3102. Environmental restoration and waste management .....	373
Assessment of Environmental Waste Management Program .....	373
Providing the Tools for a Solution .....	373
Section 3103. Other defense activities. ....	374
Section 3142. Authority to reprogram funds for disposition of certain spent nuclear fuel .....	374
Korean reactor reprogramming .....	374
Arms Control .....	374
Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development .....	375
Section 3104. Defense nuclear waste disposal .....	375
Section 3105. Payment of penalties assessed against Rocky Flats Site .....	375
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions .....	375
Section 3121. Reprogramming .....	375
Section 3122. Limits on general plant projects .....	376
Section 3123. Limits on construction projects .....	376
Section 3124. Fund transfer authority .....	376
Section 3125. Authority for conceptual and construction design .....	376
Section 3126. Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities .....	377
Section 3127. Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy .....	377
Section 3128. Availability of funds .....	377
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations .....	377
Section 3131. Tritium production .....	377
Section 3132. Plutonium disposition .....	377

	Page
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued	
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations—Continued	
Section 3133. Tritium recycling .....	378
Section 3134. Manufacturing infrastructure for refabrication and certification of enduring nuclear weapons stockpile .....	378
Weapons refabrication strategy .....	378
Defense Programs Planning Council .....	379
Integrated Weapons Refabrication Plan .....	379
Section 3135. Hydronuclear experiments .....	379
Section 3136. Fellowship program for development of skills critical to the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex .....	379
Section 3137. Effect of issuance of environmental impact statements on use of funds for certain Department of Energy facilities .....	380
Section 3138. Dual-axis Radiographic Hydrotest Facility .....	381
Section 3139. Limitation on use of funds for certain research and education purposes .....	381
Section 3140. Processing of high level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel rods .....	381
Section 3141. Department of Energy Declassification Productivity Initiative .....	382
Section 3143. Protection of Workers at Nuclear Weapons Facilities ....	382
Subtitle D—Transfer of Jurisdiction Over Department of Energy National Security Functions .....	382
Section 3151. Plans for transfer of jurisdiction over Department of Energy national security functions .....	382
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	382
Section 3161. Responsibility for Defense Programs Emergency Response Program .....	382
Section 3162. Requirements for Department of Energy weapons activities budgets for fiscal years after fiscal year 1996 .....	383
Section 3163. Enduring nuclear weapons stockpile .....	383
Section 3164. Report on proposed purchases of tritium from foreign suppliers .....	383
Section 3165. Report on hydronuclear testing .....	383
Section 3166. Master plan on warheads in the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile .....	384
Section 3167. Prohibition on international inspections of Department of Energy facilities pending certification of protection of restricted data .....	384
Other Items of Interest .....	384
Merger of operating and capital resources into one category .....	384
Nuclear stockpile dismantlement .....	384
Nuclear reactor safety in Ukraine .....	385
Accountability for civilian nuclear materials .....	385
Title XXXIII—Naval Petroleum Reserves .....	387
Section 3301. Sale of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills) .....	387
Section 3302. Study regarding future of Naval Petroleum Reserves (other than Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1) .....	388
Title XXXIV—National Defense Stockpile .....	389
Section 3401. Authorized uses of stockpile funds .....	389
Section 3402. Disposal of obsolete and excess materials contained in the National Defense Stockpile .....	389
Section 3403. Disposal of chromite and manganese ores and chromium ferro and manganese metal electrolytic .....	389
Section 3404. Restrictions on disposal of manganese ferro .....	389
Section 3405. Excess defense-related materials: transfer to Stockpile and disposal .....	389
Title XXXV—Panama Canal Commission .....	391
Legislative Requirements .....	392
Departmental recommendations .....	392
Committee action .....	392
Fiscal data .....	393
Congressional Budget Office cost estimate .....	394
Regulatory input .....	394
Changes in existing law .....	394

XVII

	Page
Additional and Minority Views .....	395
Additional Views:	
Mr. McCain .....	395
Mr. Exon .....	401
Mr. Kennedy .....	403
Mr. Glenn .....	406
Mr. Lieberman .....	409
Mr. Bryan .....	412
Minority Views:	
Mr. Levin .....	413
Mr. Bingaman .....	417

104TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
104-112

---

---

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

JULY 12 (legislative day, JULY 10), 1995.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

## REPORT

together with

### ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1026]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the armed forces, and for other purposes, and, recommends that the bill do pass.

### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

- (1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996;
- (2) authorize the personnel end strength for each military active duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 1996;
- (3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 1996;
- (4) authorize the annual average military training student loads for the active and reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 1996;
- (5) impose certain reporting requirements;

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

(7) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996; and

(8) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1996.

### **Committee overview and recommendations**

As the committee organized to carry out its constitutional responsibilities and those assigned by the Senate for the 104th Congress, the Chairman and the Members established priorities which guided the committee through the authorization process.

As its top priority, the committee recognized that well-motivated, well-trained, well-led soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are the bedrock of national security. The committee's goal was to ensure that forces remain effective and force levels remain sufficient, and that the services are manned by personnel of the highest quality. This in turn required strong congressional support for equitable pay and benefits, bachelor and family housing, and other quality of life measures.

The committee emphasized the need to protect the combat readiness of the armed forces. A prime concern was to establish a proper balance between near-term and long-term readiness. Although near-term readiness is a matter of critical importance, a disproportionate allocation of scarce resources to operation and maintenance accounts would unwisely limit funds for research, development and procurement activities essential to modernization. This could leave the force ill-prepared for a future conflict. The committee sought to achieve a reasonable balance by providing adequate funds for training, and operation and maintenance accounts while authorizing increases both for weapons and equipment currently in production and for multiyear procurement. This will help to avoid creating "bow waves" of funding requirements in subsequent years. The committee has recommended a level of funding for research and development which should assure U.S. military superiority in the future. To make the best use of the funds available, the committee made a concerted effort to reduce spending for non-defense programs in the defense budget.

The committee was also concerned about the viability of the nation's nuclear forces. According to the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the United States will continue to depend on these forces for nuclear deterrence into the foreseeable future. Safe, reliable, and effective nuclear weapons are at the core of this deterrence. In this bill the committee sought to redirect the focus of the Department of Energy toward its primary responsibility of maintaining the nation's nuclear capability. To do this the department must emphasize a stockpile management program geared to the near-term refabrication and certification requirements outlined in the NPR.

Finally, the committee addressed the proliferation of missile technology and weapons of mass destruction. With an increasing number of nations acquiring or developing long-range missile technology, the United States must be able to defend both its deployed

forces and the homeland. The committee provided direction and funds for both of these requirements. It initiated a program to enhance defense against cruise missiles while funding robust Theater Missile Defenses and mandating a National Missile Defense program that will lead to the deployment of a limited defense of the United States in the foreseeable future. The committee reaffirmed its support for cooperative threat reductions with Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan.

The committee is concerned that the administration's budget request did not include funding for numerous operations which the armed forces are conducting currently, despite the fact that the administration fully expects that these operations will continue into fiscal year 1996. The committee has therefore authorized \$125.0 million to pay for these ongoing operations. The committee cautions the administration that the consequence of paying for these operations on an unprogrammed, *ad hoc* basis, is often to deny necessary funds to maintain force readiness. Last year the importance of timely, full funding for such operations became apparent in lower readiness ratings and curtailed training in some military units. Unless the Department of Defense includes the funds for such operations in the budget request, the committee's ability to assess the impact these operations will have on other accounts throughout the department and the services will be impaired. The committee and the Congress have oversight responsibilities which are hindered when the department does not budget for known requirements.

The committee has long expressed its concern about the decreasing levels of defense funding. The trend over the past 10 years has been one of constant decline. The administration's request for procurement this year is at the lowest level since 1950, declining about 40 percent since 1985. Each successive budget since 1993 has continued to push recapitalization further into the outyears. As a result, the services have been forced to delay the fielding of critical modern systems while maintaining aging equipment at ever-increasing operating and maintenance costs.

The committee remains concerned about the adequacy of funding levels for national defense programs in the coming years. Despite the recommended fiscal year 1996 funding increase of \$7.0 billion above the administration request, budget levels proposed for future years do not adequately fund even the level of forces required for the Bottom-Up Review Force. These levels cannot meet modernization needs and do not cover inflation. This shortfall will seriously impair the ability of the Department of Defense to field the ready, modern forces essential to our national security. The limited progress reflected in this bill cannot be maintained unless future funding is increased.

Department of Defense decisions to cancel or delay modernization programs create unrealistic modernization funding requirements for the future. In this bill, the committee has addressed critical modernization needs by adding \$5.3 billion in procurement and \$1.7 billion in research and development accounts to offset some of these problems. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must continue to fund these accounts at similar, inflation-adjusted levels in future budget requests.

Throughout the past six months, the committee worked in its traditional bi-partisan manner which places the national security interests of the United States and the safety of the American people above other considerations. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 reflects this cooperative effort and provides a clear direction for U.S. national security policy, and a foundation for the defense of the nation.

#### **Explanation of funding summary**

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 1996 was \$257.7 billion, of which \$189.5 billion was for programs which require specific funding authorization.

The committee's authorization recommendation is substantially larger (\$264.70 billion in budget authority) than the amount requested. The primary reason for this difference is that the committee authorized an additional \$5.3 billion in procurement and \$1.7 billion in research and development.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 1996 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: military personnel funding; military construction authorizations provided in prior years; and other small portions of the defense budget that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or which do not require an annual authorization. As explained above, funding for military personnel is included in the amounts authorized by the committee, but not in the total funding requested for authorization.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns relating to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totalling \$264.7 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the fiscal year 1996 Budget Resolution, an increase of \$7 billion above the President's budget request. The committee decided to allocate this increase to the modernization accounts, authorizing an additional \$5.7 billion in procurement and an additional \$1.3 billion in research and development.

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (\$M)**

Account Title	Authorization Request		Request BA 1996	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications	Outlay Implications
	Request 1996	BA 1996					
<b>DIVISION A</b>							
<b>TITLE I</b>							
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,223.07	1,223.07	1,223.07	173.38	1,396.45	1,396.45	24.62
Missile Procurement, Army	676.43	676.43	676.43	218.00	894.43	894.43	27.25
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles,	1,298.99	1,298.99	1,298.99	233.98	1,532.96	1,532.96	4.68
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	795.02	795.02	795.02	325.10	1,120.12	1,120.12	126.79
Other Procurement, Army	2,256.60	2,256.60	2,256.60	514.50	2,771.10	2,771.10	94.15
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	3,886.49	3,886.49	3,886.49	1,030.10	4,916.59	4,916.59	143.18
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,787.12	1,787.12	1,787.12	(15.70)	1,771.42	1,771.42	(2.28)
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	5,051.94	5,051.94	5,051.94	2,060.00	7,111.94	7,111.94	140.92
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Procurement, Navy	2,396.08	2,396.08	2,396.08	75.78	2,471.86	2,471.86	16.52
Procurement, Marine Corps	474.12	474.12	474.12	209.30	683.42	683.42	53.16
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,647.71	3,647.71	3,647.71	(50.21)	3,597.50	3,597.50	(14.56)
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	6,183.89	6,183.89	6,183.89	134.70	6,318.59	6,318.59	8.35
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Procurement, Air Force	6,804.70	6,804.70	6,804.70	(258.70)	6,546.00	6,546.00	(132.97)
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,179.92	2,179.92	2,179.92	(61.59)	2,118.32	2,118.32	(12.01)
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	-	-	-	777.40	777.40	777.40	58.31
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
O&M	393.85	393.85	393.85	-	393.85	393.85	-
Proc	299.45	299.45	299.45	(75.00)	224.45	224.45	(11.63)
R&D	53.40	53.40	53.40	-	53.40	53.40	-
Defense Production Act Purchases	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (\$M)**

Account Title	Authorization	Request	Request	Senate	Senate	BA	Outlay
	Request	1996	BA	Change	Authorized	Implications	Implications
Coastal defense augmentation	288.03	-	-	-	288.03	-	-
Defense Health, Procurement	1.00	-	-	-	1.00	-	-
Office of the Inspector General, Procurement	39,697.78	39,408.75	-	5,291.04	44,988.82	44,699.79	524.49
<b>Total Procurement</b>							
<b>TITLE II</b>							
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army	4,444.18	4,444.18	-	400.92	4,845.10	4,845.10	228.53
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy	8,204.53	8,204.53	-	419.70	8,624.23	8,624.23	226.64
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force	12,598.44	12,598.44	-	488.95	13,087.39	13,087.39	227.36
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-	8,802.88	8,802.88	-	468.34	9,271.22	9,271.22	203.73
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	22.59	22.59	-	-	22.59	22.59	-
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense	259.34	259.34	-	(20.00)	239.34	239.34	(5.00)
FFRDC Reduction	-	-	-	(90.00)	(90.00)	(90.00)	(43.83)
<b>Total Research &amp; Development</b>	34,331.95	34,331.95	-	1,667.91	35,999.86	35,999.86	837.42
<b>TITLE III</b>							
Operation and Maintenance, Army	18,184.74	18,184.74	-	(98.53)	18,086.21	18,086.21	(75.18)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	21,225.71	21,225.71	-	131.25	21,356.96	21,356.96	101.46
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,269.72	2,269.72	-	135.99	2,405.71	2,405.71	100.50
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	18,256.60	18,256.60	-	(18.70)	18,237.89	18,237.89	(14.03)
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	10,366.78	10,366.78	-	(306.62)	10,060.16	10,060.16	(233.64)
Defense Health Program, O&M	9,865.53	9,865.53	-	78.30	9,943.83	9,943.83	67.65
Defense Health Program, PROC	-	-	-	-	-	288.03	-
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,068.59	1,068.59	-	(6.00)	1,062.59	1,062.59	(4.48)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	826.04	826.04	-	14.80	840.84	840.84	10.36
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	90.28	90.28	-	-	90.28	90.28	-

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (SMs)**

Account Title	Authorization Request		Request BA		Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications	Outlay Implications
	1996	1996	1996	1996				
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,485.95	1,485.95	1,485.95	1,472.95	(13.00)	1,472.95	1,472.95	(10.76)
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	2,712.22	2,712.22	2,712.22	2,734.22	22.00	2,734.22	2,734.22	18.04
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,304.11	2,304.11	2,304.11	2,304.11	-	2,304.11	2,304.11	-
Office of the Inspector General	138.23	138.23	139.23	138.23	-	138.23	139.23	-
United States Courts of Appeals for the Armed Forces	6.52	6.52	6.52	6.52	-	6.52	6.52	-
Environmental Restoration, Defense	1,622.20	1,622.20	1,622.20	1,601.80	(20.40)	1,601.80	1,601.80	(4.49)
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	680.43	680.43	680.43	680.43	-	680.43	680.43	-
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction Account	371.00	371.00	371.00	365.00	(6.00)	365.00	365.00	(0.22)
Summer Olympics	15.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	-	15.00	15.00	-
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Arm Contributions for International Peacekeeping and Peace Humanitarian Assistance	65.00	65.00	65.00	65.00	(65.00)	-	-	(65.00)
Disposal and Lease of DOD Real Property	79.79	79.79	79.79	79.79	(59.79)	20.00	20.00	(14.95)
Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense	-	8.00	8.00	8.00	-	-	8.00	-
1995 Special Olympics World Games	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Payment from General Fund, Kaho OIawe Island Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Real Property Maintenance, Defense	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Defense Cooperation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DOD 50th Anniversary of World War II Commemoratio	-	0.10	0.10	-	-	-	0.10	-
Kaho'OIawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Envi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Goodwill Games	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Payment to Kaho'olawe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (SMs)**

Account Title	Authorization	Request	Senate	Senate	Senate	BA	Outlay
	Request	BA	Changes	Authorized	Authorized	Implications	Implications
	1996	1996					
Defense Reinvestment for Economic Growth	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Restoration of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Disaster Relief	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Science Center, Army	-	0.09	-	-	-	0.09	-
Armed Forces Retirement Home (Memo Entry)	-	-	45.00	45.00	-	-	-
<b>Total Operation &amp; Maintenance</b>	<b>91,634.43</b>	<b>91,931.65</b>	<b>(211.71)</b>	<b>91,422.73</b>	<b>91,422.73</b>	<b>91,719.95</b>	<b>(124.75)</b>
<b>Revolving Funds</b>							<b>∞</b>
Defense Business Operations Fund	878.70	878.70	-	878.70	-	878.70	-
National Defense Sealift Fund	974.22	974.22	110.00	1,084.22	-	1,084.22	5.61
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund	-	(150.00)	-	-	-	(150.00)	-
Stockpile Fund-Public Enterprise	-	(202.00)	-	-	-	(202.00)	-
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1,852.92</b>	<b>1,500.92</b>	<b>110.00</b>	<b>1,962.92</b>	<b>1,962.92</b>	<b>1,610.92</b>	<b>5.61</b>
<b>TITLE IV-Y-VI-VII</b>							
<b>Total Military Personnel (Sec 431)</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>68,696.66</b>	<b>200.20</b>	<b>68,896.86</b>	<b>68,896.86</b>	<b>68,896.86</b>	<b>190.13</b>
<b>GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>							
<b>DIVISION B</b>							
Military Construction, Army	472.72	472.72	66.90	539.62	-	539.62	10.57
Military Construction, Navy	488.09	488.09	44.40	532.48	-	532.48	4.88
Military Construction, Air Force	495.66	495.66	70.87	566.53	-	566.53	5.95
Military Construction, Defense-wide	857.41	857.41	(246.00)	611.40	-	611.40	(14.76)
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure	179.00	179.00	-	179.00	-	179.00	-

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (\$Ms)**

Account Title	Authorization		Request		Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications	Outlay Implications
	Request 1996	BA 1996	Request BA	1996				
Military Construction, Army Reserve	42.96	42.96			1.65	44.61	44.61	0.12
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	7.92	7.92			-	7.92	7.92	-
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	27.00	27.00			4.98	31.98	31.98	0.25
Military Construction, Army National Guard	18.48	18.48			66.87	85.35	85.35	1.47
Military Construction, Air National Guard	85.65	85.65			47.31	132.95	132.95	0.66
Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction	-	-			-	-	-	-
Base Realignment and Closure Account	3,897.89	3,897.89			-	3,897.89	3,897.89	-
<b>Total Military Construction</b>	<b>6,572.77</b>	<b>6,572.77</b>			<b>56.97</b>	<b>6,629.75</b>	<b>6,629.75</b>	<b>9.15</b>
Family Housing, Army	43.50	43.50			11.04	54.54	54.54	0.34
Family Housing Support, Army	1,337.60	1,337.60			12.01	1,349.61	1,349.61	9.61
Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps	465.76	465.76			-	465.76	465.76	-
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	1,048.33	1,048.33			12.01	1,060.34	1,060.34	7.57
Family Housing, Air Force	249.00	249.00			20.95	269.95	269.95	1.05
Family Housing Support, Air Force	849.21	849.21			12.01	861.23	861.23	7.90
Family Housing, Defense-wide	25.77	25.77			-	25.77	25.77	-
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	30.47	30.47			-	30.47	30.47	-
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense	75.59	75.59			-	75.59	75.59	-
Sec 2809-Authority to convey Family Housing	-	-			5.00	5.00	5.00	2.86
<b>Total Family Housing</b>	<b>4,125.22</b>	<b>4,125.22</b>			<b>73.03</b>	<b>4,198.25</b>	<b>4,198.25</b>	<b>29.33</b>

**SUMMARY OF NATIONAL  
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1996 (SMs)**

Account Title	Authorization Request 1996	Request BA 1996	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications	Outlay Implications
<b>DIVISION C</b>						
<b>TITLE XXXI-DOE</b>						
Weapons Activities	3,540.18	3,540.18	101.64	3,641.81	3,641.81	71.15
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	198.40	198.40	-	198.40	198.40	-
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Manage	6,008.00	6,008.00	-	6,008.00	6,008.00	-
Other Defense Activities	1,432.16	1,432.16	(101.64)	1,330.52	1,330.52	(71.15)
Salaries and Expenses	18.50	18.50	-	18.50	18.50	-
<b>Total DOE</b>	<b>11,197.24</b>	<b>11,197.24</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11,197.24</b>	<b>11,197.24</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>TITLE XXXIV</b>						
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Memo En	-	(150.00)	-	-	(150.00)	-
<b>OTHER</b>						
Salaries and Expenses	44.01	44.01	(44.01)	-	-	(37.41)
Emergency Management Planning and Assistance	24.03	24.03	(24.03)	-	-	(10.81)
FEMA Civil Defense (Total)	68.03	68.03	(68.03)	-	-	(48.22)
<b>RECAPITULATION</b>						
Department of Defense (Division A)	167,517.08	236,019.93	7,057.45	243,271.19	243,077.38	1,432.91
Department of Defense (Division B)	10,698.00	10,698.00	130.00	10,828.00	10,828.00	38.47
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund	-	(150.00)	-	-	(150.00)	-
Other Funds	28.01	483.00	(28.01)	-	454.99	(26.61)
Offsetting Receipts	-	(1,207.79)	-	-	(1,207.79)	-
Total DoD Military (051)	178,243.09	245,843.14	7,159.44	254,099.19	253,002.58	1,444.78
Total Atomic Energy Defense Act (053)	11,197.24	11,197.24	-	11,197.24	11,197.24	0.00
Total Other Defense (054)	68.03	562.26	(68.03)	-	494.23	(48.22)
<b>Total National Defense Function (050)</b>	<b>189,508.36</b>	<b>257,602.64</b>	<b>7,091.41</b>	<b>265,296.42</b>	<b>264,694.04</b>	<b>1,396.56</b>

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
AUTHORIZATION**

**TITLE I—PROCUREMENT**

The committee's concerns over continually declining defense budgets and the impact of these lower budgets on long-term readiness was reinforced during both committee and subcommittee hearings. The senior leaders of the military services repeatedly expressed their concerns about the effects that sharply reduced funding for modernization would have on future capabilities.

Procurement accounts, including the current budget request, have been cut 44 percent since fiscal year 1992, and the current budget request does not provide sufficient funds to address the needs of long-term readiness (modernization). Basic items of equipment have not been procured in sufficient quantities. Requirements for additional operating funds have grown sharply in order to support the higher costs of maintaining older equipment in reliable operating condition.

The committee has given priority to increasing the modernization accounts in order to buy the weapons and equipment needed to fight and win decisively with minimal risk to personnel. The committee has utilized the following precepts in allocating congressional increases to the defense budget:

- buy basics;
- invest to achieve savings; and
- invest in the future.

The committee notes that procurement of basic weapons and items of equipment has been neglected during the decline in defense spending. Consequently, the committee recommended increases in such basic items as new ships, trucks, small arms and upgrades to weapon systems and items of equipment already in the inventory.

To avoid creating "bow-waves" of funding that the military services could not afford in the outyears, the committee has recommended increases for weapons and items of equipment currently in production and the use of multiyear procurement contracts, as well as a new concept of "split-funding" for ships, where savings might be achieved. Buying more weapons and equipment currently in production at more efficient rates lowers overall costs to the government. It also avoids overlapping procurement sequencing and reduces competition for procurement resources in the future.

In summary, the committee's recommendation reprioritizes the defense budget to ensure an appropriate balance between near-term readiness and long-term readiness (modernization). The committee also recommends a level of funding for research and development to assure U.S. military superiority in the future.

#### Budget requests for weapons and equipment

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the military services frequently fail to request funding for essential weapons and equipment, believing that the Congress will provide the necessary funds through the legislative process.

This practice of not funding essential weapons and equipment, commonly known as “gold-watching”, occurs more frequently as the budgets of the military services decline and they are hard-pressed to find the funds necessary to fill their requirements. All the military services have employed this practice in some form or other, and the Department of Defense apparently has not exerted appropriate discipline in order to bring this fiscal “gaming” under control.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the budget requests of the military services as well as that of defense agencies in order to eliminate the practice of “gold-watching”. Where sufficient funds are not requested for essential weapons and items of equipment, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Military Service will include a statement explaining why the weapon or item of equipment was not funded or severely underfunded.

#### Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 1996 and the committee’s actions in regard to the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense’s budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures.

### **SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS**

#### **Section - 107. Chemical demilitarization program.**

The budget request included \$854.7 million for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program for operation and maintenance (\$393.9 million), procurement (\$299.4 million), research and development of alternative technologies for the unitary and nonstockpile chemical agents (\$53.4 million), and military construction (\$108.0 million).

The committee recommends a reduction of \$170.0 million to the budget request, \$75.0 million from the procurement account, defense-wide and \$95.0 million from the military construction account, defense-wide. The committee’s recommendation is based on the information provided to it that funds appropriated in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 and allocated for procurement and military construction for the Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility have not been obligated because of delays caused by the lack of environmental permits from the State of Alabama, as well as other contracting, fiscal, and political considerations.

*Use of Unobligated Fiscal Year 1994 and 1995 Funds*

The recent decision of the Department of Defense and the Army to place Fort McClellan, Alabama, on the base closure list has caused a delay in the issuance of environmental permits by the State of Alabama, and resulted in the inability to award contracts for the Anniston facility. The committee recommends that unobligated fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 funds in the procurement and military construction accounts which have been allocated for use at the Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility be reallocated for procurement of equipment and facilities design and construction at Pine Bluff, Arkansas and Umatilla, Oregon.

*Transportation of the Unitary Stockpile*

The committee also directs the Department of Defense to conduct a study to assess the risk associated with transportation of the unitary stockpile from one location to another within the continental United States. The study shall also include the following: the results of the physical and chemical integrity report conducted by the Army on the existing stockpile; a determination of the viability of transportation of any portion of the stockpile, to include drained agent from munitions and the munitions. The report shall consider the safety, cost-effectiveness, and public acceptability of transporting the stockpile, in its current configuration, or in alternate configurations.

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>						
	<b>AIRCRAFT</b>						
	<b>FIXED WING</b>						
1	ARL (TIARA)	1	18,403				18,403
2	C21A AIRCRAFT						
3	C-XX (MEDIUM RANGE) AIRCRAFT			4	23,000	4	23,000
4	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR (TIARA)		6,014				6,014
	<b>ROTARY</b>						
5	TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING						
6	AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE)		3,268				3,268
7	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	60	526,041	(10)	(53,216)	50	472,825
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(191,161)				(191,161)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
9	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING		458				458
	<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>						
	<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>						
10	TRACTOR DEW						
11	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)		48,969				48,969
12	AH1F MODS		2,165				2,165
13	AH-64 MODS		53,596				53,596
14	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		14,081				14,081
15	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		675				675
16	OH-58 MODS		2,886				2,886
17	C-30 AIRCRAFT MODS		929				929
18	LONGBOW		421,406		82,000		503,406
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(79,438)				(79,438)
19	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		12,879				12,879
20	UH-1 MODS		4,975				4,975
21	UH-1 HUEY SLEP						
22	UH-60 MODS		19,300				19,300
23	KOWA WARRIOR		71,334				71,334
24	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS		38,049				38,049
25	AIRBORNE AVIONICS		30,424				30,424
26	ASE MODS		4,216				4,216
27	MODIFICATIONS < \$2.0M		1,862				1,862
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>						
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>						
28	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		49,177				49,177
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>						
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</b>						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
29	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS		22,304				22,304
	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT						
	OTHER SUPPORT						
30	AVIONICS COMMAND & CONTROL		3,981				3,981
31	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,168				22,168
32	TRAINING DEVICES		37,206				37,206
33	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		30,839		(3,400)		27,139
34	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (ALSE)		9,732				9,732
35	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		8,187				8,187
36	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,826				2,826
37	AVIONICS COMMUNICATIONS		25,897				25,897
38	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT						
	<b>Total</b>		1,223,087		173,384		1,396,451
<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>							
<b>OTHER MISSILES</b>							
<b>SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM</b>							
1	HAWK SYSTEM SUMMARY		5,070				5,070
2	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY						
3	STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY		31,441				31,441
4	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY						
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
4	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
5	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	352	209,460	750	40,000	1,102	249,460
6	ANTITANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
6	JAVELIN (AAWR-AR) SYSTEM SUMMARY	557	171,428	453	39,000	1,010	210,428
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
7	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY						
8	MLRS ROCKET		7,378	1,000	20,000	1,000	27,378
9	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS		3,086	1,500	43,000	1,500	46,086
9	MLRS TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS		48,158		48,000		96,158
10	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS	91	106,971	29	18,000	120	124,971
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
<b>MODIFICATIONS</b>							
11	PATRIOT MODS		6,988				6,988
12	STINGER MODS		10,096		10,000		20,096
13	AVENGER MODS						
14	TOW MODS		33,358				33,358
15	MLRS MODS		17,996				17,996

Line No.	Title	FY 1998 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
16	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
17	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		11,841				11,841
18	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		6,791				6,791
19	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (MISSILES)		1,000				1,000
20	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION		1,683				1,683
21	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		3,876				3,876
22	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	<b>Totals</b>		676,430		218,000		894,430
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY							
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES							
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD		3,115				3,115
2	BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (MYP)						
3	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT		138,308				138,308
4	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES						
5	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)		1,872				1,872
6	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES		6,259				6,259
7	ARMORED GUN SYSTEM (AGS)		141,551				141,551
8	M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP)	26					
9	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE						
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES							
10	CARRIER, MOD		48,067				48,067
11	BFV SERIES (MOD)		74,336		14,000		88,336
12	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		220,239				220,239
13	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A5 (MOD)		131				131
14	FAASV PW TO FLEET		4,065				4,065
15	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)		23,492		33,900		57,392
16	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)						
17	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)		15,095				15,095
18	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)						
19	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		77,076		(25,322)		51,754
20	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		393,864		110,000		503,864
21	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (FY)		(52,373)				(52,373)
22	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		132,959				132,959
	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (MCR)						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	FY 1996 Request Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Change to Request Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Senate Authorized Amount
23	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-WTCV) SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.	581	581				581
24	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	152					152
25	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-WTCV)						
26	TANK ENGINE INDUSTRIAL BASE	11,619	11,619				11,619
27	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	1,452	1,452				1,452
28	REGIONAL MAINTENANCE TRAINING SITES-EQUIP WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
29	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
29	PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON (ROLL)	10,000	4,000	10,000	4,000	10,000	4,000
30	MOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119						
31	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	10,420	28,500	10,420	28,500	10,420	28,500
32	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	2,100	33,900	2,100	33,900	2,100	33,900
33	MORTAR, 120MM	3,007	3,007				3,007
34	M16 RIFLE	25,000	13,500	25,000	13,500	25,000	13,500
35	5.56 CARBINE M4	25,000	13,500	25,000	13,500	25,000	13,500
35b	MED MACHINE GUN MOD	1,434	6,500	1,434	6,500	1,434	6,500
36	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHL.	930					930
36	M4 CARBINE MODS						
37	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)						
38	M16 RIFLE MODS	2,842	2,842				2,842
39	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV) SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES.	1,383	1,383		1,500		2,883
40	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,150					1,150
41	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	6,049	6,049				6,049
42	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	5,574	5,574				5,574
43	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	2,428	2,428				2,428
44	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG) SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
45	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	34,343	34,343				34,343
	<b>Totals</b>	1,298,966	1,298,966		233,978		1,532,964
<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b>							
<b>AMMUNITION</b>							
<b>SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION</b>							
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	58,579	58,579				58,579
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	2,873	2,873				2,873
3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	3,837	3,837				3,837

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
4	CTG. .50 CAL. ALL TYPES		27,584				27,584
5	CTG. 20MM. ALL TYPES						
6	CTG. 25MM. ALL TYPES		35,139				35,139
6a	CTG. 25MM. HEIT M792				20,000		20,000
7	CTG. 30MM. ALL TYPES		4,289				4,289
8	CTG. 40MM. ALL TYPES		40,278				40,278
8a	CTG. 40MM. M430A1				10,000		10,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	CTG MORTAR 60MM 1/10 PRAC M766						
10	CTG MORTAR 81MM ILLUM M721	31	13,021		7,000		20,021
11	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880						
12	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE XM931	45	18,768				18,768
13	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE XM933 W/PD FUZE						
14	CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE XM829 W/MO FUZE	44	47,704		20,000		67,704
	TANK AMMUNITION						
15	CTG TANK 35MM SUBCAL PRAC M968						
16	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2				87,100		87,100
17	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1				20,000		20,000
18	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	41	29,400				29,400
19	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M866	136	91,041				91,041
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
20	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M37A1	102	3,749				3,749
21	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915						
22	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913						
23	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825		10,607				10,607
24	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	75	37,040		20,000		57,040
25	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM XM898	77	24,284				24,284
26	PROJ ARTY 155MM PRAC M804						
	MINES						
27	MINE. TRAINING. ALL TYPES		3,853				3,853
28	MINE A/TAP M87 (VOLCANO)				30,000		30,000
29	WIDE AREA MINE	134	15,000				15,000
	ROCKETS						
30	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)						
31	ROCKET. HYDRA 70. ALL TYPES		28,087				28,087
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
32	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS. ALL TYPES		26,269				26,269
33	GRENADES. ALL TYPES		27,496		6,000		27,496
34	SIGNALS. ALL TYPES		16,314				16,314

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
35	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		6,070		11,000		6,070
35a	SELECTABLE LIGHTWEIGHT ATTACK MUNITIONS, XM94						11,000
	MISCELLANEOUS						
36	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		4,100				4,100
37	M483 TO M864 CONVERSION						
38	UPGRADE/IMPROVEMENT OF AT4		3,523				3,523
39	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		855				855
40	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION						
41	EDD EXPLOSIVE ITEMS		5,000				5,000
42	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		3,925				3,925
43	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)						
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
44	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		41,906				41,906
45	COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT		1,456				1,456
46	LAYWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		13,663				13,663
47	PROVING GROUND MODERNIZATION						
48	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		51,325		45,000		51,325
48a	ARMAMENT RETOOLING & MANUFACTURING SUPPORT (ARMS)		96,280		4,000		100,280
49	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION						
50	FLEXIBLE MANUFACTURING CENTERS		795,015		325,100		1,120,115
	<b>Totals</b>						
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		13,803				13,803
2	SEMITRAILER FB BR/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T						
3	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G						
4	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 1 1/2 4WHL M129A2	58	3,179				3,179
5	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHELD VEH (HMMWV)(MYP)	548	57,690				129,690
6	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (MYP)		39,692	1,300	72,000	1,845	149,692
7	HEAVY EQUIPMENT TRANSPORTER, SYS				110,000		
8	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (MYP)		596		125,000		125,596
9	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (COMBAT SPT) TAC						
10	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC (GMESPT) (PREV S				30,000		30,000
11	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		2,802				2,802
12	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 OM (TAC VEH)		200				200
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
13	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		994				994
14	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	41	993				993
15	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		993				993
16	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PRO		4,189				4,189
17	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT		697				697
18	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)		2,000				2,000
19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
20	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USRDCOM)		2,271				2,271
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
21	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM		78,232				78,232
22	SAT TERM. EMLUT	618	17,498				17,498
23	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM	15,026	32,502				32,502
24	GROUND COMMAND POST		1,049				1,049
25	SMART-T		66,714				66,714
26	SCAMP		25,816				25,816
27	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		4,166				4,166
	COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM						
28	MSE MOD IN SERVICE		14,683				14,683
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
29	COMMAND CENTER IMPROVEMENT PROG (CCIP)		920				920
30	SOUTHCOM C3 UPGRADE		11,424				11,424
31	STD THEATER CMD & CONTROL SYS (STACCS)		14,526		3,300		17,826
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
32	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS)		19,988		25,000		44,988
33	MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE)		3,477				3,477
34	SINCGARS FAMILY		310,620		54,100		364,720
35	SW ASIA COMM INFRASTRUCTURE						
36	EAC COMMUNICATIONS		5,896				5,896
37	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EAC COMM)		11,637				11,637
38	TAC RADIO	700	24,803				24,803
39	C-E CONTRINGENCY/FIELDING EQUIP		5,108				5,108
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
40	TSEC - INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY		11,105				11,105
41	TSEC - JCSE EQUIP						
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
42	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		9,596				9,596

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Setsis Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
43	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		2,205				2,205
44	DEFENSE DATA NETWORK (DDN)		4,927				4,927
45	ELECTRONIC COMP PROG (EMCP)		498				498
46	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		4,811				4,811
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
47	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		64,142				64,142
48	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		7,983				7,983
49	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)		61,547				61,547
50	PENTAGON TELECOM CTR (PTC)		2,741		2,800		2,741
	ELECT EQUIP - MAT FOR INT PRDG (INEIPL)						
51	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)		536				536
52	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)		29,409				29,409
53	ITEMS LESS THAN 42.0M (INTEL SPT) - TIARA		2,826				2,826
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT RELACT (TIARA)						
54	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)		9,886		6,400		16,286
55	COMMANDERS TACTICAL TERM (CTT) (TIARA)	33	11,314		18,700		30,014
56	HF COMINT SYSTEM (TIARA)						
57	NEW - GMD BASE COMMON SENSORS (TIARA)		46,937				46,937
58	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONN PROGRAM (DARP)		82,984				82,984
59	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)		6,954				6,954
60	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	5					
61	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)						
62	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABIL						
63	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION		4,617				4,617
64	TROJAN (TIARA)		30,914				30,914
65	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)		19,313				19,313
66	ITEMS LESS THAN 42.0M (TIARA)		19,491				19,491
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EJEW)		517				517
67	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EJEW)						
68	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASUR						
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV (ITAC SURV)		2,582				2,582
69	LT SPEC DIV INTERNM SENSOR (LSDIS)						
70	FAAD GBS		44,678		19,200		63,878
71	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	8	77,132		8,000		85,132
72	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS						
73	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		12,364				12,364
74	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (ITAC SURV)		26,860				26,860
75	LIGHTWEIGHT LEADER COMPUTER (LLC)						
76	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR XM-23		5,019				5,019

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
77	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS	12	7,029				7,029
78	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	221	30,897				30,897
79	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION						
80	INITIAL FIRE SPT AUTOMATIC SYSTEM (IFSAS)						
81	COMBAT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	29	5,915				5,915
82	COMPS/THEATER ADP SVC CTR (CTASC)						
83	FAAD C2	5	32,942				32,942
84	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)						
85	COMMON HARDWARE SOFTWARE						
86	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)						
87	LOGTECH						
88	ISYCON EQUIPMENT						
89	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	152	13,178				13,178
90	STAMMS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)				5,000		
91	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION	1,830	23,485				23,485
92	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP						
93	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS LAOJL						
94	APRTS						
95	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (A/M)						
96	ELECT EQUIP - TEST MEAS/DIAG EQUIP (ITMDEI)						
97	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT						
98	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)						
99	TIME MODERNIZATION (TMOD)						
100	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
101	INITIAL SPARES - PEO CCS						
102	INITIAL SPARES - PEO COMM						
103	INITIAL SPARES - PEO IEW						
104	INITIAL SPARES - PEO STAMIS						
105	INITIAL SPARES - NON PEO						
106	ARMY PRINTING AND BINDING EQUIPMENT						
107	INSTALLATION C4 UPGRADE (ICU)						
108	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
109	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
110	SMAP COLL PROT EQUIP M20						
111	COLL PROT EQUIP, NBC TEMPER, TENT M28						
112							
113							
114							
115							
116							
117							
118							
119							
120							
121							
122							
123							
124							
125							
126							
127							
128							
129							
130							
131							
132							
133							
134							
135							
136							
137							
138							
139							
140							
141							
142							
143							
144							
145							
146							
147							
148							
149							
150							
151							
152							
153							
154							
155							
156							
157							
158							
159							
160							
161							
162							
163							
164							
165							
166							
167							
168							
169							
170							
171							
172							
173							
174							
175							
176							
177							
178							
179							
180							
181							
182							
183							
184							
185							
186							
187							
188							
189							
190							
191							
192							
193							
194							
195							
196							
197							
198							
199							
200							
201							
202							
203							
204							
205							
206							
207							
208							
209							
210							
211							
212							
213							
214							
215							
216							
217							
218							
219							
220							
221							
222							
223							
224							
225							
226							
227							
228							
229							
230							
231							
232							
233							
234							
235							
236							
237							
238							
239							
240							
241							
242							
243							
244							
245							
246							
247							
248							
249							
250							
251							
252							
253							
254							
255							
256							
257							
258							
259							
260							
261							
262							
263							
264							
265							
266							
267							
268							
269							
270							
271							
272							
273							
274							
275							
276							
277							
278							
279							
280							
281							
282							
283							
284							
285							
286							
287							
288							
289							
290							
291							
292							
293							
294							
295							
296							
297							
298							
299							
300							
301							
302							
303							
304							
305							
306							
307							

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Authorized Amount
109	MASK, PROTECTIVE, NBC M40/M42						
110	REMOTE SENSING CHEMICAL AGENT ALARM XM21						
111	IMPROVED CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR						
112	AUTO CHEMICAL AGENT ALARM (ACADA), XM22						
113	DECONTAMINATE APP PWR DR LT WT M17						
114	GEN SAK MECH:INTRZD DUAL PURP XM56						
115	GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH XM88	34	12,698				12,698
116	GEN SET, SMOKE, MECH: PUL JET, XM157	170	5,214				5,214
117	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEM (DPA-3)						
118	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM INDIGING EQUIPMENT						
119	MINION BRIDGE ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT		3,828				3,828
120	DISPENSE, MINE M139						
121	METALLIC MINE DETECTOR, VEHICLE MOUNTED COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		953				953
122	AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITY						
123	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM		3,176				3,176
124	CHEM/BIO PROTECTIVE SHELTER						
125	SPACE HEATER		1,440				1,440
126	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	290					
127	FORCE PROVIDER	2	12,275				12,275
128	REFRIGERATION EQUIPMENT		2,562				2,562
129	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000 (CSS-EQ) PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT		2,222				2,222
130	LAB PETROLEUM MODULAR BASE	1	2,786				2,786
131	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		1,115				1,115
132	HEMITT AVIATION REFUELING SYSTEM	21	648				648
133	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000 (POL) WATER EQUIPMENT		5,537				5,537
134	PWD AREA WTR POINT SUP SYSTEM	148	2,692				2,692
136	SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	387	3,953				3,953
138	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000 (WATER EQ) MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		2,394				2,394
137	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT		14,310				14,310
138	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	71	1,778				1,778
139	TOOL OUTRT HYDRAULIC REPAIR 3/4 TRL MTD						
140	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000 (MAINT EQ)		1,450				1,450

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
141	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT.						
142	COMPACTOR 14-SPEED TAMP SELF PROP (CCE)	47	7,115				7,115
143	ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	18	9,938				9,938
144	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	7	1,987				1,987
145	CRANE, WHEEL MTD, 25T, 3/4 CU YD, RT ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (CONST EQUIP)		1,981				1,981
146	RAIL FLOAT CONTAMINERIZATION EQUIPMENT.						
147	PUSHER TUG, SMALL	1	3,576				3,576
148	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON						
149	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS						
150	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 100 TON ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) GENERATORS.	238	11,767				11,767
151	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP				35,000		48,761
152	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT.						
153	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 50000 LB	33	10,928				10,928
154	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARTICULATING SYSTEM ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (MHE)	112	14,403				14,403
155	TRAINING EQUIPMENT.		2,843				2,843
156	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		22,208				22,208
157	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		71,561				71,561
158	SMANET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.		30,655				30,655
159	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS		12,616				12,616
160	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA-3)		6,190				6,190
161	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)		10,030				10,030
162	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT						
163	ARMS CONTROL COMPLIANCE						
164	COMBINED DEFENSE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (CDIP)						
165	MODIFICATION OF M-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)		21,911				21,911
166	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		1,836				1,836
167	INDUSTRIAL MODERNIZATION INCENTIVE PROG						
168	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		9,165				9,165
169	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (OTH SFT EQ)						
170	OPA INITIAL SPARES						
171	TRACTOR VAPOR						
172	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION		2,223				2,223
173	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	QPA1						
174	INITIAL SPARES - TSV		1,093				1,093
	QPA2						
175	INITIAL SPARES - C&E		82,994				82,994
	QPA3						
176	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP		2,038				2,038
	<b>Total</b>		<b>2,256,601</b>		<b>514,500</b>		<b>2,771,101</b>

**Section - 111. AH-64D Longbow Apache Attack helicopter.**

The budget request included \$354.0 million to buy 18 AH-64D aircraft and 13 Longbow fire control radars. The program would buy 227 fire control radars by 2002 and 758 AH-64D by 2012. The committee is advised that fielding of the Longbow Apache aircraft to high priority units can be accelerated significantly with substantial savings by providing for multiyear procurement for fiscal years 1996 through fiscal year 2000.

The Army indicates that the proposed multiyear plan would:

- increase fiscal years 1996 to 2000 production from 182 to 240 aircraft—an additional 58 aircraft—which allows fielding 86 percent of active duty force package one units within the five year period versus the current plan which fields only 57 percent;
- lower the unit cost from \$13.3 million to \$10.6 million per aircraft; ramps up to most efficient production rates while taking advantage of economic order quantities; and
- provide for estimated savings of up to \$630.0 million over five years and potential savings of \$1,000.0 million over the life of the program.

The committee understands that an additional \$82.0 million is required for fiscal year 1996, \$16.0 million in fiscal year 1999, and \$43.0 million in fiscal year 2000 in order to execute the proposed multiyear.

The committee recommends an increase of \$82.0 million for fiscal year 1996 and directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure necessary funding is provided in future years to execute the multiyear procurement. The committee recommends a provision that would provide authorization for multiyear procurement of the AH-64D Longbow Apache helicopter.

**Section - 112. OH-58D AHIP Scout helicopter.**

The budget request included \$71.3 million to retrofit 33 OH-58D's to the armed configuration. No funds were included for conversion of OH-58A to the much more capable OH-58D Kiowa Warrior. The Army is still far short of its requirement for 507 Kiowa Warrior scout helicopters and the Comanche program is unfortunately, once again experiencing program delays. Therefore, the committee considers it imprudent to terminate production of the Army's only scout helicopter and recommends an additional authorization of \$125.0 million for 20 OH-58D Kiowa Warrior aircraft. The committee recommends a provision that would repeal current law to permit this procurement.

**Section - 113. Hydra 70 Rocket.**

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for procurement of Hydra 70 rockets. However, no funds may be expended until the Army certifies the rocket motor failure problem has been corrected and alternative motor systems have been examined.

The conference report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 noted limitations of the current Hydra 70 rocket and encouraged investigation of non-developmental motor systems in the section pertaining to advanced rocket systems.

## **OTHER ARMY PROGRAMS**

### **Army Aircraft**

#### **C-XX Mid-Range turboprop aircraft**

The committee recommends an increase of \$23.0 million for competitive procurement by the Army of four new production C-XX Mid-Range turboprop aircraft. The Army has identified the C-XX Mid-Range program as its highest priority fixed wing program due to cost and operational efficiencies. These efficiencies will be achieved by the procurement of the C-XX planes in conjunction with the retirement of older turboprops as well as the enhanced level of standardization in the Army's aviation fleet, thus reducing training and support costs.

#### **UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter**

Current Army plans would terminate UH-60 production after the procurement of 60 UH-60 helicopters included in the fiscal year 1996 budget request, the final year of a five-year multiyear procurement.

The committee believes it is necessary to continue production of UH-60 helicopters to maintain a production base until the Comanche helicopter is ready for procurement. With continually declining defense budgets, the Army is unable to afford to buy UH-60's at the annual levels within the current multiyear contract. The committee is convinced that the Army and the contractor should work together toward a future multiyear contract at annual levels which the Army can afford and at which the contractor can produce the aircraft efficiently.

The committee recommends an authorization of \$281.7 million for approximately 50 UH-60 helicopters.

### **Army Missile**

#### **Hellfire missile**

The budget request included \$197.5 million to procure 352 Longbow Hellfire missiles and \$12.0 million for post-production support, for a total of \$209.5 million. Due to funding shortfalls, the Army has stopped production of the Hellfire II missile despite the fact that stocks are well short of the requirement for 6,000 missiles. The committee notes that the Army could take advantage of favorable contract options by using the \$12.0 million of post-production support funds plus an additional \$40.0 million to procure 750 additional Hellfire II missiles.

The committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million for a total of \$249.5 million, \$52.0 million of which is for the procurement of 750 Hellfire II missiles.

#### **Javelin medium anti-tank weapon**

The budget request included \$171.4 million which would procure 557 Javelin missiles. The committee is pleased with reports of the performance of the Javelin anti-tank system, but notes that a reduction in fiscal year 1996 funding in the budget request resulted in a decrease of \$39.0 million from previously planned levels. Res-

toration of these funds would provide for the procurement of an additional 453 missiles—a 45 percent increase in missiles for an 18 percent increase in funds. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$39.0 million for Javelin procurement.

#### **TOW missile**

The budget request included \$7.4 million for plant closure and production support of prior year TOW missile deliveries. No funds were requested for continued TOW missile production. The TOW remains the centerpiece antiarmor weapon of U.S. ground forces. Under current Army plans, a replacement for the TOW missile will not be fielded until sometime after 2003. As a result of normal shelf-life aging and the expenditure of missiles in training and testing, the TOW missile inventory will fall below levels required to equip contingency forces by 2003. The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to procure 1,000 TOW 2B missiles.

#### **Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS)**

The committee provided funds in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995 to procure MLRS launchers and associated equipment for an MLRS battalion for the Army National Guard. Unfortunately, the funds provided were not sufficient to complete fielding the entire battalion. The committee recommends an increase of \$16.4 million to recondition nine MLRS launchers and provide ancillary equipment to complete fielding of the MLRS battalion in the South Carolina National Guard. The committee continues to support the conversion of artillery battalions to MLRS battalions, and recommends an increase of \$48.0 million to recondition 29 more MLRS launchers and provide necessary equipment for another MLRS battalion.

The committee has strongly supported the expeditious fielding of the Extended Range-MLRS (ER-MLRS) rocket to assist in overcoming range deficiencies in U.S. Army artillery. The ER-MLRS rocket will extend the range of the MLRS from 30 to 45 kilometers. The committee recommends an increase of \$43.0 million dollars to produce 1500 extended range rockets in fiscal year 1996. The committee directs that in meeting requirements, the Secretary of the Army continue the successful arrangement for procurement of MLRS rockets, including rocket motor cases and warhead metal parts by sustaining the current production team.

The committee is aware of the Army's proposal to initiate foreign military sales (FMS) of the Extended Range MLRS (ER-MLRS) during low rate initial production. The committee understands that the initial funded ER-MLRS production levels will be well below the industrial capacity. Utilizing this unused production capacity for FMS will result in better efficiency for U.S. production. The committee supports this initiative to use FMS production to benefit the U.S. planned program.

#### **Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)**

The budget request included \$106.97 million for 91 ATACMS missiles (50 block I, 41 block IA). The block IA missile is the version which provides exceptionally greater capability in terms of ex-

tended range. The committee has consistently supported ATACMS and was impressed by its performance in the Persian Gulf War.

The committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million to procure 29 additional extended range ATACMS missiles (50 block I, 70 block IA).

#### **Stinger missile modifications**

The budget request included \$10.1 million for the modification of 650 Stinger missiles. These retrofits will increase overall missile performance in certain engagement situations and resolve a key aviation deficiency which requires aviation platforms to super elevate. The committee is informed that current funding is inadequate to provide economical production rates for the Block 1 retrofit program and could cause shutdown of critical elements of the industrial and technical base.

The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million to retrofit Block 1 upgrades to an additional 650 Stinger missiles, and \$3.0 million to modify 45 percent of Force Package I platforms to accommodate the Block 1 configured missiles.

### **Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles**

#### **M113 family of vehicles (FOV)**

The budget request included \$48.1 million to continue the modernization of the M113 armored personnel carrier family of vehicles. The committee fully supports the Army's efforts to upgrade the M113 FOV. M113A3 family vehicles are used by the Army for a variety of critical combat, logistical, and command and control functions within its heavy divisions. In fiscal year 1995, the Army proposed a five-year, level-funded program to continue to upgrade this critical armored vehicle fleet. However, the Army's fiscal year 1996 request reflects a decrease of \$20.0 million in fiscal year 1997. The committee remains convinced that the level-funded program is far more advantageous for the Army. The Army is directed to restore the \$20.0 million to the fiscal year 1997 program, and ensure that the fully-funded program is reflected in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

#### **Bradley fighting vehicle**

The budget request included \$138.3 million for the Bradley Base Sustainment Program. The committee notes that no funding is provided for continuing the upgrade of the oldest configuration of the Bradley fighting vehicle (BFV), the A0, to the more modern, survivable A2 version. Under current plans, there will still be approximately 2,000 of the A0 BFV's in the fleet, when the upgrade program would be terminated. Even with a reduced force structure, the Army will not be able to fill its total BFV requirement.

The committee believes this plan to terminate A0 to A2 BFV upgrades may be premature, since the A0's lack the survivability and improvements needed for the modern battlefield. Commanders in Operation Desert Storm demanded the more modern configuration when facing actual combat. It is also likely that significant operation and support cost savings can be realized by continuing to modernize the BFV fleet. The committee believes the Army should

consider continuation of the A0 to A2 BFV upgrade program, and directs the Army to submit a plan which addresses funding profile and procurement strategy for continuation of the upgrade program. The plan should be submitted with the fiscal year 1997 budget.

The committee also recommends an increase of \$14.0 million to buy one battalion set of reactive armor tiles for BFV.

#### **Improved Recovery Vehicle (IRV)**

The budget request included \$23.5 million to procure nine M88A1E1 Improved Recovery Vehicles (IRV). The IRV is a product-improved tank recovery vehicle capable of independent recovery (lift, winch and tow) of the Abrams series tank. Fielding of the IRV is essential for battlefield recovery of the latest, heavier (70 ton) M1A1 and M1A2 Abrams tanks. Fielding of the IRV has been delayed due to lack of modernization funds in the Army.

The committee recommends an increase of \$33.9 million to procure 12 more IRV's for the Army.

#### **M1A2 tank upgrades**

The budget request included \$473.8 million for 100 M1A2 tank upgrades for the Army. Section 111(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 authorized the use of multiyear procurement contracts for the M1A2 tank upgrade program. The committee continues to be supportive of multiyear procurement but notes that the Army has not proposed such a strategy in the fiscal year 1996 budget.

The committee believes that procurement of tracked combat vehicles (TCV) now and in the future must continue to maintain a proper balance between the heavy and medium portions of the fleet. The Army needs to field required modern equipment and to protect critical elements of the industrial base as well. The committee is concerned that multiyear contracting for the tank upgrade program could result in an unbalanced TCV procurement program if currently projected future budget increases do not materialize. This would occur if funds committed to multiyear contracts consumed the major share of a smaller than currently projected TCV procurement account. The committee, therefore, insists that any multiyear procurement proposals must include sufficient flexibility in both quantity of upgrades and funding to ensure appropriate balance in future TCV procurement. The committee directs the Army Acquisition Executive to demonstrate to the defense committees how this flexibility is achieved before he agrees to multiyear contracts for M1A2 tank upgrades.

The National Defense Authorization Act Fiscal Year 1995 also included a provision (section 112) which directed the Army to transfer 24 M1A1 common tanks to the Marine Corps Reserve in conjunction with receipt of an additional 24 M1A2 tank upgrades provided to the Army by an increase of \$108.0 million to the Abrams upgrade program. The intent of the committee, according to the report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1995 (S. Rept. 103-282) and of the conferees, according to the statement of managers in the conference report accompanying that Act (H. Rept. 103-701), was that the transfer in fiscal year 1995 was the first year of a two-year program to eliminate a short-

fall of 48 tanks in the Marine Corps Reserve tank battalions. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$110.0 million for 24 additional M1A2 tank upgrades for the Army. The Army is directed to transfer 24 additional M1A1 common tanks to the Marine Corps Reserve in accordance with procedures set out in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

**Small arms programs**

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 directed the Secretary of the Army to enter into multiyear contracts for the MK-19 Grenade machine gun, the M-16A2 rifle, the M-249 squad automatic weapon, and the M-4 Carbine in fiscal year 1996 if he did not do so in fiscal year 1995. Despite congressional direction, the Army did not request any funds for small arms in the fiscal year 1996 budget request.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to comply with congressional direction for multiyear procurements and recommends increases for fiscal year 1996 as indicated below for these programs:

- MK-19: \$33.9 million for approximately 2100 weapons.
- M-249: \$28.5 million for approximately 10,420 weapons.
- M-16A2: \$13.5 million for approximately 25,000 weapons.
- M-4: \$13.5 million for approximately 25,000 weapons.

The committee is aware of a requirement for the Army to procure approximately 1434 modification kits for medium machine guns, and recommends an increase of \$6.5 million for this procurement.

The committee also understands that there is an outstanding requirement for M-9 9mm Personal Defense Weapons, and recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for approximately 10,000 pistols.

The committee is also aware of a requirement for a universal mounting bracket for the MK-19, and recommends an increase of \$1.5 million within program modifications under \$2 million, to begin initial production of a nondevelopmental universal bracket, and \$0.5 million in program element 604802 to type-classify this bracket.

**7.62 millimeter medium machine gun**

The committee understands that the Army has a requirement to upgrade its current 7.62 millimeter medium machine gun. The committee further understands that the requirement for non-vehicular, 7.62 millimeter machine guns is in excess of 20,000 weapons for the Army's current force structure. Therefore, to ensure the viability of the U.S. small arms industrial base, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that long-term production to meet this requirement will be done in the United States.

**Army Ammunition**

**Army ammunition**

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Army ammunition procurement:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Millions</i>
7.62mm .....	\$10.0

<i>Item</i>	<i>Millions</i>
25mm M792 HEIT .....	20.0
40mm M430A1 .....	10.0
60mm Illum M721 .....	7.0
120mm APFSDS-T M829A2 .....	87.1
120mm M830A1 HEAT-MP-T .....	20.0
120mm M929 (HV MORT) .....	20.0
155mm M795 (ex rge) .....	20.0
HYDRA 70 M264 (smoke) .....	20.0
M87A1 (Volcano) .....	30.0
BDM .....	15.0
SLAM XM94 .....	9.5
SLAM XM94 (SOCOM) .....	1.5
Demolition Items .....	6.0
Conventional Demilitarization .....	4.0
Subtotal .....	280.1

### **Selectable Lightweight Attack Munition XM94**

The committee recommends an addition of \$11.0 million for procurement of the Selectable Lightweight Attack Munition (SLAM). Of this amount, \$9.5 million shall be available for Army SLAM inventory, and \$1.5 million shall be available for the Special Operations Command.

### **Procurement of M-795 artillery projectile**

The committee recognizes a need to provide land combat forces with extended range artillery munitions, and recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to procure the M-795 round.

The committee also recognizes the value of soliciting competitive bids for procurement items, and directs the Secretary of the Army to consider competition among public and private entities for procurement of this item.

### **Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS)**

The committee recommends an increase of \$45.0 million to compensate for unobligated funds rescinded in 1995 to offset contingency operation expenses in the administration's emergency supplemental request.

ARMS has proven to be a highly successful program which allows DOD to avoid costs for operating and maintaining government ammunition facilities still necessary for national security requirements.

The committee strongly recommends that the DOD study an ARMS-like approach as a viable method of controlling costs at other DOD facilities.

## **Other Army Procurement**

### **High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)**

The budget request included \$57.7 million for 546 HMMWV's. These numbers are significantly reduced from levels previously presented by the Army. The need for additional HMMWV's, however, has been indicated by both the Army and the Marine Corps during testimony before the committee. The recently released Tactical Wheeled Vehicle investment strategy outlining the Army's long range acquisition strategy for its truck programs, reflects increased funding for trucks beginning in fiscal year 1997. However, funding

shortfalls in fiscal year 1996 jeopardize HMMWV production capabilities. In order to continue to fill the needs of the military services and maintain minimum levels of production, the committee recommends an increase of \$72.0 million to procure approximately 1,300 additional HMMWV's for the Army in fiscal year 1996. The committee is also concerned about the increasing age and condition of the HMMWV fleet and recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in the Army's research and development accounts to initiate prototype development of a HMMWV Extended Service Program (ESP).

#### **Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV)**

The Office of the Secretary of Defense recently published a new Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Investment Strategy (TWVIS) in response to concern expressed by all four defense committees of the Congress. This strategy described the extreme underfunding of the Army's truck fleets, the rapidly deteriorating age and condition of the fleets, and what can be accomplished at different levels of increased funding. The committee has been concerned about the Army's truck fleets for several years, and notes the increased operation and maintenance costs and declining readiness as these fleets continue in use without replacement or remanufacture.

The committee notes that the Army failed to request funds for the fifth year of a multiyear contract for the FMTV in the fiscal year 1996 budget request. The committee is aware that the Army has been forced to cut deeply into its modernization efforts in order to fund immediate readiness shortfalls resulting from inadequate budget levels. As the TWVIS indicated, "At this funding level there is no modernization \* \* \*" As a result, the fiscal year 1996 funding for FMTV procurement was reduced from \$384.0 million to \$39.7 million, which would effectively terminate this vitally-needed modernization program. The committee understands that the contractor has indicated a willingness to negotiate a production "stretch-out" if additional funding is provided in fiscal year 1996 that is less than the contractually required amount. The committee recommends an increase of \$110.0 million for the FMTV program and expects the Army and the contractor to cooperate fully in contract renegotiations to maintain favorable pricing for the government and to avoid delays in delivery of trucks to the Army. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the military services' truck programs are adequately funded in fiscal year 1997 and throughout the Future Years Defense Plan.

#### **Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV)**

The Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Investment Strategy (TWVIS) recently forwarded to the congressional defense committees by the Secretary of Defense indicated significant problems in the Army's light, medium and heavy truck fleets. Nonetheless, the committee notes that funding provided in the Army's truck procurement account for fiscal year 1996 is far below levels provided in previous years. The amount in this account over the past ten years ranges from a high of \$917.0 million to a low of \$419.0 million and averages \$738.0 million per year. The Army's fiscal year 1996 funding is only \$128.0 million.

While the most severe problems are currently found in the medium fleet, there are serious problems in the other fleets as well. Critically important heavy fleets such as the Heavy Equipment Transporter (HET), the transporter for the Abrams main battle tank, with an estimated economic life of 14 years, reached a fleet average age of 13.1 years in 1995.

The committee, therefore, recommends increases in the amounts indicated below within the Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles budget line for the following components of the heavy vehicle fleet:

	<i>In millions</i>
—Heavy Equipment Transporters .....	\$17.0
(buys 38 HET's toward Force Package (FP)1 prepositioned ship requirements)	
—Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Trucks .....	33.0
(HEMTT 10 ton)(buys 125 wreckers and tankers for FP 1)	
—Flatracks (for Palletized Loading System) .....	30.0
(buys 2500 flatracks for PLS)	
—Yard Tractors .....	15.0
(procures 202 vehicles to replace overage fleet)	
—HEMTT 10 ton Extended Service Program (ESP) .....	30.0
(Refurbishes 196 HEMTT for FP1)	
—Total .....	\$125.0

#### **Medium truck extended service program (ESP)**

The committee is aware that the medium truck fleets (2½ ton and 5 ton) are in worse shape than the other truck fleets in the Army in terms of both age and condition. Sixty-one percent of the 2½ ton trucks and seventeen percent of the 5 ton trucks in the Army qualify for antique license plates in several states. The committee has supported programs to procure new medium trucks as well as programs to remanufacture trucks currently in the fleet. A program is currently underway to remanufacture 2½ ton trucks for the Army National Guard. Both the Army and DOD now agree that a comprehensive extended service program for medium trucks for both the active and reserve components is necessary. The Marine Corps has decided to upgrade its medium trucks through an extended service program.

The committee supports the conclusions of the recent Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Investment Strategy which endorses new vehicle procurement, as well as remanufacture with technology insertion for the light, medium and heavy truck fleets. The committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million for the medium truck extended service program.

The committee is concerned, however, about the possibility of initiating several truck remanufacture programs, thereby creating excess capacity in the industry. The committee is also concerned about the Army's past selection of firms to manufacture military trucks which had never done so, with extremely troublesome results.

The committee prefers that maximum use be made of the medium truck ESP currently underway; that separate, additional procurements be kept to a minimum to avoid industrial overcapacity; and that, for future procurements, consideration be given to reliable manufacturers who have demonstrated capabilities to produce military trucks.

In that regard, the committee expects the Army and Marine Corps requirements for medium truck ESP will be harmonized to provide for the most efficient procurement and to take maximum advantage of economies of scale.

#### **Communications and intelligence systems**

The committee is aware of several communications and intelligence systems where small investments now will provide performance enhancements and significant potential for savings. The committee recommends the following increases:

- \$3.3 million to procure CHS-2 hardware for the Army Global Command and Control System;
- \$2.8 million to accelerate procurement of the Defense Messaging System (DMS);
- \$6.4 million to initiate the CHS-2 buy and accelerate software insertion in the All Source Analysis System (ASAS);
- \$5.0 million to procure hardware to support the initial operational test and evaluation and the Task Force XXI operational evaluation for the Maneuver Control System (MCS).

#### **Army Data Distribution System (ADDS)**

The budget request included \$19.9 million for the ADDS-Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS). ADDS-EPLRS is a state-of-the-art radio network developed to provide robust, wide-area secure tactical data communication, friendly identification, and position location/navigation information. The committee is impressed with the performance of ADDS-EPLRS and recommends an increase of \$25.0 million for the procurement of 300 EPLRS units, necessary support and field testing.

#### **Single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS)**

The committee is aware of significant savings that can be achieved through accelerated procurement of SINCGARS radios. The committee recommends an increase of \$54.1 million to buy an additional 9600 radios, and urges the Army to add funds in fiscal years 1997 and 1998 to allow fielding three years earlier than planned.

#### **Commanders Tactical Terminal**

The budget request included \$11.3 million for 33 Commanders Tactical Terminals (CTT). The committee is aware of the capability of CTT to rapidly deliver critical, time-sensitive intelligence and targeting information to Army air defense, aviation, field artillery and military intelligence units. The committee notes the inefficient rates at which the CTT is being procured and recommends an increase of \$18.7 million to procure an additional 55 units.

#### **Forward area air defense-ground based sensor (FAAD-GBS)**

The budget request included \$44.7 million to procure eight FAAD-GBS systems. The committee is advised that additional funds will provide for more efficient rates of production and lower unit acquisition costs. Added funding to procure another 12 systems would lower the unit acquisition cost from \$3.7 million to \$2.7

million—a reduction of \$1.0 million per unit. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$19.2 million for a total of \$63.9 million to procure 24 systems in fiscal year 1996.

#### **Night vision devices**

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, the committee supported efforts by the Army to upgrade night weapon sights which incorporate older generation night vision technology. This support included the authorization of \$2.25 million for generation III image intensification technology which, as a direct drop-in replacement for the older tubes, would double the range of these weapons sights and increase the useful life of the image tube by a factor of five times that currently experienced. The Army is currently in the process of procuring the first 500 25 millimeter image tubes.

The committee understands that the Army has provided funding in future budgets for this upgrade program. In the interim, to ensure continuation of production of the 25 millimeter tube, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million for the Army and an increase of \$2.0 million for the Marine Corps within their respective night vision devices funding lines.

#### **Tactical quiet generators**

The committee is aware of an effort the Army has pursued for several years to replace its old, inefficient family of generators for field use. The new family of generators will be quieter and far more dependable than generators currently in use. Significant savings are anticipated through reduced maintenance and operating costs and changes in maintenance procedures resulting from the procurement of the new family of generators. The committee provides an increase of \$35.0 million to procure new, tactical, quiet generators from 5kw up to 60kw for force package 1. The committee expects the Army to include funding in fiscal years 1997 through 1999 to continue procurement through force package 2.

## SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Line No.	Title	FY 1986 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	EA-6B/REMFG (ELECTRONIC WARFARE) PROWLER				180,000		180,000
2	AV-8B (V/STOL) HARRIER	4	163,582	4	100,000	8	263,582
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(15,419)				(15,419)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		21,582				21,582
4	F/A-18C/D (FIGHTER) HORNET	12	694,101	12	564,000	24	1,258,101
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(84,197)				(84,197)
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
6	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET						
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
8	CH-53E (HELICOPTER) SUPER STALLION		236,882	3	90,000	3	236,882
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
9	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)						90,000
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
11	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA		48,022				48,022
12	SH-60B (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK		10,385				10,385
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		13,744				13,744
13	SH-60F CV (ASW HELICOPTER)						
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
14	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	3	212,589				212,589
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(41,376)				(41,376)
15	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		43,020				43,020
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
16	T-45B (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	317,143				317,143
	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(30,961)				(30,961)
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		29,902				29,902
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
18	HH-60H (HELICOPTER)		23,750				23,750
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
19	A-8 SERIES						
20	EA-6 SERIES				36,000		36,000
21	AV-8 SERIES		16,007				16,007

Line No.	Title	FY 1956 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
22	F-14 SERIES		59,047		17,100		76,147
23	ADVERSARY		153				153
24	ES-3 SERIES		20,608				20,608
25	F-1B SERIES		91,606				91,606
26	H-46 SERIES		83,665				83,665
27	H-53 SERIES		46,152				46,152
28	SH-60 SERIES		66,770				66,770
29	H-1 SERIES		54,530		13,000		67,530
30	H-3 SERIES		6,975				6,975
31	EP-3 SERIES		32,405				32,405
32	P-3 SERIES		178,557				178,557
33	S-3 SERIES		40,232				40,232
34	E-2 SERIES		19,636				19,636
35	TRAINER A/C SERIES		727				727
36	C-130 SERIES		6,939				6,939
37	FEWSG		550				550
38	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		31,354				31,354
39	E-6 SERIES		112,904				112,904
40	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		35,965				35,965
41	T-45 SERIES		4,949				4,949
42	POWER PLANT CHANGES		17,525				17,525
43	MISC FLIGHT SAFETY CHANGES		167				167
44	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		4,234		30,000		34,234
45	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		73,947				73,947
46	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
46	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		784,782				784,782
47	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
47	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		387,017				387,017
48	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		30,656				30,656
49	WAR CONSUMABLES		20,191				20,191
50	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		21,881				21,881
51	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		11,743				11,743
52	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,866				1,866
53	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	Totals		3,886,486		1,030,100		4,916,586

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	<u>BALLISTIC MISSILES</u>						
1	TRIDENT II	6	343,392				343,392
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(18,960)				(18,960)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		190,820				190,820
4	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,199				2,199
	<u>OTHER MISSILES</u>						
	<u>STRATEGIC MISSILES</u>						
5	TOMAHAWK	164	161,727		(41,700)		120,027
	<u>TACTICAL MISSILES</u>						
6	AMRAAM	115	81,691		(4,000)		77,691
7	HARPOON	30	46,368				46,368
8	JSOW		26,218				26,218
9	STANDARD MISSILE	151	231,540				231,540
10	RAM	230	69,206				69,206
11	HELLFIRE		68,620				68,620
12	AERIAL TARGETS						
13	DRONES AND DECOYS						
14	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		22,203				22,203
	<u>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</u>						
15	TOMAHAWK MODS		684				684
16	SPARROW MODS		4,338				4,338
17	SEAWINDER MODS		17,661				17,661
18	HARPOON MODS		4,370				4,370
19	HARM MODS						
20	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		35,055				35,055
	<u>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES</u>						
21	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		13,094				13,094
22	FLEET SATELLITE COMM (MYF)		51,764		30,000		81,764
23	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,012				5,012
	<u>TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT</u>						
24	MK-48 ADCAP TORPEDO (MYF)						
25	MK-50 ALWT						
26	ASW TARGETS		652				652
27	VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC (VLA)						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
27	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY) MOD. OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
28	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS		3,613				3,613
29	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		61,022				61,022
30	QUICKSTRIKE MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
31	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		31,237				31,237
32	ASW RANGE SUPPORT DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		18,128				18,128
33	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION OTHER WEAPONS		4,032				4,032
34	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		922				922
35	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS CIWS MODS		37,328				37,328
36	8754 GUN MOUNT MODS		2,805				2,805
37	MK-75 75MM GUN MOUNT MODS		901				901
38	MODS UNDER 0.2 MILLION OTHER		1,645				1,645
39	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS OTHER ORDNANCE						
40	AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		46,142				46,142
41	2.75 INCH ROCKETS		14,806				14,806
42	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		11,469				11,469
43	PRACTICE BOMBS		11,195				11,195
44	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		17,974				17,974
45	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		10,586				10,586
46	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		22,828				22,828
47	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS		871				871
48	JATOS SHIP ORDNANCE		4,940				4,940
49	5 INCH/64 GUN AMMUNITION		21,501				21,501
50	CIWS AMMUNITION		93				93
51	75MM GUN AMMUNITION		6,432				6,432
52	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION OTHER ORDNANCE		5,148				5,148
53	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		5,814				5,814
54	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		11,253				11,253

Line No.	Title	FY 1986 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount	
55	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	787	787				787	
56	SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	8,871	8,871				8,871	
57	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		64,022				64,022	
	Totals		1,787,121		(15,700)		1,771,421	
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY &amp; MARINE CORP</b>							
	<b>PROC AMMO, NAVY</b>							
	<b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>							
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS							
2	2.75 INCH ROCKETS							
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION							
4	PRACTICE BOMBS							
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES							
6	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS							
7	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES							
8	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS							
9	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL							
10	JATOS							
	<b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>							
11	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION							
12	CIWS AMMUNITION							
13	76MM GUN AMMUNITION							
14	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION							
	<b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>							
15	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO							
16	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION							
17	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES							
18	SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES							
	<b>PROC AMMO, MC</b>							
	<b>MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION</b>							
19	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES							
20	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES							
21	.50 CALIBER							
22	40 MM, ALL TYPES							
23	81 MM HE M889							
24	81 MM HE							
25	81 MM SMOKE SCREEN							

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
26	81MM ILLUMINATION (M853)						
27	120MM TPCSDS-T M865						
28	120MM TP-T M831						
29	FUZE, ET, XM762						
30	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES						
31	9 MM ALL TYPES						
32	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES						
33	AMMO MODERNIZATION MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
34	ITEMS LESS THAN 92 MIL						
	<b>Totals</b>						
	<b>SHIPBUILDING &amp; CONVERSION, NAVY</b>						
	<b>OTHER WARSHIPS</b>						
	<b>OTHER WARSHIPS</b>						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM						
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	1	1,876,102				1,876,102
2	SSN-21		(368,625)				(368,625)
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
3	NEW SSN		704,498		110,000		814,498
4	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		221,988				221,988
5	CGN REFUELING OVERHAULS		1,719				1,719
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(1,719)				(1,719)
6	DDG-51	2	2,162,457	2	650,000	4	2,812,457
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		6,800				6,800
	<b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>						
	<b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>						
8	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)			1	1,400,000	1	1,400,000
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)				(100,000)		(100,000)
8a	LHD-7						
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
	<b>MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS</b>						
	<b>MINE WARFARE AND PATROL SHIPS</b>						
10	MCS CONY						
	<b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR</b>						
	<b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM COS</b>						
11	AE(C)	2	62,130				62,130
12	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount	
13	SERVICE CRAFT		16,996				16,996	
14	OUTFITTING		144,791				144,791	
15	POST DELIVERY		174,991				174,991	
16	AFS (C)	2	47,096				47,096	
17	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		2,711				2,711	
18	SSN MAIN STEAM CONDENSERS				2,060,000			
	<b>Totals</b>		5,051,935				7,111,935	
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>							
	<b>SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>							
	<b>SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT</b>							
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE		7,973				7,973	
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		7,143				7,143	
3	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT		781				781	
4	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT GENERATORS		3,185				3,185	
5	OTHER GENERATORS		7,754				7,754	
6	PUMPS							
7	SUBMARINE PUMP RETROFIT KITS		1,014				1,014	
8	AIR COMPRESSORS							
9	HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSORS							
10	PROPELLERS							
11	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS		1,543				1,543	
12	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS							
13	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT							
14	ELEC SUSPENDED GYRO NAVIGATOR		4,108		(2,500)		1,608	
15	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		17,688		10,000		27,688	
16	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT							
17	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT PERISCOPES		14,008				14,008	
18	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		24,157				24,157	
19	OTHER SUBORDINATE EQUIPMENT							
20	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		19,652				19,652	
21	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		4,702				4,702	
22	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		104,493				104,493	
23	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT		4,539				4,539	
24	SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT							
25	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		7,347				7,347	

Line No.	Title	FY 1986 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
21	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,982				4,982
22	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		4,500				4,500
23	DSSP EQUIPMENT		6,822				6,822
24	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT		12,985				12,985
25	HMAE ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION		43,389				43,389
26	LASER ARTICULATION ROBOTIC SYSTEM (LARS)						
27	SURFACE IMA		1,407				1,407
28	DEGAUSSING EQUIPMENT						
29	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS		151				151
30	MIH/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR		990				990
31	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM						
32	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
33	REACTOR POWER UNITS						
34	REACTOR COMPONENTS						
35	OCEAN ENGINEERING		187,943				187,943
36	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT						
37	NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT		8,234				8,234
38	SMALL BOATS		4,784				4,784
39	STANDARD BOATS						
40	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		8,072				8,072
41	OTHER SHIP TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
42	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		5,388				5,388
43	OPERATING SUPPORT FACILITIES						
44	OPERATING FORCES IPE		3,258				3,258
45	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT		821				821
46	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS						
47	FLEET MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		120,452				120,452
48	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
49	SHIP RADARS						
50	AN/SPS-40		2,167				2,167
51	AN/SPS-48		10,038				10,038
52	AN/SPS-49		311				311
53	AN/SYS-0		5,283				5,283
54	MIK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM		466				466
55	RADAR SUPPORT						
56	SURFACE ELECTRO-OPTICAL SYSTEM		3,542				3,542
57	SHIP SONARS						
58	SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,349				9,349
59	AN/SOC-88 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		30,297				30,297

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
51	SSN ACOUSTICS		42,269				42,269
52	SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME						
53	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,836				25,836
54	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		9,069				9,069
55	FIM SYSTEM SONARS						
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
56	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		7,973				7,973
57	SSTD		13,781				13,781
58	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS		225				225
59	SOSUS		19,726				19,726
60	AN/SOR-18 TOWED ARRAY SONAR						
61	SURTASS		18,513				18,513
62	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER		8,358				8,358
63	CARRIER ASW MODULE		169				169
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
64	AN/WLO-32		19,076		23,000		42,076
65	AN/WLR-1		2,898				2,898
66	AN/WLR-9						
67	ICAD SYSTEMS		1,449				1,449
68	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,381				8,381
69	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES		9,840				9,840
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
70	COMBAT DF		4,967				4,967
71	OUTBOARD		1,805				1,805
72	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTEN						
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
73	AN/WLO-4		2,977				2,977
74	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		4,432				4,432
	SUBMARINE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
75	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		301				301
76	TACTICAL FLAG COMMAND CENTER		15,330				15,330
77	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		31,380				31,380
78	LINK 16 HARDWARE		15,452				15,452
79	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		5,019				5,019
80	SHALLOW WATER MCM		398				398
81	EMSP (MYP)		26,100				26,100
82	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS		1,487				1,487
83	HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS		3,578				3,578
84	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV		3,649				3,649

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
85	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP TRAINING EQUIPMENT	10,007	10,007				10,007
86	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	2,298	2,298				2,298
87	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	11,602	11,602				11,602
88	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
88	MATCAL5	1,588	1,588				1,588
89	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,704	7,704				7,704
90	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	6,659	6,659				6,659
91	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM						
92	TACAN	28	28				28
93	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,801	5,801				5,801
94	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	507	507				507
95	FACSFAC	6,388	6,388				6,388
96	ID SYSTEMS	10,202	10,202				10,202
97	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	10,248	10,248				10,248
97	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
98	TADIX-B	4,450	4,450				4,450
99	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM						
100	NATIONAL IMAGERY SUPPORT	1,292	1,292				1,292
101	NCCS ASHORE	7,730	7,730				7,730
102	RADIAC	4,877	4,877				4,877
103	GPETE	13,452	13,452				13,452
104	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	6,164	6,164				6,164
105	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	2,384	2,384				2,384
106	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	5,917	5,917				5,917
107	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION	8,558	8,558				8,558
107	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
108	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS				3,500		
109	PORTABLE RADIOS	6,635	6,635				6,635
110	SINCGARS	1,436	1,436				1,436
111	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	3,132	3,132				3,132
112	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION	6,110	6,110				6,110
112	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS	11,104	11,104				11,104
113	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	4,288	4,288				4,288
114	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	17,961	17,961				17,961
114	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
115	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
115	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS	98,099	98,099				98,099
116	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS	12,228	12,228				12,228
116	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS				14,400		

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
117	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		1,551				1,551
118	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		795				795
119	SHORE HF COMMUNICATIONS		2,361				2,361
120	WVHMCCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		34,160				34,160
121	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		4,204				4,204
122	SECURE VOICE SYSTEM		8,636				8,636
123	SECURE DATA SYSTEM		12,913				12,913
124	KEY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS		-				-
125	SIGNAL SECURITY		-				-
126	CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILL CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		5,925				5,925
127	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		-				-
128	CRYPTOLOGIC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION		-				-
129	CRYPTOLOGIC FIELD TRAINING EQUIP OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT		1,781				1,781
130	ELEC ENGINEERED MAINT (NAV/SEA)		-				-
131	ELECT ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-				-
132	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		-				-
	SOMOBUDYS		-				-
133	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)		8,902		200		200
134	AN/SSQ-83 (DIFAR)		-		(8,902)		-
135	AN/SSQ-82 (D/CASS)		-		4,100		4,100
136	AN/SSQ-110 (EER)		-		21,900		21,900
137	AN/SSQ-86 (DLC)		-		-		-
138	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS) AIR LAUNCHED ORBNANCE		-		-		-
139	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVELOP		-		-		-
140	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS		-		-		-
141	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		-		-		-
142	MAIRINE LOCATION MARKERS		-		-		-
143	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		-		-		-
144	JATOS		-		-		-
145	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		40,280		-		40,280
146	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,924		-		4,924
147	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		7,505		-		7,505
147	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		-		-		-

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
148	CATAFULTS & ARRESTING GEAR		15,876				15,876
149	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		20,196				20,196
150	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		732				732
151	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		17,708				17,708
152	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		19,506				19,506
153	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		17,914				17,914
154	REWSOIN PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		612				612
155	JSP8-N						
156	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,518				1,518
157	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,577				12,577
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
158	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT		4,076				4,076
159	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		739				739
160	MARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,952				2,952
161	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
162	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
163	AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM		520				520
164	ENGAGEMENT SYSTEMS SUPPORT		24,994				24,994
165	NATO SEASPARROW		6,619				6,619
166	RAM GMLS		50,037				50,037
167	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM		15,643				15,643
168	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,288				64,288
169	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		71,293				71,293
170	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP		1,391				1,391
171	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS		10,617		(1,917)		8,700
	EBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
172	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP						
173	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP		106,189				106,189
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
174	MK-117 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		12,917				12,917
175	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,730				6,730
176	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,169				8,169
177	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,118				5,118
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
178	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		9,690				9,690
179	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET		4,333				4,333
180	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		15,199				15,199

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
181	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT)		5,316				5,316
182	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		1,483				1,483
183	OTHER ORDNANCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		4,452				4,452
184	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		-				-
185	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES		-				-
186	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL		-				-
187	SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURE CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		-				-
188	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	213	2,881				2,881
189	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES		6,298				6,298
190	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		7,045				7,045
191	TRAILERS/TRUCK TRACTORS		1,345				1,345
192	EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT		2,293				2,293
193	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		1,329				1,329
194	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		2,224				2,224
195	WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT		1,017				1,017
196	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		3,010				3,010
197	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP		1,026				1,026
198	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		710				710
199	COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT		577				577
200	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		139				139
201	FLEET MOORINGS		-				-
202	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		18,141				18,141
203	OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		100				100
204	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		-				-
205	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,750		(2,000)		1,750
206	FORKLIFT TRUCKS		1,559				1,559
207	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		48				48
208	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		48				48
209	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TRAINING DEVICES		6,827		14,000		6,827
210	SUBMARINE SONAR TRAINERS		74,934				74,934
211	SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS		-				-
212	SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS		745				745

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
213	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,622			2,622	
214	TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS		21,954			21,954	
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
215	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		33,298			33,298	
216	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		385			385	
217	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,462			7,462	
218	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
219	ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION						
220	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
221	NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		596			596	
222	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		647			647	
223	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		4,567			4,567	
224	INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIP		6,953			6,953	
225	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM						
	OTHER						
226	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
227	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		210,213		75,781		210,213
	Totals		2,396,080				2,471,861
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS							
AMMUNITION							
AMMUNITION							
1	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES		28,487			28,487	
2	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES		2,082			2,082	
3	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES				10,000		
4	.50 CALIBER		8,588			8,588	
4a	.50 CALIBER SLAP				10,000		
4b	.50 CALIBER 4 & 1				15,000		
5	40 MM, ALL TYPES		3,939			3,939	
6	60 MM HE M888		9,855			9,855	
7	81 MM HE		4,724			4,724	
8	81 MM SMOKE SCREEN		5,445		24,000	28,724	
8a	81 MM IR M 816				11,400		
9	120MM TPCSDS-T M865						
10	120 MM TP-T M831		8,902			8,902	
10a	CTG TANK 120MM APFSDS-T M7829A2		3,314			3,314	
					5,000		5,000

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
10b	CTG TANK 120MM MP-T M830A1				5,000		5,000
11	FUZE, ET, XM782						
12	FUZE, ET, XM787						
13	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		6,724		6,724		6,724
14	9 MM ALL TYPES		2,979		2,979		2,979
15	MIMES, ALL TYPES						
16	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		474		474		474
17	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		7,034		7,034		7,034
18	AMMO MODERNIZATION		9,611		9,611		9,611
	PROP CHARGE M203A1				26,000		26,000
	GRENADE, SMOKE VIOLET				700		700
	IGNITER M776				400		400
	DEMO SHEET				2,200		2,200
	OTHER SUPPORT						
19	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		8,711		8,711		8,711
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
20	AAV7A1 PIP		11,779		11,779		11,779
21	LAV PIP		23,291		23,291		23,291
22	LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE						
23	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)						
24	ITEMS UNDER \$2M (TRKD VEH)		3,273		14,500		17,773
25	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS		100		100		100
25	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)		488		488		488
26	ITEMS UNDER \$2M (ALL OTHER)		120		120		120
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
27	HAWK MOD		3,040		1,600		4,640
28	AAWS-MEDIUM						
29	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)		25,833		25,833		25,833
	OTHER SUPPORT						
30	MODIFICATION KITS		1,991		1,991		1,991
31	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		100		100		100
	MANPACK RADIOS						
32	MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIP		9,735		3,000		12,735
33	GPS						
	VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT						
34	VEHICLE MTD RADIOS & EQUIP (MYP)						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
35	TSC-96 PIP FLEET SATCOM TERMINAL TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT						
36	UNIT LEVEL CIRCUIT SWITCH (ULCS)						
37	TACT COMM CENTER EQUIP						
38	TACTICAL DATA NETWORK						
39	JOINT TACT INFO DIST SYS (CL I)		5,375				5,375
40	GROUND MOBILE FORCES REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
41	AUTO TEST EQP SYS		9,747				9,747
42	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (TEL)		6,184				6,184
43	OTHER COMM/LEC EQUIPMENT						
44	SINGLE CHAN GRD & AIR RADIO OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		48,027				48,027
45	MODIFICATION KITS (TEL)		1,095				1,095
46	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (TEL)		1,443		1,000		2,443
47	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
48	POS LOCATING RPTG SYSTEM (PLRS)		2,421				2,421
49	TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM)		7,214				7,214
50	ADVANCED TACT AIR COMMAND CENTER MARINE TACTICAL C2						
51	MULTI-SERV ADF FIELD ART TACTICAL DATA SYS	188	12,140		11,000		23,140
52	TACTICAL COMBAT OPERATIONS SYS INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		11,025				11,025
53	AVTPO-3W FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE		3,393				3,393
54	METEOROLOGICAL SYSTEMS	7	6,283				6,283
55	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT MOD KITS (INTEL)		843				843
56	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (INTEL)		1,755				1,755
57	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
58	ELECTRONIC TRADE REPAIR FACILITY						
59	MECH TEST TRADE		3,042				3,042
60	SHOP SET ELECT ANGRM-32						
61	OTHER COMM/LEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
62	ADP EQUIPMENT		2,283		2,000		4,283
63	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		22,839		21,600		44,439
64	NAVYRE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		3,401		3,000		6,401
65	TEST CALIB & MAINT SPT						
66	MODIFICATION KITS (NON-TEL)		6,738				6,738

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (MONTEL) SUPPORT VEHICLES		1,480				1,480
66	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES		2,824				2,824
67	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	194	9,771				9,771
68	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES						
69	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
69	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)						
69	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM						
70	TRAILERS		4,932		5,500		10,432
71	OTHER SUPPORT						
71	MODIFICATION KITS		6,496				6,496
72	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL		100				100
72	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
72	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
73	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
73	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		2,338				2,338
74	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEM (TFS) EQUIP				2,400		2,400
75	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		2,372				2,372
76	MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEM						
77	AUTOMATIC BUILDING MACHINES						
78	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
78	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
79	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		257				257
80	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT		1,839				1,839
81	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		5,169				5,169
82	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP		8,268				8,268
83	TELEPHONE SYSTEM		2,927				2,927
84	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION		3,105				3,105
85	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		1,726				1,726
86	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
86	GENERAL PROPERTY						
87	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		3,215				3,215
88	TRAINING DEVICES		17,792				17,792
89	CONTAINER FAMILY				34,000		34,000
89	OTHER SUPPORT						
90	MODIFICATION KITS		1,471				1,471
91	CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR						
92	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL		75				75
93	DRUG INTERDICTION						
93	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	<del>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</del>		51,982				51,982
94	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		474,116		209,300		683,416
	<b>Totals</b>						

**Section - 121. Seawolf and New Attack Submarine programs.**

The budget request included \$1.5 billion to complete acquisition of the third and final *Seawolf* class attack submarine, known as SSN-23. The budget request also contains \$455.4 million for development and \$704.5 million for advanced procurement for a lead ship of a new class of attack submarine, now known as the new attack submarine (NAS).

The Navy plan, reflected in the budget request, has been to obtain authorization for SSN-23 in fiscal year 1996 and continue what it calls a design/build process for the NAS with lead ship authorization in fiscal year 1998. Design/build, as described by the Navy, would be conducted by close coordination between the Navy and the proposed builder, Electric Boat. Process teams composed of design engineers, waterfront production trades, key suppliers, and the Navy, would pool their technical and engineering knowledge and employ state-of-the-art CAD/CAM computer programs to execute preliminary and contract design. If the design/build process works as planned, it will produce far greater progress toward completion of detailed design than is normal at contract award, optimize the design for Electric Boat's production process, and produce significant overall cost savings. Production efficiencies introduced during design and a lower potential for disruptive design changes are examples offered by the Navy of the potential benefits of the design/build process.

The Navy contends that its plan would be the most cost-effective way of delivering advanced capability nuclear submarines to satisfy JCS requirements. However, the plan derives from a premise that it is vital to national security to maintain two nuclear capable shipbuilders—Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock for nuclear aircraft carrier construction and refueling overhauls and Electric Boat for nuclear submarines. During hearings held by the committee this year, some questioned the validity of the Navy's underlying premise.

Testimony and correspondence on submarine procurement that the committee received this year dealt with two central issues—the requirement to build SSN-23 and competition between General Dynamics Electric Boat Division and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company for construction of the NAS. At issue with respect to SSN-23 was whether the requirement to build the submarine is based on industrial concerns, operational requirements, or both and whether the submarine is affordable in today's budget environment. At issue with respect to the NAS was whether the Navy's plan to allocate all future submarine construction to Electric Boat without competition, a plan that derives from the Department of Defense's Bottom Up Review, was an acceptable course of action for the Navy to follow. To properly consider these issues, the committee heard testimony from the Navy, the shipbuilders, the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), and the Congressional Research Service (CRS).

Prior to this year the Navy advanced an industrial base argument for SSN-23, asserting that the submarine was necessary as an "industrial bridge" that will provide sufficient work at Electric Boat for that company to remain viable as a shipbuilder until con-

struction of the NAS begins in fiscal year 1998. This year the Navy also introduced an operational requirements argument for SSN-23, based on intelligence estimates that the worldwide submarine threat from modern, quiet submarines is proliferating rapidly. The Navy directed specific attention to the Russian submarine program—the quietness of both its existing and new construction boats relative to the Navy’s current front-line attack submarine, the SSN-688 class, and the large commitment of resources that Russia was devoting to submarine construction. In evaluating this threat-based argument, the committee was informed by witnesses that, while there is little doubt that the SSN-23 will perform superbly compared to any submarine now built or under construction in both open ocean and littoral missions, the existing JCS requirement, 10–12 submarines with quietness equivalent to *Seawolf* (SSN-21), by the year 2012, can be met if the Navy executes its current construction plan for the NAS without the need to build SSN-23. Thus the committee did not find the Navy’s operational requirement argument a compelling reason to authorize SSN-23.

Based on testimony and independent evaluation, the committee does not take issue with the argument that construction work on a scope comparable to that associated with SSN-23 is needed for Electric Boat to remain a viable shipbuilder for the NAS class. While the committee received testimony on other possible construction options that might sustain Electric Boat until fiscal year 1998, none appears more cost-effective than building SSN-23. Even with SSN-23, Electric Boat must reduce its work force from about 18,000 to a steady state of about 6,000 and introduce a wide range of management and labor efficiencies to remain profitable while building the NAS at the rate projected in the future years defense program.

The issue of competition for the NAS produced strong, forceful, and conflicting testimony. Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock introduced strong objections, echoed by committee members, to the Navy’s plan to allocate submarine construction to Electric Boat. Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock is the lead design yard for the SSN-688 class and the *Seawolf* class, and has been actively involved in construction of SSN-688 class submarines for the past twenty years. It desires to remain in the submarine construction business and is seeking competitive access to the NAS program as a means to do so. In pursuit of this goal Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock performed an economic analysis of the savings to the Navy that would result if it decided to build all nuclear ships—aircraft carriers and submarines, at Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock and determined the savings would be substantial. Initially, the Navy chose not to offer a comparable analysis, maintaining the position that two nuclear capable yards were essential to national security and citing the findings of the Bottom Up Review as justification. After conflicting testimony before the House National Security Committee (HNSC) revealed glaring disparities between the Navy and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock over the potential cost benefits associated with carrying out the Navy’s plan or shifting all construction to Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock, the HNSC commissioned the Congressional Research Service to conduct an independent analysis for

purposes of resolving the confusion. Preliminary results of this analysis were available when the committee held its hearing on submarine procurement. Further, the Navy had decided to prepare its own assessment of the savings and offered it for consideration shortly before the committee's hearing.

Much of the testimony on submarine construction received by the committee at its hearing on submarine procurement has been summarized in the preceding paragraphs. Additional information provided by the witnesses included:

1. the Navy's position on competition for the NAS had evolved. The Navy testified that it was now agreeable to competition at a time, not precisely specified, when the design of the NAS was mature and a building rate that would support competition was achieved;

2. testimony by GAO included observations that there is some disagreement within the intelligence community on the severity of the potential foreign submarine threat, which could imply a future reassessment of the requirement for U.S. submarine construction;

3. CBO, which had performed an assessment at the request of a committee member, focused primarily on short-term cost effects associated with not authorizing SSN-23 in fiscal year 1996;

4. the CRS witness, based on analysis performed by CRS at the request of the HNSC, devoted attention to both the transient short-term and long-term recurring savings that would occur in the period fiscal year 2006–fiscal year 2012. Summarizing major items from his testimony:

- a. when consistent assumptions regarding building rate and future inflation are applied to the Navy and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock estimates, savings associated with reducing to a single building yard for submarine construction over the period from fiscal year 1996 to fiscal year 2012 would be:

- Newport News—\$5.8 billion
- Navy— \$1.9 billion; and

- b. the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock and Navy estimates of average annual recurring savings after a steady state is reached differed by about \$200 million per year. Different estimates for direct labor and material account for most of this difference rather than fixed overhead costs;

5. both Navy and Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock agreed that a one yard strategy would be cheaper but disagreed substantially on the amount of savings that could be realized;

6. the Navy, based on its assessment of cost savings associated with a single yard strategy, believes that the 3 percent penalty it will have to pay to keep two yards is worth the additional cost;

7. there is no significant difference in the quality of the submarines built by the two shipyards;

8. there appeared to be a general consensus among the witnesses that, if a competition for the fiscal year 1998 lead NAS

occurred and the follow ship profile currently planned remained valid, the competition would be winner take all, i.e., the losing yard could not sustain its submarine construction capability until fiscal year 2000 when the Navy plans to request authorization of the second submarine;

9. some provision must be made to give Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock access to design information if the shipyard is to be competitive for the lead NAS in fiscal year 1998; and

10. Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock asserted that modification of the NAS design that is produced by the design/build process at Electric Boat would not be necessary for Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock to compete, provided that Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock could remain current on the design as it evolved.

While the committee intends to pursue the most cost effective approach to the NAS program, it is reluctant to rely exclusively on the accuracy of cost estimates presented at its hearing on submarine procurement. The Navy and the shipbuilders clearly had positions to defend, and the assumptions underlying their analysis were in general favorable to the outcome they desired. Attempts at objective analysis by the GAO, CBO, and CRS were handicapped by uncertain and incomplete data, or data withheld as proprietary. While the estimates tended to bound the potential savings associated with shifting to a single shipyard for submarine construction, they lacked sufficient precision to permit the committee to use them as sole justification for a recommendation that would likely cause the loss of submarine construction capability at Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock or the extinction of Electric Boat as a shipbuilder. Further, while the design/build concept appears a sound approach to designing an affordable submarine, the committee is concerned that the Navy may wait too long before starting competition for the NAS. With regard to competition the committee considers that:

1. competition in shipbuilding is an effective means to minimize cost to the government;
2. without authorizing and appropriating the necessary funds for the third *Seawolf* class submarine, SSN-23, in fiscal year 1996, Electric Boat may likely go out of business and competition for the NAS would not be possible; and
3. for real competition to occur, both shipbuilders must possess a sufficient level of knowledge about the design that either could build the NAS.

After extensive additional review and consultation the committee recommends a provision that would:

1. authorize the SSN-23 at \$1.5 billion, the budget request;
2. limit the ability of the Secretary of the Navy to obligate or expend funds for SSN-23 until he restructures the NAS program to provide for:
  - a. procurement of the lead NAS from Electric Boat in fiscal year 1998;
  - b. procurement of the second NAS from Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock in fiscal year 1999; and

- c. competitive procurement of any other vessels under the NAS program with potential competitors being any source to which the Secretary of the Navy has awarded a contract for construction of nuclear attack submarines during the past 10 years.
3. direct the Secretary of the Navy to solicit competitive proposals and award the contract or contracts for NAS submarines after the second one on the basis of price;
  4. direct the Secretary of the Navy to take no action that would impair the design, engineering, construction, and maintenance competencies of either Electric Boat or Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock to construct the NAS.
  5. direct the Secretary of the Navy to report every six months to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House National Security Committee the obligation and expenditure of funds for SSN-23 and the NAS;
  6. authorize \$814.5 million in fiscal year 1996 for design and advance procurement of the lead and second NAS. Of this amount \$10.0 million would be available only for participation of Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock in the NAS design; and \$100.0 million would be available only for advance procurement and design of the second submarine under the NAS program;
  7. authorize \$802.0 million in fiscal year 1997 for the lead and second NAS. Of this amount \$75.0 million would be available only for participation by Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock in the design of the NAS; and \$427.0 million would be available only for advanced procurement and design of the second submarine under the NAS program; and
  8. authorize \$455.4, the budget request, for research, development, test, and evaluation for the NAS program.

**Section - 124. Split funding for construction of naval vessels.**

Documentation provided with the budget request and testimony offered by witnesses at the committee's hearing on shipbuilding programs painted a bleak picture of the current projections for modernization of the fleet. Navy ship procurement is at its lowest level in real terms since the years immediately following World War II. The Navy, which testified that it is seeking to sustain a force structure of 336 ships, will procure an average of 4.67 new ships per year under the six year plan accompanying the budget request. Even with an optimistic 35 year life expectancy for these ships, this procurement rate would produce a steady state fleet size of less than 200 ships. Further, when the overlapping period included in the fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 budget requests were compared, the fiscal year 1996 shipbuilding plan lost seven of 22 ships, a 30 percent reduction. This phenomenon of unrealized outyear expectations is not uncommon and reflects a siphoning away of planned modernization to accommodate emerging operational requirements associated with Bosnia, Haiti, and Somalia, and reordering of modernization priorities for the other services.

Aside from the impact that such volatile shipbuilding plans may have on force structure planning, they can also have a dramatic ef-

fect on the shipbuilding industrial base. For example, a Congressional Research Service study, *Navy DDG-51 Destroyer Procurement Rate: Issues and Options for Congress* (CRS Rept. 94-343F), published in April 1994, concluded that a production rate below three DDG-51s per year would be inadequate to sustain the two shipyards that the Navy, based on a recently completed acquisition study, concluded are necessary for continued procurement of the DDG-51 Aegis Class destroyers at an efficient rate.

Hearing testimony and the committee's analysis of the budget request yielded the following observations:

1. as previously described, the Navy's budget request does not provide sufficient funding to meet its force structure goals;
2. the construction rate of the six year shipbuilding plan will create a funding "bow wave" in fiscal years 2002-2005 that will be between two and three times the average funding for construction of new ships during the next six years; and
3. the shipbuilding industrial base is severely under-utilized, resulting in production inefficiencies and increased unit costs. For example, during his review of the Navy's fiscal year 1996 Program Objective Memorandum, the Secretary of Defense chose to defer the acquisition of two DDG-51 Class destroyers in order to meet what he considered higher priority needs. Aside from further exacerbating the underfunding of ship procurement relative to force structure requirements, this action increased the total cost of the remaining 13 destroyers by almost \$800.0 million dollars.

Since the early 1960's the Department of Defense has followed a policy for acquisition of major weapons systems, shipbuilding being a prime example, that requires full funding in the year of authorization—all the funds necessary to procure the ship, including a provision for future inflation, are included in the budget request even though actual expenditures for the ship will occur over five or more years. The full funding approach was adopted because unpredictable cost growth once construction had begun generated unexpected pressure on the annual appropriations process and in the worst case caused partially completed projects to be abandoned. While this conservative approach helps to insulate the ship acquisition process from the impact of unexpected cost growth, rigid adherence to it is apt to generate volatile annual funding requirements and put extraordinary stress on shipbuilding budgets that require a very large commitment of capital resources for each ship that is bought. When modernization is underfunded relative to requirement and capacity, both force structure and the shipbuilding industrial base are jeopardized.

Based on these considerations the committee recommends a provision that would permit the Department of Defense to modify its acquisition policy for specific shipbuilding programs, in selected cases, to allow split funding of ship acquisition. This provision incorporates the following concepts:

1. applies only to shipbuilding programs because of the extraordinary unit cost and the time required to construct;
2. in preparing its budget request the Department of Defense would divide the total amount required for procurement of a

ship, including provision for escalation, into two equal parts that would be requested in consecutive budget requests;

3. authorization and appropriation of the first increment of funding would be sufficient for the Navy to enter into a contract for the full cost of the ship;

4. the contract would include a provision for a termination liability reserve in the event that the second increment of funding does not become available;

5. only ship construction programs that have been in progress for a sufficient amount of time for the costs to be well understood and predictable will be eligible for split funding; and

6. the Secretary of Defense will propose ships for split funding subject to approval of the committee and the House National Security Committee.

The committee has incorporated split funding into its recommendations on the fiscal year 1996 budget request. Accordingly, in fiscal year 1996 the committee recommends authorization of \$2.2 billion, the budget request, for the full funding procurement of two DDG-51 Class destroyers. Of this amount \$6.8 million is advanced procurement in fiscal year 1996 to support the fiscal year 1997 DDG-51 budget request. Further, the committee recommends an increase of \$650.0 million for the acquisition of two additional DDG-51 Class destroyers under the split funding provision.

## **OTHER NAVY PROGRAMS**

### **Navy Aircraft**

#### **AV-8B remanufacture**

The budget request contained \$148.0 million for the remanufacture of four US Marine Corps AV-8B harrier aircraft into the Harrier II Plus configuration. The Harrier II Plus configuration provides needed radar-equipped aircraft for day/night/adverse weather use with improved survivability and enhanced multi-mission capability. Because additional aircraft are needed for fleet deployments of radar-equipped aircraft, the committee recommends an increase of \$100.0 million to procure an additional four aircraft. Procurement of eight AV-8B aircraft is a more cost-effective approach than the budget request and provides the Marine Corps with increased combat capability at a more efficient production rate.

#### **Additional F/A-18C/D strike fighters**

The committee understands that the F/A-18C has substantial upgrades over the older F/A-18A's that significantly increase its operational capability and warfighting effectiveness. Improvements such as AMRAAM, JSOW, JDAM, APG-73 radar, and night vision compatibility provide the F/A-18C greater capability with greater survivability.

When the last F/A-18C is delivered in 1998, the F/A-18C inventory will peak at approximately 400 aircraft, 36 short of the requirement for an all F/A-18C carrier force. This figure, 436, includes regular squadrons, RDT&E, and pipeline aircraft. It does not account for attrition.

The budget request for 12 F/A-18C's in fiscal year 1996 and none in fiscal year 1997 is a reduction of 36 aircraft from the Navy's plan for 24 in each of those years. However, the requirement for those aircraft still exists to sustain combat effectiveness through the early 21st century as the Navy transitions to the newer F/A-18 E/F. The night strike F/A-18C's will serve until 2015 and beyond.

The committee is persuaded by the need for more capable strike fighter aircraft on carrier decks both now and in the future, and recommends the acquisition of 24 F/A-18C's, an increase of twelve, and an increase of \$564.0 million in the APN account of the fiscal year 1996 budget request to provide the needed capability.

#### **CH-53E helicopters**

This year the committee is aware of the continuing need of the Marine Corps for additional CH-53E helicopters for its active and reserve component. In fiscal year 1995 the Navy proposed to resolve Marine Corps CH-53E shortages by transferring MH-53E helicopters from its airborne mine countermeasures (AMCM) squadrons. The committee remains concerned about the overall condition of the Navy's mine countermeasures capability and has concluded that any reductions in the Navy's AMCM squadrons to help satisfy the requirement of the Marine Corps would be imprudent. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$90.0 million for the purpose of buying additional CH-53E helicopters for the Marine Corps. This action should eliminate any need for the Navy to transfer more CH-53E helicopters from the Navy to the Marine Corps.

#### **F-14 Forward looking infrared (FLIR)/Laser**

The committee understands the Navy has a continuing need for F-14 capability upgrades as the A-6 medium attack aircraft retires, and the F-14 assumes the A-6's long range strike role. Operational requirements for a FLIR/Laser Designator system have only recently been documented in an Operational Requirements Document (ORD 406-88-95) of June 1995. This emergent requirement is a high priority for carrier operations, and will be budgeted in future years by the Navy in the budget request. However, the committee understands that before the Navy can proceed with any upgrades, it must comply with requirements in the Appropriations Conference Committee Report (H. Rpt. 103-747) regarding F-14 modernization programs.

The committee recognizes the need for upgrading F-14 capabilities and recommends an increase in aircraft procurement Navy (APN-5) of \$17.1 million to be used with existing funds to incorporate a FLIR/Laser in the F-14. These additional funds are not to be obligated until previous reporting requirements are complied with. The committee understands that the Navy will not obligate these funds without providing for funding in the FYDP.

#### **Thermal imaging modifications for USMC aircraft**

In order to improve flight safety and navigation, and enhance effectiveness of USMC UH-1N helicopters in search and rescue missions, the Navy has undertaken a program to upgrade them with

AN/AAQ-22 navigation thermal imaging systems. To ensure that this equipment is procured at an efficient and cost-effective rate, the committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million to the budget request for the purpose of equipping UH-1N helicopters of the Marine Corps' active helicopter fleet.

#### **AN/APR-39A(V)-2 radar warning receiver**

The committee has been made aware of the status and need for radar warning receivers in helicopters and other low flying aircraft. The AN/APR-39A(V)-2 provides warning against radar-guided and radar-aided threats, and is a joint program led by the Army. Now in engineering and manufacturing development, the system recently passed Operational Test and Evaluation, but was not included in the fiscal year 1996 budget request because the services were awaiting the completion of testing before requesting funding. The committee recognizes the need for the system and recommends an increase of \$30.0 million for initial procurement of the AN/APR-39A(V)-2 radar warning receiver. The committee's recommendation supports the non-recurring engineering field support and procurement of an estimated 50 systems. The committee further expects the department to ensure future year acquisition of the system will be budgeted for by the department in the FYDP prior to obligating any amounts for the acquisition of the initial sets.

#### **Undergraduate NFO Training**

The committee has been advised of a proposal to sell seventeen T-39N aircraft plus spare engines and simulators for \$45.0 million. The aircraft are now leased to the Navy for undergraduate Naval Flight Officer flight training. This is the only undergraduate aircrew training system in the DOD that is not owned by the military. The committee has been informed that ownership of these assets by the Navy may result in future savings amounting to over \$100.0 million. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide an analysis of the proposal to the committee no later than March 29, 1996, so that it can be reviewed for possible further action.

### **Navy Weapons**

#### **Tomahawk missile**

In its review of the budget request, the committee determined that \$41.7 million, authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995, had not been obligated because contract savings eliminated the need. Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of \$120.0 million in fiscal year 1996 for the procurement and remanufacture of Tomahawk missiles and further recommends that \$41.7 million of funds previously authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1995 be made available in fiscal year 1996 to satisfy the balance of funds required for the procurement of 164 Tomahawk missiles, the quantity of missiles contained in the budget request.

#### **Direct broadcast service**

The committee has followed the progress of several new commercial satellite communications (SATCOM) technologies with special

interest in direct broadcast service. The committee supports insertion of this technology into the military communications master plan to reduce the load on dedicated military SATCOM systems as well as to provide near-real-time information to the warfighter. The committee believes that the most affordable means for achieving a near-term Global Broadcast Service (GBS) capability is to use the Navy's ultra-high frequency follow-on (UFO) satellite system. The committee is aware of other concepts to provide a GBS capability, and is willing to allow the newly established Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (DUSD) for Space to evaluate the tradeoffs.

In order to support a timely resolution of this issue, the committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to PE 0303109N. If the DUSD for Space does not submit a written report justifying an alternative GBS concept to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed to obligate the \$30.0 million to integrate a direct broadcast capability on UFO satellites 8, 9, and 10. If the DUSD for Space selects, and justifies in writing, an alternative approach, the committee authorizes the DUSD for Space to proceed to employ the \$30.0 million on the preferred GBS approach, beginning 30 days after the committees have received the written report. The committee will consider the selected approach to be a pilot program for a future military GBS system, which will be incorporated into the Department of Defense's future MILSATCOM architecture.

### **Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion**

#### **Amphibious lift**

The budget request did not contain funds for procurement of additional amphibious lift. The committee understands that there exists a shortfall in the Navy's ability to satisfy the 2.5 Marine expeditionary brigade (MEB) requirement of the Defense Planning Guidance with active ships. This lift is badly needed by the Marine Corps to satisfy its mission as an expeditionary force that is ready to respond to emerging crises on short notice. One prominent shortfall is in the area of large deck, aviation-capable, amphibious assault ships with the command and control capabilities needed to support amphibious task force commanders. The LHD-7, for which a negotiated contract option exists, would satisfy that shortfall.

The operational requirement for LHD-7 is clear. In written reports and testimony before the committee a series of senior military leaders have confirmed the strong requirement of LHD-7 as the anchor for a twelfth amphibious ready group (ARG).

Last year Congress authorized \$50.0 million for the purpose of extending the existing contract option for LHD-7 until this year. The contractor agreed to extend the option at no cost to the government. An additional \$50.0 million was appropriated in fiscal year 1994.

Exercising the contract option at this point, while the production is in progress, rather than procuring LHD-7 in 2001, as currently reflected in the six-year shipbuilding plan, will result in a substantial cost savings. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase to the budget request of \$1.3 billion for LHD-7 with the un-

derstanding that funds previously appropriated in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 will be made available as the additional increment needed to fully fund LHD-7 at \$1.4 billion.

#### **LCAC service life extension program**

During its consideration of the budget request, the committee received a contractor proposal for a service life extension program (SLEP) for the Navy's fleet of landing craft, air cushion (LCAC). The proposal raised the committee's awareness on how best to maintain the future condition of the Navy's LCACs over their projected twenty year service life. A related question concerns any capability improvements that may be needed to deal with increased lift demands of new weapons systems that have been fielded since the LCAC was originally designed. Of concern is the fact that production of new LCACs already on contract will be completed in fiscal year 1997. It may be necessary to take action to preserve the LCAC contractor's production capability if it is determined that an LCAC SLEP would best be conducted at his production facility rather than in home port.

Discussions between the committee and the Navy determined that the Navy has not yet developed a detailed plan for a LCAC SLEP program, based on its evaluation that the need for such a plan was not imminent. Given current affordability constraints in its budget, the Navy had decided that a decision on a LCAC SLEP program could be deferred for at least two years. It is not clear, however, that the Navy fully considered the future status of the LCAC production line when it made this decision. The committee also determined that there had not been any substantive dialogue between the contractor and the Navy about the scope, timing, and costs of a LCAC SLEP program.

The committee needs more information before it can act on the LCAC SLEP program. Accordingly, the Navy is directed to prepare a detailed plan for such a program and submit it to the committee in company with its fiscal year 1997 budget request, ensuring that the costs, benefits, and timing of an option to perform the LCAC SLEP on the exiting production line are fully considered.

#### **Shipbuilding contract retentions**

The committee is concerned that the Navy may need to revise its current procedures for retaining payments on shipbuilding and conversion contracts. The committee fears that current practices may provide insufficient incentive to the builder for improved performance, or may deny shipbuilders needed operating capital. These procedures could weaken the Navy's fragile shipbuilding industrial base.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to work with the shipbuilding industry to review its practices with respect to progress payments, retentions, and dispute resolution. The committee directs the Secretary to report on the results of this review to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House by March 1, 1996. The committee expects that the report will propose any procedural changes that may better sustain the naval shipbuilding industrial

base and encourage improved shipbuilder performance, without forgoing protection of the taxpayers' interests.

### **Other Navy Procurement**

#### **Submarine navigation sets**

In fiscal year 1995 the Navy began limited rate procurement of the MK-49 ring laser gyro (RLG) navigator. These navigation sets will be installed on DDG-51 class destroyers. Other candidate ships for this system include cruisers, attack submarines, aircraft carriers, and other major combatants. An attractive aspect of this plan is that for the first time a common navigation set will be installed on surface combatants and submarines, greatly simplifying logistics support.

The navigation system currently installed on U.S. Navy submarines is the electrically suspended gyro navigator (ESGN). Input from senior submarine force commanders in both the Atlantic and Pacific fleets indicates that the ESGN continues to be a maintenance and fiscal burden. They recommend replacement of submarine force ESGN sets with RLG sets at the earliest opportunity.

Although the Navy has just begun to procure the MK-49 RLG navigator, they have been in service as a NATO standard and in continuous production since 1987. In service they have proven more reliable and accurate than the older spinning mass units that they will replace.

The committee acknowledges the strong recommendations of the Navy's senior submarine force operational commanders. It is mindful of their conclusion that prompt installation of RLG navigation sets in place of existing ESGN sets will generate an immediate and significant drop in maintenance costs for the U.S. Navy's submarine force. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to purchase and install MK-49 RLG navigators in U.S. Navy submarines. As a partial offset for this increase, the committee authorizes only \$1.6 million, a reduction of \$2.5 million, for the ESGN. The \$2.5 million reduction was included in the budget request for ESGN reliability modifications. The committee believes that these funds would be better utilized for the purchase and installation of new MK-49 RLG navigators rather than for modifying a system they will soon replace.

#### **AN/SLQ-32 electronic warfare system**

The SLQ-32 advanced capability (ADCAP) program has been designed to improve the SLQ-32's active countermeasures capabilities against modern threats, support combined and integrated operation with decoys, and improve the system's counter-targeting capabilities against advanced search and targeting radars. The SLQ-32 ADCAP successfully completed operational testing after the budget request had been prepared. Consequently, the request contained no provision for procurement of the SLQ-32 ADCAP in fiscal year 1996. Because of affordability constraints, the current future years program spreads production over several years at quantities that are below economically efficient rates. Upgrades to the system can be accomplished by simple removal of old components

and insertion of new components without the need for a shipyard availability.

The committee believes that the improvements afforded by SLQ-32 ADCAP provide badly needed capabilities against modern threats and will provide far better electronic countermeasures in littoral operations. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$23.0 million for this program and recommends that the Secretary of the Navy consider a multiyear procurement approach that will permit the program to be executed in a cost effective manner.

### **Integrated communications for aircraft carriers**

In recent years, major technological improvements have been made in command and control systems installed in the Navy's aircraft carriers. However, it is the committee's opinion that no substantial progress has been made in fielding improvements to the interior communications (IC) systems on the aircraft carriers or to effectively integrate them with other shipboard communications systems. For example, the Navy's newest aircraft carrier, CVN 74, will get underway for sea trials with an IC system that is not integrated and is based on 40 year old technology.

A formal operational requirement exists for the Navy to provide an integrated wired IC system that would provide seamless interior and exterior connectivity for the aircraft carriers. The committee is aware of a non-developmental item system that has been tested aboard CVN 73 with very positive results, indicating that there are systems currently available that will correct this serious deficiency in the IC systems on the aircraft carriers. Whether this system is the best one to meet the Navy's needs remains to be fully evaluated. However, the committee believes that the Navy needs to promptly survey available candidate systems and initiate a procurement program for the most suitable one, rather than continuing to pursue the lengthy development process that is ill-suited to the rapid evolution occurring in information systems technology. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a report on its plan to replace the obsolete IC technology currently installed on the Navy's aircraft carriers and submit it to the committee no later than December 31, 1995. The committee also authorizes an increase of \$3.5 million in the budget request for the purpose of procuring the best candidate system and installing it in an aircraft carrier that the Secretary deems most suitable.

### **Challenge Athena**

The committee has followed the progress of several commercial satellite communications (SATCOM) technologies with special interest in commercial wideband service such as that demonstrated by the Chief of Naval Operations special project Challenge Athena. The committee is interested in how this technology could be effectively inserted into the military communications master plan to reduce over-subscribership to current military SATCOM systems as well as provide near real-time information to the warfighter. Operationally, these commercial systems will provide near real-time imagery for precision targeting/precision strike, video teleconferencing, as well as other high data rate computer capabilities. In ad-

dition, this connectivity will provide for the health and welfare of deployed sailors through the use of video telemedicine/telepsychiatry, sailor telephone, and video training. The committee recommends an increase of \$14.4 million to fund wideband terminals in support of commercial communications for afloat warfighters.

### **Sonobuoy procurement**

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal Year 1994 (H. Rept. 103-254) directed the Navy to submit a report on sonobuoy inventories. That report was supposed to project inventories over a five year period, by accounting for: (1) shelf life, (2) procurement rates, (3) usage rates, and (4) future inventory requirements. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition submitted the report on April 13, 1994.

In reviewing the Navy's report, the committee found that the Navy's fiscal year 1995 budget did not carry out the report's recommendations. Consequently, the committee shifted funds among the individual types of sonobuoys without adding funds to the sonobuoy request.

The Navy budget request for fiscal year 1996 also fails to implement the Navy's requirements. The committee understands that the Navy made a combination of errors in preparing and establishing priorities when developing its budget. More important, the budget request fails to satisfy the requirements of the Unified and Specified Commanders in Chief. They have supported buying roughly 125,000 sonobuoys per year as necessary to meet minimum training and operational requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following:

<i>Sonobuoy</i>	<i>Million</i>
AN/SSQ-36 .....	\$0.2
AN/SSQ-53 .....	0
AN/SSQ-62 .....	4.1
AN/SSQ-110 .....	21.9

### **Electro-optical sight/weapons director**

The committee is aware that the Navy has a broad range of electro-optical (E-O) requirements for day/night surveillance that the gunfire control systems installed on its surface combatants should satisfy. The committee is also aware that a wide variety of E-O devices and systems are currently installed on Navy combatants. While many of these systems perform similar or nearly similar functions, each requires unique life cycle support, maintenance and operator training.

The committee has been informed that the MK-46 E-O sight and gun director has demonstrated excellent at-sea performance aboard the DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke* Class destroyers. The committee questions why the Navy has chosen not to use this E-O system, which is a congressionally funded Navy program, fully life-cycle supported, and has established Navy school house maintenance and operator training in place, for the Navy's CG-47 Aegis class cruisers and DD-963 *Spruance* Class destroyers. Instead the Navy appears intent on developing and introducing yet another E-O system with its own set of unique support requirements.

In the absence of additional information it would appear that the Navy has not been pursuing a cost effective approach to procurement of E-O systems for its ships. To clarify this situation, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the committee by February 1, 1996 that will specifically address the Navy's E-O plans and the future funding requirements required to provide the CG-47 Aegis class cruiser, the DD-963 class destroyer, and other classes of ships with a fully integrated E-O surveillance sight and gun director.

#### **Vertical launch system**

During its review of the budget request, the committee determined that the Navy's fiscal year 1996 budget could be reduced by \$1.9 million because fiscal year 1995 installation costs for vertical launch systems had proven lower than expected. The excess fiscal year 1995 funds can be used in fiscal year 1996. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of only \$3.6 million for the vertical launch system in fiscal year 1996, a reduction of \$1.9 million.

#### **Forklift trucks**

During the review of the Navy's fiscal year 1996 budget request, the committee determined that funds requested for the procurement of forklift trucks can be reduced by \$2.0 million because excess fiscal year 1995 funds are available to satisfy the requirement. Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of \$1.8 million for the procurement of Navy forklift trucks, a reduction of \$2.0 million.

### **Marine Corps Ammunition**

#### **Marine Corps ammunition**

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Marine Corps ammunition procurement:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Millions</i>
7.62mm .....	\$10.0
cal. .50 SLAP .....	10.0
cal. .50 4&1 .....	15.0
81mm M889A1 (HE) .....	24.0
81mm M816 (IR) .....	11.4
120mm APFSDS-T M829A2 .....	5.0
120mm M830A1 HEAT-MP-T .....	5.0
Prop Charge, M203A1 .....	26.0
Grenade, Smoke, V. G955 .....	0.7
Igniter, M766 .....	0.4
Demo Sheet .....	2.2
Subtotal .....	\$109.7

### **Marine Corps**

#### **M1A1 tank modifications**

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, directed that 24 M1A1 tanks be transferred to the Marine Corps Reserves. The statement of managers in the conference report accompanying the Act (H. Rept. 103-701) indicated that the transfer in fiscal year 1995 was intended to be the first year of a two-year pro-

gram to eliminate a shortfall of 48 tanks in the Marine Corps Reserve tank battalions. The committee recommends an increase of \$110.0 million for an additional 24 M1A2 upgrades for the Army and directs the Army to transfer 24 M1A1 tanks to the Marine Corps Reserve in accordance with procedures set out in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. The Marine Corps has indicated a requirement to modify these tanks to standards of the Marine tank fleet. The committee recommends an increase of \$12.3 million to the modification kits (trkd veh) program to modify 48 M1A1 tanks to Marine Corps baseline configuration.

The committee also recommends an increase of \$2.2 million to the same program to procure 268 modification kits and other enhancements for M240G ground-mount medium machine guns.

#### **Operational enhancements**

The committee is aware of several enhancements which would provide significant operational improvements for the Marine Corps. The committee recommends increases indicated below to implement these enhancements:

—\$1.6 million for HAWK Launch modifications.

—\$1.0 million in items less than \$2 million for

procurement, modification, and downsizing of four Improved Direct Air Support System Central (IDASC) systems.

#### **PSC-5 radios**

The committee understands that the Marine Corps has a requirement for critical satellite communications with multi-service interoperability. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to procure 174 PSC-5 radios to complete the planned acquisition.

#### **Advanced field artillery tactical data systems (AFATDS)**

The committee strongly supports the AFATDS and is advised that operations will be substantially enhanced and savings achieved by accelerating procurement and completing the planned acquisition for the Marine Corps. The committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million to procure 186 AFATDS units currently planned for fiscal year 1997, in fiscal year 1996.

#### **Night vision devices (NVD)**

The committee supported efforts last year to upgrade night weapon sights which incorporate older generation night vision technology. Generation III image intensification technology is available as direct drop-in replacements for older tubes. The replacement tubes double the range of the weapon's sights and increase the useful life of the image tube by a factor of five times over that currently experienced. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in the Night Vision Equipment program for procurement of the 25 millimeter replacement tubes.

The committee also recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in the Marine Enhancement Program for procurement of Night Vision Magnification Devices which provide 3X magnification, significantly extending the range of the current night vision goggles.

**Computer upgrades**

The committee is advised that the Marine Corps has a requirement to upgrade selected computer networks which have become technically obsolete and do not interface effectively with more modern equipment used by the other services. The committee recommends increases indicated below within the ADP Equipment program to facilitate necessary upgrades.

—\$17.8 million for Asset Tracking Logistics and Supply System to replace current supply and maintenance system with deployable, integrated system.

—\$3.8 million for procurement of 1580 Lightweight Tactical Computer Units to replace obsolete units.

**Trailers**

The committee is aware of the need for the Marine Corps to replace its fleet of 40-ton low-bed trailers which are reaching the end of service life. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million for the procurement of M101A3 and M870A2 trailers.

**Water purification and support equipment**

The committee is aware of the need to provide additional equipment for both active and reserve Marine Corps units to enable Marine forces to purify, store and distribute water in tactical operations. The committee recommends increases in the tactical fuel systems as indicated below to enhance current capabilities:

—\$1.9 million to procure additional equipment used for water storage and distribution.

—\$0.5 million to procure 13 medium freshwater purification units for the Marine Corps Reserve.

**Training simulators**

The committee strongly supports increased use of training simulators by Marines, especially during extended deployments aboard ship, when combat skills are subject to rapid deterioration. The committee encourages the Marine Corps to explore opportunities for greater use of simulation for active units and reserve units, especially aboard amphibious ships to maintain Marine combat skills. The committee recommends the following increases to the training devices program for various simulators and devices:

—\$27.5 million for 181 Indoor Simulated Marksmanship Trainers.

—\$5.9 million to modify 287 systems and procure 48 additional system trainers for TOW and Dragon antitank weapons.

—\$0.6 million to procure Marine Corps Tank Full Crew Interactive Simulator.

## AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
1	B-1B (MYP)		56,336				141,336
2	B-2A (MYP)		279,921		85,000		279,921
	TACTICAL FORGES						
3	ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER		-		-		-
4	F-15A		-		-		-
5	F-16 C/D (MYP)		-		-		-
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		-		-		-
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
6	C-17 (MYP)	8	2,592,391				2,592,391
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(189,900)				(189,900)
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-		-		-
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
8	C-130H		-		-		-
9	C-130J	2	88,608				88,608
	STRATEGIC AIRLIFT						
10	STRATEGIC AIRLIFT		183,757				183,757
	NON DEVELOPMENT AIRLIFT						
11	NON DEVELOPMENT AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		-		-		-
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
12	ENHANCED FLIGHT SCREENERS		-		-		-
13	JPATS		54,968				54,968
14	TANKER, TRANSPORT, TRAINER SYSTEM	3	4,374				4,374
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
15	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,597				2,597
16	DRUG INTERDICTION	27	-		-		-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
17	E-8B		536,334				536,334
17	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	2	(141,700)				(141,700)
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		97,140				97,140
19	SOF A/C CSE		-		-		-
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
20	B-2A		17,286				17,286

Line No.	Title	FY 1956 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
21	B-1B		75,383				86,983
22	B-52		4,908				4,908
23	F-117		47,660				47,660
	<u>TACTICAL AIRCRAFT</u>						
24	A-10		79,424				79,424
25	F/RF-4		61				61
26	F-15		79,488				79,488
27	F-16		118,606				118,606
28	EF-111		1,900				1,900
29	F-111						
30	T/AT-37		502				502
	<u>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</u>						
31	C-5		45,431				45,431
32	C-9		4,066				4,066
33	C-17A		12,687				12,687
34	C-21		4,654				4,654
35	C-22		670				670
36	C-STOL		298				298
37	C-137		2,402				2,402
38	C-141		95,162				95,162
	<u>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</u>						
39	T-1		5,762				5,762
40	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT		78				78
41	T-38		11,487				11,487
42	T-41 AIRCRAFT		25				25
43	T-43		5,441				5,441
	<u>OTHER AIRCRAFT</u>						
44	KC-10A (ATCA)		20,690				20,690
45	C-12		3,237				3,237
46	C-18		2,675				2,675
47	C-20 MODS		7,765				7,765
48	VC-25A MOD		7,772				7,772
49	C-130		84,399				84,399
50	C-135		142,764				142,764
51	E-3		230,439				230,439
52	F-4		957				957
53	H-1		6,160				6,160
54	H-60						
55	<u>OTHER AIRCRAFT</u>		29,433				29,433

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	<u>OTHER MODIFICATIONS...</u>						
56	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS						
57	DARP				-48,000		48,000
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
58	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		603,619		(19,900)		583,719
	C-17 Spares						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON AGE						
59	COMMON AGE		216,048				216,048
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
60	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		13,955				13,955
61	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		194,672				194,672
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
62	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		48,694				48,694
63	BOMBER INDUSTRIAL BASE SUPPORT						
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
64	WAR CONSUMABLES		25,479		(15,000)		10,479
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
65	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		167,676		25,000		192,676
66	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
67	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		4,871				4,871
	DARP						
68	DARP		194,374				194,374
	Totals		6,183,886		134,700		6,318,586
	<u>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</u>						
	PROC. AMMO. AE						
1	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR						
2	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
3	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180						
4	20MM TRAINING						
5	30 MM TRAINING						
6	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180						
7	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188						
8	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
9	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 TIMER ACTUATOR PIN FUZE						
10	GBU-16						
11	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND						
12	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON						
13	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
14	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 FLARE, IR M4L-7B						
16	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
17	PARACHUTE FLARE LUU-2 B/B						
18	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE						
19	INITIAL SPARES						
20	REPLENISHMENT SPARES						
21	MODIFICATIONS						
22	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 FMU-139 FUZE						
23	FMU-139 FUZE						
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 MUNITIONS UNDISPATCHED						
25	M-16 A2 RIFLE						
Totals							
	MISILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		18,749			18,749	
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
2	HAVE MAP						
3	TRU-SERVICE ATTACK MISSILE			50	38,000	50	38,000
4	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE TACTICAL		1,873			1,873	
5	GPS AIDED MUNITION						
6	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON						
7	AMRAAM	291	190,672		(8,000)		182,672
8	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-16		69,303		40,000		109,303
8a	Interfm JSOW				10,400		10,400

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
9	TARGET DRONES INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	88	39,150				39,150
10	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER		8,100				8,100
11	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES CLASS IV		147		27,200		147
12	CONVENTIONAL ALCM						27,200
13	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)						15,379
14	AIM-9 SIDEWINDER		15,379				29,344
15	MM III MODIFICATIONS		19,344		10,000		
16	AGM-85D MAYERICK						1,602
17	AGM-88A HARM		1,602				1,370
18	MODIFICATIONS UNDER \$2.0M SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,370				
19	MISSILE SPARES & REPAIR PARTS OTHER SUPPORT		53,914				53,914
20	SPACE PROGRAMS						19,158
21	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		19,158				202,910
22	GLOBAL POSITIONING (MY/P)	4	202,910				(66,850)
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(66,850)				
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		38,412		(38,412)		
25	SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS		56,963				56,963
26	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
27	SPACE BOOSTERS		464,953		(15,000)		449,953
28	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
29	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE	4	179,493				179,493
30	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(28,564)				(28,564)
31	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		38,856				38,856
32	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG		29,265				29,265
33	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MY/P)		102,911		(35,900)		67,011
34	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)						
35	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)						
36	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM SPECIAL PROGRAMS		25,666		(7,500)		18,166
37	IONOS (MY/P)	4	29,045				29,045
38	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(9,954)				(9,954)

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	FY 1996 Request Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Change to Request Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Senate Authorized Amount
33	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CV)						
34	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS						
35	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
	MUNITIONS & RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	ROCKETS & LAUNCHERS						
36	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	30,000	10,402				10,402
37	2.75	24,320	1,993				1,993
38	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		950		(71,000)		950
	CARTRIDGES						
39	5.56 MM	13,835	5,534				5,534
40	20MM TRAINING						
41	30 MM TRAINING	1,360	14,480				14,480
42	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	720	10,030				10,030
43	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	903	1,192				1,192
44	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3						
45	CART IMP 3000 FT/LBS						
46	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		5,162				5,162
	BOMBS						
47	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	12,586	8,253				8,253
48	TIMER ACTUATOR FIN FUZE	10,000	6,242				6,242
49	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	400,000	5,928				5,928
50	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	3,718	9,261				9,261
51	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	500	165,447				165,447
52	CBU-89 GATOR INERT	236	6,531				6,531
53	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		1,500				1,500
	OTHER ITEMS						
54	FLARE, IR MJU-78	945,049	21,859				21,859
55	MJU-23 FLARE	7,426	6,483				6,483
56	MJU-108	110,436	7,204				7,204
57	M-208 CARTRIDGE FLARE	331,564	11,250				11,250
58	INITIAL SPARES		621				621
59	REFLESHMENT SPARES		2,329				2,329
60	MODIFICATIONS		2,340				2,340
61	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		11,289				11,289
	FUZES						
62	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUZE(JPF)						
	OTHER WEAPONS						
63	M-16 A2 RIFLE		5,048		(50,212)		5,048
	<b>Totals</b>		<b>3,547,711</b>		<b>(50,212)</b>		<b>3,597,499</b>

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	OTHER PROCUREMENT - AIR FORCE						
	MUNITIONS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT						
	ROCKETS & LAUNCHERS						
1	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	CARTRIDGES (THOUSANDS)						
2	5.56 MM						
3	20MM TRAINING						
4	30 MM TRAINING						
5	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180						
6	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188						
7	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3						
8	CART IMP 3000 FT/LBS						
9	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	BOMBS						
10	BSU-49 INFLATABLE RETARDER						
11	GBU-15						
12	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND						
13	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON						
14	COMB/COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITIONS)						
15	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000			30,000	30,000		30,000
	TARGETS						
16	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	OTHER ITEMS						
17	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
18	MJU-108						
19	ALA-17 FLARE						
20	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
21	MODIFICATIONS						
22	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	FUZES						
23	FMU-139 FUZE						
24	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	OTHER WEAPONS						
25	M-16 A2 RIFLE						
26	.50 CAL RIFLE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
27	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	186	1,798				1,798

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
28	STATION WAGON, 4X2	69	1,053				1,053
29	BUS, 28 PASSENGER						
30	BUS - 32-44 PASSENGER						
31	BUSES	43	2,339				2,339
32	AMBULANCE, BUS						
33	AMBULANCES						
34	MODULAR AMBULANCE						
35	14-23 PASSENGER BUS						
36	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	86	1,327				1,327
37	ARMORED SEDAN	1	202				202
	CARGO ± UTILITY VEHICLES						
38	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	134	2,760				2,760
39	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	235	2,469				2,469
40	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	435	4,777				4,777
41	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	164	3,671				3,671
42	TRUCK CARRYALL						
43	TRUCK, CARGO, 2 1/2T, 6X6, M:35	50	2,705				2,705
44	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	56	5,860				5,860
45	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	57	2,799				2,799
46	CAP VEHICLES						
47	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
48	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11	154	22,339				22,339
49	HMMWV, ARMORED	56	7,170				7,170
50	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	152	4,460				4,460
51	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
52	TRUCK CRASH P-23						
53	TRUCK WATER P-26 (P-1B)						
54	HEAVY RESCUE VEHICLE	15	2,616				2,616
55	TRUCK PUMPER P-24						
56	TRUCK PUMPER P-22						
57	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
58	TRUCK, F/I, 10,000 LB						
59	60K A/C LOADER	28	35,336				35,336
60	50K CONTAINER HANDLER						
61	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
			1,670				1,670

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
62	WELL DRILLING SYSTEM						
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
64	MODIFICATIONS		200				200
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		2,352				2,352
66	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
67	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT (CONSECL)						
68	COMMSEC EQUIPMENT		39,422				39,422
69	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		462				462
70	MODIFICATIONS (CONSECL)						
71	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
72	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS		11,966				11,966
73	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,368				2,368
74	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP		5,510				5,510
75	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		995				995
76	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
77	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYS (ATCALS)						
78	NATIONAL AEROSPACE SYSTEM		32,345				32,345
79	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT		7,103				7,103
80	WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST		36,909				36,909
81	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM		67,596				67,596
82	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		8,667				8,667
83	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		19,895				19,895
84	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG		1,170				1,170
85	NAVSTAR GPS		14,350				14,350
86	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG		5,879				5,879
87	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT						
88	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM		5,770				5,770
89	BUDGET DETECTION SYSTEM (INDS)						
90	DAIRP						
91	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS				(19,895)		
92	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		23,958				23,958
93	ADP OPERATIONS CONSOLIDATION		5,173				5,173
94	WWWCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS						
95	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL						
96	PENTAGON RENOVATION						
97	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		15,247				15,247
98	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		2,079				2,079
99	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		7,548				7,548
100	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM		26,851				26,851

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
96	AIR FORCE SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK		25,495				25,495
97	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS		52,616				52,616
98	EASTERN/WESTERN RANGE I&M AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS		114,505				114,505
99	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS				(15,000)		
100	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE		73,138				58,138
101	USCENTCOM		2,219				2,219
102	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG		18,058				18,058
103	MILSATCOM		43,362				43,362
104	SATELLITE TERMINALS DISA PROGRAMS						
105	WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE						
106	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMER COMM NET ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
107	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		24,628				24,628
108	RADIO EQUIPMENT		7,172				7,172
109	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)		2,492				2,492
110	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		5,764				5,764
111	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE						
112	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
113	CAP COM & ELECT						
114	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 MODIFICATIONS		6,638				6,638
115	COMM ELECT MODS						
116	ARTLUM VOICE		20,424				20,424
117	SPACE MODS OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		37,142				37,142
118	TEST EQUIPMENT						
119	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE		10,024				10,024
120	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		1,604				1,604
121	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP		11,820				11,820
122	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		976				976
123	BREATHING APPARATUS TWO HOUR		3,134				3,134
124	UNIVERSAL WATER ACTIVATED REL SYS		7,480				7,480
125	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000		4,802				4,802
126	DEPOT PLANT & MATERIALS HANDLING EQ MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		3,525				3,525

Line No.	Title	FY 1986 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
127	BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT						
128	AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP						
129	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT		4,090				4,090
130	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC		3,186				3,186
131	FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF2D		328				328
132	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,284				3,284
133	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT						
134	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT		12,843				12,843
135	MEDICAL/GENERAL EQUIPMENT						
136	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS						
137	AIR BASE OPERABILITY		4,316				4,316
138	PALLET AIR CARGO	4,000	3,677				3,677
139	NET ASSEMBLY, 108		1,952				1,952
140	BLADES/FUEL		3,933				3,933
141	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM		6,231				6,231
142	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
143	PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT						
144	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS						
145	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		17,670				17,670
146	WARTIME HOST NATION SUPPORT		1,699				1,699
147	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
148	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS		3,320				3,320
149	SPATIAL DISORIENTATION DEMONSTRATOR						
150	AIR CONDITIONERS						
151	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		9,269				9,269
152	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY						
153	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ		61,228		16,700		61,228
154	SR YR GROUND STATIONS		1,049				1,049
155	DAWP						
156	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		74,051				74,051
157	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		5,409,357				5,409,357
158	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		158,402				158,402
159	MODIFICATIONS		1,156				1,156
160	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		199		(247,100)		199
			12,914				12,914

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
161	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		61,715		(258,696)	61,715	6,846,001
	Totals		6,804,696				

**Air Force Aircraft**

**Strategic airlift**

The Milestone III Defense Acquisition Board (DAB) Integrated Airlift Force Decision is planned for November, 1995. The committee understands this decision will determine the proper size and composition of the airlift fleet. If the November Milestone III DAB Integrated Airlift Force Decision recommends a mixed fleet of additional C-17 and Non Developmental Airlift Aircraft (NDAA) to best support our airlift requirements, the committee encourages the Air Force to begin a robust procurement of those aircraft. To initiate this effort, of the funds provided in the fiscal year 1996 budget request in the Strategic Airlift account, \$183.0 million may be used for the NDAA program or for advanced procurement for the C-17. The committee also encourages the Air Force to merge the \$85.0 million remaining from fiscal year 1994 with these funds. The committee further expects the Air Force to program funds in the future year defense program, starting with fiscal year 1997, for procurement of the recommended NDAA program in order to accelerate and achieve the airlift goals.

**C-17 Spares**

The committee is aware that the Air Force's fiscal year 1996 request for spares and repair parts can be reduced by \$21.9 million for initial spares allocated to the C-17 because the aircraft requires only \$95.6 million for initial spares instead of the requested \$117.5 million. These data are based on the assumption of a 120 aircraft C-17 program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease in aircraft procurement, Air Force spares and repair parts.

**Air Force Ammunition**

**Air Force ammunition**

The committee recommends the following adjustment to the budget request for Air Force ammunition procurement:

<i>Item</i>	<i>Millions</i>
CBU 87 .....	\$30.0
Subtotal .....	30.0

**Air Force Missile**

**Defense Support Program procurement**

The budget request included \$102.9 million for Defense Support Program (DSP) procurement. The committee understands that \$35.9 million in fiscal year 1995 funds are excess and being considered for reprogramming for non-DSP purposes. The committee, therefore, reduces the fiscal year 1996 DSP procurement budget by \$35.9 million and directs the Air Force to use the excess fiscal year 1995 funds to fulfill fiscal year 1996 requirements.

**Minuteman guidance replacement program**

The Department of Defense's Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) recommended that the United States maintain three wings of Minute-

man III intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) for the foreseeable future. The NPR recommended the replacement of the aging Minuteman III guidance system electronics and the remotoring of the missiles. The committee strongly supports rapid implementation of these recommendations and the maintenance of 500 operational Minuteman III missiles.

Minuteman III guidance systems were produced from 1970 to 1978 with all systems now 7 to 15 years beyond their design life of 10 years. To ensure the timely replacement of the aging Minuteman III guidance system, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in procurement funds to begin the guidance replacement program and to ensure that the first article delivery, now scheduled for September 1998, does not slip again, and that all installations on the 500 Minuteman III missiles are complete in the 2002 timeframe.

#### **Global Positioning System block IIF advanced procurement**

In fiscal year 1996 the Air Force plans to begin both development and advanced procurement of the Block IIF Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites. The budget request for advanced procurement was \$38.4 million. Due to the excessive amount of concurrency between development and procurement of this system, the committee believes that a one year delay is warranted. The committee believes that this delay will not seriously impact the Air Force's ability to develop and deploy the Block IIF. Moreover, the delay will allow time to solve technical issues associated with the Block IIR. The committee therefore recommends no funds for GPS Block IIF advanced procurement in fiscal year 1996.

#### **Space boosters**

Due to savings possible by combining Titan, Atlas and Centaur activities at the launch bases and manufacturing facilities, the committee recommends a \$15.0 million reduction in the Air Force budget for space booster procurement.

#### **Defense Satellite Communications System**

The budget request for the Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS) procurement was \$25.7 million. Due to reduced launch costs, the committee recommends a reduction of \$7.5 million in Air Force procurement for DSCS.

### **Other Air Force Procurement**

#### **Avionics support equipment**

The Navy has been developing the consolidated automated support system (CASS) to provide a common ground support system for its sophisticated aircraft avionics. The committee notes that the Navy has been making progress on CASS, with reliability currently at rates greater than three times the operational requirement. Further, the recent competition for CASS production has provided significant procurement cost savings. The Navy expects that fully fielding the CASS program will yield up to \$8.0 billion in life-cycle cost savings for Navy aviation units.

The committee is concerned about the Air Force's plans to pursue a separate path for supporting each of its aircraft avionics systems, despite the similarities among different aircraft avionics. Since the Navy has consolidated its support requirements for multiple types of aircraft, the committee questions whether the additional research and development, procurement, and support for each Air Force aircraft system is a prudent expense.

The committee believes that the Air Force should investigate using the Navy CASS program as the basis for consolidating its avionics support requirements. The committee notes that the Air Force has identified airlifting support equipment as a major concern for any future deployments. Since the Air Force has also established several composite wings, it seems reasonable to consider providing common support equipment to lessen the potential deployment burdens for these wings. The committee understands that the Navy's CASS architecture would allow repackaging for a deployable configuration to meet this requirement.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the potential of applying the Navy's CASS program to meet the Air Force's requirements. The Secretary should submit the report by March 1, 1996.

#### **SUBTITLE D—OTHER PROGRAMS**

##### **Section - 131. Tier II predator unmanned aerial vehicle program.**

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 limited the Tier II UAV to ten air vehicles and three ground stations, and expressed concern regarding the overall DOD management of UAV programs. The committee is unaware of additional requirements for Tier II UAV that would justify continued procurement, and continues to be concerned about the proliferation of different types of UAV's and the capability of the DOD organizational structure to manage the number of complex and diverse UAV programs in development and procurement. The committee notes the lack of progress in fielding effective, operational UAV systems, and believes that the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office and the UAV Joint Program Office could manage fewer programs more effectively. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would prohibit obligating or expending funds for further procurement, research, development, test or evaluation of the Tier II Predator UAV program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the defense committees along with the fiscal year 1997 budget request indicating measures to strengthen the management of UAV programs in order to facilitate more timely fielding of required operationally effective systems.

##### **Section - 132. Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle program.**

The committee has strongly supported the adaptation of the CARS to the entire family of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) for several years to reduce total personnel requirements, reduce the requirement for pilot training, and extend operational capabilities by enabling UAV recoveries in all weather conditions during day and

night operations. The committee is convinced that use of CARS will dramatically reduce accidents during UAV recoveries, currently a major source of aircraft loss and damage.

The committee has repeatedly identified this system as an example of desired commonality, and directed that it be applied promptly to all UAV systems in use and under development. The committee understands that five sets of CARS are to be procured in the summer of 1995 for Pioneer UAVs, and that the remaining four of the nine Pioneer systems are to be transferred to the Navy.

As a result of the continuing delay in fielding of CARS on UAVs, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Navy ensure that five sets of CARS are procured as government furnished equipment (GFE) and installed on Navy UAVs as soon as possible.

The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million and directs the Secretary of the Navy to procure four additional sets of CARS as GFE and install them on the four remaining Pioneer systems. The committee reaffirms its commitment that CARS should be integral to every UAV system used by U.S. military services, and directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the defense committees with the fiscal year 1997 budget submission a plan for procurement and integration of CARS to all U.S. military UAVs.

The committee recommends a provision which would restrict the obligation of funds for the operations and activities of the UAV Joint Program Office until all nine Pioneer systems are equipped with CARS.

**Defense-Wide Procurement**

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..OSD/WHS..						
1	MOTOR VEHICLES		304			304	
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..OSD		193,321			193,321	
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..WHS		16,670			16,670	
4	ARMED FORCE INFORMATION SERVICE		4,907			4,907	
5	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY		1,612			1,612	
6	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		770			770	
7	DAHP		179,307			183,807	
8	CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT		4,933		4,500	4,933	
9	DEFENSE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE		54,234			54,234	
10	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..NSA						
11	DEFENSE ARMORRE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM		16,978			16,978	
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DNA..						
12	VEHICLES		130			130	
13	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		7,971			7,971	
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DIA..						
14	WVWCCS ADP SYSTEMS		4,446			4,446	
15	INFORMATION SERVICES TRANSFER						
16	PLANS & PROGRAM ANALYSIS SUPPORT CENTER		1,498			1,498	
17	ITBMS LESS THAN 92 MILLION		294			294	
18	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DIA						
21	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		7,291			7,291	
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DLA..						
22	COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT						
23	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
24	VECTOR PRODUCT EQUIPMENT						
25	DEVELOPMENT TEST FACILITY						
26	MC & G MAINFRAME UPGRADE						
27	VEHICLES		1,211			1,211	
28	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT						
29	DEFENSE HYDROGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DIS..						
30	VEHICLES						
	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	333	3,117			3,117	
31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT..DCAA..		6,801			6,801	

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
32	ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION		3,980				3,980
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
33	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO		25,104				25,104
34	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO		-				-
35	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		-				-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, IJS						
36	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		38,717				38,717
	ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY						
37	VEHICLES		-				-
38	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		2,941				2,941
39	PATROIT		399,500		(104,500)		295,000
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
40	C4I		32,242				32,242
41	HAWK BN/C3 MODS		5,106				5,106
42	NAVY LOWER TIER		16,900				16,900
	CENTRAL IMAGERY OFFICE						
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
44	RADIO FREQUENCY MOBILE ELECTRONIC TEST SET		29,801				29,801
45	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES		9,042				9,042
46	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS		26,818				26,818
47	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II		12,134				12,134
48	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION		57,165				57,165
49	C-130 MODIFICATIONS		115,518				115,518
49	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(5,101)				(5,101)
50	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-				-
51	H-63 MODIFICATIONS		-				-
52	MH-47/MH-60 MODIFICATIONS		-				-
53	OH-6 PROCUREMENT & MODIFICATIONS		-				-
54	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		5,946				5,946
	SHIPBUILDING						
55	PC CYCLONE CLASS		-				-
56	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)		-				-
57	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE		11,115				11,115
58	SUBMARINE CONVERSION		6,770				6,770
58	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)		(2,086)				(2,086)
59	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		-				-
60	MK V SPECIAL OPERATIONS CRAFT (MK V SOC)		19,501	2	17,700	4	37,201
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request		Change to Request		Senate Authorized	
		Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount	Quantity	Amount
61	SOF PYRO/DEMO		23,887				23,887
62	SOF PLATFORM GUN AMMUNITION		45,412				45,412
63	SOF INDIV WEAPONS AMMUNITION OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS		8,559				8,559
64	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS		35,878				35,878
65	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		32,824				32,824
66	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS		19,810				19,810
67	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		9,972				9,972
68	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS		11,776		(4,293)		7,483
69	SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
70	LIGHT STRIKE VEHICLE						
71	DRUG INTERDICTION		809				809
72	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		595				595
73	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM (SOPARS)		77,656				77,656
74	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		28,106				28,106
75	PSYOP EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
75	PROTECTIVE MASK		24,819				24,819
76	AIRCREW MASK		4,190				4,190
77	REMOTE CHEM AGT ALARM (RSCAAL)		7,232				7,232
78	IMPROVED CHEM AGENT MONITOR (ICAM)	237					
79	AUTO CHEM AGENT ALARM (ACADA)						
80	NBC RECON SYS (NBCRS) MODS		46,033				46,033
81	MODULAR DECON SYSTEM						
82	M17 DECON MODS		3,165				3,165
83	POCKET RADIAC AN/UDR-13	4,636					
84	CB PROTECTIVE SHELTER	62					
85	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PRGM		11,494				11,494
86	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE EQ (AF)		22,860				22,860
87	CHEM WARFARE DETECTORS		11,049				11,049
88	CB HELO NDN		5,485				5,485
89	CBR EQUIP-SHIPBOARD		498				498
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		428,603		25,000		453,603
	Totals		2,179,917		(61,893)		2,118,324
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT				777,400		777,400

Line No.	Title	FY 1996 Request Quantity	Amount	Change to Request Quantity	Amount	Senate Authorized Quantity	Amount
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
1	DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-ROTB&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - ROT&E		53,400				53,400
	Totals		53,400				53,400
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC		239,448		(75,000)		224,448
	Totals		239,448		(75,000)		239,448
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M		393,850				393,850
	Totals		393,850				393,850
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		288,033				288,033
1	DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL		1,000				1,000

### Mark V special operations craft

The Mark V special operations craft is an 81-foot aluminum monohull craft with a displacement of 55 tons, a sustained top speed of 45 to 50 knots and a range of 250 to 300 nautical miles. The Mark V is intended to provide a medium range insertion and extraction capability for Special Operations Forces in a low to medium threat environment and a secondary mission of coastal patrol and interdiction. The budget request provided \$19.5 million for the procurement of two Mark V craft with associated equipment. Commander-in-Chief, Special Operations Command in testimony before the Armed Services Committee in February, 1995 stated that four craft were required in fiscal year 1996.

The committee recommends an increase of \$17.7 million to procure two additional Mark V craft and associated equipment in fiscal year 1996.

### Rigid hull inflatable boat (RHIB)

The committee supports the effort to acquire a fleet of RHIBs as the standard mobility platform for SEAL platoons, and is aware that the initial 10-meter RHIB design proved unsatisfactory. The committee recommends a decrease of \$4.3 million in Special Operations Forces (SOF) Maritime Equipment and a corresponding increase of that amount to the RDT&E account program element 116404BB to provide adequate funds for a follow-on developmental effort. The committee authorizes the Special Operations Command to use funds remaining in the SOF Maritime Equipment account to procure 24-foot RHIB craft from industry until the new RHIB under development can be procured in sufficient quantities.

### National Guard and Reserve Equipment

The committee continues its strong support for the National Guard and the other reserve components but remains concerned about the degree to which the National Guard and the other reserve components are being modernized. The committee is convinced that the Department of Defense has grown to rely on annual congressional increases for equipment for the National Guard and the other reserve components and does not include in annual budget requests adequate resources to properly equip the reserve components. The committee recommends a provision in title X, described elsewhere in this report, which would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a special report to the congressional defense committees dealing with these issues.

The committee recommends an increase of \$777.4 million for equipment for the National Guard and the other reserve components as indicated in the following table:

#### *Title I Procurement*

<i>National Guard and Reserve Equipment</i>		
<i>Army Reserve</i>		<i>Thousands</i>
Medium Truck ESP .....		\$10,000
Heavy Truck Modernization .....		15,000
Night Vision Equipment .....		5,000
Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System (SINCGARS) .....		5,000
Chemical/Biological Defense Equipment .....		2,000

Miscellaneous Equipment .....	25,000
	<hr/>
	\$62,000
<i>Naval Reserve</i>	
C9 Upgrade .....	\$25,000
F-18 Upgrades .....	24,000
MIUW TS Q-108 .....	10,000
Miscellaneous Equipment .....	15,000
	<hr/>
	\$74,000
<i>Marine Corps Reserve</i>	
AH-1W Helicopters (3) .....	\$35,000
SINCGARS .....	5,000
Night Vision Equipment .....	5,000
Miscellaneous Equipment .....	10,000
	<hr/>
	\$55,000
<i>Air Force Reserve</i>	
C-130J (5) .....	\$210,000
C-20G (1) .....	30,000
	<hr/>
	\$240,000
<i>Army National Guard</i>	
Avenger (1BN) .....	\$54,000
Paladin/FAASV (1BN) .....	55,000
MLRS (1BTRY) .....	16,400
M113A3 Upgrades .....	10,000
M113A3 Night Viewers .....	2,000
Medium Truck ESP .....	10,000
Heavy Truck Modernization .....	10,000
Night Vision Equipment .....	5,000
Chemical/Biological Defense Equipment .....	2,000
SINCGARS .....	5,000
AH-64 Mission Simulator .....	15,000
AH-1 Boresighting Device .....	5,000
Full Authority Digital Electronic Control (CH-47) .....	5,000
Miscellaneous Equipment .....	15,000
	<hr/>
	\$209,400
<i>Air National Guard</i>	
C-130 H (3) .....	\$102,000
KC-135 Re-engining (1) .....	26,000
C-26 (2) .....	9,000
	<hr/>
	\$137,000
Total .....	\$777,400

### **National Guard artillery modernization**

The committee remains committed to ensuring the Army National Guard is adequately modernized. A key component in the modernization plan of the Army National Guard is the upgrade of 51 battalions and seven additional batteries with the M109A6 Paladin system. Initial cost estimates of this modernization exceed current levels of funding.

A possible interim solution to this modernization problem is an upgrade of the M109A5 system currently in the Army National Guard inventory. The committee encourages the Army to evaluate the M109A5 upgrade for digital and survivability advantages and other enhancements until the M109A6 can be fielded to all appropriate Army National Guard units.

In order to accomplish this evaluation, the Army is authorized to use RDTE funds to prototype and evaluate not more than two M109A5 systems for use by the Army National Guard.

**High Capacity Air Ambulances**

The committee understands the Army will complete a mission needs statement (MNS) and operational requirements document (ORD) before October 1, 1995 for a High Capacity Air Ambulance (HCAA). These documents will provide the rationale and definition for a program of responsive casualty evacuation combined with enroute treatment.

Because of the existing expertise within the National Guard in emergency medical service, aviation, and operations, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to assign the mission, once developed, to the National Guard; and to report to the committee not later than April 15, 1996 on the recommended doctrine, organization, and mission statement for the High Capacity Air Ambulance concept.

**Naval Reserve C-9B Aircraft**

The committee is aware of the need to get the longest use of existing systems through periodic upgrades. The committee recommends \$25.0 million of the total funds authorized for National Guard and Reserve equipment be used for the purpose of continuing the avionics modernization program for the C-9B aircraft in an effort to avoid block obsolescence of these efficient and durable aircraft.

## **TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION (RDT&E)**

The committee recommends investments in research and development to address mission needs and to ensure that military systems embody the most advanced technologies.

Appropriate subcommittees of the full committee conducted hearings and reviewed information on various research and development program requests including: national and theater missile defense programs; Army general purpose programs; new ships and related ship programs; tactical and strategic aircraft and associated systems; counterproliferation programs; command, control and communications programs; science and technology programs; and DOD dual-use technology programs.

The committee's research and development priorities were to focus on improving battlefield capabilities assuring contingency U.S. military superiority and to achieving future savings. In the case of the request for science and technology programs, the committee agreed to reduce funding for the maintenance of the RDT&E infrastructure and for unspecified investment in favor of maintaining strong technology base programs in the military departments.

The committee recommendations appear in subsequent tables.

### **Explanation of tables**

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 1996 and the committee's actions in regard to the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures.

## **SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS**

### **Section - 211. A/F117X long-range, medium attack aircraft.**

#### **Joint advanced strike technology program**

The Department of Defense established the joint advanced strike technology (JAST) program to develop technologies that would lead to replacements for several different aircraft systems for the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Navy. Each of the three services has distinctly different requirements. The Air Force needs a conventional takeoff and landing (CTOL) aircraft to replace the F-16. The Marine Corps needs a vertical/short takeoff and landing (VSTOL) aircraft to replace the AV-8B. The Navy needs a survivable medium attack variant to meet the requirements formerly filled by the A-6. The committee believes that the JAST program

represents a bold leap ahead in technology integration, with an emphasis on cost-effective solutions.

The organization, management and technical expertise embodied in the JAST program leadership have made a favorable impression on the committee. However, even with the best leadership and expertise, the program faces substantial challenges.

The most doubtful aspect of the program's future is its ability to fulfill the needs of three different services. Two years ago, the committee asked the Department to report on the potential for having the Navy participate in the F-22 program as a way to meet the Navy's requirements for a highly capable aircraft platform. The DOD report explained the difficulty of having the Navy join the F-22 program, although the F-22 program had not completed a single engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) aircraft. So, while the Department claims that the F-22 cannot be modified before production for a naval mission, the Department asserts that the JAST program will provide Air Force, Marine and Navy variants.

The committee believes that there are two separate approaches that would be appropriate to reduce risk that JAST will not meet expectations.

#### *Risk Reduction—Current Program*

For the JAST program to be deemed a complete success, the program must deliver a true, low cost family of operational aircraft to meet the needs of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. The committee believes that concept demonstration aircraft flight testing is critical to making such a successful transition. A test of full scale, full thrust demonstration aircraft by competing contractors would provide test data applicable to evaluating the unique attributes required by each Service. It would also be in keeping with the committee's longstanding "fly-before-buy" philosophy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, from within funds in the original fiscal year 1996 budget, to ensure that the JAST program leads to such a competitive demonstration.

Further, the committee believes supporting competitive propulsion programs would help reduce risk and lead to higher confidence of achieving more affordable life cycle costs. The committee fears that the current JAST approach may lead to selecting one power plant manufacturer prematurely. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary to evaluate at least two propulsion concepts from competing engine companies as part of the full scale, full thrust aircraft demonstrators.

#### *Risk Reduction—Additional Program Scope*

Of the three sets of requirements, the committee believes that Navy's is most demanding. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense will have few alternatives for meeting the medium attack variant requirement if the JAST program cannot.

The committee is aware of a proposal to develop a carrier-capable variant of the F-117 stealth fighter that could greatly benefit from capabilities pioneered in the F-117 program. The F-117 has a distinguished combat record. Developing a carrier-capable variant would be in keeping with a near-term modernization strategy of ac-

quiring developed systems. This could help provide confidence in a workable solution to meet the Navy's needs through capitalizing on development already done, and could provide an available alternative in case the JAST program is unable to fulfill all three sets of requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a thorough examination of this proposal in fiscal year 1996 to develop a carrier-capable variant of the F-117 stealth fighter, a so-called "A/F-117X," in defining a potential program. The committee expects the essential risk reduction efforts to include: large scale high and low speed wind tunnel testing, radar cross section (RCS) component testing, detailed propulsion design, structural analysis to validate carrier suitability, and completion of required trade studies and reports to validate A/F-117X capability to meet defined Navy requirements.

The committee recommends an additional \$175.0 million in fiscal year 1996. The committee directs that the Navy not expend more than \$25.0 million of this amount to conduct the initial examination. The Secretary shall submit a report on the results of this examination to the congressional defense committees by March 29, 1996. Final analysis by the Navy should assess production risk, scope, aircraft performance, and cost for engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program.

The remaining \$150.0 million would be made available to execute an A/F-117X EMD program, presuming that the Secretary of the Navy approves the results of program definition effort. The committee expects that these additional EMD funds will be used to modify an existing F-117A test asset to a configuration able to demonstrate carrier suitability, flying qualities, and low observables durability in a shipboard environment in the near-term. Such demonstrations should allow the Navy to assess the critical carrier suitability qualities of the A/F-117X design concept early in the execution of a full EMD program.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Air Force to review the manufacturer's offer to complete the originally planned F-117 force structure, including potential upgrades through inserting technology from present development efforts. This effort should serve as the basis for comparing alternatives for meeting future Air Force requirements, including JAST products, F-22 attack variants, and an upgraded F-117.

#### **Section - 212. Navy mine countermeasures program.**

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 included a provision that transferred the primary responsibility for developing and testing naval mine countermeasures systems to the Director, Defense Research and Engineering during fiscal years 1993 through 1997. The provision contained a waiver that would permit the Navy to retain responsibility for developing and testing naval mine countermeasures if (1) the Secretary of Defense determined that the Secretary of the Navy had annually submitted to him an updated mine countermeasures master plan whose budget was adequately funded in the future years defense plan and (2) the Secretary of Defense certified the adequacy of the Navy's plan to the congressional defense committees each year during the effec-

tive period of the provision. The National Defense Authorization Act of 1994 amended the applicable period to include fiscal years 1995 through 1999.

To better assign responsibility to the cognizant official in the Department of Defense, the committee recommends an amendment that would substitute the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology in lieu of the Director, Defense Research and Engineering as the person responsible for developing and testing naval mine countermeasures systems. The amendment would also change the applicable period to include fiscal years 1997 through 1999.

### **Section - 213. Marine Corps shore fire support.**

The committee has strongly encouraged the Navy/Marine Corps team over the past five years to develop or acquire shore fire support capability to supplant the firepower lost when the Navy's battleships were decommissioned. The committee has repeatedly indicated its views to the Navy and the Marine Corps that the capability to provide indirect fire suppression, essential for the conduct of amphibious operations, is an urgent requirement. The committee is unimpressed with Navy/Marine Corps efforts to date to devise a solution to this deficiency.

The committee is aware of improvements to the Army Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) which may make the MLRS a suitable system to provide requisite shipboard indirect fire suppression for Marine Corps amphibious operations. The Army has already developed and will soon begin production of the Extended Range (ER) rocket which will increase the range from 30 to 45 kilometers. The Army also has a program underway to improve the actuator system on the launcher which may provide sufficient stabilization to the system to enable MLRS to be fired effectively from the deck of a ship. The Army also has a developmental program to adapt Global Positioning System (GPS) guidance to both the MLRS launcher and rocket. These improvements indicate the potential of the MLRS to assume a major role in filling the Marine Corps requirement for sea-based indirect fire suppression.

The committee believes the Navy could conduct a live-fire demonstration in fiscal year 1997 if funding is provided in fiscal year 1996 to allow preparation for such demonstration.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million and recommends a provision which would direct the Secretary of the Navy to make necessary preparations in fiscal year 1996 to conduct a shipboard demonstration of ER-MLRS, incorporating the improved launcher mechanical system (ILMS) and a guided rocket in fiscal year 1997. The Secretary of the Navy is also directed to ensure that the Navy/Marine Corps team thoroughly examines two potential applications of ER-MLRS: (1) firing the improved ER-MLRS from the deck of a ship to support an amphibious assault; and, (2) transporting the MLRS launchers via LCAC to the beach where these launchers then would become the Marine Corps general support artillery. The Secretary of the Navy shall also submit to the congressional defense committees a progress report on this program in May and September, 1996.

The committee does not intend this effort to supplant Navy shore fire support developmental efforts, but to complement such efforts. The committee believes, however, that the sea-based MLRS concept could be fielded early, providing a near-term capability.

**Section - 214. Space and missile tracking system program.**

The Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) will replace and provide increased performance over the existing Defense Support Program (DSP) system. SBIRS will incorporate new technologies to enhance detection, provide direct reporting of strategic and theater ballistic missile launches, and provide mid-course tracking and discrimination data for national and theater missile defense. The system will consist of sensors located in geosynchronous orbits (GEO), highly elliptical orbits (HEO), and low earth orbits (LEO), and an integrated centralized ground station serving all space elements of SBIRS as well as DSP.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for the process that was employed in deciding upon the SBIRS architecture and the streamlined acquisition strategy that has been adopted. The committee expects the resulting integrated structure to provide the basis for program stability and efficiency in what has been an overly turbulent and protracted search for a DSP follow-on. More importantly, the committee expects the SBIRS program to be a catalyst in the development of a new approach to missile warning. Tactical Warning and Attack Assessment (TW/AA) can no longer be viewed as a mission which stands separate from ballistic missile defense. Future national and theater missile defenses must be integrated with, and take maximum advantage of, the SBIRS architecture. SBIRS also signals a dramatic technical departure from past approaches. The introduction of a distributed LEO constellation will provide tremendous advantages and opportunities, some of which are not yet fully understood. In addition to its role in missile defense, the LEO system will make major contributions in the areas of technical intelligence and space object characterization and surveillance.

The budget request for SBIRS included \$130.7 million for Demonstration/Validation (Dem/Val), \$152.2 for Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD), and \$19.9 million for Procurement. Of the funds requested for Dem/Val, \$114.8 million was for the Space and Missile Tracking System (SMTS), formerly known as "Brilliant Eyes."

After evaluation of its original ground system development plan, the Air Force has decided to restructure the program to re-phase hardware purchases and software engineering to allow for a more careful evaluation of system costs versus military utility. Hence, the \$19.9 million procurement request is no longer needed for the previously identified purpose. The committee, therefore, recommends no funding for SBIRS procurement (PE 35915F), and recommends that \$10.0 million of these funds be transferred to SBIRS EMD (PE 0604441F) to support ground system risk reduction, for a total of \$162.2 million. Of this amount, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to use \$9.4 million to launch the third Miniature Sensor Technology Integration (MSTI-3) satellite.

MSTI-3 will provide critical infrared background clutter phenomenology data for the SBIRS high element EMD program.

Although the committee endorses the priority and schedule for the GEO and HEO components of SBIRS, it views the current schedule for the LEO segment to be unacceptably prolonged. Current plans do not call for the first launch of an objective SMTS satellite until 2006. This leisurely schedule is based on the assumption that SMTS will not be needed to support national or theater missile defenses before this date. The committee strongly disputes this planning assumption. Theater missile defense systems that will be able to exploit SMTS data will become operational before the turn of the century. More important, the Missile Defense Act of 1995 (Subtitle C of Title II), is premised in part on an SMTS initial operational capability in fiscal year 2003.

The committee notes that there are no technical obstacles to having a first launch of an SMTS user operational evaluation system (UOES) satellite in 2001. The committee, therefore, recommends a provision which requires the Secretary of the Air Force to restructure the SMTS program to support a first launch of UOES satellites in fiscal year 2001, with the full SMTS constellation (consisting of a combination of UOES satellites and objective satellites) on orbit by the end of fiscal year 2003. To support this restructured schedule, the committee recommends an authorization of \$250.0 million in fiscal year 1996 for the SMTS program, an increase of \$135.0 million over the budget request. The committee directs the Air Force to restructure the SMTS schedule to meet the following milestones:

- Preliminary Design Review (PDR) and Critical Design Review (CDR) of the flight demonstration system (FDS) in fiscal year 1996.
- System Requirements Review (SRR) for the objective SMTS satellites in fiscal year 1996.
- Formal Requirements Review (FRR), deployment decision, and PDR for the objective SMTS satellites in fiscal year 1997.
- Launch of the FDS satellites in fiscal year 1998.
- CDR for the objective satellites in fiscal year 1999.

The objective SMTS system shall be designed, developed, tested and constructed to detect, characterize, track, and synthesize stereo track information concerning ballistic missile attack. The system shall be designed to generate and transmit, in a sufficiently timely manner, all data necessary to enable defensive interceptors to commit, launch, fly-out, and receive in flight target updates and guidance information in advance of—or in place of—the defensive system's associated radar, and in a way which maximizes the kinematic potential of the defensive interceptor to conduct ballistic missile intercepts.

To ensure that this schedule and these technical specifications are met, the committee recommends a provision which would require the Air Force to seek the concurrence of the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization before implementing any decision that would have any of the following results regarding SMTS: (1) a reduction in funds available in any fiscal year; (2) an increase in the total program cost; (3) a schedule delay; or (4) a modification of the performance parameters or specifications.

As a result of budgetary constraints, the Air Force has been forced to down-select to a single flying contractor for the SMTS FDS. While the committee does not oppose this decision, it does believe that the Air Force should consider alternatives for maintaining competition and reducing risk. The committee is aware of proposals to have the non-flying contractor conduct a low-cost flight experiment to provide a second SMTS concept capable of moving forward into EMD. The committee understands that such a flight experiment could be conducted for a total of \$80 million over three years. The committee urges the Air Force to carefully evaluate this alternative and to determine whether this approach could in fact reduce risk and help meet the deployment goals specified above. If the Secretary of the Air Force determines that this approach would help achieve the deployment goals specified above, the committee authorizes the use of up to \$40 million of the funds authorized for SMTS in fiscal year 1996 to begin such a low-cost flight experiment.

#### **Section - 215. Precision guided munitions.**

The Heavy Bomber Study required by the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 1995 emphasized the value of precision guided munitions (PGM) in future air campaigns as an especially cost effective warfighting capability.

While the committee is persuaded of the importance and value of precision guided munitions, it is also concerned over the management and rationalization of the many disparate programs in production and under development. The military services have bought or are developing 33 types of PGM with over 300,000 individual munitions to attack surface targets. The services estimate that when planned development and procurement are complete, the United States will have invested nearly \$58.6 billion (then year dollars) in the 33 PGM types. Presently there are 19 munition types in inventory and production with a total of 130,422 munitions acquired at a cost of \$30.4 billion.

Within the overall category of PGM, the committee has acknowledged three areas for concern: upgrades to the bomber force to enable them to employ PGM; the need for a long-term cohesive, joint PGM program; and a coherent, interim plan to provide limited numbers of precision munitions that are now available while the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) family of weapons completes development.

#### *Interim PGM*

The committee acknowledges the requirement for precision munitions, both those that can be procured now as "interim" capability, and those under development for the future. However, the committee also recognizes the need for a rational, structured program for both near-term and long-term PGM requirements, while acknowledging the individual Services' concepts of operations and unique platform characteristics. In requiring a comprehensive review of PGM procurement and development, the committee's intent is not to develop a single weapon that embodies excessive compromises to fit each service's platform characteristics, but rather to ensure com-

plementary development of systems to cover a wide range of targets.

The committee is persuaded of the need to rationalize and oversee the acquisition of PGM's to ensure:

- adequate future commitment to completion of the acquisition programs;
- a comprehensive evaluation of complementary and joint use of weapons to attack a comprehensive target set (fixed, mobile, land and sea) from a variety of delivery systems;
- efficient development and procurement of systems.

### **Section - 216. Defense Nuclear Agency programs.**

The committee is concerned with the decline in funding for research and development for the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) and the resulting detrimental impact on nuclear expertise and the ability of the Services to operate in a nuclear, biological, and chemical environments. Funding for DNA research and development has declined by around 40 percent over the past fifteen years, and based on documents provided to the committee, it appears that the Secretary of Defense intends to make even further reductions. This action is extremely disturbing, considering the threat of the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and technology, as stated by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Commanders in Chief and the Services, in statements and testimony before the Congress.

Equally, if not more troubling, is the idea that radiation hardening of microelectronics to protect space-based systems is unnecessary and not affordable in today's security environment. The demand for radiation hardened chips has dropped since the end of the Cold War, however, the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction makes limited nuclear use in regional conflicts much more likely. Current U.S. strategy and conventional superiority relies on high technology systems which are becoming inherently vulnerable to the effects of radiation and electromagnetic pulse (EMP). Current and next generation military satellites are vulnerable to a single nuclear strike, undermining our conventional warfighting capability. Given the attention the Department places on proliferation and the maintenance of conventional superiority in a regional contingency, the current lack of attention on radiation hardening is strategically shortsighted.

#### *DNA Mission*

The committee is also concerned that the Office of the Secretary of Defense continues to question DNA's mission, despite a series of exhaustive congressionally-mandated reviews spanning several years, which concluded that DNA should serve as the Department of Defense's center for nuclear expertise; and that its expertise should be applied to the emerging nuclear and related weapons of mass destruction (WMD) challenges and related defense needs, particularly in the area of counterproliferation targeting technologies and biological and chemical agent destruction. The committee expects the Department of Defense to maintain this mission and to maximize the DNA's inherent expertise over a wide range of national security challenges, as well as consolidate further nuclear

support missions within the Agency. Furthermore, as the agency with expertise in nuclear matters for the Department, the committee expects DNA to be an outspoken advocate for its missions. In order to be effective, the resources necessary to perform simulation of weapons effects using non-nuclear testing methods and other applications to enhance the span of lethality options must be included in its budget. The committee is not convinced that in this era of declining budgets that the Services will allocate or prioritize the necessary funds to compensate DNA for such tests. It is the committee's experience that, faced with conflicting priorities, the Services would place simulation and testing near the bottom of their priority lists. Additionally, DNA can offer efficiencies, as DOD's center for nuclear expertise, which the Services cannot offer. In this era of declining budgets, consolidating funding and effort should be guiding principles in dealing with the WMD threat. DNA remains a key player in the national nuclear support infrastructure and a central participant in the national response to the WMD challenge.

#### *DNA Budget Request*

The committee recommends authorization of \$252.9 million for fiscal year 1996 for the Defense Nuclear Agency, a \$23.0 million increase to the fiscal year 1996 budget request. Of those funds authorized, the committee directs the following:

—\$3.0 million for the establishment of a tunnel characterization/neutralization program to be managed by DNA as part of the department's counterproliferation effort. The initial source of funding for this effort shall include the \$10 million directed by the Deputy Secretary to DNA in Fiscal Year 1996 for this purpose;

—\$6.0 million for the establishment of a long-term radiation tolerant microelectronics program to ensure the continued operability of U.S. military systems in regional WMD-threat scenarios. DNA shall serve as the focal point for this DOD-wide effort to develop affordable and effective hardening technologies, ensure their incorporation into systems, and sustain the supporting industrial base. Additionally, the Secretary is directed to provide a report to Congress on the effort to be conducted and the outyear funding required, no later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act.

The committee strongly encourages the Department to maintain DNA research and development funding at no less than the current level and to apply greater resources in the outyears to ensure continued nuclear competence.

#### *Electro-Thermal Chemical (ETC) Gun Program*

Lastly, the committee is pleased to learn of the significant technical progress of DNA's Electro-Thermal Chemical (ETC) Gun Program. This program is an ideal example of the outgrowth of DNA nuclear expertise being used for conventional purposes. Using nuclear expertise developed at DNA for pulse power and plasma physics, the DNA ETC gun program meets the United States Navy's requirement for Naval Surface Fire Support as a low cost, high performance alternative with sufficient range and lethality, as well as

required rate-of-fire. This past year, DNA completed a series of firings with a conventional propelling charge and a low vulnerability (LOVA) propellant which demonstrated better repeatability than the current naval gun system. Equally significant, DNA technological advancements have dramatically reduced the electrical requirement, significantly reducing the size of the Pulse Forming Network. Recognizing the revolutionary potential of this new technology, the United States, British, German, and French armies are now pursuing analogous electric armaments research. The committee encourages Army consideration of ETC propulsion for future tank applications. DNA is encouraged to support these expanded U.S. and allied efforts. To compensate for the reduction made in the fiscal year 1995 appropriations process, the committee recommends an additional \$4 million in fiscal year 1996 for the DNA ETC Gun Program.

#### *Thermionics*

The committee is dissatisfied with the slow pace of the thermionics conversion technology under Air Force management, and therefore recommends the transfer of the thermionics conversion technology from the Air Force Weapons program (PE62601F) and unobligated funds authorized and appropriated in prior years, totalling around \$12.0 million to the Defense Nuclear Agency program (PE62715H). This program converts thermal energy from a number of different sources into electricity without the use of moving parts. There are a number of defense applications for satellite power and propulsion systems as well as potential commercial applications in energy conservation. The committee also recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to accelerate this program in fiscal year 1996.

#### **Section - 217. Counterproliferation support program.**

The fiscal year 1996 budget request included \$108.2 million for the Counterproliferation Support Program to accelerate the development and deployment of essential military counterproliferation technologies and capabilities in the Department and the military services. The committee recommends an increase of \$36.3 million to the budget request.

Since the end of the Cold War, the committee has been reviewing programs of the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the intelligence community to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and their delivery systems. The committee has supported robust funding in research and development programs for near-, mid-, and long-term approaches to addressing the problem. To prioritize and optimize funding for non/counterproliferation initiatives, the Congress created the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC).

The proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are a major potential threat to national security. Areas of continuing concern to the committee are biological detection, deep underground detection and attack, and emergency preparedness and response. The committee is also concerned that funds requested for the Counterproliferation Support Program for accelerating or enhancing research and development activities in the chemical and

biological weapons defense program are not being used appropriately. Funds in this program should be used to significantly accelerate or enhance programs, or to promote advanced procurement of advanced commercial technologies which would provide the services with operation capabilities in a cost-effective manner.

#### *Biological Detection*

Biological agents and weapons are a powerful threat to the security of our nation, our allies, and innocent people everywhere because they are easy to produce, easy to conceal, cheap, and extremely lethal. The Department of Defense has established programs to develop capabilities to detect and defend against biological agents. However, delivery to the services, with limited exceptions, is expected to be around between the years 2000 to 2005. DOD's *Defense Science and Technology Strategy* states that "Bolder detection of and defense against biological agents, however they are developed, is needed today." Universities and non-profit industry have developed potential technologies for biological detection which include ultraviolet fluorescence sensors, fiber optic wave guide biodetectors, upconverting phosphor detectors, micro-electromechanical systems, whole cell biosensors, and bio-sensing mini-mass spectrometers, which could provide the military Services with operational capability at an earlier date.

The committee recommends that \$15.0 million of the funds authorized for the Counterproliferation Support Program for fiscal year 1996 be used for biological detection research and development. It is the committee's view that used separately or jointly, the above mentioned biological detectors would provide for much earlier operational capability for detection and, in some cases, near real-time detection of biological agents.

#### *Special Operations Forces*

In recognition of the Secretary of Defense's direction to prepare United States special operations forces to conduct operations in support of counterproliferation objectives, the committee recommends that \$6.3 million of the funds authorized for the Counterproliferation Support Program be allocated to the Special Operations Command (SOCOM). Funds are provided expressly for the purposes of broadening SOCOM's counterproliferation activities to include those needs consistent with the Commanders-in-Chiefs' (CINCs) priorities and the program guidance reflected in the May 1995 Report on Activities and Programs for Countering Proliferation.

#### *Underground and Deep Underground Structures*

The United States' record of detecting underground facilities is very poor. The number of facilities, activities in the facilities, and equipment stored in facilities, has been consistently underestimated. U.S. intelligence clearly underestimated the number and size of underground facilities, the amount of equipment stored, and the number of research and prototype production facilities built in the underground facilities in Germany, Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, South Africa, and Iraq. Tunnels and underground facili-

ties in North Korea and China are even more difficult for current detection systems to penetrate.

The Department must continue to pursue an aggressive program of developing detection and attack capabilities. Discriminate destruction of deep underground targets remains important, and concepts such as “deep digger” should be explored for discriminate attack on such facilities. “Deep digger” can potentially be used for a variety of missions, especially special operations, and can be delivered a number ways, ranging from special forces to aircraft. The committee directs that \$1.5 million of the funds identified for hard target characterization be used to explore the “deep digger” concept.

#### *Cruise Missile Proliferation*

The committee is concerned about the growing threat posed by cruise missiles. At least a dozen countries now have land-attack cruise missiles under development. Several of those countries appear willing to export complete systems, including systems with low observable features and component technologies and development expertise. The widespread availability of cheap guidance, navigation, and digital mapping technologies would enable developing countries to convert widely proliferated anti-ship cruise missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles to land-attack roles. Cruise missile accuracy and aerodynamic stability make them excellent platforms for delivery of biological and chemical agents, which could threaten U.S. and allied projection forces.

Given the emerging cruise missile threat, the committee believes that certain prudent measures should be taken, and recommends an increase of \$35.0 million in program element 0203801A to upgrade Patriot PAC-1 missiles to provide an improved anti-cruise missile capability. Further details of this recommendation are contained in the report section on Army research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) programs.

#### *Proliferation of Space Technology*

Now more than ever before, the United States military relies on space. The military owns, operates, and sustains a broad mix of space and ground-based capabilities to meet the spectrum of multi-service and joint warfighting requirements.

The Department of Defense and the military services are moving to greater use of commercial-off-the-shelf space technology. At the same time, the United States is granting export licenses for a number of these commercial technologies to foreign countries. Items which have been exported include commercial satellite communications, remote sensing, satellite-based navigation, and space launch services. In a conflict the United States could be faced by an adversary with significant space capabilities, or with access to space-derived data.

The administration believes it is in the United States’ interests to export these technologies so that the nation can compete effectively in the foreign market. However, the committee is concerned about the ability of the United States to counter the technological gains by proliferant countries who may gain access through massive decontrol of these technologies for export.

The committee is committed to ensuring that the United States can influence when and how those capabilities are used in a conflict. The committee recommends \$30.0 million for the continuation of the Army tactical antisatellite technologies (ASAT) program (PE 633292A) for a user operational evaluation system (UOES) contingency capability. This program would provide a contingency capability enabling the United States, if necessary, to influence the use of these technologies in a conflict, and prevent the misuse or denial of space systems and access to space.

#### *Emergency Preparedness and Response*

The nerve gas attack in Japan, the bombing in Oklahoma this year, and the 1981 contamination of the New York City water supply with U-235 serve to highlight the need for disaster preparedness. Additionally, because of recent reports of attempts to smuggle highly enriched uranium and plutonium in Eastern Europe and Russia, there is concern that those materials could make their way into the United States.

The Congress included a provision (section 1704) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should strengthen the capabilities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) interagency emergency planning and other appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies to respond to the use of chemical or biological agents by terrorists against the United States.

The following year, the Congress included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 to enable FEMA to provide, among other things, financial assistance, training, and equipment by loan or grant to the states for emergency preparedness to respond to the use of radiological, chemical, bacteriological, and biological agents or weapons.

The committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy and the intelligence community to conduct an assessment of its military disaster preparedness and civil defense plans and programs, including who will coordinate those programs, and how, to anticipate and respond to the use of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological agents or weapons.

#### *Transfer Authority*

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to transfer up to \$50.0 million from fiscal year 1996 defense-wide research and development accounts for counterproliferation support activities that are determined by the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC) to be necessary and in the national security interests.

#### *Report to Congress*

The CPRC failed to meet the requirement to provide the Congress with the annexes on special compartmented programs and special access and activity programs. The committee reminds the Department that the decision of a program manager to compartment information does not supersede the law, nor grant him the right not to produce and send the information required by law to the Congress. The committee directs the Department to comply

with the legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

**Section - 218. Nonlethal weapons program.**

Non-lethal weapons (NLW) offer field commanders important new capabilities across the spectrum of conflict, but are especially valuable in non-traditional operations where high collateral damage can inflame the situation, put U.S. lives at risk, and undermine the political objectives of the mission. NLW disable or incapacitate personnel and equipment while causing minimal collateral damage. They can also be used to make reversible attacks against infrastructure—roads or power grids, for example. NLW systems can also locate and destroy an enemy's weapons or the projectiles fired by them.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 authorized \$41.0 million for work on non-lethal weapons technology applicable to peacekeeping and law enforcement. The committee supports the continuation of the effort to identify, evaluate, develop, and field non-lethal systems and technologies, and recommends \$37.2 million for fiscal year 1996. This effort includes dual use technologies that will benefit both military forces and law enforcement. Thus the fiscal year 1996 authorization for a NLW program will incorporate the joint program conducted under the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Justice and the Department of Defense, and managed in fiscal year 1995 by the Advanced Research Projects Agency.

The committee notes the interest on the part of the Department of Defense in developing near-term NLW capabilities because of their possible value in complex, ambiguous situations that demand operational flexibility. In particular, the committee commends the initiative of the Marine Corps in transitioning non-lethal technologies for employment in Operation United Shield. Although limited in scope, the Marine Corps experience validated the operational utility of NLW. It also revealed significant shortcomings in the U.S. military's ability to deploy nonlethal and less-than-lethal systems.

Consequently, the committee directs that a new, consolidated program for non-lethal systems and technology be established and managed by the Office of Strategic and Tactical Systems of the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, which has demonstrated a commitment to systemization and fielding of mature NLW technologies. The focus of this new Program Office shall be to create the earliest possible operational capabilities for deployed forces. The committee establishes a new Program Element/budget line item for this program, and directs the following transfer of funds to the new Program Element: from PE 603570D Defense Laboratory Partnership Program, \$6.0 million; from PE 603750D Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations, \$3.4 million; from PE 602702E Tactical Technology (Advanced Land Systems), \$17.8 million; and from PE 603226E Experimental Evaluation of Major Innovative Technologies, \$10.0 million.

The committee intends that these funds be used to execute the NLW program plan recently approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology. However, the committee is

also aware of other funds being used to support highly classified programs in non-lethal technology and Operations Other Than War. The committee recommends that the new Program Office for Non-lethal Systems and Technology be given responsibility for coordinating a comprehensive, Department-wide effort in NLW and Operations Other Than War, including currently classified programs.

**Section - 219. Federally funded research and development centers.**

The committee is pleased at the degree to which the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology is attempting to assert greater management control over the 11 Department of Defense federally-funded research and development centers (FFRDC) and the similar university affiliated research centers (UARC). The committee supports the current initiatives within the Department of Defense to improve the management of fees, to define the core work that FFRDC's and UARC's perform, to compete the non-core work, and to establish an independent advisory committee to review and report annually on Department of Defense management of FFRDC's and UARC's. The committee intends to review the implementation of these initiatives in future hearings to insure that implementation is timely and aggressive.

The committee notes that the recent DOD FFRDC management efforts have included two independent reviews of the controversial issue of executive compensation. Both the DOD Inspector General and the private sector Hay Group analyzed this issue and found that executive compensation levels at FFRDC's were generally either at or below the market averages. Therefore, the committee believes that continuation of a congressionally-mandated salary ceiling is inappropriate.

In recognition of the continuing decline in funding for research and development, the committee recommends an undistributed reduction in FFRDC funding of \$90.0 million below the ceiling for fiscal year 1995 and has established a statutory ceiling for FFRDC's of \$1.162 billion in fiscal year 1996. The committee expects that this reduction will be implemented by moving non-core work, from FFRDCs other than Studies and Analyses FFRDCs, to other competitively-awarded contracts as determined by the ongoing DOD review of core capabilities for FFRDC's. The committee directs the Department to ensure adequate funding this year for those FFRDCs engaging in studies and analyses for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the services. The committee further directs the Department to provide Congress with a recommended funding ceiling for the UARCs for fiscal year 1996. The committee directs that no more than one third of the total funds for UARCs be released until the proposed ceiling is transmitted to Congress.

**Section - 220. States eligible for assistance under Defense Experimental Program To Stimulate Competitive Research.**

The committee recommends an amendment to section 257 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 that

would modify the graduation criteria for states participating in the Department of Defense EPSCoR program.

**Section - 221. National defense technology and industrial base, defense reinvestment, and conversion.**

In fiscal year 1993 the committee created the Technology Reinvestment Project (TRP), in response to the rapidly declining percentage of the national research program devoted to military research. This investment was part of a larger defense reinvestment program designed to respond to the declining defense budget.

For the last three years, the committee has supported large investments in the TRP portion of the defense reinvestment program. The projects under the TRP have been required to be competitively selected and have incorporated a requirement that the non-government participants at least match the funds invested by the federal government in the development of the technology.

This year a number of policy issues have arisen that require the committee to consider the degree to which the TRP should be funded in fiscal year 1996 and beyond. The Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology reviewed these issues during a hearing on May 17, 1995.

The first issue involves the relevance of the selected projects to the science and technology priorities of the Department of Defense and the degree to which the military services are involved in the process of selecting the technology projects. The committee has heard a number of criticisms about the insufficient involvement of the military services in the selection process for the fiscal year 1993 competition. The General Accounting Office provided testimony indicating that some of the projects, especially in the deployment portion of the program, had only an indirect relevance to a military mission. The GAO also testified, however, that defense relevance has played an increasing role in the selection process since fiscal year 1993. The committee is pleased to see the emphasis on defense relevance underscored further in the most recent solicitation for the fiscal year 1995 competition. The committee is concerned, however, that statutory selection criteria for the Defense Advanced Manufacturing Technology Partnerships are still being interpreted by the Department of Defense to allow benefits such as environmental hazard reduction to be given weight equal to the potential direct defense benefits of the proposed project.

Another management concern is the outyear funding associated with some of the technology projects and the lack of congressional oversight of the expenditure of these funds. For example, the Affordable Composites for Propulsion project will have required a total of \$130 million in federal funds over five years for completion. The option for fiscal year 1996 requires \$35.0 million. The justification documentation supporting the request for defense reinvestment gives no insight into such amounts that, on an annual basis, are larger than many separate programs which the committee reviews and approves. Consequently, the committee has inadequate insight into the degree to which many of the projects in the TRP are integrated with other programs in similar technology thrust areas.

Finally, the committee is faced with the difficult choice of either funding a new competition in fiscal year 1996 under the TRP, or putting priority on the technology programs of the services. At the hearing on May 17, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology voiced strong support for continuing this program because of its unique collaborative features. Despite this strong support for the TRP, the Department of Defense has yet to define the technology thrusts that would be the subject of a new competition. Therefore, under the current budget constraints, the committee believes that a new TRP competition in fiscal year 1996 involving unspecified technologies is a lower priority than ensuring the funding of defined research and development projects in the technology base programs of the services. To reflect this, the committee has recommended reducing the amount of the request by \$262.0 million.

In order to preserve the proven benefits of the competitive and collaborative approach under the TRP, however, the committee recommends an authorization of \$238.0 million in the defense reinvestment account (PE 603570E) to continue the existing program. The committee expects that these funds will be used to fund options on 20 major and small business innovative research projects awarded in prior fiscal years as well as to allow full funding of the fiscal year 1995 competition. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense provide to the Committees on Armed Services and National Security by December 15, 1995, a list of all projects, including the Small Business Innovative Research Program's Phase II projects, which are under consideration for funding under the TRP in future fiscal years. This list should include the proposed federal and non-federal funding required to complete each.

The committee has also recommended legislation which would redesignate the program as the Defense Dual-use Technology Initiative, repeal the statutory authorization for all but the Defense Dual-use Critical Technology Partnerships and the Defense Advanced Manufacturing Technology Partnerships, and clarify the primacy of direct defense relevance in the criteria for the award of the projects under the program.

#### **Section - 222. Revisions of manufacturing of science and technology programs**

The committee remains disappointed that the Department of Defense has yet to develop an adequate program for the development and implementation of process technologies for the production of systems and subsystems for military services. The request for \$119.3 for the total programs of the services and OSD is substantially less than current requirements for these efforts. The goal of increasing the affordability of DOD programs will not be achieved unless the Department succeeds to a much greater extent than in the past in linking funding requests for the manufacturing science and technology program with the requirements of the individual program managers. The Department must also strengthen the interservice coordination process through such organizations as the Joint Directors of Laboratories to avoid duplication and to ensure that priority technology thrusts within manufacturing science and technology are addressed. A further prerequisite of a sound invest-

ment approach is the ability to more adequately measure the return on manufacturing technology investments.

While recognizing that the manufacturing science and technology programs remain underfunded, the committee recommends approval only of funding at the requested amount. In the case of the Navy, the committee directs that funding for the Navy program in PE603771N be allocated strictly in accordance with the budget item justification exhibit R-2, dated February 1995, submitted for the program. The committee reiterates its strong support for requirements for cost-sharing by non-federal participants in all cases where there is a potential for the development of dual-use technologies. The committee urges the services to more aggressively seek cost-sharing in the projects under their programs.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2525 of title 10, United States Code, in two ways. First, the committee recommends a change that would clarify the role of the Joint Directors of Laboratories in establishing the Manufacturing Science and Technology Program. Second, the committee has recommended language that would clarify its intent that producers of manufacturing equipment be involved more directly in the projects funded under this program. Such producers are a primary mechanism for the dissemination of new technologies throughout the defense industrial base. As such, they should be involved as partners in the individual projects wherever practicable.

**Section - 223. Preparedness of the Department of Defense to respond to military and civil defense emergencies resulting from a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack.**

The tragic events of the past—the nerve gas attack in Japan and the bombing in Oklahoma this year, and the 1981 contamination of the New York City water supply with U-235—serve to highlight the need for disaster preparedness. There are also reports of highly enriched uranium and plutonium being smuggled out of Eastern Europe and Russia, which could potentially find its way to the United States. These are only recent manifestations of a continuing problem.

Due to concern with the threat of possible use of these weapons of mass destruction in the United States by terrorist or subnational groups, a provision (Section 1704) was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should strengthen the capabilities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) inter-agency emergency planning and other appropriate federal, state, and local agencies to respond to the potential use of chemical or biological agents or weapons use by terrorists against the United States.

The following year, the Congress included provisions (Title VI) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 that would enable FEMA to provide financial assistance, training, and equipment by loan or grant, to the states for emergency preparedness to respond to the use of radiological, chemical, bacteriological, and biological agents or weapons.

The committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to submit a report to Congress by February 28, 1996 of its military and civil defense plans and programs to respond to the use of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological agents or weapons.

### **SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE**

#### **Sections 231 through 241**

##### **Missile Defense Act of 1995**

The committee recommends that the Missile Defense Act of 1991 be replaced by a provision (Subtitle C of Title II) that more completely responds to the challenges and opportunities of the post-Cold War era, and which charts a firmer and clearer course for missile defenses than the United States is currently on. The Missile Defense Act of 1995 would: (1) accelerate and focus U.S. theater missile defense (TMD) efforts; (2) establish a deployment plan for a national missile defense (NMD) system; (3) establish a cruise missile defense (CMD) initiative to strengthen and coordinate current CMD programs while preparing systems that will be highly capable against future threats; (4) set forth a compliance standard for air and theater missile defense with regard to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty; (5) advocate a cooperative transition to a regime that does not feature mutual assured destruction as the basis for strategic deterrence and stability; and (6) recommend establishment of a Senate select committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the continuing value and validity of the ABM Treaty and recommend a specific course of action.

The committee has received extensive testimony and briefings from the intelligence community, administration officials, and non-governmental experts on the expanding ballistic and cruise missile threat. It is clear that the threat to the national security of the United States posed by the proliferation of such missiles is significant and growing, both qualitatively and quantitatively. It is equally clear in the committee's view that the United States must respond aggressively by deploying effective defenses against ballistic missiles of all ranges and against cruise missiles.

##### *Theater Missile Defense Architecture*

The committee recommends rapid development and deployment of a core theater missile defense program. The committee recommends a provision that would specify that the following systems shall define the core program: the Patriot PAC-3 system, the Navy Lower Tier system, the Theater High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, and the Navy Upper Tier system. The provision would also establish guidelines for advancing new systems into the core TMD program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the systems in the core program are developed aggressively so that they become operational as soon as possible.

*THAAD*—The committee understands that the THAAD user operational evaluation system (UOES), consisting of operational prototype hardware, will meet the primary system performance requirements against the full threat spectrum. The budget request

for the THAAD program in fiscal year 1996 includes funds to acquire 40 UOES missiles. Additional funding will be required to support testing of the UOES missiles in fiscal year 1997. The THAAD UOES systems delivered during 1997 and 1998 will provide a warfighting commander-in-chief (CINC) with a critical capability to deploy advanced theater missile defenses in the event of a crisis. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to execute the option to procure the UOES missiles. Upon completion of the demonstration/validation (DemVal) phase, the THAAD program will enter a four year engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase. Limited rate initial production (LRIP) will begin after adequate testing of the EMD missiles. The purpose of the EMD program should be to build on the DemVal system by addressing the manufacturing technology, producibility, and reliability improvements, all while maintaining the continuity necessary to achieve reductions in procurement and life cycle costs. Thus, the committee believes there should be a smooth transition from DemVal to EMD and LRIP. Since the UOES missile appears to meet most system performance requirements in its current configuration, the committee believes that additional missiles should be made available for contingency use before the year 2000. To accomplish all these objectives, the committee believes that LRIP could be initiated concurrently with the testing of the EMD missiles, once initial tests have verified that performance has not been degraded by any EMD design changes. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit, as part of the TMD reporting requirement contained in the Missile Defense Act of 1995, an analysis of these planning issues and the department's plan for implementing a smooth transition from DemVal to production, all while providing additional EMD missiles to augment the initial UOES inventory.

*NAVY LOWER AND UPPER TIER*—The committee is equally concerned that the Navy Lower Tier and Upper Tier systems become operational as soon as possible. The committee has recommended sufficient funding, which, if continued in the out years, would ensure availability of Navy Lower Tier UOES missiles in fiscal year 1997 and an initial operational capability (IOC) of the objective system in fiscal year 1999. For Navy Upper Tier, the committee's recommended funding would provide a UOES in fiscal year 1999 and an IOC in fiscal year 2001. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide sufficient funding to ensure that these schedules are met. Regarding Navy Upper Tier, the committee supports a thorough comparison of the Lightweight Exoatmospheric Projectile (LEAP) system and a "marinized" version of the THAAD kill vehicle, along with associated boosters, to reduce risk and ensure that the best system is selected. This comparison should reflect the results of the ongoing cost and operational effectiveness analysis (COEA), as well as actual technical developments and demonstrated performance. The committee urges the Navy to consider developing a program plan for a competition between these two kill vehicle/missile concepts, including parallel development activities and flight tests, followed by a down-select in time to achieve a UOES capability in fiscal year 1999 and an IOC in fiscal year 2001.

*TMD BATTLE MANAGEMENT/COMMAND AND CONTROL*—The committee is aware both of an ongoing Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) study on missile defense command and control, and of individual missile defense command and control efforts by the services, notably the Navy's Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) and the Army's Battlefield Integration Center (BIC). The committee welcomes the effort by the Department to examine the command and control requirements for effective theater missile defenses, in light of the numerous programs currently under development. However, the committee is concerned that the CEC and BIC efforts appear to be proceeding on independent paths, with little interaction between them; and even less effort on the requirement for their ultimate integration into a "seamless" theater-level command and control network under the control of a Theater CINC. The committee sees little evidence that Theater CINCs—the ultimate users—have been consulted as to their preferences for the design and operation of theater missile defense command and control centers. Moreover, any command and control solution for Theater CINCs must be designed for effective operations under a variety of possible scenarios, including such variants as the CINC's initial command center being remote from the theater of operations, or initial operations from shipboard with a subsequent transfer of command and control authority to a facility ashore. Finally, the theater missile defense center has to be capable of dealing with both ballistic missile and cruise missile threats within the theater. Because of the evident complexity of the theater missile defense command and control problem, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to expand the charter and focus of this ongoing study effort. This effort should involve close consultation and interaction with Theater CINCs regarding the development of a "seamless" command and control center capable of rapid integration of sensor information, surveillance information, and interceptor allocations, whether land or sea based.

*OTHER TMD ACTIVITIES*—Despite its strong support for TMD in general and the core programs in particular, the committee is concerned that approximately eighty percent of our investments in BMD are currently being directed to TMD activities. The committee is also troubled by the expanding number of new TMD systems that are headed for acquisition. If the current course is allowed to continue, the United States will expend virtually all its effort and resources on a plethora of TMD systems that are designed for narrow in-theater applications. The committee does not understand how the Department of Defense can contemplate an entirely new development and acquisition program to provide air and missile defense for maneuver forces when it is already planning to spend \$15.8 billion on the Patriot PAC-3 and THAAD systems. Also, while the committee is strongly supportive of developing systems capable of intercepting ballistic missiles in the boost phase, it does not understand how the Department of Defense can push a fighter-launched kinetic energy boost-phase intercept (BPI) system in the direction of acquisition when serious technical and operational obstacles remain to be solved.

The committee recommends a more focused TMD investment strategy and increases to other BMD activities to restore a more

balanced BMD program. The committee is not opposed to the emergence of new core TMD systems, but insists that such systems be coherent and affordable, and that they leverage to the extent possible existing systems and technologies. Follow-on TMD investments must be targeted so as to build on existing investments, or to support significant leaps ahead in the technological state of the art. The United States cannot afford and does not need six kinetic-energy TMD systems that approach the threat fundamentally in the same technical manner.

The committee, therefore, recommends the termination of the existing Corps SAM and kinetic-energy BPI programs. To satisfy the Corps SAM requirement, which the committee views as valid, the Department of Defense should propose a restructured program, which essentially merges ongoing efforts in PAC-3 and THAAD to produce a mobile hybrid system with 360 degree coverage. The committee believes that such a system will satisfy the requirement more rapidly and in a more cost-effective manner than the Corps SAM/MEADS program. The committee also believes that this will present an opportunity to begin replacing existing Patriot infrastructure, which is excessively large and manpower-intensive, with a new type of system that is essentially a mobile PAC-3. If implemented properly, production of the new system could be phased into ongoing PAC-3 production, thereby providing savings from both ends of the spectrum.

The committee is sensitive to the diplomatic implications of canceling the MEADS program, but believes that it is better to restructure the program in its infancy rather than later. The committee is not opposed to having an international aspect to the restructured program. More important, the committee believes that the United States should seek to foster cooperation with its allies on wide-area missile defense. The primary threat to our European and Asian allies will not be countered by a MEADS-like system. The committee believes that the United States should place greater emphasis on fostering cooperation on programs such as THAAD and Navy Upper Tier.

With regard to boost-phase intercept, the committee remains highly skeptical about a BPI system based on manned tactical aircraft. Even if the needed interceptor technology should mature, the operational implications of this system make it almost unsustainable. To the extent that kinetic-energy BPI systems hold promise for TMD applications, the committee believes that reliance should be placed on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). The committee notes that the United States is conducting extensive work on UAVs and has an ongoing, though severely under-funded, program to study a UAV/BPI concept with the State of Israel. The committee believes that leveraging existing U.S. UAV programs and the ongoing effort with Israel would provide the basis for a much more cost-effective BPI program. The committee, therefore, recommends that the Secretary of Defense initiate a cooperative program between the United States and Israel, which leverages the work both countries have done on missile defense and UAVs.

*National Missile Defense Architecture*

The committee notes that there is greater ambiguity and more disagreement regarding the future ballistic missile threat to the territory of the United States than there is regarding the threat posed by short- and medium-range missiles, which are already deployed in large numbers throughout the world. With regard to ballistic missile threats to the United States itself, there are really two subcategories—existing threats that we have lived with for some time, and emerging new threats. Most of the debate has surrounded the question of new threats.

The committee notes that the intelligence community does not presently forecast the emergence of a new indigenously-developed ballistic missile threat to the continental United States within the next ten years. Nevertheless, the intelligence community does confirm that the proliferation trend is toward longer-range and more sophisticated ballistic missiles, and that there are a number of ways for determined countries to rapidly acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) by means other than indigenous development. The intelligence community also confirms that North Korea is developing an ICBM class missile (the Taepo Dong II), which may become operational within five years, and which may have sufficient range to target Alaska. Some analysts speculate that this missile could have an even longer range. In any event, the mere existence of this North Korean program is cause for questioning the intelligence community's ten year forecast. It also highlights how suddenly a new ICBM threat can emerge. Given North Korea's history as a missile proliferator and its ongoing cooperation with Iran on such programs, the committee views these developments as extremely threatening.

The committee does not believe that the intelligence community's ten year threat assessment in any way undermines the case for accelerating deployment of a national missile defense system. Even if it were certain that a new threat would not materialize for ten years, the United States would still need to get started now to ensure that it develops a highly effective and affordable system in time. As previously noted, however, there is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the ten year estimate. The United States must be prepared to respond earlier if necessary. Perhaps more important, deploying an NMD system prior to the unambiguous emergence of new missile threats to the United States may serve to deter countries that would otherwise seek to acquire ICBMs. A vulnerable United States merely invites proliferation, blackmail, and even aggression.

In addition to dealing with emerging threats to the United States, NMD can help pave the way for a more reliable and less adversarial form of strategic stability. Mutual vulnerability is clearly not a necessary basis for a stable deterrence relationship. In the near-term, NMD deployments would serve to stabilize mutual deterrence by reducing prospective incentives to strike first in a crisis. The committee believes that even modest NMD deployments can reduce the vulnerability of U.S. strategic forces and thereby strengthen stability. Over time, as political circumstances permit, increasingly robust defenses can serve to devalue offensive forces, especially those that are most destabilizing, virtually elimi-

nating first strike incentives and establishing the basis for deeper offensive reductions.

Indefinitely extending Cold War notions of nuclear deterrence based on vulnerability and threats of retaliation is likely to perpetuate basic animosities and security concerns, and prohibit the development of the more positive relations necessary for a genuinely stable U.S.-Russian strategic relationship. Arms reductions alone cannot accomplish this goal. By easing concerns about possible non-compliance and third party ballistic missile threats, missile defenses can help provide the confidence necessary to move toward deeper offensive reductions. In sum, the argument that effective national ballistic missile defenses are inconsistent with deterrence and arms control is as outdated as the Cold War itself.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would establish an NMD program to deploy a multiple-site, ground-based interceptor system by 2003, with a more limited contingency capability available by the turn of the century. The committee believes that there is an urgent need to establish explicit milestones and performance goals for the NMD program in order to achieve these deployment goals. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to employ streamlined acquisition procedures and other cost saving measures as appropriate to ensure rapid and cost-effective development of an NMD system.

The committee notes that the ground-based interceptor (GBI) program, with its exoatmospheric kill vehicle (EKV), has been underway for almost five years, and has achieved significant technical progress. The committee also notes the existence of various options for off-the-shelf boosters for the GBI, but questions whether these can be optimized for the GBI mission. The committee therefore recommends that a detailed analysis be conducted in order to select an optimized booster configuration that balances cost and performance considerations. The committee supports aggressive development and testing of the EKV to support the deployment goals specified above. The committee is troubled by recent schedule delays in the EKV program and the fact that BMDO is considering a down-select to a single design and contractor before conducting flight tests. To ensure that the best design is selected upon demonstrated performance, and to minimize program risk, the Secretary of Defense is directed to maintain competition in the EKV program through successful completion of flight demonstrations.

In order to develop and deploy optimized sensor support for an NMD system, the committee supports upgrading existing early warning radars while new X-band fire control radars are readied for deployment. The committee also strongly supports the development of the Space and Missile Tracking System (SMTS), which is being developed by the Air Force as part of the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS). The committee believes that SMTS should be developed for a first launch in fiscal year 2001, with an IOC in fiscal year 2003, to support the objective multiple-site NMD system. The committee believes that the proper mix between space-based sensors and ground-based radars must be achieved to maximize coverage and effectiveness while minimizing the ultimate cost of the NMD system. With robust space-based sensor support, the sys-

tem may not require new radars at each interceptor deployment location.

The committee recognizes that there may be opportunities to significantly improve the cost and operational effectiveness of a ground-based NMD system by including space-based and/or sea-based defensive systems in the NMD architecture. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include an analysis of such options in the NMD implementation plan.

#### *Cruise Missile Defense Initiative*

In a significant departure from the Missile Defense Act of 1991, the Missile Defense Act of 1995 addresses the threat posed by existing and emerging cruise missiles. The committee believes that CMD has not been given the degree of attention warranted by the threat, and notes with concern the intelligence community's estimate that at least twelve countries have land-attack cruise missiles under development. Although there are many programs in the Department of Defense involving CMD, for the most part these have not been sufficiently emphasized, funded, or coordinated. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should seek to coordinate and leverage activities involving air defense, CMD and BMD to maximize synergies and cost savings.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to coordinate the department's CMD and BMD efforts and to ensure that existing air defense systems are upgraded to improve capabilities against cruise missiles. The committee also directs the Secretary to undertake a high priority development program to support the future deployment of systems that are highly effective against advanced cruise missiles, including cruise missiles with low observable features. Finally, the committee directs the Secretary to prepare a plan for implementing a cruise missile defense initiative, including an assessment of organizational and managerial changes that could strengthen and further coordinate the cruise missile defense activities of the Department of Defense. The committee recommends a substantial increase in funding for cruise missile defense activities, which is described in a separate funding section below.

#### *Policy Regarding the ABM Treaty*

The committee acknowledges that many of the policies and recommendations contained in the Missile Defense Act of 1995, if implemented, would require relief in one form or another from the ABM Treaty. Rather than recommend a specific course of action at this time, however, the committee believes that Congress should undertake a comprehensive review of the continuing value and validity of the ABM Treaty with the intent of making a well informed and carefully considered recommendation on how to proceed by the end of the 104th Congress.

The Missile Defense Act of 1995 would establish a policy to seek a cooperative transition to a regime which does not feature mutual assured destruction as the basis for deterrence and stability, yet it is not presently clear how best to achieve this goal. Incremental amendments to the treaty must be considered, but there is a risk that such incrementalism may undermine the ultimate goal of replacing the treaty with a more appropriate and up-to-date regime.

Congress also will want to evaluate the Secretary of Defense's NMD implementation plan and a variety of technical and policy issues before recommending a specific course of action. Furthermore, given that there are no ABM Treaty limitations on research, development, or testing of ground-based NMD systems or components, it is prudent to dedicate a year to studying all ABM Treaty-related issues and alternatives. The committee, therefore, recommends a provision that calls for the Senate to undertake a careful one-year review of the continuing value and validity of the ABM Treaty, during which time all efforts by the administration to modify, clarify, or otherwise alter U.S. obligations under the ABM Treaty should cease.

To conduct this comprehensive review and to issue specific guidance, the committee recommends that the Senate consider establishment of a select committee on the future of the ABM Treaty, which would convene for a one-year period of time. The select committee would conduct hearings and interviews, review all relevant documents, and carefully consider the full range of policy issues. At the end of the 104th Congress, the select committee would issue a report and be disbanded.

To facilitate the Senate's review and to foster full and open debate, the committee recommends requiring the declassification of the ABM Treaty negotiating record. This action would be consistent with the classification policy in Executive Order 12958, announced by the administration on April 17, 1995. The Reagan Administration, which declassified a significant portion of the ABM Treaty record, established the precedent for this action. The committee understands that in connection with the 1987 study of the ABM Treaty by the State Department Legal Advisor, most of the negotiating record along with a complete index was compiled. The committee suggests that this would be a good starting point for the administration in providing Congress with the information requested.

#### *Development, Testing and Deployment of Non-ABM Systems*

The committee observes that the ABM Treaty does not limit the development or deployment of TMD or air defense systems; yet, as a result of ambiguities in the treaty, the United States has for years unilaterally limited the development of non-ABM systems. These self-imposed restraints exceed not only the requirements of the Treaty, but common sense. Article VI(a) of the ABM Treaty states that non-ABM systems may not be "tested in an ABM mode" and may not be "given capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles." Unfortunately, these terms and concepts remain essentially undefined. In this void, the Department of Defense developed an arbitrary methodology, based on computer simulations of one-on-one engagements, to determine whether defensive systems have "capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles." This approach, unfortunately, conforms neither to operational reality nor to the requirements of the ABM Treaty. Since the treaty is verified and monitored solely by "national technical means," compliance standards based on computer simulations clearly exceed the terms and requirements of the Treaty. There is no evidence that Russia, or the Soviet Union before it, has ever employed anything as onerous and self-limiting as this.

The results of this excessive self-regulation have recently become very apparent. Recent compliance reviews have imposed a variety of constraints on our ability to proceed efficiently and aggressively with TMD programs such as THAAD and Navy Upper Tier. Both systems are now being forced down a very precarious path between artificial ABM Treaty constraints and the pressing need to maximize their operational capability.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would codify in precise terms that a demonstrated standard shall be used for evaluating the compliance of TMD and air defense systems. The provision would establish that TMD and air defense systems are not subject to the terms of the ABM Treaty unless flight tested against a ballistic missile with a range greater than 3,500 kilometers or a velocity in excess of 5 kilometers per second. The committee did not select these parameters arbitrarily; in fact, they formed the basis for the official United States position tabled at the Standing Consultative Commission in November 1993. The committee finds that specific performance or deployment limitations on TMD systems would be inconsistent with our current treaty obligations and United States national security interests in general. Unlike the demonstrated standard recommended by the committee, such limitations would establish new legal obligations for the United States under the ABM Treaty, essentially transforming it into a TMD treaty.

#### *Ballistic Missile Defense Program Elements*

The committee recommends a provision that would realign the program element (PE) structure of BMDO's budget, reducing the number from thirteen to seven. The committee believes that all core TMD programs should be covered in individual PEs, and that all other TMD programs, projects and activities should be covered in the Other TMD Activities PE. The committee believes that battle management, command, control and communications (BM/C3) programs should be covered in the Other TMD or the NMD PEs, and that funding for program support activities should be included in the relevant PEs.

#### **Ballistic missile defense funding**

The fiscal year 1996 budget request for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) was \$2.9 billion, including research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), procurement, and military construction. The committee recommends a total BMDO authorization of \$3.4 billion, an increase of \$490.0 million over the request. The committee notes that this funding level is approximately \$136.0 million lower than the amount recommended for fiscal year 1996 by the Clinton Administration's own Bottom-Up Review, and approximately \$4.0 billion lower than the amount recommended for fiscal year 1996 in the last budget submitted by the Bush Administration.

The committee recommends the following budget allocation:

(Millions of dollars)

Program	Request	Change	Recommendation
Patriot System*	666.9		666.9
Navy Lower Tier*	254.4	+ 45.0	299.4
THAAD**	589.9		589.9
Navy Upper Tier	30.4	+170.0	200.4
Hawk Upgrade*	28.3		28.3
TMD BM/C3*	70.8		70.8
Corps SAM	30.4	- 30.4	
BPI	49.1	- 49.1	
Other TMD**	463.0	+15.0	478.0
NMD**	371.5	+300.0	671.5
Support Technology	172.7	+ 70.0	242.7
Management	185.5	- 30.0	155.5
<b>Total BMDO</b>	<b>2,912.9</b>	<b>+490.5</b>	<b>3,403.4</b>

\* Includes RDT&amp;E and Procurement

\*\* Includes RDT&amp;E and Military Construction

#### CORE THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

The committee recommends the establishment of a core TMD program consisting of the Patriot PAC-3 system, the Navy Lower Tier system, the THAAD system, and the Navy Upper Tier system. The committee notes that this prioritization is consistent with the Department of Defense's Bottom-Up Review, which recommended that these four programs be funded as major acquisitions in the fiscal year 1995-99 Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The committee recommends a total core TMD funding level of \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 1996. This includes an increase of \$45.0 million for Navy Lower Tier, an increase of \$170.0 million for Navy Upper Tier, and full funding of the requests for THAAD and Patriot. The committee understands that this funding profile, if sustained, would lead to the following operational capabilities:

—For Patriot PAC-3, a First Unit Equipped (FUE) in fiscal year 1998.

—For THAAD, a user operational evaluation system (UOES) capability in fiscal year 1997 and an IOC in fiscal year 2002, which may be accelerated by as many as three years.

—For Navy Lower Tier, a UOES capability in fiscal year 1997 and an IOC in fiscal year 1999.

—For Navy Upper Tier, a UOES capability in fiscal year 1999 and an IOC in fiscal year 2001.

The committee endorses this schedule and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide sufficient funding in the outyears to sustain it. The committee also directs the Secretary to ensure that funds authorized for core TMD programs not be utilized for other purposes without the express consent of the congressional defense committees. The committee also directs that no funds authorized for the Navy Upper Tier program be used for additional Terrier-LEAP flight tests.

#### *Other Theater Missile Defense Activities*

The committee believes that BMDO's TMD activities lack sufficient focus. Establishment of a well funded, high priority, core

TMD program will help but will not solve this problem. The committee believes that other theater missile defense (OTMD) activities must also be focused and made more efficient. In addition to providing core support activities such as targets, the committee believes that OTMD funds must be pooled and focused so as to satisfy outstanding TMD requirements. Some difficult choices will have to be made and greater efficiencies will have to be realized.

Therefore, the committee recommends the termination of the Corps SAM and Boost-Phase Interceptor (BPI) programs. As explained elsewhere in this report, there are more efficient ways to satisfy the requirements that these programs are attempting to fulfill. The committee believes that the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT) program, which has been funded as part of the BPI program, should be transferred to the OTMD PE, and be restructured as a follow-on kill vehicle technology program.

The committee does recommend an increase of \$15.0 million in the OTMD PE to initiate a joint U.S.-Israel boost-phase intercept program based on unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs). The committee looks forward to evaluating a restructured Corps SAM program, which leverages to a much greater degree existing systems, technologies and programs.

#### *National Missile Defense*

The Missile Defense Act of 1995 (Subtitle C of Title II) would establish a highly focused effort to defend the United States against limited ballistic missile attacks. The NMD program as it now exists is structured to spend approximately \$400 million a year for the foreseeable future without deploying a single element of defensive capability. The committee views this as a wasteful expenditure and a program that fundamentally neglects a serious emerging threat to the national security of the United States. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$300.0 million for the NMD program, for a total of \$671.5 million, to accelerate key technologies and systems pending the outcome of a detailed NMD deployment plan.

The committee recognizes that deploying a multiple-site NMD system by 2003 will require significant investments in the out years, and directs the Secretary of Defense to budget accordingly. Given the consequences of not being prepared for the emerging threat, the committee believes that this investment should be one of the Secretary's highest priorities.

The committee believes that the ultimate cost of deploying an NMD system can be significantly reduced by employing streamlined acquisition procedures and a sense of urgency. The Missile Defense Act of 1995 would establish a requirement for the Secretary to prescribe and employ such procedures as well as other cost saving measures. The committee believes that, for purposes of acquisition, the Secretary should consider NMD deployment a national priority, requiring highly streamlined treatment. The committee notes the case of the Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missile development and deployment effort during the late 1970s and early 1980s, in which streamlined acquisition procedures and a sense of urgency produced rapid, cost-effective and technically

very satisfactory results. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to emulate this model for NMD as much as possible.

#### *Support Technologies*

The committee notes that of the BMDO budget request, only approximately 6 percent is for advanced follow-on technology development. While the committee is pleased that BMDO is now pursuing a variety of major acquisition efforts, it is concerned that the pendulum may have swung too far away from technology development. If the present funding allocation continues, the United States will soon have "consumed its seed corn" and built structural obsolescence into its deployed BMD systems. Moreover, the United States will have abandoned promising missile defense technologies, which offer the possibility of vastly improving BMD cost and operational effectiveness.

The committee is particularly troubled by the administration's plans to terminate our last remaining space-based missile defense program, the space-based laser, at the end of fiscal year 1997. The committee believes that it is critical for the United States to continue developing space-based defenses to preserve the option of deploying highly effective global defenses in the future. The committee notes that a space-based laser would be the most effective system for intercepting ballistic missiles of all ranges in the boost phase. The committee therefore recommends an increase of \$70.0 million to the Support Technologies PE for the space-based laser program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to reinvestigate this program and to ensure that sufficient funds are provided in the outyears to continue a robust effort.

#### **Cruise missile defense funding**

The committee has become increasingly concerned by the growing threat of cruise missiles. The committee is particularly alarmed by the emerging threat posed by land-attack cruise missiles, especially those that employ low observable technologies. Although the Department of Defense has a number of programs designed in part or whole to deal with this threat, the committee believes that more can and must be done to enhance and coordinate these efforts. The committee therefore recommends a provision, as part of the Missile Defense Act of 1995, that would establish a Cruise Missile Defense Initiative. To support this effort, the committee recommends a funding increase of \$145.0 million for various cruise missile defense programs and activities. The allocation of this proposed increase is presented below.

The committee endorses the Defense Science Board's recommendation to enhance existing air defenses through improved connectivity among existing shooter and sensor assets. To help foster this improved connectivity, the committee recommends an additional \$15.0 million to accelerate joint programs between the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) and the military services. Specifically, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in each of the following three service program elements for ARPA/Service seeker development: (1) 0603009A TRACTOR HIKE; (2) 0207163F AMRAAM; (3) 0603746N RETRACT MAPLE.

The most serious aspect of the emerging cruise missile threat is the severe reduction it will cause in available battlespace to detect and intercept low-flying, low-observable missiles. Existing and planned improvements in theater air defenses will not restore that battlespace. Fortunately, advanced sensors and sensor platforms being developed by ARPA and the services are maturing and offer vastly improved capabilities to detect and track low-observable targets at ranges of several hundred kilometers. Fixed-wing platforms offer flexibility for a centralized airborne surveillance and fire control system. By contrast, lighter-than-air platforms, including aerostats and airships, would significantly reduce cost, technical risks, and acquisition time, at some marginal degradation in operational flexibility. Life-cycle costs also favor lighter-than-air options over fixed-wing alternatives. To explore this potential, the committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 0603009A for aerostat risk reduction evaluations jointly conducted by ARPA and the Army. The committee believes that airships may offer the most cost-effective alternative to the airborne sensor problem. Airships would provide sufficient payload volume, weight, and power to carry the sensors capable of providing three dimensional target resolution sufficient to acquire a target at considerable standoff ranges, and provide target illumination and data link services for a beyond the horizon intercept. Hence, the committee recommends an increase of \$60.0 million in PE 0603238N to begin the development of an airship and mission system that is militarily significant in scope, of full size and operationally capable of demonstrating a counter-cruise missile capability for ground and naval forces. The committee also recommends an additional \$10.0 in PE 0603226E to support ARPA's classified cruise missile defense activities.

The committee is particularly supportive of the Navy's Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) program, which will dramatically enhance air and missile defense effectiveness. The committee encourages the Navy's efforts to include the Army and the Air Force in the CEC program. CEC integration into systems such as Patriot, Hawk, THAAD and AWACS appears to be quite promising. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PE 0603755N to accelerate joint Army-Navy and Air Force-Navy exploitation of CEC for cruise missile defense and theater missile defense.

The committee is aware of a proposal to refurbish and upgrade existing Patriot missiles within the Army's current inventory to provide an improved anti-cruise missile capability. This effort would provide a new seeker for older Patriot missiles to optimize their performance against cruise missiles. The committee strongly supports this upgrade. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$35.0 million in PE 0203801A for the first year of a three-year research and development effort for the proposed upgrade.

**OTHER PROGRAMS**

**Army**

PS	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY	14,340		14,340
	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	127,565		127,565
	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	62,715		62,715
	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	2,618		2,618
	4	TRACTOR ROSE		4,000	4,000
	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	10,178		14,178
	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	21,918		21,918
	7	TRACTOR HIP	5,885		5,885
	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	20,381	3,000	23,381
	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	15,311		15,311
	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	17,985	5,000	22,985
	11	LASER WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	23,770		23,770
	12	MODELING AND SIMULATION	39,207		39,207
	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	28,126		28,126
	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	1,891		1,891
	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	5,114		5,114
	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	23,968	3,000	26,968
	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	17,525		17,525
	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	17,088	2,000	19,088
	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	12,534		12,534
	20	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,304	3,000	24,304
	21	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	15,726		15,726
	22	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICE TECHNOLOGY	3,992	2,000	5,992
	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	35,220		35,220
	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	7,500		7,500
	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	28,036		28,036
	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	56,658		56,658
	27	LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY			
	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY			
	29	TRACTOR FLOP			
	30	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	2,168		2,168
	31	LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,589		10,589
	32	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	11,760	3,000	14,760
	33	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,593		48,593
	34	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,518		18,518
	35	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	30,616		30,616
	36	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,922	7,000	23,922
	37	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,828		4,828
	38	TRACTOR HIKE	14,588	10,000	24,588

Line No	EE	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
39		TRACTOR HOLE			
40		TRACTOR DIRT	1,805		1,805
41		TRACTOR RED	5,683		5,683
42		TRACTOR ROSE	4,513	13,500	18,013
43		ACQUIRED IMMUNE DEFICIENCY SYNDROME (AIDS) RESEARCH	2,948		2,948
44		TRACTOR HP			
45		GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIO	39,824		39,824
46		EW TECHNOLOGY	4,022		4,022
47		MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	123,913	12,000	135,913
48		TRACTOR CAGE	8,530		8,530
49		LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,820		18,820
50		JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,487	3,000	7,487
51		LINE-OF-SIGHT, ANTI-TANK (LOSAT)	14,727		14,727
52		NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,969		37,969
53		MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,380	6,000	18,380
54		CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE AND SMOKE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY			
55		INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	17,776		17,776
56		ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	33,989		33,989
57		TRACTOR TREAD	14,930		14,930
58		TRACTOR DUMP	18,028		18,028
59		ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	2,985		2,985
60		NUCLEAR MUNITIONS - ADV DEV			
61		NON-LINE OF SIGHT (N-LOS)			
62		LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	32,839		32,839
63		SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	3,248		3,248
64		ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE	61,491		61,491
65		ARTILLERY PROPELLANT DEVELOPMENT	10,946	10,700	21,646
66		ARMORED SYSTEM MODERNIZATION - ADV DEV	201,513		201,513
67		TRACTOR DIRT			
68		ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT		4,500	10,115
69		ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	5,615		5,615
70		ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	9,955		9,955
71		TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	6,694		6,694
72		TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS - ADV DEV			
73		SINGLE CHANNEL GROUND AND AIRBORNE RADIO SYSTEM (SINGARS) ADV DEV	2,937		2,937
74		SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY			
75		DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	33,848		33,848
76		TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	28,369		28,369
77		NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	2,980		2,980

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603801A	78	AVIATION - ADV DEV	8,430		8,430
0603802A	79	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV			5,000
0603804A	80	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMT - ADV DEV	7,427	5,000	7,427
0603805A	81	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT COMPUTER SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	13,969		13,969
0603806A	82	NBC DEFENSE SYSTEM-ADV DEV			
0603807A	83	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	10,576		10,576
0603851A	84	TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	3,411		3,411
0604814A	85	COUNTERDRUG ROT&E PROJECTS			
0604814A	86	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV			
0604018A	87	TRACTOR TREAD			
0604201A	88	AIRCRAFT AVONICS	22,044	11,000	33,044
0604220A	89	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	726		726
0604223A	90	COMANCHE	198,103	174,000	373,103
0604270A	91	EW DEVELOPMENT	65,222		65,222
0604315A	92	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE			
0604321A	93	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	52,698		52,698
0604325A	94	ADVANCED MISSILE SYSTEM-HEAVY	995		995
0604328A	95	TRACTOR CAGE			
0604604A	96	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES		10,000	10,000
0604609A	97	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS ENG DEV	2,000		2,000
0604611A	98	JAVELIN			
0604619A	99	LANDMINE WARFARE	31,028		31,028
0604622A	100	HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES		1,900	1,900
0604633A	101	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	1,813		1,813
0604640A	102	ADVANCED COMMAND AND CONTROL VEHICLE (AC2V)	18,238		18,238
0604641A	103	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)			
0604642A	104	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	2,187	5,000	7,187
0604645A	105	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASAM)-ENG. DEV.	38,465	5,360	43,825
0604645A	106	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	21,831	14,153	35,984
0604710A	107	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	39,697		39,697
0604713A	108	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	17,959		17,959
0604715A	109	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	55,303		55,303
0604716A	110	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	9,011		9,011
0604726A	111	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,000	3,000
0604740A	112	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV	22,030	10,000	32,030
0604741A	113	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	5,437		5,437
0604746A	114	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT			
0604760A	115	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT			
0604766A	116	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV	24,699		24,699

PE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604768A	117	TRACTOR BAT	193,303		200,303
0604770A	118	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	18,771	7,000	18,771
0604778A	119	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	460		460
0604780A	120	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT)	59,475		59,475
0604801A	121	AVIATION - ENG DEV	5,142		5,142
0604802A	122	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	15,928	500	16,428
0604804A	123	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,756		20,756
0604805A	124	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	13,432		13,432
0604806A	125	MBC DEFENSE SYSTEM-ENG DEV			
0604807A	126	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	4,738		4,738
0604808A	127	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	7,382		7,382
0604814A	128	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	16,617		16,617
0604816A	129	LONGBOW - ENG DEV	23,590		23,590
0604817A	130	NON-COOPERATIVE TARGET RECOGNITION - ENG DEV	30,466		30,466
0604818A	131	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (ATCCS) ENG DEV	18,769		18,769
0604820A	132	RADAR DEVELOPMENT			
0604256A	133	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	14,397		14,397
0604258A	134	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	14,292		14,292
0604759A	135	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	66,874	(10,000)	56,874
0605103A	136	RAND ARROYO CENTER	21,872	(5,000)	16,872
0605104A	137	LOS ALAMOS MESON PHYSICS FACILITY			
0605301A	138	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	149,769		149,769
0605502A	139	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605601A	140	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	147,330		147,330
0606602A	141	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	27,600		27,600
0606904A	142	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	34,535		34,535
0605605A	143	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	3,000	31,800	34,800
0605608A	144	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	2,976		2,976
0605702A	145	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,860		6,860
0605706A	146	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	17,864		17,864
0605709A	147	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	8,869		8,869
0605710A	148	JOINT NUCLEAR BIOLOGICAL CHEMICAL TEST, ASSESSMENT AND SURVIVABILITY			
0605712A	149	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING			
0605801A	150	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	46,491		46,491
0605802A	151	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	63,849		63,849
0605803A	152	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	1,806		1,806
0605806A	153	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	16,401		16,401
0605810A	154	RDT&E SUPPORT FOR NONDEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS	6,903		6,903
0605853A	155	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	2,533		2,533

FE	Line_No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605854A	156	POLLUTION PREVENTION	13,005		13,005
0605856A	157	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	66,101		66,101
0605878A	158	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	5,497		5,497
0605878A	159	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	95,696		95,696
0605896A	160	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	329,978	(20,000)	309,978
0605898A	161	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	8,766		8,766
0909999A	162	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0603778A	163	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	68,786	3,700	72,486
0203726A	164	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	39,422	6,200	45,622
0203735A	165	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	197,669	1,309	198,978
0203740A	166	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	38,327		38,327
0203744A	167	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	2,326		2,326
0203752A	168	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,012		3,012
0203801A	169	DIGITIZATION	88,567		88,567
0203801A	170	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	17,069		17,069
0203802A	171	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	57,949	44,800	102,749
0203806A	172	TRACTOR RIG	3,215		3,215
0203808A	173	TRACTOR CARD	10,156		10,156
0208010A	174	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	13,368		13,368
0301359A	175	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	8,690	7,200	15,890
0303140A	176	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	3,644		3,644
0303142A	177	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT	56,355	2,300	58,655
0303152A	178	WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFORMATION SYSTEM	-		-
0305127A	179	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	-		-
0305150A	180	AIR RECONNAISSANCE LOW	-		-
0708045A	181	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	-		-
XXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	-		-
		Total Army RDT&E	4,444,175	400,922	4,845,097

### **High modulus polycrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber**

Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber is a critical composite material used in the Theater High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD) missile component. Currently, the only company supplying this material is located in Japan. In order to develop at least two domestic sources for this material, the committee recommends an additional authorization of \$4.0 million in PE 602105A to fund this effort. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost-sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

### **Army technology base programs**

The committee notes and applauds the degree to which the Army is attempting to evaluate and embrace new concepts of warfare in its Force XXI vision for shaping the Army for the year 2010. Unfortunately, these intentions are jeopardized by the investment strategy the Army is pursuing in the technology base budget request for fiscal year 1996. The fiscal year 1996 request for programs in the basic research, exploratory development, and advanced development categories are 10 percent, 30 percent and 40 percent respectively below the amounts appropriated for programs in those categories in fiscal year 1995.

The Force XXI vision draws its essence from the current efforts in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and elsewhere to determine the elements of the next revolution in military affairs. The Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technologies reviewed these efforts in a hearing on May 5. The testimony of Admiral Owens, Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, indicated the degree to which the aggressive development of a broad spectrum of technologies will be necessary to put the new forms of warfare within reach over the next 10 to 15 years. The current Army technology base program is inadequate to the emerging challenge.

The committee urges the Army leadership and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to break the cycle of the recent past, in which the Army and the Department of Defense chronically underfunded the Army technology base, and provide more balanced funding for the Army technology base program in relation to the other Army accounts in the fiscal year 1997 request. To partially address the underfunding issue in fiscal year 1996, the committee has recommended an increased authorization of \$24.0 million to be distributed as follows:

	<i>Million</i>
PE 602211A Aviation Technology .....	\$3.0
PE 602303A Missile Technologies .....	5.0
PE 602624A Weapons and Munitions Tech .....	3.0
PE 602709A Night Vision Technology .....	2.0
PE 602782A C3 Technologies .....	2.0
PE 603006A C3 Advanced Technologies .....	3.0
PE 603734A Military Engineering Adv. Technology .....	6.0

### **Environmental Policy Simulation Laboratory (EPSL)**

The committee notes that the department faces increasing environmental challenges with decreasing environmental budgetary resources. It also faces a subsequent mandate to avoid any costly

false starts and to optimize first-time field deployments while encouraging maximum innovation and technology transfer. In this regard, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to simulate new environmental technology processes and products whenever possible. The committee also recommends the establishment of the Environmental Policy Simulation Laboratory (EPSL) under the direction of the Army Environmental Policy Institute (AEPI). The EPSL will develop policy simulation models for air, water, soil, noise, and visual pollution characteristics of military operations in order to increase pollution prevention and risk compliance, and to reduce costs of integrating innovative environmental technology solutions to military missions. The committee recommends that \$3.0 million be added to PE 602720A to provide for the competitive establishment of EPSL operations. No part of these funds may be used for construction of facilities. During its second operating year, the committee directs the EPSL to report all ongoing and potential environmental technology deployment cost savings resulting from its operation.

#### **Funding for medical total access programs (telemedicine)**

The committee commends the Army for its innovative and timely use of medical total access programs, especially pertaining to teledentistry program development, outpatient referral service for telemedicine, and its planned program for both active duty soldiers and their dependents. The committee also wishes to commend the Navy for its outstanding field tests of telemedicine on the aircraft carrier USS Eisenhower. The committee believes that further total access program development by the military offers each of the services the possibility of increasing available medical care of its patient population while possibly decreasing associated costs for health care.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increased authorization of \$3.0 million in PE 603002A for total access programs in the fiscal year 1996 authorization bill, and directs the Army to coordinate with and include the Air Force and the Navy in its total access program format. Further, the committee requests that the Army report to the committee not later than March 1, 1996 on the implementation of its total access programs.

#### **Wave net technology**

The committee supports the Army's efforts to enhance command, control, and communications for the digital battlefield by applying emerging technologies. The committee understands that, in connection with evaluating various technologies to enhance its battlefield digitization efforts, the Army is interested in examining wave net technology which has the potential to reduce costs, increase bandwidth utilization, and provide increased command and control capability. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to program element 603006A for development and testing of wave net technology for possible application to the Army's digitization initiatives.

**Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS)**

The committee recommends authorizing PE 603105A at the requested level of \$2.9 million and directs that \$1.0 million of that amount be used to continue domestic clinical HIV programs.

**Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) enhancements**

The committee strongly supports the MLRS/Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) and is aware of developmental efforts which have potential to greatly enhance the effectiveness of these systems. The committee recommends the following increases:

- \$3.7 million to program element 603778A for MLRS improved launch mechanical system;
- \$7.0 million to program element 603313A for MLRS low cost guidance;
- \$7.0 million to program element 604768A for ATACMS/Brilliant Anti-armor submunition risk reduction; and
- \$5.0 million to program element 603313A for development of Low Cost Autonomous Attack Submunition (LOCAAS).

The committee believes there is potential to employ the MLRS/ATACMS as a sea-based indirect fire suppression weapon for amphibious assaults and has directed the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a test/demonstration firing of an Extended Range MLRS rocket with low cost guidance from a launcher with improved launch mechanism and GPS location device. The committee expects the Army to cooperate fully to ensure items suitable for Navy/Marine Corps test/demonstration are available in fiscal year 1997.

**Objective individual combat weapon (OICW)**

The committee supports the effort to improve the effectiveness of individual infantrymen and is aware of the effort to develop an Objective Individual Combat Weapon. The committee is advised of a shortage of funds within the Joint Service Small Arms Program, and recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in program element 0603607A to permit continued competitive development of OICW through Phase 3 of the development process.

**Advanced artillery propellant development**

The budget request included \$10.9 million to continue development of advanced solid propellant (unicharge) and a 52 caliber solid propellant armament system as a backup to the advanced field artillery system-liquid propellant (AFAS-LP). While the committee continues to support the AFAS program, it recognizes that even if AFAS-LP is fully successful, there will still remain in the Army—certainly in the National Guard—a large number of conventional 155mm cannon. With a bolt-in/bolt-out gun mount, it is anticipated that a significant number of 155mm cannon could be candidates for conversion to the 52 caliber solid propellant system.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.7 million to program element 603640A for continued development of the 52 caliber solid propellant system and the advanced solid propellant as a hedge against risk in the AFAS-LP program and for possible integration in the M109A6 Palladin and other field artillery systems.

### **Armored systems modernization (ASM)**

The committee recommends the following increases to the Army's budget request:

\$5.3 million, Armored Gun System, program element 604645A/D413

\$4.5 million, CMS/Grizzly, program element 603649A/DG24

\$9.9 million, CMS/Grizzly, program element 604649A/DG25

\$4.2 million, CMS/Wolverine, program element 604649A/DC26

\$1.3 million, Abrams tank, program element 203735A/D330

The Abrams tank modification line is reduced \$25.3 million to offset these increases.

### **Small arms common module fire control system (SACMFS)**

The committee is aware of new fire control system technology which has the potential to significantly increase the lethality and probability-of-hit of the Mark-19 grenade machine gun. In addition to enhanced performance of the Mark-19, the new fire control system technology could provide substantial savings in ammunition and logistical support. The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to program element 603802A to initiate a program to upgrade the Small Arms Common Module Fire Control System (SACMFS), and directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the defense committees by March 1, 1996 on the progress of this effort.

### **Command and control centers**

The committee supports continuing efforts in the Army to improve operations through enhanced command and operations centers and recommends the following increases:

—\$11.0 million to program element 604201A for prototype airborne command and control system for Task Force XXI;

—\$10.0 million to program element 604741A for Air Defense Artillery Brigade Operations Centers for Patriot and Forward Area Air Defense command and control.

### **Comanche helicopter**

The budget request included \$199.1 million for continued research and development of the RAH-66 Comanche helicopter. The committee continues to be supportive of the Comanche, but is concerned that the development program continues to be extended while the procurement is pushed further into the future. If the Comanche is truly the "quarterback" of the Army's Force XXI, then the program must be viewed as viable—with a realistically credible fielding date. Repeated reductions in the research and development program by the Office of the Secretary of Defense delay the program unnecessarily and discourage the Army from putting more funds at risk.

The committee recommends an increase of \$174.0 million for the Comanche program. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army are directed to submit a jointly developed plan with the fiscal year 1997 budget request, indicating restoration of funding in the outyears to provide for procurement of Comanche commencing by fiscal year 2001 with initial operating capability by 2003.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to structure the engineering development program to ensure that the upgraded T800 (T801) engine is appropriately flight certified and included in the second Comanche prototype.

#### **Medium tactical truck extended service program (ESP)**

The committee is aware of deficiencies in the Army's truck programs, especially its medium trucks. The committee is advised that only 6,000 new medium tactical vehicles (MTV) are scheduled to be procured through the year 2002. Nearly 27,000 vehicles will be over age by that time. Further, approximately 35 percent of the five-ton fleet will be beyond 20 years old, which will impact unit readiness and operations and support costs. The committee strongly supports current Army efforts to remanufacture two and one-half ton trucks and believes the Army should immediately initiate a similar program for five-ton trucks.

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to program element 604604A for initiation of a five-ton truck extended service program to:

- remanufacture M809 and M939 series vehicles to augment the MTV buy and replace over age vehicles;
- insert technologies to improve reliability, correct operational deficiencies, and comply with EPA and safety requirements;
- co-manage Marine Corps Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement (MTVR) program with the Army five-ton ESP; and
- include Air force and Navy requirements to known Army and Marine Corps quantities for five-ton truck ESP.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the five-ton truck ESP to the defense committees with the fiscal year 1997 budget submission addressing all the points above and laying out a schedule leading to five-ton truck remanufacture commencing in fiscal year 1997. The committee expects the Army to harmonize requirements for the other military services to take maximum advantage of medium truck ESP currently underway, to minimize additional procurements to avoid industrial overcapacity, and to give consideration to reliable manufacturers who have demonstrated capabilities to produce military trucks.

#### **Heavy tactical vehicles**

The committee recommends an increase of \$1.9 million in program element 0604622A for development of a water heater/chiller for the Army's water tank semitrailer.

#### **High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)**

The committee recognizes that many of the HMMWV's in both the Army and Marine Corps are reaching age and mileage levels leading to increased maintenance and operating costs and lower reliability. This indicates the need for an extended service program (ESP). Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to program element 604642A to initiate prototype development leading to an ESP for HMMWV. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the defense committees with the fiscal year 1997 budget request describing a program to

develop and test prototypes and to initiate a program to remanufacture HMMWV's for both the Army and the Marine Corps. The committee directs the Army and the Marine Corps to conduct a joint program, harmonizing their requirements for ESP.

#### **Laser warning component-suite of survivability enhancements**

The committee is aware of the growing threat to ground combat vehicles in the form of laser-based range finders and anti-tank guided missiles, and recognizes that many nations throughout the world already have programs underway to field laser warning systems on their ground combat vehicles. The committee is concerned that efforts within the U.S. Army have not been adequately funded, and recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in program element 604740A to be used for development of the laser warning component of the suite of survivability systems.

#### **Mark-19 universal bracket**

The committee recommends an increase of \$0.5 million in program element 604802A for type classification of a non-developmental universal mounting bracket for the Mark-19 grenade machine gun.

#### **High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility**

The committee continues to support the operation of the High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (HELSTF) as the central test facility to support the nation's high energy laser development. The committee is disappointed with the \$3.0 million request for HELSTF, which would be insufficient to carry out the current Army plan to terminate the Mid-Infrared Advanced Chemical Laser (MIRACL), but continue the operation of the rest of the facility. That plan would require \$19.6 million in fiscal year 1996 according to Army documents. The committee does not agree with the plan to terminate MIRACL, particularly when constraints on testing the laser against objects in space will not be imposed in fiscal year 1996, and the full potential of the facility can be realized for the first time. The committee therefore has added \$21.8 million to the request for this facility.

#### **Nautilus/Tactical High Energy Laser Program**

The committee continues to support the joint Army-Israel Ministry of Defense Nautilus program to assess the potential of high energy lasers to meet tactical threats. The committee has added \$5.0 million to PE603308A to fund the U.S. share of phase II of the Nautilus program. The committee also understands that the tactical high energy laser (THEL) concept is drawing increasing support within the Army, ranking as the highest science and technology priority of the Depth and Simultaneous Attack Battle Lab, and second of 140 concepts in Mobile Strike Force 2010 planning. The Marine Corps has also established a mission need statement for THEL. The committee therefore provides \$5.0 million in PE603308A to initiate program planning for a THEL technology demonstration in fiscal year 1996.

**Army Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS)**

The committee has been advised that upgrades and digital links are required to adapt AFATDS for digitization exercises in conjunction with Task Force XXI. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.2 million to program element 203726A for this purpose.

**Stinger missile modifications**

The committee recommends an increase of \$9.8 million to program element 203801A to continue and accelerate the Stinger missile modification block II program.

**Communications enhancements**

The committee is aware of communications developmental efforts where relatively small investments now could lead to significantly enhanced communications as well as savings. The committee recommends the following increases:

—\$2.3 million in program element 303142A to accelerate development and fielding of the Single Channel Anti-jam Man Portable (SCAMP) Block II., and

—\$7.2 million in program element 208010A to accelerate development and fielding of the Integrated System Control (ISYSCON).

Navy

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Budget	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ACCOUNT			
	1	RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY	16,084		16,084
0601152N		IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LABORATORY RESEARCH	385,917	(12,000)	373,917
0601153N		DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	32,658	9,400	42,058
0602111N		SURFACE/AEROSPACE SURVEILLANCE AND WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	36,786	6,000	42,786
0602121N		AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	22,238		22,238
0602131M		MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	17,623		17,623
0602232N		COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	60,090		60,090
0602233N		READINESS, TRAINING, AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	40,511		40,511
0602234N		MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	74,849		74,849
0602270N		ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,341		18,341
0602314N		UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE WEAPON TECHNOLOGY	51,182	4,800	55,982
0602315N		MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	43,384		43,384
0602435N		OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	48,526		48,526
0602633N		UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	35,582		35,582
0603217N		AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (H)	17,082	9,000	26,082
0603238N		PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE	64,502	60,000	124,502
0603270N		ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	14,532		14,532
0603508N		SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM	43,544	(25,558)	17,986
0603640M		MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATDI)	27,754		27,754
0603706N		MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	17,797		17,797
0603712N		MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	21,504		21,504
0603747N		ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	51,818		51,818
0603771N		UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	41,251		41,251
0603782N		INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	50,958		50,958
0603792N		SHALLOW WATER MCM DEMOS	96,825		96,825
0603792N		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	26,794		26,794
0603207N		C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,621		16,621
0603208N		AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	3,069		3,069
0603216N		TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	7,477		7,477
0603254N		AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	30,202		30,202
0603261N		ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	18,924		18,924
0603382N		TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	2,803		2,803
0603451N		ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,383		1,383
0603502N		TACTICAL SPACE OPERATIONS	54,527		54,527
0603504N		SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	21,281	7,500	28,781
0603506N		ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,049		10,049
0603512N		SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	16,164		16,164
		CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	16,804		16,804
0603514N	40	SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY	11,649		11,649
0603525N	41	PILOT FISH	78,960		78,960
0603536N	42	RETRACT JUNIPER	10,002		10,002
0603542N	43	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	3,202		3,202
0603553N	44	SURFACE ASW	6,655		6,655
0603561N	45	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	35,748		35,748
0603562N	46	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	5,070		5,070
0603563N	47	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	16,736		16,736
0603564N	48	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	9,708		9,708
0603570N	49	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	141,835		141,835
0603573N	50	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	39,156	25,558	64,714
0603576N	51	CHALK EAGLE	114,175		114,175
0603582N	52	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	6,414		6,414
0603609N	53	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	31,537		31,537
0603610N	54	ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT (MK-50)	2,993		2,993
0603611M	55	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	34,157	6,000	40,157
0603612M	56	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	2,470		2,470
0603634N	57	ELECTROMAGNETIC EFFECTS PROTECTION DEVELOPMENT			
0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	46,733	4,200	50,933
0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,298		7,298
0603709N	60	ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM			
0603711N	61	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	4,268		4,268
0603713N	62	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,166		5,166
0603721N	63	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	65,947		65,947
0603724N	64	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	1,976		1,976
0603725N	65	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,803		1,803
0603734N	66	CHALK CORAL	71,085		71,085
0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	82,932	5,000	87,932
0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	17,879	4,000	21,879
0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	32,561		32,561
0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	245,620	42,500	288,120
0603783N	71	WARFARE SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING			
0603785N	72	COMBAT SYSTEMS OCEANOGRAPHIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	16,042		16,042
0603787N	73	SPECIAL PROCESSES	72,281		72,281
0603795N	74	GUN WEAPON SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY	12,028	19,200	31,228
0603800N	75	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	149,295	175,000	324,295
0604707N	76	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT			
0603889N	77	COUNTERDRUG ROT&E PROJECTS	5,742		5,742

EE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604212N	78	ASW AND OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	91,803		91,803
0604214N	79	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	11,309		11,309
0604215N	80	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	10,567		10,567
0604217N	81	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	12,872	13,200	26,072
0604218N	82	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,182		6,182
0604221N	83	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,945		1,945
0604231N	84	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	27,389		27,389
0604281N	85	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	762,548		762,548
0604282N	86	V-22A	9,788		9,788
0604284N	87	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604285N	88	AIR LAUNCHED SATURATION SYSTEM (ALSS)			
0604270N	89	EW DEVELOPMENT	87,440	25,000	112,440
0604301N	90	MK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE	105,683		105,683
0604307N	91	AEGIS COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING			
0604372N	92	TR-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE			
0604366N	93	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS			
0604372N	94	NEW THREAT UPGRADE	8,572		8,572
0604373N	95	AIRBORNE MCM			
0604503N	96	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION			
0604504N	97	AIR CONTROL			
0604507N	98	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	42,226		42,226
0604512N	99	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	70,315		70,315
0604516N	100	SHIP SURVIVABILITY	7,815		7,815
0604518N	101	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	8,342		8,342
0604524N	102	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	11,343		11,343
0604558N	103	NEW DESIGN SSN	4,907		4,907
0604561N	104	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	15,859		15,859
0604562N	105	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	43,302		43,302
0604567N	106	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	347,415		347,415
0604574N	107	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	83,503		83,503
0604601N	108	MINE DEVELOPMENT	38,479		38,479
0604603N	109	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	5,499		5,499
0604610N	110	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	3,046		3,046
0604612M	111	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	40,817		40,817
0604618N	112	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	22,027		22,027
0604654N	113	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	263		263
0604703N	114	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	37,832		37,832
0604710N	115	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,408		5,408
0604719M	116	MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	1,043		1,043
			2,628		2,628
			15,380		15,380

CE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604721N	117	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	7,600		7,600
0604727N	118	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	81,837		81,837
0604755N	119	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	185,997	18,500	184,497
0604781N	120	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING			
0604771N	121	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	3,402		3,402
0604777N	122	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	56,472		56,472
0604784N	123	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	93,507		93,507
0604256N	124	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	25,911		25,911
0604258N	125	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	24,364		24,364
0604759N	126	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	46,586		46,586
0605152N	127	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	9,281		9,281
0605154N	128	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	44,429		44,429
0605155N	129	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,620		2,620
0605802N	130	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605804N	131	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	2,027		2,027
0605853N	132	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	20,371		20,371
0605856N	133	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,584		3,584
0605861N	134	RD&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	61,001		61,001
0605882N	135	RD&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	8,278		8,278
0605863N	136	RD&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	63,232		63,232
0605864N	137	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	245,911	(5,000)	240,911
0605865N	138	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	5,675		5,675
0605866N	139	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,638		3,638
0605867N	140	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,134		12,134
0605871M	141	MARINE CORPS TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES	2,984		2,984
0605873M	142	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	5,914		5,914
0101221N	143	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	39,511		41,711
0101224N	144	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	26,078		26,078
0101228N	145	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	7,937	2,200	7,937
0101402N	146	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	20,416		20,416
0102427N	147	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	752		752
0304136N	148	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	919,484		919,484
0304152N	149	E-2 SQUADRONS	52,965		52,965
0304163N	150	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	24,032		24,032
0204229N	151	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	141,440		141,440
0204311N	152	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	16,440		16,440
0204413N	153	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	4,364		4,364
0204571N	154	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	48,058		48,058
0206801N	155	HARM IMPROVEMENT	3,348		3,348

ES	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	156	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	54,869		54,869
	157	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,955		9,955
	158	MK-48 ADCAP	22,214		22,214
	159	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	66,875		66,875
	160	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	6,036		6,036
	161	F-14 UPGRADE	44,490		44,490
	162	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	58,065		58,065
	163	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	3,250		3,250
	164	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	13,386	10,000	23,386
	165	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	3,915	9,400	13,315
	166	MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEMS	5,131		5,131
	167	MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	19,793		19,793
	168	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	29,721		29,721
	169	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	4,491		4,491
	171	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	38,472		38,472
	172	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	25,848		25,848
	174	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP)	18,416		18,416
	175	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS			
	999	Classified Programs	539,680	5,800	545,480
		Total Navy RDT&E	8,204,530	419,700	8,624,230

**Defense research sciences (Navy)**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$3.0 million in PE 601153N to fund other priority programs.

**Power electronics building block**

The committee recommends an additional \$6.0 million in PE 602121N for the development of the power electronics building block technology for the rapid switching and control of high power electrical systems. The committee recommends academic participation to ensure that supporting technologies, such as a computational testbed for system simulation, are developed to expedite the widespread application of this technology. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

**Parametric airborne dipping sonar**

Parametric sonar projectors transmit two relatively high frequency acoustic beams that interact to form a narrow, low frequency beam for detection and classification of underwater objects. This technology could provide reduced reverberation and superior range and bearing resolution relative to lower frequency sonars. Parametric sonar technology has potential for improved weapons system performance in applications such as dipping sonars installed in helicopters. The Navy has been conducting a technology demonstration to evaluate a parametric system. The demonstration will culminate with planned delivery of a prototype parametric projector during fiscal year 1995. Although laboratory tests and model runs have indicated a parametric sonar may offer significant benefits over other developmental systems, funding constraints have prevented the Navy from pursuing further development of this technology in the fiscal year 1996 budget request.

The committee believes that parametric sonar technology has shown considerable promise for anti-submarine warfare (ASW), particularly in littoral areas where the high power and low frequency of existing and developmental systems optimized for open ocean ASW tend to limit their effectiveness in shallower water. The committee supports continued development and evaluation of a parametric sonar system for possible airborne dipping sonar application. Consequently the committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million in PE 0602314N for the following purposes:

1. expand the scope of the current effort to provide three dimensional stabilized steerable beams around 360 degrees at full source level for an over-the-side demonstration;
2. further characterize the technology for mine avoidance applications;
3. evaluate whether parametric technology merits further pursuit; and
4. report the conclusions of this analysis to the committee as promptly as possible after testing and data analysis are complete.

**Air Systems and Weapons Advanced Technology**

The committee views with great interest the initiatives taken by the Chief of Naval Research in support of the Chief of Naval Operations to make emerging technologies more readily available to the fleet. The Technologies for Rapid Response Initiative which is designed to give operational forces access to mature technologies is particularly noteworthy. To further Commander in Chief (CINC) access to these technologies, the committee recommends a transfer of \$9.0 million from PE 601153N to PE 603217N, Air Systems and Weapons Advanced Technology. This increase is to be used by the Chief of Naval Operations to support fleet CINC use of the Technologies for Rapid Response Program with the view that these technologies will provide enhanced operational capability as well as allow the development of new tactics and concepts of operations.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide the committee with a report by March 1, 1997 of lessons learned from this technology insertion initiative.

**Intercooled recuperated gas turbine**

In its review of the budget request, the committee noted that the Department of Defense had transferred the project for development of the intercooled recuperated gas turbine from the Advanced Surface Machinery (ASM) demonstration/validation program to PE 0603508N in the technology base. The committee is concerned that the transfer may have been done as an expedient bookkeeping action without taking into account the interrelationship between the program for development of the new ICR engine and other elements of the ASM program.

To restore ASM program integrity, the committee directs the transfer of \$25.6 million, the amount requested in PE 0603508N, to PE 0603573N to restore the integrity of the ASM program and authorizes this amount for continued development of the ICR engine.

**Remote minehunting vehicle**

During its consideration of the budget request, the committee was briefed by the Navy on a developmental program that integrates commercial and Navy hardware to provide a contingency organic mine reconnaissance capability that can be remotely operated by surface ships. During an amphibious exercise conducted in March and April 1995, this remotely operated vehicle located exercise mines very effectively in support of an amphibious assault. The Navy believes that this remote minehunting operational prototype (RMOP) has shown real promise in filling a gap in its mine countermeasures operational capabilities, a deficiency that was highlighted by the impact of mines on operational planning during Desert Storm. The committee concurs, and recommends an increase of \$7.5 million in PE 0603502N to accelerate development of this remote minehunting system.

**Advanced armored amphibious vehicle (AAAV)**

The committee strongly supports the Marine Corps AAAV program, and understands that the current funding profile is inadequate. In that regard, the committee recommends an increase of

\$6.0 million for turbo charger development efforts for the AAV 2600 horsepower main propulsion engine and upgrading of modeling and simulation efforts. The committee directs that any funding changes or undistributed reductions to program element 603611M may not be made without prior approval of the defense committees.

#### **Lightweight 155mm howitzer**

The committee supports the joint Marine Corps/Army effort to develop and field a lightweight 155mm howitzer, and recommends an increase of \$4.2 million to accelerate development. The committee understands that additional funding will be used for technical testing of cannon assemblies and studies regarding various fire control measures.

#### **Cooperative engagement capability**

The Navy is developing a cooperative engagement capability (CEC) that will enable greatly enhanced engagement coordination as well as remote cuing of sensors and fire control systems by coordinating all battle force anti-air warfare sensors into a single, real-time composite track picture having fire-control quality data. When fielded, CEC will distribute sensor data from each ship and aircraft or cooperating unit to all other cooperating units in the battle force through a real-time, line-of-sight, high-data rate sensor and engagement data distribution network. Because the CEC link will be line-of-sight, its integration into an airborne platform is particularly important. An airborne platform will be able to transmit to, and relay from, cooperating units that are over the horizon and beyond direct line-of-sight of units on the surface.

To continue accelerated development of the airborne component of CEC, the committee recommends an increase of \$22.5 million to the budget request.

#### **Naval surface fire support**

During its review of the budget request for fiscal year 1996 the committee was briefed on a revised naval surface fire support (NSFS) program that focuses on near term improvements to naval NSFS systems. These included demonstration and development of a long range rocket-assisted guided projectile that would incorporate an advanced, low-cost global positioning/inertial navigation (GPS/INS) guidance technology and improvements in the existing MK-45 5-inch naval gun. While other weapons systems, such as a naval variant of the Army's tactical missile system (ATACMS), are also included in this new program, the Navy has given top priority to improvements to the 5-inch gun that is installed on the majority of its surface combatants, and its associated projectile. The Navy and Marine Corps assert that this new NSFS program was conceived after the services had evaluated a recently completed cost and operational effectiveness analysis (COEA) and determined that its recommended solution was not achievable in a realistic time frame due to affordability constraints. Consequently, with close involvement by the Marine Corps in evaluating mission requirements, the Navy has conceived a program that in its judgment makes the best use of existing assets, is affordable and achievable

in a much shorter time period, yet will still cover the majority of potential targets for an opposed amphibious assault.

The Navy has also informed the committee, however, that, because this new NSFS program emerged in the interval between preparation of the budget request and its review by the committee; it is underfunded by over \$160.0 million across the future years defense program. Further, far term requirements have not yet been adequately addressed.

The committee has stressed the issue of NSFS repeatedly over the past several years but has found the Navy's response to be lackluster and highly variable as a new program or approach emerged each year. The committee's concern about this apparent lack of commitment by the Navy was once more raised this year. With no advance coordination with the committee, the Secretary of the Navy decided to strike the Navy's four remaining *Iowa* class battleships, its only remaining potential source of around-the-clock, accurate, high volume, heavy fire support, in apparent disregard of the loss of NSFS capability that would result. In the committee's judgment, its queries to the Navy on this subject have not produced any substantive response. The committee remains unclear on any existing or near term NSFS capability that could adequately replace the capability lost by this decision.

Because the need is so strong and because the Navy finally appears committed to pursuing a program to completion, the committee is willing to provide initial support this year to the Navy's program to upgrade the capability of its 5-inch guns, based on the assurances of the Navy's leadership that the Navy will follow through with consistent, stable, and adequate future years funding. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase in funding of \$19.2 million in PE 0603795N and notes the need for the Navy to put increased emphasis on pursuing a long-term program to satisfy the NSFS mission requirements that can not be met by improvements to the 5-inch naval gun. Further, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to restore at least two *Iowa* class battleships to the naval register and to retain them in its strategic reserve until the Secretary of the Navy is prepared to certify that the Navy has replaced the potential NSFS capability that they can provide. A recommendation for testing of an extended range multiple launch rocket system for the shore fire support mission is also included elsewhere in this report.

### **S-3B Project Gray Wolf**

The Navy has been testing the concept of equipping an S-3 aircraft with a multi-mode synthetic aperture radar, designated AN/APG-76. The Navy has called this demonstration "Project Gray Wolf." With such a system, S-3B aircraft could support fleet operations in littoral warfare missions by providing real time, stand-off surveillance, targeting, and strike support. The committee is aware of the success the Navy has achieved in limited demonstrations of the system's capability in fleet exercises and in the "Roving Sands" experiment at White Sands Missile Range.

The committee recommends an increase of \$13.2 million in program element 0604217N to:

1. buy an AN/APG-76 radar system, a ground station, and a data link capability;
2. modify the radar system to include a commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS) processor; and
3. provide contractor logistics support for further testing.

The committee believes that the Department should consider identifying Project Gray Wolf as an advanced concept technology demonstration if testing and evaluation continues to show such promising results.

### **V-22 Osprey**

The committee notes that the proposed low production rate for the V-22 results in a 27 year production run to field the required 523 aircraft for the Marines, Special Operations Forces and the Navy. The committee understands this is primarily due to a cap placed by the Department of the Navy on V-22 procurement by the Department of Defense of \$1.0 billion in fiscal year 1994 dollars. The committee questions this approach as unnecessarily lengthy and inefficient. The committee is aware of Defense Science Board recommendations to reduce costs by treating the three Low Rate Initial Production lots as a package in order to permit more efficient purchasing of parts and materials.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an analysis of the Defense Science Board proposal including more efficient production profiles of up to 36 aircraft per year for the Department of the Navy. The report is to be submitted no later than 15 April 1996 to the defense committees.

The committee is also interested in the success of the development of the Special Operations Forces version, or CV-22, and consequently requests the Department to provide a detailed program overview, including funding and schedule details concerning the current CV-22 program, with any possible alternatives to accelerate initial operational capability of the Special Operations Forces aircraft.

### **Airborne electronic warfare**

Last year, the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on S. 2182 (H. Rept. 103-701) directed the Secretary of the Navy to provide for a robust upgrade of EA-6B electronic jammers by taking advantage of technologies developed in the previously canceled advanced capabilities (ADVCAP) program. The report also directed the Secretary to submit the long overdue joint tactical airborne electronic warfare study (JTAEWS) by December 31, 1994.

Although it had successfully passed all development and testing milestones, the Navy canceled the ADVCAP program. The ADVCAP program would also have provided funding for safety, reliability, maintainability, configuration commonality, and depot level maintenance for the Navy's EA-6B airborne jammer. The Navy's decision to cancel ADVCAP failed to account for continuing these other needed efforts that were unrelated to the capability upgrade portion of the ADVCAP program. The committee also believes that decision incorrectly ignored the EA-6B's dwindling capability against a widening array of threats.

Since last year, the Department has also decided to cancel the EF-111 system improvement program (SIP) and retire the aircraft on a phased basis by fiscal year 2000. The Department intends to use an additional 20 EA-6B aircraft to support the Air Force stand-off jamming mission. The report recently released by the Roles and Missions Commission noted the importance of supporting specific interoperability initiatives, such as upgrading the Navy/Marine Corps EA-6B force to meet all DOD airborne electronic stand-off jamming needs. Unfortunately, the budget does not include the funding needed to support this decision.

The committee has concluded that airborne electronic warfare (EW) has drifted backward. The committee sees no coherent DOD plan for a joint future capability to conduct integrated strike air warfare. The JTAEWS analysis was supposed to define the future shape of airborne EW by examining the dominant elements of EW: jamming, self protection, suppression of enemy air defenses (SEAD), and stealth. However, the budget does not even implement the results of that analysis.

The Department has ignored congressional intent time and again in this matter. With no coherent plan, and with disregard for Congressional direction, the Department appears to hope the problem will solve itself. The committee believes that this is an unacceptable situation. The combatant commanders will not launch strikes without EW support, yet airborne electronic warfare is not important enough to receive upgrade funds. Unfortunately, because of previous and planned cancellations, the combatant commanders now have less EW capability available now than they had during Desert Storm.

For these reasons, the committee recommends a provision directing the Navy to include a warfighting capability improvement component in its planned series of upgrades to the EA-6B.

The committee recommends additional funding as follows:

1. \$25.0 million in program element 0604270N for warfighting capability improvements. These upgrades should, at a minimum, address gaps in the aircraft's ability to counter emerging threats by improving the low band receiver system to enhance our ability to conduct smart communications and radar jamming.
2. \$40.0 million dollars to begin a robust band 9/10 capability upgrade for the EA-6B fleet. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to work with the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure that technologies developed in the EF-111 SIP program for band 9/10 jammers are used in the EA-6B program.
3. \$140.0 million to upgrade 20 EA-6B aircraft to the Block 89 configuration to support the additional Air Force stand-off jamming mission.

The committee notes that these items and initiatives are consistent with the Operational Advisory Group's (OAG) top war fighting priorities and represent a prudent step to ensure that the Department maintains needed airborne EW capability.

**NULKA decoy development**

NULKA is a joint U.S.-Australian project to develop an anti-ship missile decoy system. Increased funding in fiscal year 1996 would allow for the integration of NULKA with the Ship Self-Defense System for installation on amphibious ships and other self-defense ships, to conduct testing of the integrated system, and commence development of improvements to the payload needed to counter improvements in anti-ship missile technology. The committee strongly supports these objectives and recommends an increase of \$9.0 million in program element 0604755N for three purposes:

1. \$4.4 million would be used to integrate NULKA into the Shipboard Self-Defense System and the Electronic Warfare Decoy Device Integration, making it a fully coordinated component of a ship's self-defense architecture;
2. \$3.6 million would be used for the Enhanced Payload Improvement Program upgrade to allow NULKA to counter advanced threats; and
3. \$1.0 million would be used for Navy support of the program.

**Infrared search and track**

The budget request reduced funding and restructured the infrared search and track (IRST) program for affordability reasons. The committee believes that the IRST system has the potential to play a very important role in defending naval ships against sea-skimming antiship missiles. A recently completed cost and operational effectiveness analysis (COEA) supports this conclusion. The committee strongly believes the Navy should emphasize early integration of the IRST system with both Aegis and non-Aegis ships and place priority on early completion of its development. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.5 million in PE 0604755N to accelerate plans for combat system integration and design of the IRST system.

**BARAK 1—ship self defense**

The committee has been very concerned about protecting U.S. Navy ships from the proliferation of maneuvering, sea-skimming, low observable, anti-ship cruise missiles. The committee recognizes that budget realities make it necessary to examine existing available solutions. Consequently, the committee is pleased that the existing BARAK 1 is currently under consideration as a candidate defense system for LPD-17. The committee wishes to be kept informed on the LPD-17 cost and operational effectiveness analysis progress and results. Furthermore, the committee directs the Navy to present by December 1995 a plan that could lead to testing of the BARAK system in the U.S. during fiscal year 1996.

Because of the advantage to the fleet of an early deployment of a robust ship self defense system, the committee directs that the Navy also examine and report on BARAK applicability to other ship classes. The results of this study should be provided to the committee by January 1996.

**Medium tactical vehicle remanufacture (MTVR)**

The committee supports the Marine Corps plan to remanufacture its medium truck fleet and recommends an increase of \$9.4 million to program element 206624M for additional truck variants and development of simulation models and testing. The committee directs the Marine Corps and the Army to harmonize requirements for their respective medium truck extended service programs (ESP), to take maximum advantage of medium truck ESP currently underway, to minimize additional procurements to avoid industrial overcapacity, and to give consideration to reliable manufacturers who have demonstrated capabilities to produce military trucks.

**Crash attenuating seats for helicopters**

The committee has learned of an initiative to accelerate the inclusion of crash attenuating seats for passengers in military helicopters. While there is a program to include such seats, it is not scheduled for execution until fiscal year 1999 and beyond. In order to accelerate the effort and take advantage of non-developmental options, the committee recommends the release of the \$2.7 million appropriated in fiscal year 1995 to be used in defining specifications and qualification of non-developmental seats, and to report to the committee no later than 15 May 1996 on the non-developmental options available to provide crash attenuating seats for military transport helicopters.

**Plasma Electric Waste Converter Program**

The committee noted in fiscal year 1995 that a new technology—Plasma Electric Waste Converter technology—was available which could help the Navy solve its solid waste disposal problem on board its deployed ships. Congress authorized the Navy to spend \$1.8 million in fiscal year 1995 to explore plasma electric waste converter technology as a solution to this problem. Recognizing the growing problem of base cleanup efforts as the base closure process progresses, Congress believes that this technology might also have application in such cleanup efforts. Thus, the Navy is urged to consider ways to test the application of this technology to cleaning up bases which are being closed or realigned and at which there is environmental or waste disposal problems.

## Air Force

ACCT	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Budget	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF			
0601101F	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH			
0601102F	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	239,893	(4,000)	235,893
0602101F	3	GEOPHYSICS			
0602102F	4	MATERIALS	74,534	750	75,284
0602201F	5	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	66,268		66,268
0602202F	6	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	90,311	(15,000)	75,311
0602203F	7	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	78,592	3,000	81,592
0602204F	8	AEROSPACE AVIONICS	74,256		74,256
0602205F	9	PERSONNEL TRAINING AND SIMULATION			
0602206F	10	CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY			
0602269F	11	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	19,900		19,900
0602302F	12	ROCKET PROPULSION AND ASTRONAUTICS TECHNOLOGY			
0602601F	13	ADVANCED WEAPONS	124,446		124,446
0602602F	14	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	44,954		44,954
0602702F	15	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	98,477		98,477
0603106F	16	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	17,960		17,960
0603112F	17	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	23,283		23,283
0603202F	18	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	29,818		29,818
0603203F	19	ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AEROSPACE VEHICLES	32,131		32,131
0603205F	20	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	10,793		10,793
0603211F	21	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	13,269		13,269
0603216F	22	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	41,779		41,779
0603227F	23	PERSONNEL TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	8,930		8,930
0603231F	24	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	18,953		18,953
0603238F	25	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE	2,483		2,483
0603245F	26	ADVANCED FIGHTER TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	12,491		12,491
0603250F	27	LINCOLN LABORATORY			
0603263F	28	ADVANCED AVIONICS INTEGRATION			
0603269F	29	NATIONAL AERO SPACE PLANE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	20,421		20,421
0603270F	30	EW TECHNOLOGY			
0603302F	31	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	25,079		25,079
0603311F	32	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	16,203		16,203
0603319F	33	AIRBORNE LASER TECHNOLOGY	3,085	5,000	8,085
0603401F	34	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY			
0603410F	35	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	32,627	20,000	52,627
0603428F	36	SPACE SUBSYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	3,479		3,479
0603601F	37	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	31,637		31,637

PE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0603605F	38	ADVANCED RADIATION TECHNOLOGY	47,919		47,919
0603707F	39	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	4,577		4,577
0603723F	40	CIVIL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	9,835		9,835
0603728F	41	C3I SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	12,008		12,008
0603728F	42	ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	11,005		11,005
0603771F	43	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	53,332		53,332
0603789F	44	C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	12,617		12,617
0603260F	46	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,109		5,109
0603307F	47	AIR BASE OPERABILITY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,954		19,954
0603319F	48	AIRBORNE LASER TECHNOLOGY			
0603403F	49	SPACE TEST PROGRAM	30,038	58,000	30,038
0603430F	50	POLAR SATCOM	23,861	(10,000)	13,861
0603434F	50a	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM - DEM			
0603438F	51	SATELLITE SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY	130,744	135,000	265,744
0603440F	52	BRILLIANT EYES	6,437		6,437
0603441F	53	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SBIR) - DEM/VAL	4,571		4,571
0603817F	54	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	151,186		151,186
0603714F	55	DOD PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT - EXTERIOR	20,265	4,300	24,565
0603742F	56	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY			
0603800F	57	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	39,226		39,226
0603851F	58	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	16,892		16,892
0603852F	59	C-130J - DEM/VAL			
0603853F	60	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE (EELV) PROGRAM - DEM/VAL			
0604201F	61	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	756		756
0604212F	62	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP)	4,822		4,822
0604218F	63	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	173,838		173,838
0604222F	64	B-1B	8,786		8,786
0604228F	65	TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	88,753		88,753
0604231F	66	C-17 PROGRAM	63,042	113,800	176,842
0604233F	67	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING			
0604237F	68	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT			
0604239F	69	F-22 EMD			
0604240F	70	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	2,138,718		2,138,718
0604243F	71	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT	623,616		623,616
0604249F	72	NIGHT/PRECISION ATTACK	5,300		5,300
0604268F	73	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	8,708		8,708
0604270F	74	EW DEVELOPMENT	50,203		50,203

CE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604321F	79	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM - EMD	3,938		3,938
0604441F	80	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SBIR) - EMD	152,219	10,000	162,219
0604479F	81	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	649,666	(72,000)	577,666
0604480F	82	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF	19,699	10,000	29,699
0604600F	83	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	53,254		53,254
0604601F	84	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	-		-
0604602F	85	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,075		8,075
0604604F	86	SUBMUNITIONS	4,953	10,000	14,953
0604609F	87	R&M MATURATION/TECHNOLOGY INSERTION	-		-
0604817F	88	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	9,692		9,692
0604818F	89	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	92,161	7,000	99,161
0604703F	90	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	6,235		6,235
0604704F	91	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	1,167		1,167
0604706F	92	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	4,035		4,035
0604707F	93	WEATHER SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	2,737		2,737
0604708F	94	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	37		37
0604711F	95	SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUCLEAR EFFECTS)	44,025		44,025
0604727F	96	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	-		-
0604733F	97	SURFACE DEFENSE SUPPRESSION	-		-
0604735F	98	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	10,418		10,418
0604740F	99	COMPUTER RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (CRTT)	2,166		2,166
0604750F	100	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,294		1,294
0604754F	101	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	10,146		10,146
0604770F	102	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JTARS)	169,702		169,702
0604779F	103	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (JINTACCS)	6,356		6,356
0604851F	104	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	192,719		192,719
0303606F	105	UHF SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	15,568		15,568
0603402F	106	SPACE TEST PROGRAM	57,710	(6,500)	51,210
0604256F	107	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	53,377		53,377
0604258F	108	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,362		5,362
0604759F	109	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,879		37,879
0605101F	110	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	25,924		25,924
0605306F	111	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	3,139		3,139
0605502F	112	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (H)	-		-
0605708F	113	NAVIGATION/RADAR/SLD TRACK TEST SUPPORT	24,506		24,506
0605712F	114	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	454,067	(29,900)	424,167
0605807F	115	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	6,745		6,745
0605808F	116	DEVELOPMENTAL PLANNING	14,169		14,169
0605853F	117	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	-		-

PE	Line No	Title	FY 1986 Budget	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0605854F	118	POLLUTION PREVENTION	-	-	-
0605856F	119	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	14,046	-	14,046
0605860F	120	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (RSLP)	26,423	-	26,423
0605863F	121	RD&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	5,949	-	5,949
0605876F	122	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RD&E	-	-	-
0605878F	123	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RD&E	-	-	-
0605896F	124	BASE OPERATIONS - RD&E	-	-	-
0604268F	127	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	117,083	9,900	126,983
0101133F	128	B-52 SQUADRONS	103,700	31,500	135,200
0101120F	129	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	16,505	20,000	36,505
0101213F	130	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	7,060	-	7,060
0102325F	131	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0102411F	132	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM	4,711	-	4,711
0102412F	133	NORTH WARNING SYSTEM (NWS)	9,351	-	9,351
0207129F	134	F-111 SQUADRONS	1,015	-	1,015
0207133F	135	F-16 SQUADRONS	597	-	597
0207134F	136	F-16E SQUADRONS	175,600	-	175,600
0207138F	137	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	171,337	-	171,337
0207141F	138	F-117A SQUADRONS	2,908	-	2,908
		JASSM	3,881	-	3,881
0207160F	139	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	-	50,000	50,000
0207161F	140	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	-	-	-
0207163F	141	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	20,082	-	20,082
0207217F	142	FOLLOW-ON TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM	42,311	5,000	47,311
0207247F	143	AF TENCAP	-	-	-
0207248F	144	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	21,966	-	21,966
0207411F	145	OVERSEAS AIR WEAPON CONTROL SYSTEM	87,184	-	87,184
0207412F	146	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	-	-
0207417F	147	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	290	-	290
0207419F	148	TACTICAL AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS	96,696	-	96,696
0207422F	149	DEPLOYABLE C3 SYSTEMS	2,093	-	2,093
0207423F	150	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	-	-	-
0207424F	151	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	1,934	-	1,934
0207433F	153	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	77,688	-	77,688
0207438F	154	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	157,397	-	157,397
0207579F	155	ADVANCED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENTS	24,813	-	24,813
0207590F	156	SEEK EAGLE	105,548	-	105,548
0207591F	157	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	17,390	-	17,390
0207601F	158	USAF WARGAMING AND SIMULATION	140,571	-	140,571
			19,762	-	19,762

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0208006F	159	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	20,585		20,585
0208006F	161	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	25,102	28,000	53,102
0303110F	168	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	32,555		32,555
0303131F	169	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	15,777		15,777
0303140F	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,261	1,500	12,761
0303144F	171	ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS CENTER (ECAC)			
0303601F	172	MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	42,591		42,591
0303605F	173	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS			
0305110F	175	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK			
0305111F	176	WEATHER SERVICE	89,717		89,717
0305114F	177	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCAL)	5,771		5,771
0305119F	178	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES	3,968		3,968
0305129F	180	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	21,898		21,898
0305137F	181	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	299		299
0305138F	182	UPPER STAGE SPACE VEHICLES	13,759		13,759
0305144F	184	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES	3,554		3,554
0305145F	185	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	140,514		140,514
0305158F	186	CONSTANT SOURCE	998		998
0305160F	187	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (DMSP)	3,089		3,089
0305164F	188	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT)	21,464		21,464
0305181F	191	WESTERN SPACE LAUNCH FACILITY (WSLF)	17,371		17,371
0305182F	192	EASTERN SPACE LAUNCH FACILITY (ESLF)	26,921		26,921
0305887F	193	ELECTRONIC COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT			
0305903F	195	IMPROVED SPACE BASED TW/AA	52,272		52,272
0305906F	196	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM			
0305910F	197	SPACETRACK	60,897		60,897
0305911F	198	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM	35,583		35,583
0305913F	199	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	43,672	(15,000)	38,672
0401119F	200	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	16,277		16,277
0401218F	201	KC-135S			
0401840F	202	AMC COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	12,727		12,727
0404102F	203	AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY			
0701111F	204	SUPPLY DEPOT OPERATIONS (NON-IF)	5,369		5,369
0702207F	205	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)			
0708011F	206	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	1,464		1,464
0708012F	207	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
0708026F	208	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN, PROG OFC (PRAMPO)			
0708054F	209	POLLUTION PREVENTION	15,719		15,719

ES	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0708611F	210	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,906		5,906
0904734F	211	CRYPTOLOGIC/SIGINT-RELATED SKILL TRAINING	1,139		1,139
0901218F	212	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	5,827		5,827
1001004F	213	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,713		3,713
XXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	3,203,479	108,600	3,312,079
		Total Air Force RDT&E	12,898,439	488,960	13,087,389

**Adaptive optics**

The committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 601102F for adaptive optics research.

**Defense research sciences (Air Force)**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$9.0 million in the Defense Research Sciences program of the Air Force to allow the funding of higher priority projects.

**Human systems technology**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$15.0 million in PE 602202F to fund other priority programs. The committee notes that this reduction would still allow for a substantial increase in funding for this program in fiscal year 1996.

**Thermally stable jet fuels**

The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$3.0 million in PE 602203F for the acceleration of a program to develop thermally stable jet fuels using chemicals derived from coal.

**Range tracking and safety**

The committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in PE 0603311F for suborbital flight testing at White Sands Missile Range of ballistic missile guidance, range tracking and safety equipment that is based on existing Global Positioning System equipment.

**Micro-satellite development program**

The Air Force Phillips Laboratory, in conjunction with the Air Force Space Command's Space Warfare Center, has initiated a small satellite program to develop and demonstrate a variety of miniaturized space technologies. The micro-satellite program builds upon the highly successful Clementine satellite program. The committee recommends an authorization of \$20.0 million in fiscal year 1996 to continue this effort, under the control of the Space Warfare Center and executed by the Clementine Team (Phillips Laboratory, Naval Research Laboratory, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory). The committee recommends the \$20.0 million authorization be included in PE 0603401F, "Advanced Spacecraft Technology."

**Polar satellite communications**

The Department of Defense has an urgent requirement to provide secure communications for operations in the polar region. The most critical of these requirements can be satisfied in the near-term through an Air Force program to place extremely high frequency (EHF) communications packages, similar to the ones used on the Ultra-High Frequency Follow-On program (UFO), on host satellites. Having already approved this program as a new start in fiscal year 1995, the committee recommends the authorization of \$58.0 million in fiscal year 1996 in PE 603432F to acquire the communications payload and perform integration and test activities in support of a 1997 launch of this capability aboard a host satellite. To offset this increase, the committee recommends the realignment

of funds from the MILSTAR program (PE 604479F) that are no longer required for termination liability fees.

### **National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System**

The budget request included \$23.9 million for the national polar-orbiting operational environmental satellite system (NPOESS), a converged Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) national weather satellite program. The committee has long supported such a convergence. The committee understands that a slower than expected start-up of the Integrated Program Office and delay in the demonstration/validation phase of the program have reduced required funding. The committee, therefore, recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million.

### **Reentry vehicle applications**

The Nuclear Posture Review, conducted by the Department of Defense during the fall of 1994, recommended sustaining the industrial base for strategic ballistic missile reentry vehicles (RVs). The United States Strategic Command has reported that the RV industrial base, especially the expertise and capability to manufacture specialized material, is rapidly eroding. In response to this critical requirement, the Department of Defense has directed the Air Force and the Navy to sustain key elements of the RV industrial base through an RV applications program.

The budget request includes \$5.7 million for the Air Force and \$10.0 million for the Navy to pursue this effort. However, the Air Force funding level is inadequate. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.3 million in PE 603851F to balance the Air Force and Navy efforts. To help bolster this effort, the committee also recommends an increase of \$750,000 in PE 0602102F to the Thermal Protection Materials Reentry Vehicle Project for the purchase, testing, and evaluation of three nosetip billets and related technologies; and an increase of \$2.2 million in the Strategic Submarine and Weapons System Support program (PE 0101221N) for the fabrication and testing of carbon-carbon composite shape stable nosetip billets for submarine launched ballistic missile RV system applications.

### **Interim precision guided munitions (PGM)**

Last year, the committee directed the Department of Defense to conduct a Heavy Bomber Study to define the future needs for long range bombers. The Heavy Bomber Study strongly endorsed the need for PGM's. Accordingly, while awaiting the analysis and recommendations required by the Bill's related provision on PGM's, the committee recommends an increase of \$353.0 million as a cost-effective method of procuring capability instead of acquiring further B-2 aircraft. The committee is persuaded by that argument, and recommends an increase in the budget request as detailed below.

#### *Precision Guided Munitions Procurement*

Procure 100 AGM-130 missiles, an increase of \$40.0 million.

Convert 200 AGM-86 ALCM's to conventional configuration an increase of \$27.2 million.

Procure 50 Have Nap PGM's for use on B-52 H aircraft, an increase of \$38.0 million.

Procure additional conventional bomb modules for B-1 bombers through an addition of \$85.0 million.

Make necessary modifications to the B-1 weapons carriage system to support an interim Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) through an addition of \$11.6 million.

Procure up to 25 interim JSOW's, an addition of \$10.4 million.

#### *Precision Guided Munitions RDT&E*

\$20.0 million in PE 0604226F to acquire an interim precision munition for the B-1B, known as the B-1B Virtual Umbilical Device (BVUD), provided the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the congressional defense committees that the BVUD is a valid requirement by May 15, 1996. Failing such certification, the funds provided are to be used for further acceleration of upgrades to the B-1B through the Conventional Munitions Upgrade Program (CMUP).

An increase \$20.0 million to integrate the AGM-130 with the B-52H bomber and begin qualification and testing of the extended-range version of the AGM-130, in PE 0101113F.

\$40.0 million in PE 0604226F to provide a portion of the B-1 fleet with an interim capability for employing the Joint Standoff Weapon.

An increase of \$7.0 million for Interferometric Terrain Aided Guidance (ITAG) technology demonstration to improve JDAM accuracy, PE 0604618F.

#### *Conventional Bomber Enhancements*

Accelerate the Conventional Munitions Upgrade Program (CMUP) for the B-1 bomber, an increase of \$47.2 million in PE 0604226F.

Increase by \$6.6 million PE 0604226F to allow for an acceleration of the ECM upgrade by funding the Systems Requirements Review in fiscal year 1996, rather than the budget's planned start in fiscal year 1997.

These additions and program accelerations are made with the intent of satisfying the requirements for capable, conventional bombers as soon as practicable.

#### **F-22 program**

The committee held hearings on tactical aviation forces modernization this year and reviewed the F-22 engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program. The committee notes that issues have been raised on the level of concurrency, projected weight, and projected engine performance with specific fuel consumption (SFC).

There are conflicting viewpoints. A report of the Defense Science Board concluded that, "There is no reason based on risk/concurrency to introduce a schedule stretch at this time." But the

General Accounting Office (GAO) believes that the F-22 program “exhibits a high degree of concurrency.”

Based on hearing testimony the committee believes that the Department should address promptly a number of questions. The committee is making no finding as to the level or risk of concurrency on the F-22 program at this time. However, the committee would have serious concerns about any program that involves an inappropriately high level of concurrency that possesses high risk.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees before September 1, 1995. That report shall address the concerns on concurrency, weight and SFC, and shall, at a minimum, answer the following questions.

*A. Concurrency:*

1. What metrics for measuring the level of program concurrency are important for predicting the potential for a program to deliver the promised product, on schedule, at or below cost, with the required performance?
2. What is the level of concurrency risk in the F-22 program, given that the present program calls for 80 production planes before completion of research, development, and testing?
  - a. What is the risk of the current F-22 EMD program to cost, schedule, and performance of the overall F-22 program?
  - b. What change could or should be made to reduce whatever level of concurrency exists in the F-22 EMD program?
3. What is the department’s view of what constitutes low, medium, and high levels of concurrency in general, and specifically as to the present F-22 program?
4. What are the benchmarks that the Congress should use to gauge when any program should be pursued with moderate or high levels of concurrency?
5. How should concurrency relate to risk, either in terms of cost, schedule, or performance?
6. How should the Congress compare the F-22 EMD program’s projected level of concurrency to that experienced in the A-12 program?
7. What are the similarities and differences between the F-22 and the A-12 programs that prevent a re-occurrence of the A-12 problems in the F-22 EMD program?

*B. Weight:*

1. What is the current condition of projected weight of production aircraft?
2. Since no EMD or production aircraft has been built, on what basis is the Department projecting an overweight condition?
3. What was the outcome of the JROC review regarding weight? If the JROC approved the Air Force’s change request, what was the basis for making that decision?
4. What would be the effect on military capability of F-22 aircraft if they are delivered at the currently projected weight?

5. What is the risk that weight will grow above the current projection?

6. How large a weight increase above the current projection should the Congress be willing to accept without restructuring the program?

7. What has been the experience of other aircraft development programs in incurring additional weight after the critical design review milestone?

8. Absent fiscal concerns, could the weight goal be attained? What is the estimated cost of achieving the original weight goal?

*C. Specific fuel consumption:*

1. What is the current condition of projected SFC of engine operating in production aircraft?

2. Since no EMD or production aircraft has been built, on what basis is the Department projecting an SFC deficiency?

3. What was the outcome of the JROC review regarding SFC? If the JROC approved the Air Force's change request, what was the basis for making that decision?

4. What would be the effect on military capability of F-22 aircraft if they are delivered with engines operating at the currently projected SFC?

5. What is the risk that SFC performance will fall below the current projection?

6. How much of a performance decline should the Congress be willing to accept without restructuring the program?

7. What has been the experience of other aircraft development programs in incurring poorer SFC performance after the critical design review milestone?

8. Absent fiscal concerns, could the SFC performance goal be attained? What is the estimated cost of achieving the original SFC performance goal?

The committee recommends \$2.1 billion for the F-22 program. However, the committee directs that, of these funds, \$600.0 million shall not be made available for obligation until 60 days after the Department of Defense submits the requested report.

**Sensor Fuzed Weapon Improvement Program**

The committee understands that the Air Force has the opportunity to substantially increase the effectiveness of the sensor fuzed weapon (SFW) through a pre-planned product improvement program (P3I). The committee further understands that if an increase in Air Force funding were available for fiscal year 1996, the program's Engineering and Manufacturing Development could begin at once.

Realizing the opportunity to increase the weapon's performance by 300 percent for a 15 percent increase in production cost, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for the start of the EMD for the Sensor Fuzed Weapon (P3I). The committee further understands that the Air Force will budget for the program in the FYDP by the Air Force prior to obligating these funds.

**Ultra-high frequency satellite communications**

The budget request for Ultra-High Frequency (UHF) satellite communications was \$15.6 million. The Air Force has recently changed its acquisition strategy to down-select to a single Network Control Station contract earlier than planned. As a result, the committee recommends a reduction of \$6.5 million.

**RC-135 Re-engining**

The committee continues to appreciate the critical role of the RC-135 "Rivet Joint" Signal Intelligence aircraft. The committee is aware of a plan by the Department to re-fit two retired EC-135 aircraft to add to the RC-135 fleet, and that these aircraft are currently awaiting sensor integration.

To facilitate an affordable program for the RC-135 upgrade program, the committee recommends an increase in the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO) authorization of \$79.5 million, to include \$31.5 million of non recurring integration activity and \$48.0 million for two CFM56 engine kits. This upgrade has the support of the GAO, and is a prudent investment in future capability.

**Joint air-to-surface standoff missile (JASSM)**

The committee expects the Department to establish a joint program for the Air Force and the Navy for development of a replacement for the canceled Tri-Service Standoff Attack Missile (TSSAM). The committee is aware that the Air Force and the Navy have jointly developed JASSM requirements, are working on an aggressive development schedule/strategy, and have established a program office. The committee also understands JASSM will have an affordability focus, leveraging off existing technologies and lessons learned from the TSSAM program. The committee agrees with the focus on affordability, but expects the Air Force to emphasize weapons performance as well.

The committee understands the TSSAM cancellation occurred too late in the budget cycle for either service to address the requirement for JASSM in the fiscal year 1996 budget request. Now the program is being considered in the Air Force fiscal year 1997 request as a new program. The Air Force has a more urgent need for JASSM missiles, and is therefore funding the early development of the joint requirement. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$50.0 million in Air Force RDT&E for this purpose.

**Standoff Land Attack Missile Extended Response**

The committee recognizes the Navy's need for an upgrade program to the standoff land attack missile (SLAM) to make it operationally suitable and effective. Accordingly, the committee supports the budget request of \$40.5 million in PE 64603N for continued development of the Standoff Land Attack Missile Extended Response (SLAM ER) to upgrade the 700 SLAM in the current inventory.

**Rivet Joint technology transfer program**

The committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million to the theater missile defense (TMD) program element (PE 208060F) to

initiate the migration of the Cobra Ball medium wave infrared acquisition technology to the Rivet Joint RC-135 tactical reconnaissance fleet. With the transfer of this technology, the Rivet Joint fleet would be provided with a cost-effective means to significantly improve theater missile defense long-range surveillance, warning, and rapid cueing for attack operations as well as impact point prediction for both active and passive defensive measures. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force has programmed the balance of the funds in the outyears to complete the TMD migration program.

#### **Information systems security**

The committee strongly supports efforts to develop multi-level security systems for the Department of Defense's information systems. Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of \$1.5 million in PE 0303140F to complete research and development of the Trusted RUBIX database management system.

#### **Defense Support Program**

The budget request for Defense Support Program (DSP) RDT&E was \$43.7 million. \$5.0 million in fiscal year 1995 funds have been identified as excess and are expected to be reprogrammed as part of the fiscal year 1995 Omnibus reprogramming. The committee directs the Air Force to use these funds for fiscal year 1996 requirements and therefore reduces the fiscal year 1996 request by \$5.0 million.

#### **Fighter data links**

The committee finds the Air Force's decision to equip its air superiority fighters (F-15Cs) with the data link called "Link 16" encouraging. Nevertheless, the committee does not understand why the Air Force is planning to equip only this subset of its forces with data links. Getting tactical data links for Air Force attack aircraft has been a difficult challenge over the years. The committee believes the added situational awareness resulting from sharing data among various platforms has real potential for making our forces more effective warfighters.

The committee believes that the Air Force should place a higher priority on increasing situational awareness of our attack aircraft. The other Services are taking a more determined approach:

1. The Army is installing the improved data modem and data links among helicopters, and between helicopter forces and other Army and Air Force units.
2. The Navy is installing multifunction information distribution system (MIDS) terminals in its fighter and attack aircraft. The MIDS program is an international effort to provide this capability for a variety of weapons platforms for the U.S. and our allies.

The Air Force says that it cannot afford to outfit all of its aircraft with the full MIDS terminal. The committee understands that the budget process and tight fiscal constraints force the Services to make tough choices. However, the committee remains puzzled by the relative priority that the Air Force has accorded data link capability. In response to inquiries, the Air Force provided the congres-

sional defense committees a prioritized list of how it would choose to spend extra funds if they were available. That list totals more than \$1.8 billion in fiscal year 1996 alone. The list shows that the Air Force would choose to spend none of any additional funds on spreading this data link capability.

The committee believes that investing in additional data links could yield a several fold increase in combat capability in the near-term and provide much greater leverage than many items on the Air Force's list.

The Air Force has also said that its forces do not need all the capability that the Navy requires from its MIDS terminals. The committee understands that the Air Force has been considering a proposal for a lower-cost joint tactical information distribution system, called "JTIDS 2R."

Department of Defense officials have told the committee that a variant of the current MIDS terminal could achieve the reduced costs the Air Force seeks, while avoiding the overhead associated with launching another program. In view of this information, the committee will not support initiation of a new, redundant program to meet similar requirements. The common approach should reduce the department's costs of ownership and increase interoperability with our allies, and will help promote cooperative development efforts.

The committee recommends that the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) continue to pursue a MIDS production strategy that maximizes competition for U.S. industry, while maintaining the benefits of the MIDS architecture and commonality. The Air Force should share the results of the Mountain Home Air Force Base technology demonstrations with the MIDS program office to assist in fulfilling the Air Force's fighter data link requirement.

Defense-Wide

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEFWIDE			
	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	3,551		3,551
	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	89,732		89,732
	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	236,185	(5,000)	231,185
	4	FOCUSED RESEARCH INITIATIVES	14,009		14,009
	5	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	23,947		23,947
	6	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	9,952		9,952
	7	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES/FOLLOW-ON TECHNOLOGIES EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	93,308		93,308
	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	13,258	8,000	21,258
	9	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGS AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE AND ENGINEER	14,779		14,779
	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	19,903		19,903
	11	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	403,875	3,000	406,875
	12	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	60,665		60,665
	13	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	113,168	(11,350)	101,818
	14	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	48,000		48,000
	15	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	228,045	16,000	242,045
	16	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	219,003	23,000	242,003
	17	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	7,501		7,501
	18	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,999		1,999
	19	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,088		4,088
	20	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY			
	21	COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	12,044	2,000	14,044
	22	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	55,331	6,300	91,631
		ASAT PROGRAM		30,000	
	23	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES/FOLLOW-ON TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVEL	79,387	70,000	149,387
	24	LIMITED DEFENSE SYSTEM			
	25	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT			
	26	RESEARCH AND SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
	27	JOINT DOD-DOE MURNTONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,799		16,799
	28	EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	618,005	8,000	626,005
	29	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	25,684		25,684
	30	ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	7,473		7,473
	31	DEFENSE LABORATORY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	16,106	(6,000)	10,106
	32	DEFENSE DUAL USE TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE	500,000	(282,000)	218,000
	33	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	18,187		18,187
	34	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	33,971		33,971
	35	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	58,435		58,435
	36	BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT			
	37	COMPUTERS & COMMUNICATIONS TO REDUCE MEDICAL COSTS			

EE	Line.No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	38	JOINT TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	4,976		4,976
	39	CALS INITIATIVE	6,545	12,000	18,545
	40	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH			
	41	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	419,863	(50,000)	369,863
	42	ADVANCED SIMULATION	5,799		5,799
	43	SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	89,554		89,554
	44	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY	49,657		49,657
	45	ELECTRIC VEHICLES			
	46	NATURAL GAS VEHICLES			
	47	EARTH CONSERVANCY			
	48	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	63,251	(3,400)	59,851
	49	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	89,682		89,682
	50	CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE			
	51	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	7,007		7,007
	52	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	30,675		30,675
	53	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	77,690		77,690
	57	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT			
	58	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	20,092		20,092
	59	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	10,266		10,266
	60	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	17,382		17,382
	61	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	25,923	10,000	35,923
	62	AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM			
	63	ISLAND SUN SUPPORT	1,584		1,584
	64	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	45,642	(5,000)	40,642
	65	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	14,939	12,000	26,939
	66	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL			
	67	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE GROUND BASED RADAR (GBR-T) - DEM/VAL	576,327		576,327
	68	HAWK UPGRADES THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL			
	69	BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND C4I FOR TMD ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	23,188		23,188
	70	NAVY LOWER TIER TMD ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	24,231		24,231
	71	NAVY UPPER TIER TMD - DEM/VAL			
	72	CORPS SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE - TMD - DEM/VAL	30,442	170,000	200,442
	73	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	30,442	(30,442)	-
	74	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	49,061	(49,061)	-
	75	OTHER THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE/FOLLOW-ON TMD ACTIVITIES ACQUISITION - DEM	370,821	300,000	670,821
	76	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	460,470	16,000	476,470
	77	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION EMD PROGRAMS	32,461		32,461
	78	MOBILE OFFSHORE BASE ANALYSIS			
	79	CINC C2 INITIATIVES			

FE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0604160D	80	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - EMD	2,786		2,786
06043948P	81	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	95,324		95,324
0604771D	82	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	62,068		62,068
0604861C	83	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD			
0604864C	84	BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND CAI FOR TMD ACQUISITION - EMD	14,301		14,301
0604865C	85	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	247,921	104,500	352,421
0604866C	86	ERINT/PATRIOT PAC-3 RISK REDUCTION - TMD - EMD	19,485		19,485
0604867C	87	NAVY LOWER TIER TMD ACQUISITION - EMD	237,473	45,000	282,473
0604869K	88	COUNTERDRUG ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS			
0603710D	89	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	2,510		2,510
0603712S	90	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,800		16,800
0605104D	91	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	39,302	(5,000)	34,302
0605110D	92	TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USS/IAI--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY	2,851		(2,349)
0605114E	93	BLACK LIGHT	4,745		4,745
0605117D	94	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	46,338	(4,927)	46,338
0605129D	95	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	4,927		
0605160D	96	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	6,468		6,468
0605218C	97	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ROTAE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	185,542	(30,000)	155,542
06053848P	98	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	4,936		4,936
0605602D	99	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
0605790D	100	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,574	(1,574)	
0605798S	101	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	14,752		14,752
0605801S	102	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER	42,989		42,989
0605898E	103	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	32,843		32,843
0305154D	104	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	10,000	20,000	30,000
0305889D	105	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT			
0708011S	106	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS			
0201135J	107	CINC C2 INITIATIVES	200		200
0200048K	108	C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY)	25,338		25,338
0302018K	111	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEMS-WIDE SUPPORT	2,153		2,153
0302019K	112	JOINT/DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	5,138		5,138
0303128K	113	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	20,538		20,538
0303127K	114	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	4,062		4,062
0303131K	115	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	2,269		2,269
0303140D	116	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,884		23,884
0303153K	118	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	4,859		4,859
0303154J	119	WYMWCS ADP MODERNIZATION			
03051398	124	DMA MAPPING, CHARTING, AND GEODESY (MC&G) PRODUCTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	80,131		80,131
0305141D	125	JOINT REMOTELY PILOTED VEHICLES PROGRAM			

PE	Line No	Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
0305154D	126	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM			
0305154I	128	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	515,148	13,000	528,148
0305157I	129	LAND REMOTE SENSING SATELLITE SYSTEM			
0305159B	130	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
0305159I	132	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES			
0305190D	133	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS			
1160401BB	138	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	59,183		59,183
1160402BB	139	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,907		7,907
1160404BB	140	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,090		4,090
1160405BB	141	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,288		13,288
1160407BB	142	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	101,602	8,293	109,895
1160408BB	143	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	2,901		2,901
		NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGIES	1,891		1,891
		Classified Programs	16,534		16,534
		Transfer to O&M (Readiness for Procurement)		37,200	37,200
XXXXXXXXXX	999	Total Defense Wide	1,194,090	30,800	1,224,890
		Undistributed	8,802,881	468,339	9,271,220
		FFRDC CEILING REDUCTIONS		(90,000)	(90,000)
ACCOUNT		DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVAL DEFENSE			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	119,714	(10,000)	109,714
0605130D	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	34,062		34,062
0605131D	3	LIVE FIRE TESTING			
0605804D	4	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	105,565	(10,000)	95,565
		Totals	259,341	(20,000)	239,341
ACCOUNT		DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION			
0605118D	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	12,183		12,183
0605131D	2	LIVE FIRE TESTING	10,404		10,404
		Totals	22,587		22,587

**Combat readiness research**

The committee is aware of the potential to accelerate certain research activities affecting combat readiness within the university community. The committee recommends an addition of \$10.0 million to the University Research Initiative account (601103D) to allow the Secretary of Defense to enter an agreement with a qualified institution of higher learning with strong capabilities in areas of combat research, including chemical and biological warfare, target acquisition and identification, anti-submarine warfare, combat medicine, biodeterioration, and command, control and communications. The committee directs the Secretary to follow all applicable competitive procedures in awarding this agreement, to require the institution awarded the agreement to contribute at least twice the amount provided by the federal government to execute the program, and to stipulate in the agreement specific savings in research or other federal expenditures that will accrue from accelerating research covered under the agreement.

**DODDS Director's fund for Science, Mathematics, and Engineering**

The committee is again pleased with the progress made in this important program. The Department of Defense Dependent School System (DODDS) is one of the nations only two federal school systems. It enrolls children from every state in the union and from sponsors who range in rank from the lowest enlisted grades to the highest flag ranks. Many of the DODDS schools also enroll students from other federal agencies and from allied nations.

The director's fund is intended to allow the Director to focus modern technology on the most pressing educational needs of students in the system in the disciplines of science, mathematics, and engineering. Its success to date is demonstrated by the increasing progress DODDS has made toward meeting the Goals 2000 educational standards.

The committee is aware of the many stresses that an overseas assignment places on the families of the men and women in uniform. Not the least of these is the challenge that children of service members face as they attend relatively small schools remote from American life, often in locations that are widely dispersed. This program is designed to insure that these children have the benefit of the best technology possible as they acquire the technical disciplines that so often lead to higher education, and the technical and medical skills needed by our nation.

The committee remains concerned that these funds be at the disposal of the Director of the DODDS system. The committee recognizes the need for program management and for the integration of this program with other educational programs of the department. Nevertheless, the ultimate authority on the allocation of these resources should be the Director of the DODDS system who has the overall responsibility to educate the children of our military personnel serving overseas. The committee directs that \$10.0 million of the funds in PE 601103D be provided for this program.

**University Research Initiatives**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$15.0 million in the University Research Initiatives program to fund other priority programs.

**Medical Free Electron Laser program**

The committee notes the continued progress of the Medical Free Electron Laser (MFEL) Program, which was initiated to develop medical applications of free electron laser technology at university medical centers. This technology has proven itself in a number of military and civilian clinical applications, such as the treatment of skin lesions, skin burns, cancers, and kidney and gallstones. The geographically-distributed, merit-selected medical centers have been successful in transferring significant amounts of technology to the private sector.

Given the success of the MFEL program to date, the committee is concerned about the impact of the reduction in the funding request for fiscal year 1996 of \$13.0 million below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1995. The committee notes that the Department of Defense intends to restore the funding level in the request for fiscal year 1997 to \$24.8 million. In order to ensure an orderly continuation of the MFEL program, the committee has recommended an addition of \$8.0 million to PE 602227D in fiscal year 1996. Additionally, the committee continues to support the DOD practice requiring that no less than four-fifths of the funds authorized be applied through the university-based centers to adapt tunable, short-pulsed, high-peak power free electron laser applications in medicine, photobiology, surgery, and associated material sciences.

**Software reuse**

The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$3.0 million in PE 602301E to continue software reuse activities in the Department of Defense.

**Tactical landing system**

The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$6.5 million in PE 62702E for the completion of the tactical landing system program.

**Diamond substrates**

The Advanced Research Projects Agency has had an ongoing program to address issues in the manufacture of industrial diamond materials for use in thermal management in integrated circuits. With the growth of on-chip integration of transistors, developers and producers are facing serious limitations because of the need to dissipate ever increasing thermal energy. Diamond has the highest thermal conductivity of any known material combined with high electrical resistance, making it a leading material for addressing this problem. Successful reduction in the cost of producing diamond substrates using the chemical vapor deposition (CVD) process could result in significant increases in power and decreases in size and weight of military electronics. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional authorization of \$8.0 million to PE

602712E to accelerate the program. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

#### **High temperature superconductivity**

High temperature superconductivity (HTS) offers the opportunity to realize the processing speed benefits of superconductivity while cooling electronic devices to a temperature no lower than that of liquid nitrogen. There are significant potential military benefits from this technology including reduction in the size of electronic components, increases in the sensitivity of radars and other sensors, and increases in useful bandwidth. There are a number of manufacturing issues that must be addressed to make this technology operational, including reducing processing costs and increasing the yields within those processes. To enable ARPA to address these issues in a coherent framework, the committee recommends an additional authorization of \$8.0 million in PE 602712E. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

#### **Pulsed fast neutron analysis (PFNA) technology**

Congress initiated funding for the Department of Defense in 1991 to develop non-intrusive cargo detection which has resulted in the Pulsed Fast Neutron Analysis (PFNA) technology. PFNA is an automated, non-intrusive detection technology that recognizes the presence of hidden explosive material and other contraband. It can be particularly useful in detecting the contents of sealed cargo containers through the use of a scanning beam which measures the elemental composition of the cargo. The committee recommends an authorization of \$2.0 million in PE 603122D for continued development of PFNA cargo inspection technology under the direction of the Technical Support Working Group of the Department of Defense.

#### **Thermophotovoltaics**

The thermophotovoltaics program (TPV) is a collaborative program between ARPA and NASA to demonstrate and develop a passive power generator powered by liquid and gaseous fuels. TPV has potential for a number of military applications including power generation in unmanned underwater vehicles. The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$5.0 million in the Experimental Evaluation of Major Innovative Technologies to continue the program in fiscal year 1996. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

### **Large Millimeter Wave Telescope**

The Large Millimeter Wave Telescope (LMT) design project has significant potential for advancing the state of the art for radio telescopes through the use of intelligent structures. The design could greatly improve capability for acquisition and recognition of targets in space, as well as demonstrate the feasibility of long range directed energy devices. The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$3.0 million for the continuation of the LMT program in the Advanced Space Technology Project within the Advanced Research Project Agency's Experimental Evaluation of Major Technologies program (PE 603226E). The committee directs that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized under the program where appropriate.

### **Rapid acquisition of manufactured parts**

The committee continues to support efforts to develop and deploy technologies under the rapid acquisition of manufactured parts (RAMP) program. The committee recommends an additional authorization of \$12.0 million to the CALS Initiative program (PE 603736D) to complete the research and development portion of the RAMP program in fiscal year 1996.

### **Advanced electronics technologies**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$50.0 million from PE 603739E for lower priority activities and activities not directly related to electronics research and development. The committee directs that the reduction be distributed among the projects in the program as follows:

	<i>Millions</i>
MT-07 Centers of Excellence .....	-\$23.6
MT-08 Manufacturing Technology .....	- 20.0
MT-11 CALS/Electronic Commerce .....	- 6.4

The committee notes that the U.S.-Japan Management program requested in project MT-07 is now managed in the Office of Scientific Research in the Air Force. The committee notes that the Air Force may, at its discretion, apply funds authorized in PE 601102F to continue the program at its present level.

### **Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology (SEMATECH)**

The committee notes the request for \$89.6 million in the request to provide direct funding for the SEMATECH consortium to continue research in semiconductor manufacturing technology. SEMATECH has made a major contribution to reestablishing the competitiveness of the U.S. semiconductor industry. However, with the funding requested for fiscal year 1996, the direct federal participation in the program will have exceeded by three years the five year period of such participation foreseen during the establishment of the consortium in fiscal year 1988. The committee agrees with the managers of SEMATECH that the time has come for the industry members to take responsibility for directly funding the operation of the consortium. Therefore, the committee recommends approval of the requested amount for fiscal year 1996, but expects that there will be no further direct federal funding requested for SEMATECH for fiscal year 1997 and beyond.

**ATD-111 non-acoustic sensor technology**

The Department of Defense has sponsored several programs to develop non-acoustic sensor technology for anti-submarine warfare and mine detection applications. Congress has consistently supported such initiatives in order to fully explore the potential of various types of non-acoustic sensors, including a light detection and ranging (LIDAR) system known as ATD-111. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (H. Rept. 103-357) directed the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a report that (1) searched for any competitive research and development projects; (2) evaluated the relative maturity, capability, and life cycle costs of ATD-111 and any other programs identified in the search; (3) outlined an appropriate acquisition strategy that could carry them forward from the development phase; (4) identified additional possible missions these technologies might satisfy; and (5) reported the results to the congressional defense committees.

The department's report was prepared by Johns Hopkins University's Applied Physics Laboratory (JHU/APL). It was submitted to Congress in June of 1995. It found no technology or program more mature, more promising, or more capable, relative to stated Navy mission requirements, than ATD-111. However, the report did not identify an acquisition plan as directed in the statement of managers. Further, the fiscal year 1996 budget request contained no funding for continued development of ATD-111 or any proposal for acquisition under the future years defense program.

The committee is concerned that the Navy has not chosen to continue development of the ATD-111 system nor to fully address the potential contribution of the ATD-111 system for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) or countermine applications. In the committee's opinion, the system has strong potential as a non-acoustic alternative for ASW at a time when the Navy has repeatedly testified before and briefed the committee on the shrinking acoustic advantage of United States ASW systems relative to those of other countries. For example, much of the debate associated with submarine procurement discussed elsewhere in this report has centered on the need to regain an acoustic advantage over other nations at a time when each incremental improvement is achieved at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase in funding in PE 603714D of \$10.0 million: (1) to test ATD-111 system upgrades; (2) to provide for system corrections identified during field tests; (3) to bring the test systems to a common configuration; and (4) to evaluate carriage on alternate airborne platforms. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a plan for the acquisition and deployment of the ATD-111 system and to provide this plan to the congressional defense committees is with the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

**NATO research and development program**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million in the NATO Research and Development program to fund other priority areas. The committee makes this reduction without prejudice and notes that this recommended reduction would still provide for an

increase above the amount appropriated for this account for fiscal year 1995.

### **Fuel cells**

For several years the Congress has provided funding for a cooperative fuel cell development program between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. The committee supports these ongoing programs but has concerns that the programs have expanded and lengthened beyond their original scope. The committee is also concerned that these programs do not have substantial cost sharing provisions despite their obvious dual-use nature. The committee is willing to continue its support for this research but only on the condition that the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy report to the committee no later than February 15, 1996 regarding the duration and long-term goals of the programs. The committee also directs the two departments to obtain cost sharing agreements with the developers of these fuel cells before additional funds are released. The committee recommends \$9.4 million in PE 63226E for carbonate-based fuel cells, and \$12.0 million in PE 63851D for fuel cells for DOD installations.

### **Special Operations Forces counterproliferation support**

The committee recognizes that Special Operations Forces are relied upon for multiple counterproliferation objectives and contingency operations. The committee recommends that of the funds provided in the Counterproliferation Support program, \$6.3 million shall be allocated to the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) for preparation and support of counterproliferation activities.

### **Technical studies, support and analysis**

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5.0 million in PE 605104D without prejudice to fund other priority programs.

### **Technical assistance and SBIR administration**

The committee recommends a denial of the authorization of \$4.92 million in PE 605129D and \$1.57 million in PE 605790D. The committee believes that the Procurement Technical Assistance Center program for which the committee elsewhere has recommended an additional \$12.0 million would provide an adequate infrastructure for offering technical assistance and other services to potential government contractors.

### **U-2 Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) sensor upgrades**

While the committee supports the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office's (DARO) initiative to define a Joint Airborne SIGINT Architecture (JASA), the committee is also concerned with DARO's apparent decision not to continue upgrading current platforms while focusing funding exclusively on a new development program. Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of \$20.0 million for the DARO to initiate the Remote Airborne SIGINT (RAS-1B) upgrade program for the U-2 fleet. The committee expects DARO to budget for the remaining funds to complete the up-

grade, and directs that this upgrade be fully compliant with JASA standards.

#### **U-2 defensive system upgrade**

The committee appreciates the need for updating the defensive system of the U-2 aircraft, especially as it could be called on to fly over hostile territory. The committee further understands that the warfighting commanders-in-chief unanimously endorse the need for an improved self-defense capability for the U-2. Accordingly, the committee recommends an authorization of \$13.0 million for the purpose. The committee expects that the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO) will budget for the remaining funds for the upgrade.

#### **Maritime unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)**

The committee is advised that a variant of the fixed wing, short-range Joint Tactical UAV currently under development is intended to fill the role of the Navy's short-range maritime UAV system. This system will require the Navy to take off from and land the system on the flight deck of a ship—either an amphibious ship or an aircraft carrier. The committee is concerned about the suitability of a tactical fixed wing UAV for Naval forces.

Vertical take-off/landing (VTOL) UAV's address both Naval and land forces' requirements for UAV's with minimal launch and recovery space constraints. A VTOL variant Joint Tactical UAV may provide an effective and complementary air vehicle solution for the multi-service need for real time data in support of reconnaissance, surveillance, targeting, battle damage assessment, and off-board electronic countermeasure anti-ship missile defense (ASMD) against radar-guided missiles. Congressionally mandated VTOL UAV variants which have demonstrated potential to meet these operational needs should be matured and evaluated further.

The committee continues to insist on maximum commonality among various UAV's—especially on such items as sensors, avionics, control systems, data links and automatic landing and recovery systems. However, the committee also believes that UAV air frames and their operating characteristics must fit the needs of the user. Therefore, the committee directs the DOD to reexamine the requirements for Joint Tactical UAV for Naval forces and to allocate \$12.5 million of the funds provided for the Joint Tactical UAV for fiscal year 1996 to support continued development and evaluation of VTOL Joint Tactical UAV variants.

The Secretary of Defense will provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the requirements for Joint Tactical UAV for Naval forces and how those requirements are being addressed by February 15, 1996.

#### **Advanced SEAL delivery system (ASDS)**

The committee has supported the development of a long-range submersible capability to deliver special operations forces for clandestine missions and is pleased with the joint efforts of the Special Operations Command (SOC) and the Navy to develop ASDS. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in program element 116404BB to facilitate testing and fielding of the ASDS.

### **Rigid hull inflatable boat (RHIB)**

The committee is aware that the Special Operations Command (SOC) has found the 10 meter RHIB design, on which initial developmental efforts were focused, unsatisfactory and has adopted a new strategy for development of a RHIB to meet Special Operations Forces requirements. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.3 million in program element 116404BB to support this developmental effort. The committee makes a corresponding reduction of \$4.3 million in the procurement account for SOF maritime equipment to offset this increase.

### **Expertise on defense trade and international technology**

U.S. government policy on the export and trade of U.S. and foreign technologies and products continues to evolve. These policy changes have put new emphasis on the requirement for DOD to evaluate and monitor the availability of technologies in the world marketplace. The committee commends the efforts of Office of the Secretary of Defense in establishing a special internal trade and technology capability in the C3I FFRDC community to provide broad-based technical and engineering support to policy makers in the evaluation of complex international trade and technology areas. The committee believes it is important to enhance support to the Department of Defense in international technology monitoring, technology transfer risk management, industrial base analyses, and the development of opportunities for trade cooperation.

### **RDT&E infrastructure**

The committee continues to be concerned about the inability of the Department of Defense to manage the size of the infrastructure supporting research, development, test and evaluation efforts. Especially in the test and evaluation area, the size of the infrastructure is not decreasing in proportion to the reductions made in the research and procurement programs that such infrastructure supports. The committee notes that at a time when the budget request for the technology base programs has decreased by over 10 percent, funding for the RDT&E support programs has declined less than 4 percent. The result is that an increasing proportion of our annual RDT&E investments pays for infrastructure maintenance rather than research and development supporting defense missions. Absent a clear approach to infrastructure consolidation from the Secretary of Defense, the committee has recommended reductions in the following RDT&E support accounts:

	<i>Millions</i>
PE 604759A .....	-\$10.0
PE 605103A .....	- 5.0
PE 605896A .....	-20.0
PE 605864N .....	- 5.0
PE 605807F .....	-20.0
PE 604940D .....	-10.0
PE 605804D .....	-10.0

In the past two years, the committee has supported a number of initiatives to help offset the growing burden of infrastructure support costs. The committee urges the managers of the test and evaluation infrastructure to use existing legislative authority granted

under section 846 of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 to sell use of the test ranges to paying customers other than the DOD in appropriate cases. While the authority was enacted at the specific request of the Department of Defense, the managers of the test ranges have been slow to use it. In particular, our allies are showing a much greater interest in using U.S. test ranges and facilities because of encroachment problems overseas, and the Department should be more aggressive in encouraging and facilitating such requests. On the other hand, the committee is concerned about reports that laboratory and test facilities are using section 846 authorities to compete with private enterprise for test services. It was not the intent of the committee that those authorities be used to foster government competition with the private sector. Continued committee support for these authorities will be contingent on the implementation of effective barriers to such competition.

#### **Individual lift vehicle development**

The committee understands that there is a proposal for developing technology that could lead to an individual flying vehicle ("X-Jet") that could have a wide variety of military applications. The committee believes that such a system could be particularly useful to the special operations community. The committee is interested in an evaluation by the Special Operations Command to determine the merits and demerits of developing such a system, and whether there is a requirement for such a system in the U.S. Special Operations Command or elsewhere within the Department.

The committee directs SOCOM and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to provide this analysis to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 1996.

### **Defense Developmental Test and Evaluation**

#### **Environmental technology**

The Department of Defense strategy for environmental technology is based on two key elements: (1) systematic identification of technology needs and (2) development, demonstration, and validation of technologies. The Defense Environmental Quality Program Annual Report to Congress for fiscal year 1994 briefly addressed the elements of environmental technology, but the report raised more questions than it resolved.

It is essential that defense environmental technology have a focus that ensures comprehensive and effective management of the existing projects and resources. Such management should include the following: centralized review and categorization of identified needs; oversight and accountability for all aspects of environmental technology; and consolidation of activities related to demonstration and validation of technologies. Centralization and consolidation of the elements of defense environmental technology will facilitate matching technology sources with identified needs, and will minimize duplication of effort.

The committee desires that the Secretary of Defense conduct a complete review of all aspects of Defense environmental technology and submit a detailed recommendation for restructuring environmental technology activities and relating those activities to funding

for the next budget cycle. That recommendation should be an integral part of the Defense budget proposal for fiscal year 1997.

In addition, the committee has become aware that the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program, and the National Defense Center of Environmental Excellence have all engaged in the development of three distinct computerized databases designed to facilitate the exchange of information relevant to the development and demonstration/validation of environmental technology. The Department of Defense should ensure that these databases are not duplicative.

### **TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

The President's budget request included \$91,634.4 million for operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces and component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1996.

The committee recommends authorization of \$91,426.7 million for the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts for fiscal year 1996, a decrease of \$207.7 million. The recommended amount authorized for the O&M accounts includes, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, transfer of \$150.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

The committee recommends authorization of \$878.7 million for the revolving and management funds.

The O&M accounts include approximately 36 percent of the total Department of Defense budget. Expenditures from these accounts pay the costs for:

- day-to-day operations of our military forces in the United States and around the world;
- all individual and unit training for military members, including joint exercises;
- maintenance and support of the weapons, vehicles, and equipment in the military services;
- purchase and distribution of spare parts and supplies to support military operations;
- support, maintenance, and repair of buildings and bases throughout the Department of Defense.

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

The quality of overall readiness essentially depends on adequate funding for both current and future readiness. Although this funding mix is often portrayed as a balance, the committee suggests it is a fundamental obligation of the federal government to provide adequate resources for both current and future readiness.

This year the committee received testimony on readiness issues from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service Secretaries, the Chiefs of Staff, and the unified combatant commanders. The committee also received testimony from four commissioned officers of various ranks from each service, who illustrated the condition of the armed forces.

The Subcommittee on Readiness conducted three hearings this year, receiving testimony from retired senior commissioned officers, the service Chiefs of Staff, the Comptroller of the Department of

Defense, and the Comptroller General of the United States on financial management.

Concerns about readiness were heightened this year as a result of an announcement by the Secretary of Defense in November 1994 that three Army divisions had reported themselves at readiness level C-3 due to deficiencies in training. Some have noted that three divisions had not been C-3 for training deficiencies since the "Hollow Force" years, when the Army had 18 divisions, and the announcement seemed to confirm the existence of a problem. Although the administration subsequently determined that these divisions would not deploy in the first increment in response to a regional contingency crisis, the significance of this development is open to debate. The committee is nonetheless concerned that the senior Department of Defense leadership did not appear to be aware of the readiness situation.

The committee received information this year about DOD efforts to improve readiness reporting, including an effort to measure "Joint Readiness." While the committee recognizes the need for DOD to improve its understanding of readiness, it would suggest that readiness reporting is not a science. Readiness comprises a variety of nonquantifiable factors. It is broadly subjective, and readiness reports become less statistically relevant as data are aggregated at higher levels. The probability that meaningful or predictive information may be derived from a joint readiness report is low. However, attempts to understand the relationship between inputs and outputs could be helpful.

While current readiness is not robust, future readiness is a larger and more serious problem. The committee believes future readiness deficiencies must be addressed now. If not, more serious indicators will emerge within the next two years and the solution will become far more difficult. Current readiness must be protected at the same time to ensure military forces have the best possible chance to accomplish their missions with minimum casualties and without exposure to unnecessary risk.

The committee recommends a reduction in O&M funding for low priority and non-defense programs. Funds made available from these reductions should be authorized for current and future readiness programs so that the Armed Forces can begin the next century with less obsolete and worn-out equipment. This planning consideration required the committee to make some difficult decisions. However, declining defense budgets and serious problems with force modernization have made such decisions necessary.

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b>				
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>				
<b>LAND FORCES</b>				
2020A	10 COMBAT UNITS	9,069,646	25,000	9,094,646
2020A	20 TACTICAL SUPPORT	1,882,069		1,882,069
2020A	30 THEATER DEFENSE FORCES	1,165,970		1,165,970
2020A	40 FORCE RELATED TRAINING/SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	178,670		178,670
2020A	50 FORCE COMMUNICATIONS	1,271,154		1,271,154
2020A	60 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	73,584		73,584
2020A	70 JCS EXERCISES	861,426		861,426
2020A	80 BASE SUPPORT	54,467		54,467
2020A	85 REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	3,582,306	25,000	3,607,306
		0		0
2020A	90 LAND OPERATIONS SUPPORT	251,301	0	251,301
2020A	100 COMBAT DEVELOPMENTS	214,364		214,364
2020A	105 UNIFIED COMMANDS	36,937		36,937
		0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>9,320,947</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>9,345,947</b>
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION</b>				
2020A	110 MOBILITY OPERATIONS	686,760	29,500	726,260
	<b>POMCUS</b>	<b>86,830</b>		<b>86,830</b>

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
2020A 120	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	393,923		393,923
2020A 130	WAR RESERVE ACTIVITIES	72,166		72,166
	SWA AWR ACCELERATION		29,500	29,500
2020A 140	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	143,841		143,841
2020A 145	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:</b>	<b>696,760</b>	<b>29,500</b>	<b>726,260</b>

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING**

2020A 150	ACCESSION TRAINING	314,798	0	314,798
2020A 160	OFFICER ACQUISITION	58,328		58,328
2020A 170	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,228		11,228
2020A 180	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	17,008		17,008
2020A 190	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	109,789		109,789
2020A 195	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	118,445		118,445
	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
2020A 200	BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	2,060,143	45,000	2,105,143
	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	236,760		236,760
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING			
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE MEDICAL TRAINING			
2020A 210	FLIGHT TRAINING	218,514		218,514
2020A 220	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	68,981		68,981
2020A 230	TRAINING SUPPORT	375,528		375,528
2020A 240	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	1,160,360	45,000	1,205,360

APPRO	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
2020A	245	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
		RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	691,154	(2,230)	688,924
2020A	250	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	211,375	4,000	215,375
2020A	260	EXAMINING	64,333		64,333
2020A	270	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	103,812		103,812
2020A	280	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	81,108		81,108
2020A	290	JUNIOR ROTC	74,506	(6,230)	68,276
2020A	300	BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	156,020		156,020
2020A	305	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>	<b>3,066,095</b>	<b>42,770</b>	<b>3,108,865</b>
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
		SECURITY PROGRAMS (ARMS CONTROL)	362,333	(6,000)	356,333
2020A	310	SECURITY PROGRAMS (ARMS CONTROL) CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	362,333	(6,000)	356,333
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,630,274	0	1,630,274
2020A	320	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	542,910		542,910
2020A	330	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	487,281		487,281
2020A	340	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	299,230		299,230
2020A	350	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	300,853		300,853
2020A	355	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AC/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</b>			
2020A 360	ADMINISTRATION	2,826,103	0	2,826,103
2020A 370	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	275,238		275,238
2020A 380	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	686,446		686,446
2020A 390	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	124,676		124,676
	NEW PARENT SUPPORT	175,832		175,832
2020A 400	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	568,225		568,225
2020A 410	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	173,290		173,290
2020A 420	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	86,930		86,930
2020A 430	BASE SUPPORT	735,466		735,466
2020A 432	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	0		0
2020A 435	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</b>			
2020A 440	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	282,224	0	282,224
2020A 450	MISC SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	252,778		252,778
2020A 455	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	29,446		29,446
		0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>5,100,934</b>	<b>(6,000)</b>	<b>5,094,934</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
	Civilian Pay		(189,800)	(189,800)
	Historical Black Colleges Fellowships		(233,000)	
	Real Property Maintenance		(300)	
	Classified Programs		110,000	
	CIVILIAN UNDEREXECUTION		500	
			(67,000)	

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	18,184,736	(98,530)	18,086,206
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	4,266,628	10,000	4,276,628
1804N	10 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	1,788,301		1,788,301
1804N	20 FLEET AIR TRAINING	627,871		627,871
1804N	30 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	68,070		68,070
1804N	40 AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	59,060		59,060
1804N	50 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	489,443		489,443
1804N	60 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	28,232		28,232
1804N	70 BASE SUPPORT	1,205,651	10,000	1,215,651
1804N	75 REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	SHIP OPERATIONS	6,879,010	25,400	6,904,410
1804N	80 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,885,234	400	1,885,634
1804N	90 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	462,396		462,396
1804N	100 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	401,812		401,812
1804N	110 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,261,190		2,261,190
1804N	120 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	758,320		758,320
1804N	130 BASE SUPPORT	1,110,058	25,000	1,135,058

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1804N 135	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</b>			
1804N 140	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,581,800	11,900	1,593,700
1804N 150	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	198,415		198,415
1804N 160	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	7,398		7,398
1804N 170	WARFARE TACTICS	153,881		153,881
1804N 180	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	138,256		138,256
1804N 190	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	198,719		198,719
	Nimitz Center	339,888	(3,100)	342,988
1804N 200	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	145,820		145,820
1804N 210	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,127		1,127
1804N 220	BASE SUPPORT	398,298	15,000	413,298
1804N 225	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>WEAPONS SUPPORT</b>			
1804N 230	CRUISE MISSILE	1,424,119	0	1,424,119
1804N 240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	96,656		96,656
1804N 250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	788,463		788,463
1804N 260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	25,945		25,945
	NAVY ORDNANCE	401,879		401,879
1804N 270	BASE SUPPORT	111,176		111,176
1804N 275	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
1804N 276	DBOF SUPPORT	695,100		695,100
1804N 277	BRAC IV PROJECTED SAVINGS	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>14,846,657</b>	<b>47,300</b>	<b>14,893,957</b>

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION</b>				
<b>READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES</b>				
1804N 280	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	511,034	0	511,034
1804N 285	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0	0	0
<b>ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS</b>				
1804N 290	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	479,601	0	479,601
1804N 300	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,215		7,215
1804N 305	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	472,386	0	472,386
<b>MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS</b>				
1804N 310	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	39,593	0	39,593
1804N 320	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	16,162		16,162
1804N 330	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	1,917		1,917
1804N 335	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	21,514	0	21,514
<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:</b>		1,030,228	0	1,030,228
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>				
<b>ACCESSION TRAINING</b>				
1804N 340	OFFICER ACQUISITION	249,069	0	249,069
1804N 350	RECRUIT TRAINING	66,755		66,755
1804N 360	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	4,667		4,667
		64,836		64,836

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1804N 370	BASE SUPPORT	112,811		112,811
1804N 375	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
1804N 380	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	1,087,406	0	1,087,406
	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	212,121		212,121
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING			
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE MEDICAL TRAINING			
1804N 390	FLIGHT TRAINING	273,004		273,004
1804N 400	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	61,214		61,214
1804N 410	TRAINING SUPPORT	125,237		125,237
1804N 420	BASE SUPPORT	415,830		415,830
1804N 425	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
1804N 430	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	225,217	(2,950)	222,267
1804N 440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	122,820		122,820
1804N 450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	54,970		54,970
1804N 460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	22,223		22,223
1804N 470	JUNIOR ROTC	24,382	(2,950)	21,432
1804N 475	BASE SUPPORT	822		822
1804N 475	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>		1,561,692	(2,950)	1,558,742
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>				
<b>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</b>		1,758,993	27,000	1,785,993

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	EY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1804N 480	ADMINISTRATION	605,287		605,287
1804N 490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	21,684		21,684
1804N 500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	63,166		63,166
1804N 510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	139,864		139,864
1804N 520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	395,629		395,629
1804N 530	NEW PARENT SUPPORT			
1804N 530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	261,463		261,463
1804N 540	CHALLENGE ATHENA	0	27,000	27,000
1804N 540	BASE SUPPORT	271,900		271,900
1804N 542	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES (DRUG TESTING LABS)	0		0
1804N 545	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
1804N 550	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,453,266	0	1,453,266
1804N 560	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	147,132		147,132
1804N 570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	249,620		249,620
1804N 580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	426,404		426,404
1804N 590	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	302,011		302,011
1804N 600	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	60,022		60,022
1804N 610	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	41,632		41,632
1804N 620	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	68,111		68,111
1804N 625	BASE SUPPORT	158,334		158,334
1804N 630	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
1804N 630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	567,479	(7,000)	560,479
1804N 630	SECURITY PROGRAMS (ARMS CONTROL)	556,805	(7,000)	549,805
1804N 630	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1804N 640	BASE SUPPORT	10,674		10,674
<b>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</b>				
1804N 650	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	7,395	0	7,395
		7,395		7,395
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	3,787,133	20,000	3,807,133
	Undistributed Total		66,900	66,900
	Real Property Maintenance		110,000	110,000
	Classified Programs		(10,100)	(10,100)
	CIVILIAN UNDEREXECUTION		(33,000)	(33,000)
	<b>TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b>	21,225,710	131,250	21,356,960
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</b>				
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>				
1106N 10	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	1,544,019	94,000	1,638,019
1106N 20	OPERATIONAL FORCES	334,133		334,133
1106N 30	FIELD LOGISTICS	158,299		158,299
1106N 30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	148,574	54,000	202,574
1106N 40	BASE SUPPORT	903,013	30,000	943,013
	PERSONNEL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		10,000	

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1106N 45	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>USMC PREPOSITIONING</b>			
1106N 50	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	85,435	(4,000)	81,435
1106N 60	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	77,416		77,416
1106N 65	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	8,019	(4,000)	4,019
		0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>1,629,454</b>	<b>90,000</b>	<b>1,719,454</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
	<b>ACCESSION TRAINING</b>			
1106N 70	RECRUIT TRAINING	74,165	0	74,165
1106N 80	OFFICER ACQUISITION	7,343		7,343
1106N 90	BASE SUPPORT	268		268
1106N 95	NEW/PARENT SUPPORT	66,554		66,554
	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</b>			
1106N 100	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	175,769	0	175,769
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING	25,057		25,057
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE MEDICAL TRAINING			
1106N 110	FLIGHT TRAINING	165		165
1106N 120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	5,792		5,792
1106N 130	TRAINING SUPPORT	74,964		74,964

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1106N 140	BASE SUPPORT	69,791		69,791
1106N 145	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
<b>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</b>				
1106N 150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	93,176	4,989	98,165
1106N 160	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	61,037	5,000	66,037
1106N 170	JUNIOR ROTC	11,055		16,055
1106N 180	BASE SUPPORT	7,588	(11)	7,577
1106N 185	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	13,496		13,496
		0		0
<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>				
		343,110	4,989	348,099
<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>				
<b>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</b>				
1106N 190	LOGISTICS SUPPORT	297,158	0	297,158
1106N 200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	95,596		95,596
1106N 210	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	131,023		131,023
1106N 220	ADMINISTRATION	31,931		31,931
1106N 230	BASE SUPPORT	28,523		28,523
1106N 235	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	10,085		10,085
		0		0
<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>				
		297,158	0	297,158
<b>Undistributed</b>				
	Real Property Maintenance		41,000	41,000
			40,000	

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	Classified Programs		1,000	
	TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS	2,269,722	135,989	2,405,711
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
	AIR OPERATIONS	7,260,977	25,000	7,285,977
3400F 10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,684,913		2,684,913
3400F 20	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	409,701		409,701
3400F 30	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	257,139		257,139
3400F 40	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	647,570		647,570
3400F 50	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	854,442		854,442
3400F 60	BASE SUPPORT	2,407,212	25,000	2,432,212
3400F 65	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	1,509,701	0	1,509,701
3400F 70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	826,526		826,526
3400F 80	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	128,374		128,374
3400F 90	OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	210,481		210,481
3400F 100	JCS EXERCISES	41,793		41,793
3400F 110	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	111,914		111,914
3400F 120	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	190,613		190,613

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>SPACE OPERATIONS</b>			
3400F 130	LAUNCH FACILITIES	1,245,644	0	1,245,644
3400F 140	LAUNCH VEHICLES	254,590		254,590
3400F 150	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	117,482		117,482
3400F 160	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	341,862		341,862
3400F 170	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	49,132		49,132
3400F 180	BASE SUPPORT	79,989		79,989
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>10,016,322</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>10,041,322</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION</b>			
	<b>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</b>			
3400F 190	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,523,373	0	2,523,373
3400F 200	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	1,544,785		1,544,785
3400F 210	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	10,961		10,961
3400F 220	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	160,110		160,110
3400F 230	BASE SUPPORT	293,027		293,027
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:</b>	<b>2,523,373</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,523,373</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
	<b>ACCESSION TRAINING</b>			
3400F 240	OFFICER ACQUISITION	183,970	0	183,970
3400F 250	RECRUIT TRAINING	49,197		49,197
		3,881		3,881

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	EX 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
3400F 260	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	39,226		39,226
3400F 270	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	91,666		91,666
3400F 275	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</b>	1,230,608	0	1,230,608
3400F 280	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	204,465		204,465
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE TRAINING			
	CHEMICAL DEFENSE MEDICAL TRAINING			
3400F 290	FLIGHT TRAINING	336,956		336,956
3400F 300	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	78,688		78,688
3400F 310	TRAINING SUPPORT	65,048		65,048
3400F 320	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	545,451		545,451
3400F 325	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</b>	226,182	1,896	228,078
3400F 330	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	44,827	5,000	49,827
3400F 340	EXAMINING	3,122		3,122
3400F 350	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	75,537		75,537
	TUITION ASSISTANCE			
3400F 360	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	77,304		77,304
3400F 370	JUNIOR ROTC	25,392	(3,104)	22,288
3400F 375	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>	1,640,760	1,896	1,642,656

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES**

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</b>			
3400F 380	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	2,280,043	0	2,280,043
	B-1 MAINTENANCE	790,324		790,324
	TICARRS			
3400F 390	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	365,535		365,535
3400F 400	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	234,836		234,836
3400F 410	BASE SUPPORT	889,348		889,348
3400F 415	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
3400F 420	ADMINISTRATION	1,335,859	(5,000)	1,330,859
3400F 430	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	118,319		118,319
3400F 440	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	318,240		318,240
3400F 450	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	84,766		84,766
3400F 460	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	40,426		40,426
3400F 470	ARMS CONTROL	48,429		48,429
3400F 480	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	34,645		34,645
3400F 490	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	396,155		396,155
3400F 500	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	32,080		32,080
3400F 510	BASE SUPPORT	14,704	(5,000)	9,704
	NEW PARENT SUPPORT	248,095		248,095
3400F 515	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
	<b>SECURITY PROGRAMS</b>			
		447,218	(8,000)	439,218

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BAL/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
3400F 520	SECURITY PROGRAMS (ARMS CONTROL) CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	447,218	(8,000)	439,218
3400F 530	SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	13,022	0	13,022
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,076,142	(13,000)	4,063,142
	Undistributed		(32,600)	(32,600)
	Real Property Maintenance		15,000	15,000
	Classified Programs		13,400	13,400
	CIVILIAN UNDEREXECUTION		(61,000)	
	TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	18,256,597	(18,704)	18,237,893
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
0100D 10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	475,977		475,977
0100D 20	MOBILITY ENHANCEMENTS SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,018,476		1,018,476
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,494,453	0	1,494,453

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION</b>			
0100D	30 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	26,000		26,000
0100D	35 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	0		0
0100D	40 WASHINGTON HQ SERVICES (DISASTER RELIEF)	45,438	(45,438)	0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:</b>	<b>71,438</b>	<b>(45,438)</b>	<b>26,000</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
0100D	50 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	112,991	0	112,991
0100D	60 DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY	19,669	0	19,669
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>	<b>132,660</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>132,660</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
0100D	70 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	90,892		90,892
0100D	80 CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT Joint Analytic Model Improvement Plan	127,967		127,967
0100D	90 CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	3,350,037	11,200	11,200
0100D	100 DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SERVICE	45,631		3,350,037
0100D	110 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	342,926		45,631
0100D	120 DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	201,582		342,926
0100D	130 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (HOMELESS INIT) PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	1,055,996	(3,000)	201,582
	<b>DEBT COLLECTION DEMONSTRATION</b>		<b>12,000</b>	<b>1,064,996</b>
0100D	140 DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	6,540		6,540
0100D	150 DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY	734,438		734,438

APPRO	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
			96,105		96,105
0100D	160	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	13,486		13,486
0100D	170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	234,682	(184,682)	50,000
0100D	180	FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	1,292,684		1,292,684
0100D	190	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	82,562		82,562
0100D	200	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	10,858		10,858
0100D	210	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	97,873		97,873
0100D	220	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	59,078		59,078
0100D	230	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	349,291		349,291
0100D	240	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE		(69,500)	(69,500)
		NG YOUTH & CIVIL/MILITARY COOPERATION PROGRAMS			
		JOINT RECRUITING ADVERTISING PROGRAM	0		0
0100D	245	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	97,987		85,987
0100D	250	ON SITE INSPECTION AGENCY (ARMS CONTROL)	308,421	(12,000)	308,421
0100D	260	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES			
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	8,599,036	(245,982)	8,353,054
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 5: INTEREST</b>			
0100D	270	DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY	0		0
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5:</b>	0	0	0
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 6: CAPITAL LEASE</b>			
0100D	280	DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY	69,195	0	69,195

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6:</b>	69,195	0	69,195
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
	Classified Programs		(15,200)	(15,200)
	Multi-Tech Auto Reader Card		(18,500)	
	CIVILIAN UNDEREXECUTION		8,000	
	TRAVEL		(57,700)	
	Current Operations, Not Budgeted		(72,000)	(72,000)
			125,000	125,000
	<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>	10,366,782	(306,620)	10,060,162
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b>MISSION OPERATIONS</b>			
2080A	10 BASE SUPPORT	958,790	0	958,790
2080A	20 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	284,036		284,036
2080A	30 RECRUITING AND RETENTION	57,377		57,377
2080A	40 TRAINING OPERATIONS	43,963		43,963
		573,414		
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	958,790	0	958,790
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	109,801	0	109,801

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
2080A	50 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	17,492		17,492
2080A	60 PUBLIC AFFAIRS	423		423
2080A	70 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	61,941		61,941
2080A	80 STAFF MANAGEMENT	29,945		29,945
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	109,801	0	109,801
	UNDISTRIBUTED		(6,000)	(6,000)
	CIVILIAN UNDEREXECUTION		(6,000)	
	<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, ARMY RESERVE</b>	1,068,591	(6,000)	1,062,591
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
1806N	10 RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	491,949	14,800	506,749
	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	291,673		291,673
	P-3 Squadron Operations		14,800	14,800
1806N	20 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,813		17,813
1806N	30 AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	1,915		1,915
1806N	40 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	49,338		49,338
1806N	50 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	356		356
1806N	60 BASE SUPPORT	130,854		130,854

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS</b>			
1806N 70	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	157,940	0	157,940
1806N 80	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	60,895		60,895
1806N 90	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	658		658
1806N 100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	23,990		23,990
1806N 110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	70,930		70,930
		1,467		1,467
	<b>RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</b>			
1806N 120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	78,434	0	78,434
1806N 130	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	817		817
1806N 140	BASE SUPPORT	25,207		25,207
		52,410		52,410
	<b>RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT</b>			
1806N 150	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,641	0	5,641
		5,641		5,641
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>733,964</b>	<b>14,800</b>	<b>748,764</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
1806N 160	ADMINISTRATION	92,078	0	92,078
1806N 170	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	8,029		8,029
1806N 180	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	3,222		3,222
1806N 190	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	31,209		31,209
1806N 200	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	0		0
		21,247		21,247

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
1806N 210	BASE SUPPORT	25,723		25,723
1806N 220	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	2,648		2,648
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>92,078</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92,078</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE			
	<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, NAVY RESERVE</b>	<b>826,042</b>	<b>14,800</b>	<b>840,842</b>
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b>MISSION FORCES</b>			
1107N 10	TRAINING	55,235	0	55,235
1107N 20	OPERATING FORCES	13,617		13,617
1107N 30	BASE SUPPORT	21,237		21,237
1107N 40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,059		18,059
1107N 45	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	2,322		2,322
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>55,235</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55,235</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			

APPRO	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	EX 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
		<b>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</b>			
		<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
1107N	50	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	35,048	0	35,048
1107N	60	SPECIAL SUPPORT	7,609		7,609
1107N	70	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	9,064		9,064
1107N	80	ADMINISTRATION	5,381		5,381
1107N	90	BASE SUPPORT	6,274		6,274
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>35,048</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>35,048</b>
		<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
		<b>REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE</b>			<b>0</b>
		<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE</b>	<b>90,283</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90,283</b>
		<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE</b>			
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
		<b>AIR OPERATIONS</b>			
3740F	10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,420,914	0	1,420,914
3740F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	1,103,593		1,103,593
3740F	30	BASE SUPPORT	35,073		35,073
3740F	33	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	282,248		282,248
3740F	35	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
			0		0

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	1,420,914	0	1,420,914
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
3740F 40	ADMINISTRATION	65,033	0	65,033
3740F 50	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	33,107		33,107
3740F 60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	17,746		17,746
3740F 70	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	7,743		7,743
3740F 80	AUDIOVISUAL	6,063		6,063
3740F 85	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	374		374
		0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	65,033	0	65,033
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED CIVILIAN UNDER EXECUTION</b>		(13,000)	(13,000)
	<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, AIR FORCE RESERVE</b>	1,485,947	(13,000)	1,472,947
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
2065A 10	MISSION OPERATIONS	2,110,418	0	2,110,418
	TRAINING OPERATIONS	1,720,134		1,720,134

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
2065A	20 RECRUITING AND RETENTION	20,110		20,110
2065A	30 MEDICAL SUPPORT	19,109		19,109
2065A	40 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	100,687		100,687
2065A	50 BASE SUPPORT	250,378		250,378
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>2,110,418</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,110,418</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
2065A	60 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	193,690	0	193,690
2065A	70 PUBLIC AFFAIRS	59,496		59,496
2065A	80 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	1,461		1,461
2065A	90 STAFF MANAGEMENT	89,665		89,665
		43,068		43,068
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>193,690</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>193,690</b>
	<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD</b>	<b>2,304,108</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,304,108</b>
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b>AIR OPERATIONS</b>			
3840F	10 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,704,107	38,000	2,742,107
	ANG PAA STRUCTURE	1,977,786	38,000	1,977,786

APPRO	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
		<b>ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG</b>			
3840F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	346,687		346,687
3840F	30	BASE SUPPORT	361,224		361,224
3840F	40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,410		18,410
3840F	45	REPROGRAMMING/CREDITS	0		0
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	2,704,107	38,000	2,742,107
		<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
		<b>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
3840F	50	ADMINISTRATION	8,114	0	8,114
3840F	60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	3,127		3,127
			4,987		4,987
		<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	8,114	0	8,114
		<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>		(16,000)	(16,000)
		<b>CIVILIAN UNDER EXECUTION</b>		(16,000)	
		<b>TOTAL, O&amp;M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD</b>	2,712,221	22,000	2,734,221
		<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>		(72,890)	12,770,804
0107D	10	INSPECTOR GENERAL	138,226		138,226
1705A	10	RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY	0		0
0104D	10	COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS	6,521		6,521

APPRO ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1996	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
0116D	10 SUMMER OLYMPICS	15,000		15,000
0832D	10 SPECIAL OLYMPICS	0		0
0810D	10 ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION DEFENSE AND STATE MOU	1,622,200	(20,400)	1,601,800
	RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARDS		(15,900)	
	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT		(3,500)	
	HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE		(1,000)	
0819D	10 HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE	79,790	(59,790)	20,000
0105D	10 DRUG INTERDICTION	680,432		680,432
0831D	10 INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING	65,000	(65,000)	0
1238N	10 PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWA ISLAND	0		0
0827D	10 WORLD UNIVERSITY GAMES	0		0
0829D	10 WORLD CUP	0		0
0130D	10 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	9,865,525	78,300	9,943,825
0132D	10 DISASTER RELIEF	0		0
0134D	10 FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	371,000	(6,000)	365,000
	ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME (Memo Entry)		45,000	
	<b>Totals</b>	12,843,694	(211,705)	12,770,804
		91,634,433		91,422,728

**SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS****Section - 303. Armed Forces Retirement Home.**

The committee recommends \$59.1 million for the operation of the AFRH in fiscal year 1996, and \$45.0 million to be added to the balance of the AFRH Trust Fund to provide for the continued solvency of the Fund. The impending depletion of the Fund is the consequence of reductions in the size of the active duty force, which has reduced the funding stream envisioned by the Congress in establishing the AFRH.

**Section - 304. Transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, to transfer \$150.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the O&M accounts.

**SUBTITLE B—DEPOT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR****Section - 311. Policy regarding performance of depot-level maintenance and repair for the Department of Defense.**

The committee recommends a provision which would provide DOD with the direction, flexibility, and legislative relief necessary to develop and execute a comprehensive depot maintenance policy during fiscal year 1996.

The single most important consideration of this policy must be to ensure a reliable maintenance and repair capability. The quality of depot work affects the safety and effectiveness of our men and women in uniform, and the responsiveness of the depot system affects the ability of the armed forces to achieve vital national security objectives. These considerations, rather than simple business practices, are most important.

Congress previously enacted various measures to preserve the capacity to perform depot-level work, absent a viable policy within DOD. These measures have tended over time to limit flexibility to the point where restructuring in order to respond to new requirements and conditions is very difficult.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to recommend a policy for the performance of depot-level work by March 31, 1996, for approval by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House. The recommendation should articulate core requirements to be performed by public depots, and delineate what competencies, skills, volumes, and plant capacities are needed for the services to perform their missions. The Secretary should then describe how these requirements might best be met.

Both public and private sector capabilities should be considered in developing this policy. Broad latitude to interservice work should be assumed in order to take maximum advantage of all capabilities.

The ability to capture accurate total cost data has been a consistent shortcoming among public sector entities, which the policy rec-

ommendation should address. When competitions are conducted, they should be based on auditable, verifiable data.

The committee cautions DOD that the most effective public-private mix may not be the most cost effective solution. Although cost is obviously a prime factor in this matter, national security considerations must take precedence over simple cost avoidance.

The committee recognizes that DOD needs the ability to select among various options for performing depot-level work. The recommended provision would enhance flexibility by repealing two current provisions of law (10 U.S.C. 2466 and 2469) which amount to artificial constraints. The repeal would become effective only upon the enactment of legislation which accepts or modifies the DOD policy recommendation. This affords Congress the latitude to retain the limitations in the event DOD is not able to develop a satisfactory policy.

**Section - 312. Extension of authority for aviation depots and naval shipyards to engage in defense-related production and services.**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 1996 the authority provided by section 1425 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as amended, for naval shipyards and aviation depots of all the services to bid on defense-related production and services.

**SUBTITLE C—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS**

**Section - 321. Revision of requirements for agreements for services under environmental restoration program.**

Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2701(d), the Secretary of Defense has entered into agreements to reimburse states and territories for regulatory oversight services provided at Department of Defense installations within their boundaries. Forty-four states and four territories have signed DSMOAs and are eligible to receive reimbursement. The Defense fiscal year 1996 budget request for DSMOAs is \$20,897 million.

At a time when the Congress is struggling with the need to produce a balanced budget and reduce the deficit it is necessary for state and federal government agencies to conduct business in a manner that ensures financial accountability. To the extent that a state or territory is undertaking a regulatory activity under generally applicable federal or state environmental laws, the committee believes that the activities should be funded from appropriate federal and state sources, not the Department of Defense.

The committee recommends an amendment to 10 U.S.C. 2701(d) that would limit the basis for state reimbursement. Under the amendment, states or territories participating in the DSMOA program could only receive reimbursement for providing technical and scientific services. The committee also recommends a provision that would limit the total amount of funds available for state reimbursement.

**Section - 322. Discharges from vessels of the Armed Forces.**

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 1251, and implementing regulation currently exempt incidental vessel discharges from permitting requirements. Incidental discharges remain subject to varying state regulation. The lack of uniformity has presented operational problems for the Navy.

The administration has proposed legislation to address incidental discharges from vessels of the Armed Forces in a comprehensive and rational manner through the development of the Uniform National Discharge Standards. The committee recommends this provision in order to establish the process necessary to develop those standards.

The Uniform National Discharge Standards provision will substantially advance shipboard environmental protection in a manner that respects and enhances the operational capabilities of the Navy. The provision is modeled after section 312 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 1322. Section 312 establishes uniform national discharge standards for sewage discharges from all vessels. The Uniform National Discharge Standards provision extends this model to regulate non-sewage incidental discharges from vessels of the armed forces.

**Section - 323. Revision of authorities relating to restoration advisory boards.**

The Department of Defense is developing a funding program for installation Restoration Advisory Boards, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2705. Section 2705 provided that RABs would be established to assist the Department with environmental restoration activities at military installations and to provide funding for local community members of RABs and existing technical review committees.

About 200 Restoration Advisory Boards have been established at operational and closing installations and Formerly Used Defense Sites. The RAB funding sources for local community member participation and for technical assistance are the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) and the Base Realignment and Closure Account (BRAC). Section 2705(e)(3)(B) provided for \$7.5 million limit on available DERA and BRAC funds for RABs technical assistance in fiscal year 1995. Under section 2705(d)(3) routine administrative expenses for RABs may be paid out of funds available for the operation and maintenance of an installation, without any limit on the amount of funds that may be expended for that purpose.

Section 2705 of title 10 has been amended to limit funding sources to BRAC and DERA, not to exceed \$4 million. Technical assistance shall be provided through federal, state, and local agencies responsible for overseeing environmental restoration at the installation, the contractors carrying out environmental restoration at the installation, or available Department of Defense personnel, unless those existing sources of technical expertise cannot serve the objective for which technical assistance is requested.

**SUBTITLE D—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES****Section - 331. Minimum number of military reserve technicians.**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a floor for military technicians in the Army and Air Force Reserve and National Guard for fiscal years 1996 and 1997.

The recommended military technician authorizations are:

Army National Guard—25,750  
Army Reserve—7,000  
Air National Guard—23,250  
Air Force Reserve—10,000

The committee notes that the severe reductions directed in the military technician program by the Department of Defense were not based on changes in force structure or missions. Rather, it appears that the directed reductions were arbitrary, full-time-equivalent targets assigned to meet National Performance Review goals. Testimony before the committee confirmed that the directed reductions would have an adverse effect on reserve readiness and the ability of the reserve component to accept missions which would relieve active component personnel tempo requirements.

**Section - 332. Exemption of Department of Defense from personnel ceilings for civilian personnel.**

The committee recommends a provision that would preclude the management of civilian personnel in the Department of Defense by artificial limits on manyears, end strength, full-time equivalents (FTEs), or other such personnel ceilings. The committee is concerned about certain aspects of the ongoing reductions in the Department of Defense civilian work force. It is apparent that, regarding the reductions in the military component, the Department has made a serious effort to associate reductions with force structure and programmatic changes. Efforts to do the same regarding the civilian work force, however, are far less apparent. The committee is concerned by the use of FTEs and the department's willingness to apply uniform, "salami slice" reductions to the military departments and defense agencies.

The Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 provided an aggregate ceiling for all federal civilian personnel measured in FTEs. Subsequently, the Department of Defense chose to provide annual FTE ceilings for each military department and each defense agency covering fiscal years 1994 through 2001. These ceilings apportion the overall reduction uniformly across the Department of Defense without regard to differences among the departments and agencies, force structure changes, workload fluctuations, the potential results of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission process, or readiness.

The administration's report: "Cutting Red Tape—Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less" in referring to "Full Time Equivalents" (FTEs) provides that "The President should direct OMB and agency heads to stop setting FTE ceilings in fiscal year 1995."

The practical effects on readiness of management by FTEs are exceptionally troublesome. Management by FTE assumes a level of

workload predictability that is inapplicable to numerous activities. It severely restricts the flexibility of depots and shipyards to adjust their workforce in response to funded customer requirements. Despite the availability of funds, FTE ceilings preclude these activities from adjusting the size of their workforce in response to operational commitments, contingencies, and other surges in workload. Additionally, certain defense agencies frequently produce goods and services for other defense agencies and are appropriately reimbursed. The imposition of FTEs precludes agency heads from retaining or hiring necessary personnel for which funds are available through this reimbursement mechanism. In addition, management by FTEs could actually require a military department or defense agency to take more than the mandated reduction if the reductions are postponed until late in the fiscal year to make up many years executed early in the fiscal year.

**Section - 333. Wearing of uniform by National Guard technicians.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require military technicians to wear military uniforms in their jobs. The provision would also place technician officers on the same footing as Active Guard and Reserve officers for purposes of qualifying for a uniform allowance.

**Section - 334. Extension of temporary authority to pay civilian employees with respect to the evacuation from Guantanamo, Cuba.**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for the Navy to continue to pay evacuation allowances until January 31, 1996 to civilian employees whose dependents were evacuated from Guantanamo, Cuba, in August and September 1994. The provision would require a monthly report regarding the number of employees with dependents in an evacuation status, their positions of employment, the number and location of their dependents, and the actions that the Secretary of the Navy is taking to eliminate the conditions making the payments necessary. The committee is disappointed that it is necessary to extend this authority. The evacuation allowances authority limits the period for evacuation payments to 180 days. In April 1995, the Congress extended the authority through the end of the fiscal year to permit the Navy more time to take the necessary actions to replace the civilian workers under an accompanied tour contract with military personnel, or with civilian personnel in an unaccompanied status. To date, the Navy has not taken any action to eliminate the conditions making these payments necessary. The lack of action by the Navy has resulted in the families of the civilian employees living in temporary arrangements separated from their spouses and unsure of what the future holds for almost a full year. This lack of action reflects an insensitivity to the professional development and quality of life of the affected civilian employees. The situation is particularly aggravated since the Navy changed the tours for military personnel assigned to Naval Station Guantanamo to alleviate a similar situation affecting the military personnel and their families. While the Secretary of the Navy has limited influence on

the diplomatic and political dynamics of the situation in Cuba, that lack of influence is not an excuse for permitting families to remain in an evacuee status for such an extended period. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to take the necessary steps to eliminate the conditions which require extending this authority before this final extension expires.

**Section - 335. Sharing of personnel of Department of Defense domestic dependent schools and Defense Dependents' Education System.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to direct the sharing of personnel resources between the Department of Defense Overseas School System and the Defense Dependents' Education System to provide administrative, logistical, personnel, or other support services to either system for a period to be prescribed by the Secretary.

**Section - 336. Revision of authority for appointments of involuntarily separated military reserve technicians.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3329 of title 5 United States Code to eliminate the requirement that separated technicians receive a job offer giving them placement rights over other separated DOD civilian employees. The provision would also eliminate the requirement to artificially create a vacancy to accommodate a separated technician.

**Section - 337. Cost of continuing health insurance coverage for employees voluntarily separated from positions to be eliminated in a reduction in force.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8905a(d)(4) of title 5 United States Code, to extend continued health insurance coverage and payment of the employer portion of the premium and administrative fee for surplus employees who voluntarily resign in response to base closures, realignments, or formal force reduction procedures.

**Section - 338. Elimination of 120-day limitation on details of certain employees.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3341 of title 5 United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that the administration of details for civilian employees be managed in 120-day increments.

**Section - 339. Repeal of requirement for part-time career opportunity employment reports.**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement in section 3407 of title 5 United States Code, that agencies provide progress reports on the part-time career employment program.

**Section - 340. Authority of civilian employees of Department of Defense to participate voluntarily in reductions in force.**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow employees who are not affected by a reduction-in-force (RIF) to volunteer to be RIF separated in place of other employees who are scheduled for RIF separation.

**Section - 341. Authority to pay severance payments in lump sums.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5595 of title 5 United States Code, to permit the lump-sum payment of severance pay.

**Section - 342. Holidays for employees whose basic workweek is other than Monday through Friday.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 6103(b)(2) of title 5 United States Code, to authorize agencies some discretion in designating holidays for employees whose basic work week is other than Monday through Friday.

**Section - 343. Coverage of nonappropriated fund employees under authority for flexible and compressed work schedules.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit nonexempt nonappropriated fund employees to work on a compressed schedule without entitlement to overtime.

**SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

**Section - 351. Financial management training.**

The budget request included \$88.9 million to establish a financial management training center in Southbridge, Massachusetts.

The committee strongly supports the DOD effort to conduct appropriate training for civilians who perform financial management work. As financial management increasingly becomes an OSD responsibility, the program direction for education and training will shift to OSD. The need for OSD involvement in curricula, standards, and processes is readily apparent. The committee strongly supports this shift and recognizes the need for OSD involvement and control.

The committee recommends a provision which would prohibit the obligation of funds to establish a DOD financial management training center pending certification by the Secretary of Defense of the need for such an organization. The committee provision requires DOD to justify the need for such a center and the decision to locate it in Southbridge.

The Secretary would be directed to analyze the requirement for a center and consider alternatives in developing a plan to achieve clearly stated financial management training objectives. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a plan and an accompanying report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives, to implement the results of this analysis. The report

would also detail the long-term and short-term costs, and state what means were considered to conduct this training.

In the event the Secretary determines there is a need to establish a new training center, the Secretary should recommend a site and describe the process by which the site was selected.

No funds would be authorized for obligation for a capital lease for any such facility until 90 days following submission of the Secretary's certification of need, report, and plan to the defense committees.

**Section - 352. Limitation on opening of new centers for Defense Finance and Accounting Service.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the need for further expansion of Defense Finance and Accounting System (DFAS) centers, and to report to the appropriate committees of the Congress prior to establishing any new DFAS centers. The committee is concerned that the current expansion plans have not been examined against actual requirements, given continued consolidation and downsizing of the services.

**SUBTITLE F—MISCELLANEOUS ASSISTANCE**

**Section - 361. Department of Defense funding for National Guard participation in joint disaster and emergency assistance exercises.**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide funding authority for National Guard units to participate in joint exercises preparing them to respond to civil emergencies or disasters.

**Section - 362. Office of Civil-Military Programs.**

The committee approved a prohibition on the use of funds for the Office of Civil-Military Programs. The committee believes civil-military cooperation efforts should be limited and at the discretion of local commanders, who are in the best position to determine the positive or negative effects of such operations on the readiness of the units under their command. The committee notes that the military has engaged in these activities in the past on an *ad hoc* basis without central direction from the Department of Defense. The committee is not aware of any change in circumstances that requires the central direction of these activities.

**Section - 363. Revision of authority for Civil-Military Cooperative Action Program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would revise section 410 of title 10 United States Code, to restrict civil-military activities under this section to reserve component forces and make other technical changes.

**Section - 364. Office of Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs.**

The committee approved a prohibition on the use of funds for the Office of Humanitarian and Refugee Affairs. The committee believes that this office is more appropriately funded and operated within the Department of State.

**SUBTITLE G—OPERATION OF MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION FUNDS****Section - 371. Disposition of excess morale, welfare, and recreation funds.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 373 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 to permit the Marine Corps to retain the MWR funds transferred from USMC installations. An unintended consequence of the current provision might require the Marine Corps to transfer MWR funds from USMC installations to the Navy MWR fund.

**Section - 372. Elimination of certain restrictions on purchases and sales of items by exchange stores and other morale, welfare, and recreation facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the cost, price, size, and country of origin limitations on purchases and sales of items sold in the military exchanges and MWR facilities. Currently, the exchanges are limited by a collection of limitations based on cost, price, size, value and country of origin. The committee believes these restrictions prohibit the exchanges from selling items service members and their families want to purchase. The recommended provision should improve the quality of life for service members and their families.

**Section - 373. Repeal of requirement to convert ships' stores to nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. The provision would repeal the requirement to convert ships' stores operations to a Navy Exchange System agency.

**SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS****Section - 381. National Defense Sealift Fund: availability for Ready Reserve component of the Ready Reserve Fleet.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the use of National Defense Sealift Fund funds for support of the national defense reserve fleet (NDRF). Beginning with the fiscal year 1996 request, funds for the operation and maintenance of the NDRF will be included in the budget request and be subject to committee recommendation for their authorization.

**Section - 382. Limitation on contracting with same contractor for construction of additional new sealift ships.**

The committee has become aware of a proposal to direct procurement of strategic sealift ships to specific shipbuilders. By separate action the committee has affirmed its commitment to competition in shipbuilding and recommended a provision that would provide for competitive procurement of the new attack submarine. The committee is also aware of potential cost growth in existing contracts for procurement of strategic sealift ships. While the committee remains strongly committed to meeting the requirements for strategic sealift established in the Mobility Requirements Study

and subsequent updates, the committee does not believe that directing procurement to a shipbuilder, particularly one experiencing cost growth in his contract with the Navy, is a proper course of action to follow.

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the ability of the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a new contract for additional sealift ships in the event of (1) cost growth in an existing contract that would exceed the maximum price originally established in the contract; or (2) there are outstanding claims against the government that, if approved, would increase the maximum price of the existing contract.

**Section - 383. Availability of recovered losses resulting from contractor fraud.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code to authorize the DOD to retain three percent of single damage funds, or \$500,000, whichever is less, recovered in contract fraud matters at military installations. This percentage would be distributed to the military departments, to be credited to the O&M accounts of the installations responsible for the recoveries.

This amendment would enable a more business-like approach to DOD operations, provide an incentive to pursue cases of suspected fraud, and reward success. It would also provide a means to fund other investigations and return 97 percent of recoveries to the Treasury. Military installations do not have budgeted funds available to pursue such cases. They incur costs in the conduct of investigations and litigation which this provision would reimburse in part.

The Department of Justice has similar authority under section 527 of title 28, United States Code.

**Section - 384. Permanent authority for use of proceeds from the sale of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed property.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2575 of title 10, United States Code to enable installation commanders to use proceeds from the sale of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property to offset costs incurred against installation O&M accounts to collect, transport, store, protect, or sell such property. Any net proceeds may be used to support morale, welfare, and recreation at the installation.

Installation commanders are currently required to expend O&M funds budgeted for other purposes to dispose of such property. The costs of these disposals are currently not reimbursed; the recommended authority would enable reimbursement. Disposals would be conducted on a business-like basis and the recommended authority would provide an incentive to obtain the best value.

This approach to disposal of such property has been validated by demonstration projects, authority for which was granted in section 343 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993.

**Section - 385. Sale of military clothing and subsistence and other supplies of the Navy and Marine Corps.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 651 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Navy and Marine Corps the authority currently granted to the Army and Air Force to conduct in-kind replacement sales of individual equipment items which have been lost, damaged, or destroyed.

**Section - 386. Conversion of Civilian Marksmanship Program to nonappropriated fund instrumentality and activities under program.**

The committee recommends a provision to provide for the conversion of the Civilian Marksmanship Program to a nonappropriated fund instrumentality.

**Section - 387. Report on contracting out certain functions of Department of Defense.**

The committee is interested in exploring possibilities to achieve efficiencies through privatization of commercial functions. Therefore, the committee has included a provision requiring the Department to submit a report describing the advantages and disadvantages of using contractor personnel, rather than civilian employees of the Department of Defense, to perform functions of the Department that are not essential to the warfighting mission of the Armed Forces.

**Section - 390. Impact aid.**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Education from considering payments to a local educational agency from defense funds when determining the amount of impact aid to be paid from Department of Education funds. Additionally, the recommended provision would make technical changes to previous year authorization of impact aid.

**OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

**Army**

**Army reimbursable positions**

The Army's civilian personnel budget request for Budget Activity 4 was based on 32,969 direct-hire work years including 4,996 reimbursable work years. The correct number of work years is 27,973. Based on an average annual salary of \$46,604, the Army's civilian personnel request is overstated by \$233.0 million. Therefore, the committee has reduced the Army O&M budget request by this amount.

**Historically black colleges and universities fellowships**

The budget request includes \$300,000 to provide fellowships for professors from historically black colleges and universities. Because the Department of Defense has not provided a national security requirement for these fellowships, the committee has reduced the Army's operation and maintenance budget by the amount that is requested for this purpose.

### **National Science Center**

The committee notes that the National Science Center has plans to begin to move from Army facilities at Fort Gordon into new facilities that are being provided by state and local funds. This new facility will significantly increase the revenues generated by user and entrance fees. The committee applauds this move and notes that this move into a facility provided by non-federal funding will allow the Army to realize significant savings. The committee further notes that the Army portion of the cost of operation of the new center should decline as new revenues are generated. The committee has provided direction in another section of this report for the Army to renegotiate its Memorandum of Understanding with the center. The committee recognizes that the Army has worked closely with the center to prepare a plan which will insure that the Army's cost of participation in the center will be reimbursed by revenues generated by the center. This plan is based on the assumption that the Army costs should be at current levels of funding or lower for the next two years and then gradually reduced until they are fully covered by reimbursements from center revenues by the fifth year of the center's operation. The committee directs the Army to work with the center to develop a modification to the current plan which would allow the Army to be fully reimbursed by the fourth year of operation. These plans should be submitted to the committee no later than the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 1997. The committee recommends an authorization of \$3.5 million for Fiscal Year 1996.

### **Navy**

#### **Nimitz Center**

The budget request included \$3.1 million for the Chester W. Nimitz Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies. The committee does not authorize funds for this program because of requirements in higher-priority programs.

#### **Active and Reserve P-3 squadrons**

The services of P-3 squadrons are historically in very high demand by the unified commanders. In recent years, that demand has increased dramatically as the ability of the P-3 aircraft to carry out littoral warfare missions has become more apparent. Simultaneously, however, budget pressures have forced the Navy to cut P-3 force structure in its budget request. The current maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) force structure consists of 22 squadrons, 13 active and nine reserve squadrons (13/9). The budget request would support Navy plans to reduce MPA force structure to 20 squadrons, 12 active and eight reserve (12/8).

The committee believes MPA aircraft make an invaluable contribution to antisubmarine warfare missions. The committee also recognizes that MPA aircraft are ideally suited to meet a variety of mission requirements for littoral operations very effectively and efficiently.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an additional \$35.0 million to sustain the MPA force structure at 13/9 in fiscal year 1996.

**Yard Tugboat Service**

The committee is encouraged by the Navy's effort to improve yard tugboat services by contracting out to private industry. Long-term tractor tug charters at Kings Bay, Georgia; Mayport, Florida; and San Diego, California have proven successful in furnishing the Navy with quality products and services at lower costs than Navy-owned and operated tug boats. The Navy is currently examining several additional ports for conversion to long-term tug charters, as well.

The committee directs the Navy to evaluate the potential for expanding the use of private sector tug boat services, and report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 1996. The report should identify locations where long-term charters for yard tug boat service would be cost effective, increase safety, and ensure compliance with the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. If contracting out would make these benefits achievable, the committee encourages the Navy to seek long-term contracts for yard tug boat services with private firms.

**Marine Corps****Marine Corps Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS)**

The committee recommends an additional \$10.0 million in the O&M account for the Marine Corps to field needed protective garments to the Fleet Marine Force. The second generation ECWCS garments are vapor permeable, waterproof, and windproof. They significantly enhance insulation. Garments can be laundered aboard ship and are resistant to petroleum contamination. Current equipment issued to Fleet Marines does not have these properties.

These are important considerations for deployed Marines, who often receive orders to conduct operations not anticipated before deployment.

**Air Force****Civil Air Patrol**

The budget request includes \$27.5 million for the Civil Air Patrol (CAP). While the committee recognizes the value of the Civil Air Patrol in providing for civilian search and rescue missions and disaster relief operations, these operations are more appropriately funded by another agency or by state governments.

In addition, the committee is concerned that such a substantial portion of the CAP's budget goes to personnel and overhead costs while only 10 percent is used to reimburse the volunteer pilots who dedicate their time and efforts to provide the search and rescue operations of the CAP. The committee notes that the ongoing reorganization of the CAP to reduce the number of active duty military and Air Force civilian employees was expected to reduce required funding by \$3.0 million a year. However, according to the General Accounting Office, this reorganization resulted in an increased requirement of \$4.0 million rather than the expected \$3.0 million savings.

The committee therefore recommends a reduction in the level of funding for this program by \$5.0 million from the fiscal year 1996 budget request. The committee intends to explore other funding sources for this program in the future to further reduce its reliance on the DOD.

### **Civilian Personnel Policy**

#### **Modernization and regionalization of civilian personnel management functions**

The committee commends the Department of Defense for the progress made in attempting to streamline and improve human resource management policy, practices, and service delivery. Of particular importance are those initiatives involving the modernization and regionalization of civilian personnel management functions. Under certain conditions, the modernization and regionalization of civilian personnel management functions could provide a tremendous opportunity for enhanced customer service and substantial savings in overhead and staff resources.

The committee is concerned, however, by the consolidation of personnel servicing before a modern, standard personnel data system and its supporting communications network are in place. Without a modern, standard personnel data system in place and without the communications network in place to support such a data system, the consolidation of personnel servicing into large service centers may not produce substantial cost savings without an unacceptable degradation in customer service. The very significant—and perhaps premature—reductions in civilian personnel specialists which unfortunately coincide with the regionalization initiative render the degradation in customer service even more probable.

The continued downsizing of the civilian workforce over the next several years will place extraordinary demands on the civilian personnel management community. The committee notes that 1) planned reductions in personnel specialists and 2) regionalization prior to modernization can only further complicate the personnel management challenge at a time when the department's civilian employees deserve only the highest levels of customer service. The committee intends to review these issues in the coming months with officials from the military services.

### **Defense-Wide**

#### **Multi-Technology Automated Reader Card (MARC)**

MARC is a multi-functional, cross-service utility card with a magnetic stripe, integrated computer chip (ICC), a bar code and static information. It combines non-updatable information (name, social security number, blood type, photograph, etc.) and updatable information (medical, pay, qualifications) in the same card. The ICC can be used to record a wide variety of transactions and records. MARC has been shown to be particularly useful in reducing administrative requirements and errors.

The committee has noted with interest the success of the DOD MARC project. Field tests of this "Smart Card" technology have demonstrated important gains in efficiency and effectiveness in a

variety of applications. The committee recommends an additional \$8.0 million to expand the project.

#### **SR-71**

The committee is pleased with the timely and cost-effective reconstitution of a contingency force of manned, high speed, penetrating reconnaissance aircraft as a hedge until penetrating unmanned aerial vehicles are widely fielded. This contingency capability of two SR-71 aircraft was accomplished by the Air Force under the direction of the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office for substantially less than the \$100.0 million appropriated for this purpose last year. The committee therefore encourages the Air Force and the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office to retain this capability in fiscal year 1996 from such funds as are made available.

#### **Museums**

The committee is concerned with the growing number of museums scattered throughout the nation's military facilities. The operation and maintenance of these museums absorbs an increasing portion of a limited defense budget. The committee believes that the military services should assess the necessity of maintaining these museums when there are limited funds available for training and other essential military needs.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to submit a report by January 1, 1996 that lists each of the military museums and the costs required for their operation and maintenance.

#### **Spending for non-military missions**

During the course of the year, the committee has become increasingly concerned that while the defense budget continues to decline and a lack of funds has caused training exercises, needed munitions purchases, and modernization programs to be canceled, the Department of Defense continues to spend increasing portions of its limited budget on non-defense or low-priority military programs. These programs include: civilian rescue missions, support to homeless shelters, assistance to local communities and civilian agencies, civilian educational programs, youth outreach programs, foreign disaster assistance, and international humanitarian efforts.

Such programs are often performed with DOD funds, but support another agency's mission. The recent report by the Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces recommended that "the President should limit the use of military forces in both peace operations and operations other than war to tasks that cannot be more appropriately assigned to others." The committee approves of this recommendation and encourages the President to assign non-military tasks to more appropriate agencies.

The committee recognizes the importance of many of these programs to the nation as a whole, and understands that the DOD possesses both the equipment and knowledge to perform them. However, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should be reimbursed for its costs if it supports the missions of other agencies. Therefore, the committee has not provided funding for many of these programs.

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense needs to reassess DOD involvement in low-priority defense activities. Over the past several years, the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Research Service have reported that these and other programs not directly related to warfighting consume billions of dollars of the defense budget each year. While such programs may be well intentioned, the declining defense budget makes it difficult to sustain their continued funding with DOD resources.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense to provide a report on those activities currently being performed by the DOD which support another agency's mission. The Secretary of Defense should provide the results of this report to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House National Security Committee no later than April 1, 1996.

#### **International peacekeeping**

The budget request included \$65.0 million for international peacekeeping assessments for those operations which the Department of Defense would have lead funding and management responsibility under proposed new legislation. The committee has determined that U.N. assessments for these activities would more appropriately be funded through the Department of State as has been the practice in the past. Therefore, the committee does not support the proposed legislation and denies authorization for these funds.

#### **Humanitarian assistance and foreign disaster assistance**

The fiscal year 1996 budget requested \$79.8 million for humanitarian assistance, including \$20.0 million for the humanitarian demining program, and an additional \$45.3 million for foreign disaster relief. The committee is concerned that these programs are outside of the department's core mission and are not affordable at a time when reductions in the defense budget are having a negative impact on essential national security functions of the Department of Defense. The committee is further concerned about the negative impact on the quality of life of military personnel resulting from increased deployments to support operations of this nature.

The committee understands the unique capability of the Department of Defense to respond to humanitarian crises, including man-made and natural disasters. Nevertheless, the committee believes that these activities would more appropriately be funded by the Department of State on a reimbursable basis. The committee authorizes the \$20.0 million for the landmine clearance program, but denies the remaining portion of the request.

#### **Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps**

The budget request included \$131.9 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Program. The committee recognizes the value of this program but authorizes only \$119.6 million (the fiscal year 1995 level of funding). This results in a \$12.9 million reduction from the budget request for fiscal year 1996.

**Civilian personnel levels**

The committee notes that the Department of Defense civilian personnel drawdown continues faster than expected. During fiscal year 1995, civilian personnel levels in the Department of Defense, have been reduced faster than anticipated when the fiscal year 1996 budget was drafted. This drawdown means lower-than-budgeted civilian personnel levels throughout fiscal year 1996 resulting in savings of \$250.0 million. The committee has made the appropriate adjustments in the fiscal year 1996 budget to reflect these savings.

**Federal Energy Management Program**

The budget request included \$234.7 million for the Federal Energy Management Program. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense could not provide a list of projects to support this funding request. Such information is necessary for determining the validity of a request this size.

While the committee believes in the importance of conserving energy at the nation's military facilities, it believes that base commanders can initiate such projects if provided sufficient funding for base operations and real property maintenance. The committee notes that these commanders are in a position to identify the most important needs of each facility, including those which would result in the greatest decrease in energy consumption.

Therefore, the committee has authorized only \$50.0 million for the Federal Energy Management Program, but it has increased the amount of funds for base operations and real property maintenance so that base commanders will have sufficient funds available for energy conservation and other important functions.

**Homeless support initiative**

The budget request includes \$3.0 million for the Homeless Support Initiative. The committee notes that 10 U.S.C. 2546 allows service Secretaries to provide assistance to homeless shelters so long as the assistance does not interfere with military preparedness or military requirements. The committee further notes that training exercises and modernization programs have been canceled because of a lack of funds. Therefore, the committee believes that providing \$3.0 million annually to this program qualifies as interference with military preparedness and military requirements.

While the committee is concerned with the health and welfare of the nation's homeless, the committee believes that supporting homeless shelters is outside the primary mission of the Department of Defense and would more appropriately be funded through those agencies with primary funding and policy responsibility for this issue.

**Civil-military/youth outreach programs**

The budget request includes \$69.5 million for civil-military programs including Civil-Military Cooperation, CHALLENGE, and STARBASE.

The committee is concerned with the cost of these programs at a time when the defense budget continues to decline. The committee understands that the armed forces can provide useful assist-

ance to local communities while at the same time perform mission training activities. However, the committee believes that civil-military efforts should be limited and at the discretion of local commanders who are in the best position to determine the positive or negative effects of such operations on the readiness of the units under their command. In the past, military commanders and personnel have been allowed to assist local communities in efforts to improve the infrastructure on an *ad hoc* basis without central bureaucratic direction. The committee sees no reason to expand these activities by authorizing limited DOD funds for their execution.

In addition, the committee is concerned with the increase in resources being dedicated to youth outreach programs while needed training exercises go unfunded. The committee believes DOD funding for civil-military youth programs should be limited to a single program that has the greatest military relevance—Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps. The committee continues to authorize the National Guard to carry out both CHALLENGE and STARBASE, however, funding for these programs will have to be provided by another federal agency, state governments, or private organizations.

### **United Services Organization**

The United Services Organization, chartered by Congress, is one of the premier voluntary civilian organizations which contributes to the quality of life of members of the Armed Forces and their families. The USO does not receive any direct federal funding, but relies on contributions from individuals and corporations. The USO does receive some in-kind assistance from the Department of Defense in the form of housing for USO personnel overseas, use of military postal services and the defense telecommunications system, and access to the DOD dependents school system. The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for his efforts to assist the USO and encourages him to seek opportunities to enhance the in-kind assistance provided to the USO.

### **Revolving Funds**

#### **National defense features**

The committee report on S. 1298 (S. Rept. 103–112) and the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (H. Rept. 103–160) expressed continuing support for a national defense features (NDF) program. An NDF program would provide funds to install important defense features in privately-owned merchant vessels during their construction. Such features would make these vessels more capable of carrying military cargo during a contingency. The commercial ship owner would bear the ship construction costs. The owner would contract directly with a U.S. shipyard for construction of the ship. The nation's shipbuilding industry would benefit from such a proposal to the extent that it would provide an incentive for commercial ship construction. Costs to the government per ship would be much lower than buying a whole ship. Through a binding agreement with the ship's owners, it would be available for immediate recall in case of a contingency.

To better evaluate the merits of an NDF program, the committee requested that the Secretary of Defense provide a study by January 1, 1994 of the costs and benefits of this program. Unfortunately, the Secretary did not submit his report until March 1995—fourteen months later.

The report supports the concept of an NDF program, but considers buying foreign-built roll-on/roll-off (RO/RO) ships for the Ready Reserve Force (RRF) a higher priority. Consequently, the fiscal year 1996 budget request contained \$70.0 million to purchase and modify more foreign-built RO/RO ships for the RRF.

The committee has reviewed the report and agrees that incorporation of additional RO/RO ships into the RRF is consistent with the Joint Staff's Mobility Requirements Study and its subsequent updates. The committee believes, however, that an NDF program has the potential to:

1. provide the strategic sealift that the country needs while building substantially superior ships;
2. support the U.S. Merchant Marine;
3. save or create a significant number of jobs in the shipbuilding industry and the suppliers of that industry; and
4. assist U.S. shipyards to reenter the commercial shipbuilding market.

The committee believes that these are worthy objectives that adding RO/RO ships to the RRF would not satisfy.

Consequently, of the funds approved in the National Defense Sealift Fund, the committee recommends \$70.0 million to be used as follows:

1. \$20.0 million to modify RO/RO vessels purchased in fiscal year 1995; and
2. \$50.0 million to procure and install defense features on commercial RO/RO ships, to be built in U.S. shipyards.

### **Maritime prepositioning ship leases**

The committee report on S. 2182 (S. Rept. 103-282) required that the Secretary of Defense provide an analysis of a Navy proposal to buy-out some of the maritime prepositioning ship (MPS) leases before taking any steps to terminate the lease contracts. The Department of the Navy submitted justification material with the amended budget request indicating that the Navy might begin using unobligated balances in the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) to purchase these vessels. If this course of action is pursued, the Navy intends to divert funds presently on deposit in the NDSF for acquisition of prepositioning/surge ships that are already under contract to buy out the MPS leases. The budget request cautions that such a buyout would in turn create a need for additional funding for these ships.

Section 2218 of title 10, United States Code requires that NDSF budget requests be made by programs, projects, and activities. The committee notes that the budget justification material does not request any specific amounts to begin buy-out of MPS leases. The committee also notes that the Secretary of Defense has not submitted the required analysis.

Therefore, the committee directs that none of the funds in the NDSF or other funds available to the Secretary of Defense be used to terminate these lease contracts or buy the MPS vessels.

### **Maritime repositioning ship enhancement**

In fiscal year 1995 the committee developed a new initiative, maritime repositioning ship (MPS) enhancement, to expand the capabilities of the three Marine Corps MPS squadrons. The committee recommended authorization of \$220.0 million for the purchase and conversion of up to three additional ships to permit the Marine Corps to add additional tanks, an expeditionary airfield, additional Navy construction battalion equipment, a fleet hospital, and other supplies to each squadron to better sustain the Marine Corps as an expeditionary force. While MPS enhancement had not been included in the fiscal year 1995 budget request, the committee took action based on its determination that the requirement was valid and information that indicated ships were available for purchase and conversion under cost effective circumstances. The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1995 provided \$110.0 million to purchase and convert the first MPS enhancement ship.

An approved requirement for MPS enhancement now exists. However, additional funding for the program was not included in the budget request. The committee's inquiries determined that the ships targeted for procurement and conversion last year are no longer available. Consequently, the Department of Defense had embarked on an apparently lengthy process to develop a design, then seek out alternate candidates that, when converted, will satisfy the requirements of the MPS squadrons. It does not appear that the department is aggressively exploring options, such as commercial ships or dual use of existing ready reserve force (RRF) ships for both repositioning and surge missions, that could make an MPS enhancement ship available more quickly.

The committee continues to strongly support MPS enhancement. The committee is troubled that, despite an approved requirement, the budget request failed to include funding for a second ship. Additionally, the committee is concerned over the limited progress made in acquiring and converting the fiscal year 1995 MPS enhancement ship.

As a measure of its strong support for the MPS enhancement program, the committee authorizes \$110.0 million to purchase and convert an additional ship. The committee expects the Department to aggressively pursue all possible options, including the use of RRF RO/ROs or commercial procurement, in order to accelerate the purchase, conversion, and delivery of the ships authorized in fiscal years 1995 and 1996. Further, the Secretary of Defense is directed to report on progress toward meeting this goal when he submits the fiscal year 1997 budget request. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare this report because, while an option such as dual designation of RRF RO/ROs presently allocated for Marine Corps assault follow-on echelon equipment appears a sensible proposal, experience indicates that it may generate bureaucratic disputes that can only be resolved at his level.

## **Defense Environment**

### **Defense environmental compliance**

There are three basic categories of non-recurring requirements in the Defense Environmental Compliance Program: Class I—necessary to bring an activity into compliance with existing mandates; Class II—necessary to meet future compliance milestones, some of which must be completed to avoid a future violation within the current budget cycle; and Class III—a positive contribution to the environment, but not needed to comply with legal requirements.

The Department of Defense budget cycle requests for compliance funding are based on costs related to recurring requirements, Class I current violations, and Class II violations projected to occur within the programmed year. The recurring requirements portion of the budget amounts to about one half of the compliance budget.

Under 10 U.S.C. 2706(b) the Secretary of Defense is required to submit to Congress an annual report on the status of environmental compliance activities at military installations. The report for fiscal year 1994 addresses the entire environmental quality program, including compliance. The report does not distinguish between the funding levels and personnel requirements associated with each of the environmental quality pillars of pollution prevention, conservation, and compliance. As a result, it is difficult to track the basis for the compliance funding request in a given budget cycle.

The committee directs that the department's future annual reports on the environmental quality program provide a breakout of the funding levels for each of the environmental quality pillars addressed in the report. The committee directs that the report shall include a projection of the funding levels and the number of full-time personnel that will be required for the Department of Defense to comply with applicable environmental laws during the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted and for the following five fiscal years. The report shall separately set forth projections for the Department of Defense as a whole and for each military installation, broken out by environmental quality pillar and by appropriation for recurring costs. For non-recurring costs, breakouts shall be provided by pillar, appropriation, and media category. Funding projections for the budget fiscal year shall include a project listing for non-recurring requirements that separately identifies Class I and II requirements for each military installation.

### **Legacy resource management program**

In the Department of Defense 1991 Appropriation Act, the Secretary of Defense was directed to establish a Legacy Resource Management Program and establish a separate appropriations line item for the program. Prior to the inception of the Legacy Program, requirements related to the preservation of natural and cultural resources under the jurisdiction of the Department Defense were planned, programmed, and budgeted within the Defense Environmental Compliance Program.

The Legacy Program was designed specifically to address those conservation and preservation projects that would be valuable and beneficial, but which were not required to be performed under ap-

plicable environmental laws. The absence of funding for those kinds of projects was perceived as a gap in the Department of Defense environmental programs.

The department has since developed a definitive annual planning, programming, and budgeting strategy for environmental conservation and preservation, so there is no longer a need for a separate line item for the Legacy Management Resource Program. The committee expects the Department of Defense to fulfill its obligation to responsibly manage its 25 million acres of valuable natural and cultural resources through the Defense Environmental Conservation Program.

### **Environmental management**

The Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) appropriation was created by Congress in fiscal year 1984 to consolidate and expand separate Department of Defense environmental clean-up programs. DERA was later codified in permanent law as section 211 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, enacted in 1986. As codified, sums appropriated to DERA may only be obligated or expended to carry out the Secretary of Defense functions related to environmental restoration.

The committee is concerned about the use of DERA funds for management and overhead costs of the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security. The committee has determined that a \$1 million decrement to the fiscal year 1996 DERA budget request is appropriate, and that no more than \$2.9 million shall be available for management and overhead costs of the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security.

The committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security to initiate a broad review of the department's management structure and funding requirements for its environmental restoration program. The results of that review should be incorporated in the fiscal year 1997 DERA budget request, and in the Defense Environmental Restoration Program Annual Report to Congress.

### **Cleanup of National Presto Industries Plant, Eau Claire, Wisconsin**

The committee is concerned that there are unresolved issues of hazardous waste contamination related to the National Presto Industries Plant, Eau Claire, Wisconsin. The plant was originally constructed in 1942 by the War Department as the Eau Clair Ordnance Works. In 1948, National Presto Industries, Inc. purchased the site and used it to produce commercial products and to fulfill contracts with the Army for the design, development and maintenance of manufacturing lines for artillery shells. In 1978, the company entered into a production standby agreement with the Army and remained in standby readiness until 1992. The committee strongly recommends that the Army and National Presto Industries, Inc. endeavor to resolve in good faith any disputes over liability and funding for remediation activities to the mutual satisfaction of the parties.

## TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

The Congress, exercising its military manpower oversight responsibilities, authorizes the end strength of the active and reserve forces annually. This year the Subcommittee on Personnel held hearings to examine the force structure plans of the Department of Defense and the military services. Based on those hearings, the administration's budget request and other information, the committee recommends end strength ceilings for the active and reserve forces, including active component support for the reserves. Additionally, the committee recommends temporary relief from the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) grade tables since the Department of Defense has not responded to the committee's guidance concerning development of comprehensive recommendations to address the DOPMA grade tables in light of changing requirements and officer retention behavior.

### SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

#### Section - 401. End strengths for active forces.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty end strength levels for fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal Year				
	1995 au- thorization	1996 re- quest	1996 rec- ommenda- tion	1997 re- quest	1997 rec- ommenda- tion
Army:					
Total .....	510,000	495,000	495,000	495,000	495,000
Officer .....		81,300	81,300	80,312	80,312
Navy:					
Total .....	441,641	428,000	428,340	409,400	409,740
Officer .....		58,805	58,870	56,550	56,615
Marine Corps:					
Total .....	174,000	174,000	174,000	174,000	174,000
Officer .....		17,978	17,978	17,978	17,978
Air Force:					
Total .....	400,051	388,200	388,200	385,400	385,400
Officer .....		75,928	75,928	76,494	76,494

The active component authorization for the Navy is recommended to be increased by 340, of which 65 would be officers, to permit the Navy to retain an active P-3 squadron. The committee recommends the Military Personnel, Navy appropriation be increased by \$14 million above the request in fiscal year 1996 to accommodate this increase.

**Section - 402. Temporary variation in DOPMA authorized end strength limitations for active duty Air Force and Navy officers in certain grades.**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Navy and Air Force temporary grade relief from the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) grade tables. The Army and Marine Corps currently have temporary grade relief in effect.

Section 502 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 required the Department of Defense to task an outside agency to conduct a review of officer management plans and to report by February 1, 1994, the results of that review, including recommendations for appropriate changes to the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) to the Committee on Armed Services in the Senate and the Committee on National Security in the House of Representatives.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 provided temporary grade table relief for the Marine Corps. In doing so, the conferees noted that they expected the Department of Defense to address the adequacy of the existing grade tables as part of the then overdue report on officer management plans required by section 502 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993. Additionally, the conferees indicated that they would consider permanent changes to the grade tables after the report was received.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 provided temporary grade table relief for the Army and extended the previously provided relief for the Marine Corps. In doing so, the conferees indicated they were still reluctant to address permanent changes to the grade tables in a piecemeal fashion and that they did not understand the department's reluctance to address this matter in a comprehensive manner. The conferees again indicated that they would consider permanent changes to the grade tables after receiving the report required by section 502 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993.

Given the conferees' consistent position on the issue of grade table relief, the committee notes with concern and disappointment that, again this year, the department has requested temporary grade-table relief for the military services. While the 1994 Rand Report, "Future Career Management Systems for U.S. Military Officers," discusses officer planning systems, it does not address the adequacy of the existing grade tables nor does it contain recommendations upon which the Congress could base permanent changes to the grade tables.

Should the Department of Defense continue to ignore congressional guidance and expectations on this matter, neither the department nor the military services should expect additional grade-table relief or any extension of the temporary relief provided in this or previous acts.

Additionally, the committee expects that the military services, and specifically the Navy, will ensure that the temporary grade-table relief provided is allocated in a way that provides the services' Nurse Corps treatment in assignments and promotion timing that is equivalent with that of the Line of the Navy or a comparable category in the Army and Air Force.

**Section - 403. Certain general and flag officers awaiting retirement not to be counted.**

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt a retiring Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps from counting in the number of general and flag officers on active duty authorized to be serving in the grade of general and admiral during the period when they are completing those activities necessary to transition to the retired list after they have been relieved from their former position. The committee intends that this authority would not be used for more than 60 calendar days.

This provision does not affect the numbers of general and flag officers authorized on active duty under 10 U.S.C. 526.

**SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES**

**Section - 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize selective reserve end strength levels for fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal year—				
	1995 authoriza- tion	1996 request	1996 rec- ommendation	1997 request	1997 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	400,000	373,000	373,000	367,000	367,000
The Army Reserve .....	242,000	230,000	230,000	215,000	215,000
The Naval Reserve .....	102,960	98,602	98,894	96,402	96,694
The Marine Corps Reserve .....	42,000	42,000	42,274	42,000	42,682
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	115,581	109,458	112,707	107,151	107,151
The Air Force Reserve .....	78,706	73,969	73,969	73,160	73,160
The Coast Guard Reserve .....	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000

The committee is pleased that the Naval Reserve completed the assessment of its future roles and missions. By turning from the traditional role of providing personnel to fill ships upon mobilization to an aggressive program of contributory support, the Naval Reserve has begun to use the many assets and resources available to enhance the readiness and effectiveness of the Navy.

The recommended increase in the Naval Reserve end strength reflects the committee's recommendation that one reserve component P-3 squadron be retained in the force. The increase of 292 in the selected reserve, combined with a recommended increase of 97 in full-time support, would permit the Navy to retain one reserve P-3 squadron. The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Navy appropriation by \$6.2 million to accommodate this increase.

The recommended increase in the Marine Corps Reserve end strength is based on the committee's concerns about inadequate active duty and full-time support for the Marine Corps Reserve. Given the anticipated early deployment role of the Marine Corps Reserve in contingency and other operations, the committee has increased the authorization for the Marine Corps Reserve to accom-

modate an increase in the number of reserves on active duty in support of reserves.

The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps appropriation by \$12.8 million to accommodate this increase. In light of the difficulties caused by recent decreases in active duty support for the reserve component, the committee expects that increases in the Marine Corps full-time support program (now called the Active Reserve (AR) Program) not be made at the expense of other important reserve programs; nor should these increases occasion a further erosion of active duty support. Similarly, in future years the committee expects that the increase in full-time support be fully budgeted without inappropriate cuts in essential reserve programs.

The committee recommends an increase in the Air National Guard end strength of 3,249. This increase, combined with an increase of 249 in Air National Guard full-time support will permit the Air National Guard to maintain the number of general purpose fighter aircraft at 15 in each unit. The committee is concerned about the planned reduction of Air National Guard general purpose fighter aircraft from 15 per unit to 12 per unit. These planned reductions resulted from budget pressures within the Air Force. The Air Force decided to maintain the number of general purpose fighter units at 27 and reduce the number of aircraft within each unit by three to 12. The committee is concerned about evidence which indicates that these reductions will reduce the effectiveness of the units.

The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Air National Guard appropriation by \$12 million to accommodate this increase. Further, the committee directs the Air Force to conduct a comprehensive study of the impact and advisability of reducing the number of Air National Guard general purpose fighter units or the number of aircraft within the units and submit a report with the recommendation on how to properly size the Air National Guard general purpose units in conjunction with the budget request for fiscal year 1997.

#### **Section - 412. End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize reserve full-time support end strength levels for fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal year—				
	1995 authoriza- tion	1996 request	1996 rec- ommendation	1997 request	1997 rec- ommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States .....	23,650	23,390	23,390	23,040	23,040
The Army Reserve .....	11,940	11,575	11,575	11,550	11,550
The Naval Reserve .....	17,510	17,490	17,587	17,074	17,171
The Marine Corps Reserve .....	2,285	2,285	2,559	2,285	2,967
The Air National Guard of the United States .....	9,389	9,817	10,066	9,824	9,824
The Air Force Reserve .....	648	628	628	625	625

The committee is concerned about the full-time support to reserve units in each of the military departments. The downsizing of

the uniformed services and continued instability in the international environment has necessitated an increased reliance on reserve components to meet contingency requirements as well as continuing existing responsibilities. Together with active duty support for reserve programs, the military technician programs in the Army and Air Force and the various full-time support programs in all of the services are essential elements of the long-term readiness of reserve component forces.

In light of the reductions in the military technician program planned by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the committee has recommended specific floors for the Army and Air Force military technician programs elsewhere in this report.

The committee also is concerned, however, about reductions in active duty support for the reserve components. For example, since fiscal year 1993, the active duty Marine Corps has been reduced approximately 2.5 percent; the Marine Corps Reserve has been reduced less than 0.5 percent; and the Marine Corps' active duty support for the Marine Corps Reserve has been reduced 11.8 percent.

Therefore, the committee has recommended full-time support levels for the Air Force and for the Marine Corps that are above the fiscal year 1995 authorizations. The committee also notes that full-time support personnel are intended to complement—not substitute for—active duty support. Therefore, the committee does not intend for these increases in full-time support to cause further erosion of active duty support. This is especially important as the reserve components in each of the services are called with increasing frequency to relieve the personnel tempo pressures being experienced in the active components and to participate directly in contingency operations.

The increase of 97 in the authorization for full-time manning for the Naval Reserve reflects the requisite increase in full-time manning to support the committee's recommendation to retain one reserve P-3 squadron.

The increase of 249 in the authorization for full-time manning for the Air National Guard reflects the requisite increase in full-time manning to support the committee's recommendation to retain the Air National Guard general purpose fighter units at 15 aircraft per unit in fiscal year 1996.

#### **Section - 414. Reserves on active duty in support of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs not to be counted.**

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt members of a reserve component participating in Cooperative Threat Reduction Act programs from counting against the authorized active duty end strength.

Another section of the bill would permit funds appropriated for programs under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act to be used to reimburse the military personnel accounts for pay and allowances paid to reserve component personnel engaged in Cooperative Threat Reduction Act programs.

**Section - 415. Reserves on active duty for military-to-military contacts and comparable activities not to be counted.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 168 of title 10 U.S.C., by adding a new subsection to exempt members of a reserve component participating in activities or programs specified in section 168 who serve over 180 days from counting against the end strengths authorized for members of the Armed Services on active duty under section 115(a)(1) of title 10 United States Code.

**SUBTITLE C—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS**

**Section - 421. Authorization of training student loads.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active and reserve average military training loads for fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal year—				
	1995 authoriza- tion	1996 request	1996 rec- ommendation	1997 request	1997 rec- ommendation
Army .....	69,420	75,013	75,013	79,275	79,275
Navy .....	43,064	44,238	44,238	44,121	44,121
Marine Corps .....	25,377	26,095	26,095	27,255	27,255
Air Force .....	36,840	33,232	33,232	35,522	35,522

## **TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY**

The committee addressed a number of military personnel policy issues as a result of information received during hearings conducted by the full committee and the Subcommittee on Personnel. The committee began a review of officer promotion policy which will continue next year. The committee identified several anomalies within the officer promotion system which are addressed in the recommended provisions. These anomalies involved legitimate activities which had not been reviewed in light of the changing requirements and reduced size of the officer corps. In other policy initiatives, the committee addressed issues pertaining to the reserve components, Service Academies, travel and transportation, and the pay and allowances for military personnel sentenced to extended confinement by courts martial.

### **SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY**

#### **Section - 501. Joint officer management.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend joint officer management policies. The provision would: (1) reduce the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to designate at least 1,000 critical joint duty assignment positions to 500. The Joint Duty Assignment study determined that approximately 500 billets should be critical joint duty assignments; (2) allow the Secretary of Defense to award joint duty assignment credit to certain officers who serve in qualifying joint task force positions. The Department requested authority to designate in-service billets as qualifying for joint duty assignment. The committee notes that initially the number of in-service billets was estimated to be 250 and that language accompanying the legislative proposal indicates that 421 positions may be designated as joint duty assignments. The committee believes this indicates an inability to discipline the process within the Department. In addition, the committee believes that authorizing the Secretary of Defense to award joint duty credit for certain officers serving in joint task force positions will permit virtually all the deserving in-service assignments to receive joint duty assignment credit; (3) allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the education and sequencing requirements and award the joint specialty designation without a 10 percent restriction by grade for each fiscal year for general and flag officers; (4) allow the Secretary of Defense to exempt selected officers from certain requirements for the management of joint duty tour requirements to permit early release of officers on a second joint tour.

The Senate version of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 included several amendments to the statutory provisions governing joint officer management. Although these amendments were not agreed to in conference, a DOD report to

Congress on joint duty assignments was mandated. The committee believes that the modifications to the Joint Officer Management provisions included in the Fiscal Year 1996 recommendation are a direct result of the committee's earlier initiatives. These modifications give the Department of Defense and the military services sufficient flexibility to manage and enhance the quality of joint specialty officers. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to closely manage the award of joint duty credit for duty in joint task forces.

The committee is disappointed that the joint duty assignment study, which was required to be submitted not later than April 15, 1993, still has not been received. Additionally, the committee was disappointed to learn that, despite the time the Department has taken to do this study and our urging, the study will not include a billet-by-billet review.

**Section - 502. Revision of service obligation for graduates of the service academies.**

The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the service obligation for graduates of the service academies from six years to five years. The recommended provision would ensure that no service academy graduate would be obligated to serve more than five years on active duty by reducing the obligation for those cadets/midshipmen currently enrolled as well as future cadets/midshipmen. It would also require a report on the effects that various periods of active duty service obligations would have on the number and quantity of applicants to the service academies.

**Section - 503. Qualifications for appointment as Surgeon General of an armed force.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3036, 5137 and 8036 of title 10, United States Code to permit educationally and professionally qualified officers such as dentists, nurses, and clinical psychologists as well as doctors to be appointed as Surgeon General of an Armed Force. Currently, only physicians may be appointed as Surgeon General of an Armed Force.

**Section - 504. Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Air Force.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8037 of title 10, United States Code, to adjust the tenure of the Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Air Force from two years to four years and authorize the grade of the deputy to be major general.

**Section - 505. Retiring general and flag officers: applicability of uniform criteria and procedures for retiring in highest grade in which served.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the retirement of three- and four-star general and flag officers to be considered under the same standards and procedures as other general and flag officer retirements at the one- and two-star level. It will also ensure that three- and four-star officers facing retirement are

not subjected to confirmation procedures that do not apply to their civilian superiors or other civilian government officials.

Promotions to three- and four-star positions are treated as temporary rather than permanent promotions. The individual holds the three- or four-star grade only “while serving” in the three- or four-star position. The member also may hold the grade for brief transitional periods to cover transfers between assignments, hospitalization, and before retirement.

Because these grades are “temporary,” an individual who is in a three- or four-star grade retains his “permanent grade,” which is typically a two-star grade. If the individual is not nominated, confirmed, and appointed to another three- or four-star position, the individual will revert to his permanent (e.g., two-star) grade.

Under current law, these considerations apply to retirements as well as promotions. As a result, if a three- or four-star officer who retires is not nominated, confirmed, and appointed to retire in a permanent three- or four-star grade, the individual will revert to his permanent (e.g., two-star) grade upon retirement—with the attendant loss of retired pay and status.

This situation applies uniquely to three- and four-star officers. Other flag and general officers, as well as other commissioned officers, retire in the highest grade held, subject to minimum time-in-grade requirements, without a requirement for nomination, Senate confirmation, and appointment to a retired grade.

Similarly, both tenured and non-tenured civilian officials who retire from the civil service are not required to face Senate confirmation, no matter how high their grade. Thus, a cabinet or sub-cabinet official, as well as career civil service officials who qualify for civil service retirement will receive their full retired pay without action by the President or the Senate.

The recommended provision would not change the current requirement for nomination and Senate confirmation of all three- and four-star active duty promotions, assignments, and reassignments.

**Section – 506. Extension of certain reserve officer management authorities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend several reserve officer management authorities currently extended by section 514 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994. When the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act becomes effective on October 1, 1996, no further extension will be required.

**Section – 507. Restrictions on wearing insignia for higher grade before promotion.**

The committee recommends a provision that would define “frocking” and limit the numbers of officers that could be frocked to grades O–4 through O–7.

Frocking is the practice of allowing an officer to wear the insignia of a higher grade prior to that officer’s being appointed to that higher grade. While the Department of Defense has attempted to control the extent of frocking through regulation, the practice remains a means by which the services circumvent the statutory limits on the number of officers authorized to serve in certain grades.

While frocking can be defended as a cost-free way to boost the morale of those officers awaiting promotion, it masks erroneous expectations and dissatisfaction about promotion timing on the part of the individual and encourages the services to select individuals for promotion unreasonably far in advance of the anticipated date of promotion. For example, the committee is aware of a November 1993 Navy flag list from which, as of June 1995, fewer than half the selectees have been promoted. Yet, all have been frocked. The practical result of overselecting in order to frock is that an individual can be selected for promotion to O-7, frocked to O-7 for over a year in a highly visible position in which he exercises supervisory authority over other O-6s, and subsequently retire without ever having been promoted to O-7.

Frocking has also evolved, unfortunately, to be a significant factor in the officer assignment process. The Joint Staff and the Combatant Commanders expect individuals assigned to their organizations to be in the correct grade. The services routinely assign newly-selected individuals to joint positions requiring the grade to which they have been selected with little or no thought to when the individual will actually be promoted. As a direct result the committee is routinely pressured by the services to confirm promotion lists abnormally in advance of the earliest effective date just so the individuals can be frocked. These developments represent an unacceptable distortion of the officer assignment and selection systems.

The committee recognizes the existence of certain situations, primarily in the international arena, in which it may be in the best interests of the United States to frock certain officers. The committee believes, however, that such situations should be viewed as the exception and not the rule.

**Section - 508. Director of Admissions, United States Military Academy: retirement for years of service.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to involuntarily retire the Director of Admissions, United States Military Academy, after 30 years of service as a commissioned officer. Currently, the Secretary of the Army can retire permanent professors at the Academy after 30 years of service. This provision would provide the Secretary of the Army the same authority for the Director of Admissions.

**SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO RESERVE COMPONENTS**

**Section - 511. Mobilization income insurance program for members of Ready Reserve.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish an income protection insurance plan for members of the ready reserve. Participation under the recommended provision would be voluntary, would be financed by premiums paid by participants, and would pay income protection benefits to reservists involuntarily called to active duty by the President.

**Section - 512. Eligibility of dentists to receive assistance under the financial assistance program for health care professionals in reserve components.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize financial assistance for qualified dentists in certain specialties engaged in training for a dental specialty which is critically needed in wartime. Physicians and nurses are currently eligible for similar assistance. This provision authorizes equal treatment for certain dentists in return for a commitment to serve in the ready reserve.

**Section - 513. Leave for members of reserve components performing public safety duty.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 6323(b) of title 5, United States Code, that would permit employees who elect, when performing public safety duty, to use either military leave, annual leave, or compensatory time to which they are otherwise entitled.

**SUBTITLE C—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE**

**Section - 522. Definitions.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend article 1 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 801) to define the terms "classified information" and "national security". The definitions would be similar to those used in the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App. 1).

**Section - 523. Article 32 investigations.**

Under present law, charges must be investigated by an officer appointed under Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice before being referred to a general court-martial. If the Article 32 officer uncovers evidence of additional misconduct in the course of the investigation, the information must be provided to the convening authority, and then referred back to the Article 32 officer before it can be investigated by the Article 32 officer. This is a burdensome and unnecessary procedure.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Article 32 officer to investigate additional misconduct uncovered during the investigation so long as the accused receives all the rights provided under Article 32 with respect to the additional charges, including full notice of the charges and the rights of legal representation, presentation of evidence, and cross-examination.

**Section - 524. Refusal to testify before court-martial.**

Article 47(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice currently limits the punishment which may be imposed by a Federal District Court for a civilian witness's refusal, after being subpoenaed, to appear or testify before a court-martial. If a civilian witness who has been subpoenaed to appear or testify before a court-martial refuses to do so, a Federal District Court under current law may impose "a fine of not more than \$500.00, or imprisonment of not more than six months, or both".

The punishment for the same offense in a civilian trial, however, is a matter within the discretion of the court under 18 U.S.C. 401-

402. The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 47 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide district courts with the same power in military cases as they have in civilian cases.

**Section - 525. Commitment of accused to treatment facility by reason of lack of mental capacity or mental responsibility.**

The Uniform Code of Military Justice does not currently provide for the commitment of an accused to a treatment facility if that accused is incompetent to stand trial or is found not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility. In such cases, the accused potentially is subject to a medical separation. Any subsequent restraint or treatment is dependent on action by state civil authorities.

Reliance on determinations by officials of different states to treat or restrain a mentally incompetent military accused introduces an element of inconsistency into the military justice process.

The Armed Forces clearly have an interest in preserving the integrity of the military justice system through consistent action on the issue of restraint or treatment of a mentally incompetent military accused. Those interests can best be preserved by making use of the existing federal criminal law procedures under 18 U.S.C. 4247(j). The committee recommends a provision that would permit the convening authority, in the case of any soldier, airman, sailor, or Marine found incompetent to stand trial, or found not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility, to commit the individual to the custody of the Attorney General for action in accordance with 18 U.S.C. 4243(e).

**Section - 527. Deferment of confinement.**

The committee recommends an amendment to the Uniform Code of Military Justice that would combine the current authority for deferment of confinement (Article 57(d)) with two new provisions.

The first would permit the Service Secretary concerned to defer confinement when a Judge Advocate General submits a case for review by the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces under Article 67(a)(2).

The second would allow the convening authority to defer the running of a sentence to military confinement so that the accused would not receive credit for time served during a period of civilian confinement following a court-martial in circumstances in which the military is obligated by an agreement, such as the Interstate Agreement on Detainers Act, 18 U.S.C. App. 2(2) or a treaty, to return the accused to state or foreign custody after a court-martial is completed.

**Section - 528. Submission of matters to the convening authority for consideration.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 60(b)(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to require post-trial submissions by an accused for consideration by a convening authority to be in writing.

**Section - 529. Proceedings in revision.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to authorize a proceeding in revision, prior to authentication of the record of trial by the military judge, to correct an erroneously announced sentence. The sentence may be corrected even if the severity of the sentence is increased, but only to the extent that federal civilian courts are authorized to do so under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 36. The amendment would apply only to correction of an erroneously announced sentence and would not authorize reconsideration.

**Section - 530. Appeal by the United States.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 62 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to allow the government to file an interlocutory appeal of rulings or orders issued by the military judge which direct the government to disclose classified information, impose sanctions for nondisclosure of classified information, or refuse a protective order sought to prevent the disclosure of classified information. The provision would apply to courts-martial the same protections with regard to classified information as apply to orders or rulings issued in Federal District Courts under the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App. 7).

**Section - 531. Flight from apprehension.**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify Article 95 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to make it clear that Article 95 proscribes fleeing from apprehension without regard to whether the accused otherwise resisted apprehension.

The clarification is needed because the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces in *United States v. Harris*, 29 M.J. 169 (C.M.A. 1989), and *United States v. Burgess*, 32 M.J. 446 (C.M.A. 1991), held that resisting apprehension does not include fleeing from apprehension, despite the longstanding provisions to the contrary in the Manual for Courts-Martial.

**Section - 532. Carnal knowledge.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 120(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice by making the crime of carnal knowledge gender neutral, bringing Article 120 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice into conformity with the spirit of the Sexual Abuse Act of 1986 (18 U.S.C. 2241-2245).

The provision also would amend Article 120 by adding a new subsection (d) to conform military law to federal civilian law (18 U.S.C. 2243) in terms of the affirmative defense of mistake of fact for alleged carnal knowledge, and regarding the age of the person with whom the accused committed the act of sexual intercourse.

**Section - 533. Time after accession for initial instruction in the Uniform Code of Military Justice.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 137(a)(1) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice by increasing the period of time in which training in certain provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice must be provided to new enlistees from six to fourteen days after entry onto active duty.

**Section - 535. Permanent authority concerning temporary vacancies on the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.**

Section 1301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 authorized the Chief Justice of the United States, upon request of the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, to appoint Article III judges to fill vacancies on the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. This provision will expire in 1995. Based on the success of this provision in permitting the Court to address the problem of temporary vacancies in a timely manner, the committee recommends that the authority be made permanent.

**Section - 536. Advisory panel on UCMJ jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces in time of armed conflict.**

Article 2(10) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice establishes court-martial jurisdiction “[i]n time of war” over “persons serving with or accompanying an armed force in the field”. In *United States v. Averette*, 41 C.M.R. 363 (C.M.A. 1970), the Court of Military Appeals ruled that an Army civilian employee in Vietnam who was convicted of theft from the Army could not be tried by court-martial because the Court interpreted Article 2(10) as requiring a war formally declared by Congress.

Since that time, the Armed Forces have made increasing use of contractor personnel to provide important technical and administrative services to deployed military forces, including forces deployed in armed conflicts not involving a declared war. Since World War II, none of the significant armed conflicts involving the United States—including Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, and the Persian Gulf—have involved a formal declaration of war. The committee is concerned that current law does not provide adequate jurisdiction to try civilians accompanying the Armed Forces in such circumstances. The committee also recognizes that court-martial jurisdiction exists primarily for the disciplinary needs of the Armed Forces, and that any use of that jurisdiction over civilians would require the most careful consideration.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General jointly to establish an advisory panel to review this issue and make appropriate recommendations to the Congress concerning jurisdiction over the Armed Forces in time of conflict not involving a formal declaration of war. The review would specifically consider the options of: (1) establishing court-martial jurisdiction over civilians; (2) establishing sufficient jurisdiction in the Article III courts over such civilians; and (3) establishing separate Article I courts with jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces in the field in time of armed conflict.

**SUBTITLE D—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS**

**Section - 541. Award of Purple Heart to certain former prisoners of war.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize award of the Purple Heart to prisoners of war captured before

April 1962 who were injured or wounded in conjunction with their capture or imprisonment.

**Section - 542. Meritorious and valorous service during Vietnam era: review and awards.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the military departments to award a decoration for an act, achievement or service performed during the Vietnam era but which was not awarded. The provision would establish a one-year period in which award recommendations could be submitted for consideration using existing award review procedures. At the end of one year, the Secretary would be required to report to the Congress on the results of this review.

**Section - 543. Military intelligence personnel prevented by secrecy from being considered for decorations and awards.**

The committee recommends a provision expressing the Sense of the Senate that the secretaries of the military departments should review the records of personnel who performed military intelligence duties during the Cold War period. The committee is aware that there are cases in which the secrecy of the mission prevented recognition through the military awards system. It is the view of the committee that these oversights should now be corrected.

**SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS**

**Section - 551. Determination of whereabouts and status of missing persons.**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new chapter to title 10, United States Code requiring the Secretary of Defense to centralize the oversight and policy responsibility for accounting for missing persons at the Department of Defense level. The recommended provision establishes procedures for review of cases of those who are missing. The recommended provision would protect the missing service member from being declared dead solely because of the passage of time. The committee believes that the recommended provision will assist the Department of Defense and the next-of-kin of missing service members as both struggle with the emotion and frustration of a system which has, to date, proved insensitive and unresponsive.

**Section - 552. Service not creditable for periods of unavailability or incapacity due to misconduct.**

The committee recommends a provision that would equalize the accrual of service credit between officers and enlisted personnel.

**Section - 553. Separation in cases involving extended confinement.**

**Section - 526. Forfeiture of pay and allowances and reduction in grade.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require forfeiture of pay or allowances or reduction in grade included in a sentence of a court-martial to be effective 20 days after the date the

sentence is adjudged or upon approval of the convening authority, whichever is earlier. The recommended provision would also require that a sentence which includes confinement for one year or more or a punitive discharge would result in a forfeiture of all pay and allowances. The committee recommends an additional provision that would authorize the administrative separation of a service member who is sentenced by court-martial to a period of confinement for one year or more.

The committee notes that, in general, individuals sentenced to extended confinement are discharged from military service and lose their entitlement to military pay. There are some circumstances under current law, however, in which an individual can remain on active duty and continue to receive pay and allowances. The provisions recommended by the committee would make it clear that persons serving extended confinement should not receive pay or allowances and should not remain on active duty.

**Section - 554. Duration of field training or practice cruise required under the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of a military department to prescribe the length of the field training portion or practice cruise that persons who have not participated in the first two years of Reserve Officers' Training Corps must complete to be enrolled in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps Advance Course. Currently, the training must be at least six weeks long.

**Section - 555. Correction of military records.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretaries of the military departments to review the composition of the Boards for the Correction of Military Records and the procedures used by those boards. The provision would require a report to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 1996.

The committee is concerned about the perception among service members that the boards have become lethargic and unresponsive, and have abdicated their independence to the uniformed service staffs.

These boards are to be the honest broker, the forum for adjudication of claims from service members who allege errors in military records. If these boards become extensions of the military staffs, they will have lost their sole reason for existence.

This provision would require a comprehensive review of the make-up, current board procedures, and recommendations for improving the process. The reports from the military departments would be submitted through the Department of Defense. The committee expects that the Office of the Secretary of Defense will carefully review the reports and, where applicable, standardize processes and procedures to ensure efficiency, effectiveness and responsiveness to the services and service members.

**Section - 556. Limitation on reductions in medical personnel.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 711 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, section 718 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, and section 518 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 to modify the limitations on reductions in medical personnel. The provision would permit active or reserve medical personnel to be reduced by not more than 5 percent per year or a total of 10 percent over 3 years without the requirement to certify that CHAMPUS costs will not increase and that the reductions are excess to the current and projected needs of the military department.

The committee understands that the military departments need to have a degree of flexibility to reduce the medical force in conjunction with the overall force reductions. However, the committee is aware that it is possible to reduce medical personnel in a manner and to an extent that might be characterized as less than prudent. The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, in conjunction with the Surgeons General of the military departments, to develop a comprehensive plan for "right sizing" medical personnel over the next five years. This plan will be submitted to the appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than March 1, 1996.

**Section - 557. Repeal of requirement for athletic director and nonappropriated fund account for the athletics programs at the service academies.**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 4357 of title 10, United States Code, and subsections (b), (d) and (e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

The committee acknowledges the report from the Secretary of the Navy which described plans to implement corrective actions with respect to the Naval Academy Athletic Association. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives when the actions recommended in the report are implemented.

**Section - 558. Prohibition on use of funds for service academy preparatory school test program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would terminate any test program for determining the cost effectiveness of transferring, in whole or in part, the mission of the military academy preparatory schools to the private sector.

**Section - 559. Centralized judicial review of Department of Defense personnel actions.**

Judicial review of Department of Defense personnel actions occurs under a disparate variety of jurisdictional statutes. The committee has received various proposals for centralized judicial review, but believes that the views of experts should be obtained prior to further consideration. The committee recommends a provision that would establish an advisory panel on the issue of centralized judicial review. The report of the advisory panel should specifi-

cally consider the utility of a statutory exhaustion requirement, discuss the need for centralized judicial review, and examine the potential effects of conducting such reviews through the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

#### **OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

##### **Capstone course for new general and flag officers**

In fulfillment of its oversight responsibilities, over the last three years the committee has encouraged the National Defense University to revise the Capstone course curriculum for new general and flag officers to include instructional segments on the roles and functions of the Congress with regard to national security matters. The Capstone course was mandated by the Congress as part of the landmark Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

Despite this urging, however, the Capstone course curriculum has only added a few hours of instruction on the legislative liaison function of the Department of Defense and the Services, and on presenting Congressional testimony. While these additions may be useful, they fail to provide new general and flag officers with an appreciation of the essential role of Congress, a co-equal branch of government that plays a major role in the organization, funding, and uses of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The committee has been heartened by the recent decision of the administration of the National Defense University to add two new instructional segments to the curriculum of the Capstone course. The first addition would add a one hour segment on the constitutional separation of powers and its implications for the military. The second would add a segment of two back-to-back seminars to be conducted on Capitol Hill to address congressional procedures and substantive defense issues being considered by the Congress.

The committee intends to continue its oversight in this area and pledges its assistance to the National Defense University to ensure that the added courses, particularly the seminars on Capitol Hill, are successfully carried out. The committee already conducts such seminars for a number of the Service colleges. These additions to the course should serve to ensure that our new general and flag officers have a greater appreciation for the roles and functions of the Congress in national security matters.

##### **Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act (ROPMA)**

The Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act (ROPMA) was enacted as Title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. Section 1691 of this Act established the effective date for the new policies in ROPMA as October 1, 1996. The accompanying report language states that the conferees agree that the Senate would consider perfecting legislation, including accelerating the effective date of ROPMA.

Based on discussions with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs and the Reserve Chiefs, the committee did not recommend any perfecting legislation or an acceleration of the effective date. The committee is committed to the provisions of ROPMA; however, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the military serv-

ices and the reserve components are not prepared to accelerate implementation of ROPMA. The committee believes that by maintaining the current effective date of October 1, 1996, the Department of Defense and the military services will have sufficient time to promulgate, staff, and implement the necessary directives which will result in a more efficient transition to ROPMA.

### **Reserve officers not on the active duty list**

Section 666 of title 10 U.S.C., as added by the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, requires the Secretary of Defense to establish personnel policies emphasizing education and experience in joint matters for reserve officers not on the active duty list. The policies are, to the extent practicable for the reserve components, to be similar to those provided by law for active duty officers.

The committee has learned that the Department of Defense does not yet have a directive or other authoritative joint officer policy document relating to reserve officers. A study to determine a strategy to meet the joint professional military education and joint officer management policy needs for reserve officers, which was started in fiscal year 1993 and placed on hold in fiscal year 1994, is once again under way, albeit reduced in scope. A decision was recently made to allocate one quota per Capstone class for new general and flag reserve officers, with a view toward allocation of additional quotas. Finally, a reserve general officer has very recently reported to the Joint Staff to serve as the first Reserve Mobilization Assistant to the Director of the Joint Staff. His primary role is to provide the Joint Staff with senior level perspective on the capabilities, roles, and missions of reserve component forces.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to expedite authoritative policy guidance relating to the joint professional military education and joint officer management for reserve officers not on the active duty list, and to increase and allocate additional Capstone seats for new general and flag reserve officers.

### **Service academy directives**

The committee is concerned about Department of Defense Directive 1322.22, dated August 24, 1994, entitled "Service Academies" and Department of Defense Directive 1025.4, dated October 18, 1994, entitled "Service Academy Resources Report." The committee understands that these directives were prepared in response to the requirement in the Conference Report accompanying The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, which required the Secretary of Defense to review oversight procedures and to promulgate a regulation which provides for the uniform oversight and management of the military service academies.

While the committee recognizes the importance of enhanced oversight, the directives in question may have taken that direction too far, unnecessarily restricting the authority of the Service Secretaries and Academy Superintendents. Examples of possible micromanagement include:

- (1) directing detailed organizational structure of the academies and preparatory schools;

- (2) regulating the details of the cadet/midshipmen daily routine;
- (3) levying unnecessary or redundant report requirements on the service academies and preparatory schools; and
- (4) specifying the composition of attendees at the annual Superintendent's conference.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to review the directives in question with a view toward rescinding or revising those sections that impose unnecessary restrictions on the authority of the service secretaries or academy superintendents. Additionally, the Secretary of Defense should submit a copy of the revised directives to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 1996.

#### **Tuition assistance program**

The committee strongly supports the tuition assistance program. Through this program military personnel may receive financial assistance while enrolled in higher education programs. The result is more qualified service members, increased readiness, better retention, and improved morale.

Since tuition assistance is not specifically funded in a budget line, the funds are fungible within the local Operation and Maintenance accounts. The committee has found that installation commanders, responding to budgetary pressures, are reducing the funds available for tuition assistance in favor of base operations, training, or maintenance.

The committee respects the necessity for the local installation commander to have the flexibility to transfer funds to meet critical requirements. However, the committee urges the military departments and local commanders to use the funds intended for tuition assistance for tuition assistance.

#### **Quality of life while on independent duty**

The committee has recommended a number of legislative provisions that reflect the committee's concern about the quality of life of all service members, their families, and the retiree community. Additionally, the committee has special concerns about the quality of life of those who serve on independent duty, i.e., those who are stationed away from major military installations.

Each service assigns personnel to positions which, by their very nature, are located in areas which do not enjoy a significant military presence. This type of duty includes recruiters and recruiting support personnel, ROTC instructors and support personnel, and active duty personnel supporting reserve component activities. These individuals and their families are ordered to various locations ranging from high-cost, major, urban areas to remote and isolated rural locations. In these instances, commissaries, exchanges, family and bachelor housing, military medical treatment facilities and other aspects of normal military life are not available to the service members and their families.

The committee encourages the civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense to be particularly mindful of the challenges these individuals and their families face on and off the job

on a daily basis, and to develop initiatives intended to address those challenges. Areas in which increased attention and initiative could prove beneficial include: the availability of affordable health care and adequate housing; the availability of reasonable office or working conditions, including modern, automated systems; appropriate transportation and supply support; and an enhanced responsiveness of administrative chains in recognition of the unique pressures and requirements of these duties.

### **Recoupment**

The report of the Senate Armed Services Committee (Senate Report 103-282) on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 directed the Secretary of Defense to review the recoupment of pay or benefits received by members who fail to complete military service obligations related to the receipt of such pay or benefits. The report was due on February 1, 1995. On February 24, 1995 the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee was informed that the report would be submitted by March 15, 1995, but the report has not been submitted to date.

It is essential for the committee's consideration of this issue that such a report be prepared. Recoupment of pay or benefits is complex and could represent a substantial loss of revenue for the Department of Defense. In order for this issue to be fully examined, the committee directs that the report must be submitted to the committee by February 1, 1996.



## **TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS**

The committee addressed a number of pay, allowances and other compensation issues during its oversight hearings. One of the committee's priorities this year was to improve the quality of life for military personnel, their families, and retired service members and their families. The committee recommends a number of provisions which will significantly improve the quality of life and living conditions, and provide equitable compensation for military personnel to protect against inflation. The committee also recommends several initiatives which address the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance program and establish procedures under which the Secretary of Defense will determine the status of personnel who are missing. In general, the committee's recommendations reflect a commitment to enhancing quality of life and concern for the welfare of military personnel and their families.

### **SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES**

#### **Section - 601. Military pay raise for fiscal year 1996.**

The committee recommends a provision that would waive Section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and increase the rates of basic pay and basic allowance for subsistence for members of the uniformed services by 2.4 percent. Additionally, the provision would increase the rates of the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services by 5.2 percent. These increases are effective January 1, 1996.

#### **Section - 602. Election of basic allowance for quarters instead of assignment to inadequate quarters.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of the basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) and variable housing allowance (VHA) (and overseas housing allowance (OHA) if assigned overseas) to single E-6 and above personnel assigned to quarters which do not meet minimum adequacy standards established by the Department of Defense. The committee believes that personnel in the career force should have the option of electing not to live in inadequate bachelor quarters.

#### **Section - 603. Payment of basic allowance for quarters to members of the uniformed services in pay grade E-6 who are assigned to sea duty.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of the basic allowance for quarters (BAQ) and variable housing allowance (VHA) (and overseas housing allowance (OHA) if assigned to a ship homeported overseas) to single E-6 Navy personnel assigned to shipboard sea duty. Current law only permits

single E-7 Navy personnel to receive BAQ, VHA and OHA (if applicable) while assigned to shipboard sea duty. The other military services already have similar BAQ/VHA/OHA authority.

**Section - 604. Limitation on reduction of variable housing allowance for certain members.**

The committee recommends a provision that would prevent the amount of variable housing allowance (VHA) paid to an individual from being reduced as long as the service member retains uninterrupted eligibility to receive VHA in the housing area and the service member's housing costs are not reduced.

**Section - 605. Clarification of limitation on eligibility for family separation allowance.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize family separation allowance (FSA II) for a member embarked on board a ship away from homeport or on temporary duty for 30 consecutive days whose dependents were authorized to accompany the member to the homeport or permanent duty station, but voluntarily chose not to do so.

**SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS**

**Section - 611. Extension of certain bonuses for reserve forces.**

**Section - 612. Extension of certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists.**

**Section - 613. Extension of authority relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays.**

The committee recommends provisions that would amend sections 308b(f), 308c(e), 308e(e), 308h(g), and 308i(i) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay bonuses for (1) enlistment, re-enlistment, or affiliation with the selected reserve; (2) enlistment, re-enlistment, or extension of an enlistment in the ready reserve other than the selected reserve; and (3) enlistment in the selected reserve of individuals with prior service.

The recommended provisions would also amend section 2130a(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay a nurse officer candidate accession bonus; amend section 302d(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay an accession bonus for registered nurses; amend section 302e(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay an incentive special pay to certified registered nurse anesthetists.

The recommended provisions would amend section 301b(a) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus; amend section 308(g) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay a re-enlistment bonus to active duty service members who re-enlist or extend in a regular component of the service concerned for at least three years; amend sections 308a(c) and 308f(c) of title 37, United States Code,

to extend the authority to pay an enlistment bonus to a person who enlists in an Armed Force for at least four years in a skill designated as critical or who extends their initial period of active duty to a total of at least four years in a skill designated as critical or who enlists in the Army for at least three years in a skill designated as critical; amend section 308d(c) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay additional compensation to enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to high priority units; amend section 16302(d) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to permit the repayment of educational loans of health professionals who serve in the selected reserve and who possess professional qualifications in a health profession that the Secretary of Defense has determined to be needed critically to meet identified wartime combat medical skill shortages; amend section 613(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 to extend the authority to pay a special pay to a health care professional who is qualified in a specialty designated by regulation as a critically short wartime specialty and who agrees to serve in the selected reserve for at least one year; amend sections 312(e), 312b(c) and 312c(d) of title 37, United States Code, to extend the authority to pay certain bonuses to attract and retain highly qualified nuclear career officers.

The committee remains concerned that, with the reduction in the number of nuclear submarines and the downsizing of the Navy, the nuclear bonuses may not have been adjusted accordingly. The committee directs the Navy to review alternatives to the current bonuses and report the results of this review to the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 1996.

**Section - 614. Hazardous duty incentive pay for warrant officers and enlisted members serving as air weapons controllers.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize special hazardous duty incentive pay for enlisted members serving as air weapons controllers aboard airborne warning and control systems. The Air Force is converting officer air weapons controller positions to enlisted billets. This provision permits the enlisted air weapons controllers to receive hazardous duty incentive pay on the same basis as their officer counterparts.

**Section - 615. Aviation career incentive pay.**

The committee recommends a provision that would change the number of years required to serve in an aviation billet to qualify for continued aviation career incentive pay. The provision would also restrict the authority to grant waivers of the number of years to the service Secretary.

**Section - 616. Clarification of authority to provide special pay for nurses.**

The committee recommends a provision that would add military nurses to the health care professionals who may receive a special pay for being board certified in their specialty.

**Section - 617. Continuous entitlement to career sea pay for crew members of ships designated as tenders.**

The committee recommends a provision that would specify duty aboard submarine and destroyer tenders as qualifying for career sea pay on the same basis as on other ships.

**Section - 618. Increase in maximum rate of special duty assignment pay for enlisted members serving as recruiters.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of additional special duty assignment pay to recruiters. The committee expects the Secretaries of the military departments to increase the special duty assignment pay proportionally for all recruiters to offset financial hardships endured by these service members.

**SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES**

**Section - 621. Calculation on basis of mileage tables of Secretary of Defense: repeal.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 104(d)(1)(A) of title 37, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that travel mileage tables be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Defense. This provision would enable the Secretary of Defense to use commercially available mileage tables and eliminate the requirement for the Department of Defense to maintain in-house mileage tables.

**Section - 622. Departure allowances.**

The committee recommends a provision that would equalize evacuation allowances to ensure equitable treatment of military dependents, civilians and their dependents when officially authorized or ordered to evacuate an overseas area.

**Section - 623. Dislocation allowance for moves resulting from a base closure or realignment.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the current dislocation allowance entitlement to service members who must relocate in a base realignment and closure (BRAC) location when their mission has not changed. This provision will permit a service member who must relocate locally from a military installation or housing area as a result of a BRAC activity to receive a dislocation allowance on the same basis as one who relocates to another installation.

**Section - 624. Transportation of nondependent child from sponsor's station overseas after loss of dependent status while overseas.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the return of certain formerly dependent children to the United States. The provision would permit someone who accompanied a military sponsor to an overseas station in dependent status but who, by vir-

tue of turning age 21, lost dependent status to return to the United States at government expense.

**SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARIES AND NONAPPROPRIATED  
FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES**

**Section - 631. Use of commissary stores by members of the Ready Reserve.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit members of the ready reserve to use commissaries on the same basis as members on active duty.

**Section - 632. Use of commissary stores by retired reserves under age 60 and their survivors.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit survivors of "gray area" retirees, members of the retired reserve who have not attained the age of 60 years, to use commissaries as if the sponsor had attained 60 years of age and was receiving retirement benefits.

**Section - 633. Use of morale, welfare, and recreation facilities by members of reserve components and dependents: clarification of entitlement.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1065 of title 10, United States Code, to give members of the retired reserve who would be eligible for retired pay but for the fact that they are under 60 years of age the same priority of use of morale, welfare, and recreation facilities of the military services as members who retired after active-duty careers.

**SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS**

**Section - 641. Cost-of-living increases for retired pay.**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the military retired pay cost-of-living adjustment payment of 1996 on April 1. In subsequent years the cost-of-living adjustment would be paid on January 1 of each year.

**Section - 642. Eligibility for retired pay for non-regular service denied for members receiving certain sentences in courts-martial.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to deny retired pay to non-regular service members who are convicted of an offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and whose sentence includes death, a dishonorable discharge, a bad conduct discharge, or dismissal. The provision would authorize the military departments to treat both regular and non-regular service members equitably.

**Section - 643. Recoupment of administrative expenses in garnishment actions.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5502 of title 5, United States Code, to shift the burden for pay-

ing administrative costs incurred incident to garnishment actions from the employee to the creditor.

**Section - 644. Automatic maximum coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance.**

The committee recommends a provision that would automatically enroll service members at the maximum insurance level of \$200,000 instead of the \$100,000 level currently in law.

**Section - 645. Termination of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for members of the Ready Reserve who fail to pay premiums.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to terminate coverage under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for members of the ready reserve who fail to make premium payments for 120 days.

The committee recommends this provision in order to provide the Secretary of Defense the authority necessary to preclude paying benefits to certain personnel who did not continue premium payments. However, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense, when implementing directives are developed, to ensure there are adequate safeguards, including a reliable notification process, to prevent inappropriate or premature termination of benefits.

**Section - 646. Report on extending to junior noncommissioned officers privileges provided for senior noncommissioned officers.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to study and report to the Congress on methods of improving the working conditions of noncommissioned officers in pay grades E-5 and E-6. This report and the accompanying legislative recommendations should provide the committee a road map to continue quality of life improvements begun in this bill.

**Section - 647. Payment to survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services for all leave accrued.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services to be paid for all leave accrued. Currently, payment is limited to 60 days of accrued leave. This provision will enable survivors to be paid for leave accrued above the 60 day limit. A similar temporary authority was granted during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

**Section - 648. Annuities for certain military surviving spouses.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to pay an annuity to the surviving spouses of retired service members who died before March 21, 1974. This group of surviving spouses has become known as the "Forgotten Widows" since they were widowed before the Survivor Benefit Plan was enacted.

**Section - 649. Transitional compensation for dependents of members of the Armed Forces separated for dependent abuse: clarification of entitlement.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1059(d) of title 10, United States Code, to include transitional compensation for dependents whose sponsor forfeited all pay and allowances, but was not separated from the service. This provision would correct an unintended consequence in the current law.

**OTHER ITEM OF INTEREST**

The committee is concerned about the method the Air Force uses when determining eligibility for aviation career pay. The committee commends the Navy for targeting aviation career pay eligibility for specific types of aircraft for which there are actual or projected crew shortages. The committee urges the Air Force to seriously consider modifying its procedure for determining eligibility for new awards of aviation career pay.



## **TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE**

The committee addressed a number of health care issues during its budget review process. One of the committee's priorities this year was to improve the quality of life for military personnel, their families, and retired service members and their families. The committee views health care as an important aspect of quality of life. The committee recommends several provisions concerning Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities and initiatives to improve the department's ability to implement managed care. The committee was not able to include a provision which would provide for Medicare to reimburse the Department of Defense for care provided to Medicare eligible beneficiaries. The committee believes medicare subvention would be fiscally beneficial to Medicare and would enable the Department of Defense to continue to provide health care to DOD beneficiaries within TRICARE. In general, the committee's recommendations reflect a commitment to enhancing quality of life and concern for the welfare of military personnel and their families.

### **TRICARE**

The committee is concerned about several aspects of the implementation of the Department of Defense managed health care plan, TRICARE. Authoritative sources suggest that the pace of implementation should be slowed, and that the Department is not taking time to benefit from the experience in contracting and implementation gained in those regions that have converted to TRICARE. Other authoritative sources suggest that the pace of implementation is too slow, that eligible beneficiaries in the eastern regions are being disenfranchised as they are forced to wait while the remainder of the nation enjoys the benefits of managed care, lower co-payments, and improved management processes.

The committee believes that a primary challenge facing the Department in a managed care environment is the need to control costs while maintaining quality care. Unfortunately, it is possible that cost-containment incentives of managed care could result in underservice and less-than-optimal care. A viable managed care environment is more than simply managing resources. It is important, therefore, that the Department of Defense, measure on a regular basis the adequacy of the care provided through the TRICARE system in terms that include accessibility, comprehensiveness, coordination, continuity, and provider accountability.

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of Defense and CHAMPUS to evaluate contracts as complex and as technical as the TRICARE region contracts. TRICARE is the first real attempt to implement a nation-wide managed care system. Although military officers and DOD civilian employees in health affairs are very capable professionals, the optimum exper-

tise and experience necessary to evaluate contracts of this magnitude may not be resident in the Department of Defense. The region contracts must be awarded and implemented according to a planned schedule. Delays caused by repeated protests will disrupt the schedule and implementation. Protests that are upheld may have a significant impact on other contracts. The committee has discussed these issues with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and offered to provide resources and authority to use private sector resources to assist the Department of Defense and CHAMPUS.

Other issues about which the committee has concerns include: (1) the impact of proposed civilian personnel reductions on the Military Health Service System (MHSS); (2) ineffective or inadequate marketing to the beneficiary population of the TRICARE benefit and implementation; (3) the ability of the Department of Defense to provide health care to the retired beneficiaries, especially the Medicare-eligible population; (4) resolution of the continuing debate between the responsibilities of the lead agent, the contractor and the military treatment facility commanders; (5) portability of benefits among TRICARE regions in CONUS and overseas; (6) and public perception about the benefits and availability of care within TRICARE. Each of these concerns are discussed in detail in the following sections:

(1) Directed reductions to civilian personnel have been discussed in conjunction with recommended legislative proposals in title III of this bill. When the military services began to drawdown in 1990, the medical departments began to civilianize selected medical positions in order to meet increasing demands for military health care. At the time, these efforts were applauded as good management by prudent military health care leaders. In 1995, the services were directed to reduce civilian personnel by four percent per year for five years. These civilian reductions were applied equally to the medical communities. As a result of these two factors, the medical communities are being forced to accept deeper reductions than previously anticipated. The civilian reductions were assigned to meet specified full-time-equivalent targets without regard for the impact on costs or medical readiness. One consequence of these mandated reductions is that TRICARE contractors will be required to provide more health care, at potentially higher cost, than could be provided in a medical treatment facility.

(2) The current marketing plan for TRICARE is inadequate. The committee commends the Office of CHAMPUS for holding their recent TRICARE marketing conference. Initiatives such as this should result in a more proactive, better coordinated and more effective program to inform participants, eligible personnel, civilian providers and chains of command about the TRICARE system. Until there is a common understanding of the benefit, procedures, and costs, TRICARE cannot be successfully implemented.

(3) The committee commends the department's efforts to continue to provide health care to Medicare-eligible retirees. These efforts cost the Department of Defense about \$1 billion per year. These costs are not reimbursed by the Health Care Fi-

nancing Agency (HCFA) through the Medicare system. Last year the committee approved a proposal to require HCFA to reimburse DOD on an annual basis for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries who enrolled in TRICARE. The committee believes the Department of Defense would provide health care to these Medicare-eligible beneficiaries for lower cost than could be provided by Medicare providers. Unfortunately, the committee has not been successful in getting Medicare reimbursement legislation enacted. The current situation results in higher liability to HCFA, dissatisfied Medicare-eligible beneficiaries, and lost opportunities for DOD health care professionals to treat diseases and conditions not found in healthy, young service members and their families.

(4) The role of the TRICARE lead agent vis-a-vis the TRICARE contractor is unclear to the committee, and, we suspect, the lead agents themselves. Clearly, in the MHSS, the military lead agent should be considered the final authority. However, there are a large number of functions which can be accomplished more efficiently and more effectively by the TRICARE contractor. The committee believes that the issue of how responsibility is shared cannot be ambiguous and must be guided by military medical readiness and stewardship of the available resources. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the Surgeons General must clearly define the sharing of responsibilities and ensure that there is no doubt or confusion on the part of the lead agents or the TRICARE contractors.

(5) The committee strongly supports the concept of a uniform benefit for beneficiaries of the MHSS. Additionally, the processes, procedures and methods of operating should be seamless between regions. Active duty service members expect the process for attaining health care to be standard wherever they are assigned. A family member or retiree should expect no less. In the infancy of TRICARE, this has not been a problem, but as TRICARE matures there is potential for disparate procedures and processes to evolve from region to region. This is especially true since the lead agents represent different services and the TRICARE contractors will be different. The committee believes that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs and the Surgeons General should assign a task force to ensure the benefit remains uniform and the processes and procedures remain standard so that there is seamless portability for beneficiaries as they move between regions. Consistent with the principles of managed care, standardization should not stifle local initiatives to improve health care delivery and lower costs. However, the processes should be invisible to the user.

(6) Inevitably, a great deal of the success of TRICARE will depend in large measure on how it is perceived by the beneficiaries and the public. Health care is one of the most visible and important factors in the enlistment and reenlistment decisions. If TRICARE is perceived to be a failure or ineffective, the impact will be manifested in the services' inability to meet enlistment quotas and in retention statistics. Less visible, but no less critical, is the impact of perceptions about TRICARE

within the civilian health care provider community. If TRICARE is seen as an important, positive step toward managed care, civilian providers will willingly join the networks and will work with the Department of Defense to improve the system. On the other hand, if TRICARE is perceived as cumbersome, ineffective, or inefficient, civilian providers will not be willing to join in partnership with the Department of Defense. Should this occur, costs will rise and negative perceptions will increase. The best way to ensure the perceptions of TRICARE are positive is to work to ensure the MHSS continues to be a model of excellence.

The committee remains positive in its assessment of TRICARE. However, future evaluations will assess how well today's military and civilian medical leaders have done. TRICARE may well be the Department of Defense's best opportunity to reform the MHSS while maintaining medical readiness and meeting the increasing demands for health care. The committee urges the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, the Surgeons General, and the military and civilian leadership of the Department of Defense and the military services to work together with the Congress to ensure TRICARE succeeds.

#### **SUBTITLE A—HEALTH CARE SERVICES**

##### **Section - 701. Medical care for surviving dependents of retired reserves who die before age 60.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit survivors of "gray area" retirees, members of the retired reserve who have not attained the age of 60 years, to receive medical care as if the sponsor had attained 60 years of age and was receiving retirement benefits.

##### **Section - 702. Dental insurance for members of the Selected Reserve.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a dental insurance plan for members of the selected reserve. The provision would require a plan similar to the active duty dependent dental insurance plan with voluntary enrollment and premium sharing by the member.

The committee believes participation in this program will be significant. Once the dental insurance program is in place, the committee would consider a recommendation to modify provisions in Title IX, Army Guard Combat Reform Initiative, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 to require members of the selected reserve to maintain certain standards of dental readiness.

##### **Section - 703. Modification of requirements regarding routine physical examinations and immunizations under CHAMPUS.**

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the "well baby" care and immunizations available through the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to determine

the types and schedule of immunizations, routine physicals, and other health screening or “wellness” visits. Under this provision school physicals and routine immunizations for dependents above six years of age will be covered under CHAMPUS.

**Section - 704. Permanent authority to carry out specialized treatment facility program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1105 of title 10 United States Code, by repealing subsection (h), the sunset provision. This provision would make the Specialized Treatment Facility Program permanent.

**Section - 705. Waiver of medicare part B late enrollment penalty and establishment of special enrollment period for certain military retirees and dependents.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Social Security Act to authorize a waiver of the penalty for late enrollment in Medicare Part B for Medicare-eligible Department of Defense beneficiaries who reside in geographic areas affected by the closure of military hospitals under the Base Realignment and Closure process. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a special 90-day Medicare Part B enrollment period for Medicare-eligible Department of Defense beneficiaries residing in each Base Realignment and Closure area, and would allow waiver of the penalties for late enrollment during the special 90-day enrollment period.

**SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM**

**Section - 712. Provision of TRICARE uniform benefits by uniformed services treatment facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities to implement the TRICARE uniform benefit concurrent with the implementation of TRICARE in that region. The recommended provision would exempt a covered beneficiary who has been continuously enrolled on and after January 1, 1995.

**Section - 713. Sense of Senate on access of medicare eligible beneficiaries of CHAMPUS to health care under TRICARE.**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the Sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should develop a program to ensure that covered beneficiaries who are eligible for Medicare and who reside in a region in which TRICARE has been implemented have access to health care services under TRICARE and that the Department of Defense be reimbursed for those services.

**Section - 714. Pilot program of individualized residential mental health services.**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement a program of residential treatment for seriously emotionally disturbed and complex-needs adoles-

cents. This treatment would incorporate the concept of “wrap-around services” in one TRICARE region. The committee notes that there are providers who have been successful in delivering these services. The Secretary would be required to report on the evaluation of this program not later than eighteen months after the program is implemented.

### **SUBTITLE C—UNIFORMED SERVICES TREATMENT FACILITIES**

#### **Section - 721. Delay of termination of status of certain facilities as uniformed services treatment facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the designation of Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities (USTF) as military treatment facilities (MTF) until September 30, 1997.

The committee recognizes that the USTFs are currently operating under at-risk contracts negotiated with the Department of Defense. These contracts expire on September 30, 1997. The committee also recognizes the importance of the eventual integration of the USTFs into the TRICARE system and the existence of several key milestones in that integration. These milestones include the current expiration of the designation as MTFs; the expiration of existing contracts negotiated with the Department of Defense; the implementation by region of the TRICARE program; and the implementation of the Uniform Benefit and related cost shares. The committee believes that, insofar as possible and given certain grandfathering provisions elsewhere in this report, the dates of these milestones should coincide.

#### **Section - 722. Applicability of Federal Acquisition Regulation to participation agreements with uniformed services treatment facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the Uniformed Services Treatment Facility’s exemption to the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR). The provision would apply to any future modification of existing agreements and to any new participation agreements entered into after the date of enactment.

#### **Section - 723. Amount payable by uniformed services treatment facilities for health care services provided outside the catchment areas of the facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074 of title 10 United States Code, to include the Uniformed Services Treatment Facilities (USTF) in the authority under which a USTF could be reimbursed for care provided to a DOD eligible enrollee who receives care out of the local area of the USTF in which they are enrolled.

**SUBTITLE D—OTHER CHANGES TO EXISTING LAWS  
REGARDING HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT**

**Section - 731. Investment incentive for managed health care in medical treatment facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize 3 percent of the total amount of the annual Operation and Maintenance account for the Defense Health Program authorized to be appropriated to remain available until the end of the following fiscal year. This provision would permit savings generated from management practices in one fiscal year to be used during the following fiscal year.

**Section - 732. Revision and codification of limitations on physician payments under CHAMPUS.**

The committee recommends a provision that would codify section 8009 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1995, which establishes a process for gradually reducing CHAMPUS maximum payment amounts to the limits for similar services under Medicare. Additionally, the provision would provide special authority to exceed the allowable amounts where managed care plan enrollees obtain emergency care from non-network providers.

**Section - 733. Personal services contracts for medical treatment facilities of the Coast Guard.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to use the same personal services contract authority currently available to the Secretary of Defense to contract for health care providers in support of the Coast Guard.

**Section - 734. Disclosure of information in medicare and medicaid coverage data bank to improve collection from responsible parties for health care services furnished under CHAMPUS.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1144 of the Social Security Act to extend access to information in the data bank to the Department of Defense. This information will enhance the effectiveness of the Department of Defense third party collection program since employers are required to submit health care insurance coverage data on individuals electing coverage under employers' health plans to the data bank annually.

**SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS**

**Section - 741. TriService nursing research.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize establishment of a tri-service research program at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences designed to further research on the furnishing of care and service by nurses in the Armed Forces.

**Section - 742. Fisher House trust funds.**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish trust funds on the books of the Treasury for Fisher Houses. The interest earned by these trust funds will be used for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Fisher Houses within the Army and Air Force.

**Section - 744. Applicability of limitation on prices of pharmaceuticals procured for Coast Guard.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8126 of title 38 United States Code, to include the Coast Guard in the authority to enter into master pharmaceutical pricing agreements.

**OTHER ITEM OF INTEREST****Telemedicine**

The committee continues to support the initiative to enhance the transportable computer-based patient record capability of the Composite Health Care System. The committee eagerly anticipates the day when a patient's record is available via the same telemedicine network on which digitized pictures and/or other diagnostic tools are passed in real time for expert consultation and collaboration. The committee is aware of the initial successes in the Pacific Medical Network (PACMEDNET) telemedicine test and the progress made by the Army's Center for Total Access at Fort Gordon, GA; Eisenhower Army Medical Center; and Fort Jackson, SC. The committee urges the Department of Defense to expand these efforts to maximize technological advances in improving access to quality care and in enhancing medical readiness.

The committee directs the Department of Defense to advise the committee not later than March 1, 1996, regarding plans to exploit these initiatives.

## **TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS**

On April 6, 1995, the Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology received testimony from the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, and the private sector on ways to build on the acquisition reforms enacted in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. To begin addressing that issue, the committee has recommended a number of provisions from title XII the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (S. 727) as well as other legislation concerning issues that have come to the attention of the committee. The individual provisions are described in the following pages of this report.

### **SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION REFORM**

#### **Section - 801. Waivers from cancellation of funds.**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for the availability of funds for satellite incentive fees beyond the five-year limitation set forth in 31 U.S.C. 1552. The funds would be available until the fee is earned under the contract subject to other applicable provisions of law.

#### **Section - 802. Procurement notice posting thresholds.**

The committee recommends a provision that would conform the notice posting thresholds in 41 U.S.C. 416(a)(1)(B) applicable to the Department of Defense to the thresholds applicable to federal civilian agencies.

#### **Section - 803. Prompt resolution of audit recommendations.**

The committee recommends a provision that would conform section 6009 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 to the reporting requirements in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

#### **Section - 804. Test program for negotiation of comprehensive subcontracting plans.**

Section 834 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 established a test program for the negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans. The test was limited to one contracting activity in each military department and defense agency, and was intended to determine whether such comprehensive subcontracting plans would result in increased opportunities for small businesses under DOD contracts. In order to more fully validate the test program, the committee recommends a provision that would amend the test authority to remove the limitation on the activities that may be included in the test. The provision would also reduce the number of contracts and aggregate dol-

lar value of those contracts that are required to establish a condition for a contractor's participation in the test program.

**Section - 805. Naval salvage facilities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would simplify the provisions of chapter 637 of title 10 relating to naval salvage facilities.

**Section - 806. Authority to delegate contracting authority.**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal 10 U.S.C. 2356 which unnecessarily duplicates the inherent authority of the Secretary of Defense to delegate research contracting authorities.

**Section - 807. Coordination and communication of defense research activities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend 10 U.S.C. 2364 to clarify that papers prepared by a defense research facility on a technological issue relating to a major weapon system must be available for consideration at all decision reviews for the program.

**Section - 808. Procurement of items for experimental or test purposes.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend 10 U.S.C. 2373 to conform the newly-codified section to the scope of the service-specific statutes it replaced.

**Section - 809. Quality control in procurements of critical aircraft and ship spare parts.**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal 10 U.S.C. 2383 regarding quality requirements for critical spare parts for ship or aircraft. This repeal is intended to assist the DOD in shifting from reliance on outdated military specifications and standards to use of modern industrial manufacturing methods to ensure quality in critical spare parts.

**Section - 810. Use of funds for acquisition of rights to use designs, processes, technical data and computer software.**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify 10 U.S.C. 2386 regarding types of information the Secretary of Defense may acquire from DOD contractors.

**Section - 811. Independent cost estimates for major defense acquisition programs.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit military departments and defense agencies, independent of their respective Acquisition Executives, to prepare independent cost estimates for major defense acquisitions that are assigned to individual components for oversight. The proposed provision would align the responsibility for independent cost estimating with the level of the decision authority.

**Section - 812. Fees for certain testing services.**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide flexibility for the Secretary of Defense to require reimbursement of indirect as well as direct costs from private sector users of DOD testing facilities.

**Section - 813. Construction, repair, alteration, furnishing, and equipping of naval vessels.**

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 included a provision that inadvertently repealed legislation regarding the application of the Walsh-Healey Act to contracts for the construction, alteration, furnishing or equipping of naval vessels. The committee recommends legislation requested by the Department of Defense that would restore the prior policy.

**Section - 814. Civil Reserve Air Fleet.**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the conditions under which a contractor under the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program is required to commit aircraft for use by the Department of Defense.

**SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS****Section - 821. Procurement technical assistance programs.**

The committee recommends an addition of \$12.0 million to continue the procurement technical assistance center program in 1996. The committee is pleased that the centers, established on a cost-shared basis throughout the United States, have enabled significant numbers of small and other businesses to compete for contracts with federal agencies since 1986. The committee recognizes the potential of the procurement technical assistance centers to support ongoing acquisition reform efforts, and urges the Secretary of Defense to utilize the infrastructure of the centers to implement acquisition streamlining initiatives, such as electronic commerce, in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994.

**Section - 822. Treatment of Department of Defense cable television franchise agreements.**

In the committee's report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, the committee expressed concerns about the lack of consistency in the Department of Defense's treatment of cable television franchise agreements by the military departments. In order to clarify the status of cable television franchise agreements, the committee recommends a provision that would state that such agreements shall be considered contracts for telecommunications services as such services are defined in Part 49 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations.

**OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST****Ship propellers**

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report of the U.S. in-

dustrial capacity to pour and finish non-ferrous castings for both fixed-pitch and controllable-reversible pitch propellers. The Navy, responding for the Secretary of Defense, submitted the report on August 22, 1994. The report dealt with large diameter propellers (diameters greater than 12 feet) that are used on Navy submarines, combatants and auxiliaries, and some Military Sealift Command Ships. The report found that the manufacturing industrial base for propellers of this type was in a fragile state due to a reduction in Navy orders and the lack of commercial shipbuilding. It concluded that, if shipbuilding programs were reduced from the then current future years defense plan, there might be only enough propeller work to sustain one fully integrated facility. The report further stated that the Department might then be required to take special efforts to preserve a U.S. industrial base for the manufacture of large propellers needed for U.S. Navy ships, including limiting procurement to only U.S. sources.

During its review of the budget request, the committee considered recommending a provision that would limit the procurement of Navy ship propellers to domestic sources. To better evaluate the need for such a provision, the committee consulted both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy concerning the need for such a provision. The Secretary of Defense offered the opinion that such a provision was not needed at this time because he already had the authority under 10 U.S.C. 2304 to take protective action.

The committee remains very concerned about the condition of the domestic propeller manufacturing base and urges the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy to take the necessary steps to preserve it.

#### **Worker's compensation coverage on overseas contracts**

Chapter 12 of title 42, United States Code mandates that all non-U.S. government personnel employed by federal contractors overseas be covered by uniform worker's compensation insurance. This insurance coverage is provided on a 24-hour basis for sickness and most accidents and injuries. Currently, each DOD contractor secures its own insurance and writes the cost of the insurance into its contract proposals. The premium charge for this coverage on individual contracts can be very expensive.

The committee is aware that the State Department and the Agency for International Development have instituted programs to consolidate all overseas workers' compensation coverage under a single large contract to realize significant cost savings through economies of scale. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, within thirty days upon enactment of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, to review this approach for providing mandated insurance coverage of foreign national employees by defense contractors overseas, and to assess the feasibility and desirability of such an approach based on potential cost savings and such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate. If the Secretary finds such an approach to be feasible and desirable, the committee directs the Secretary, not later than March 1, 1996, to develop and issue a request for proposals using full and open competitive procedures to establish an agency-wide program for provid-

ing worker's compensation coverage mandated under chapter 12 of title 42 United States Code. The committee directs the Secretary to provide to the congressional defense committees no later than March 31, 1996 a report of his findings and his decision with respect to the feasibility and desirability of providing insurance coverage through a consolidated contract, and a summary of the actions he has undertaken to implement that decision.



## **TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**

### **Section - 901. Redesignation of the position of Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy.**

The committee recommends a provision that would change the name of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Atomic Energy to be the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Chemical and Biological Defense Programs.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

#### **Joint Exercise, Training, and Doctrine Command**

The committee strongly supports the efforts of the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Atlantic Command (USACOM), in assisting in the development of joint doctrine, establishing the standards for joint readiness, and meeting the requirements of a combatant CINC.

The committee urges the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), taking into consideration the functions presently being performed by the Joint Staff and USACOM with respect to joint doctrine, joint readiness, and joint training, to consider forming a Joint Exercise, Training, and Doctrine Command which would concentrate on joint training and readiness. The CJCS might assign this command the responsibility of assisting in ensuring the preparedness and joint readiness of military units stationed in the United States. Such an organization might optimize the efforts of both the Joint Staff and USACOM with a resultant improvement in readiness, training and joint doctrine.

The committee notes that the Joint Warfighting Center at Fort Monroe, Virginia, has the mission to assist the CJCS, CINCs and Chiefs of Services in their preparation for joint and multinational operations in conceptualization, development and in the accomplishment of joint and multinational training and exercises. This center is designed to support the efforts of other commands and agencies through simulation, providing controllers, conducting after action reviews, and developing and reviewing doctrine. While the Joint Warfighting Center could be the nucleus from which a Joint Exercise, Training and Doctrine Command could be formed, the responsibilities of such a new organization would be significantly greater than those currently assigned to the Joint Warfighting Center.

#### **Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense**

The committee believes that careful consideration should be given to reorganizing the management headquarters of the Department of Defense, particularly as the military departments and the defense agencies downsize and streamline their activities. While the committee is not making specific recommendations on how such

a reorganization might be accomplished, the Report of the Commission on Roles and Missions provides a base from which to begin.

Specifically, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study of the management headquarters of the Department of Defense, including the military services, with the goal of identifying any reorganization and streamlining necessary to prepare those headquarters for the 21st century. The Secretary shall report the results of the study to the Congress, specifically addressing the need for the reorganization and streamlining of such headquarters and how best to accomplish any necessary reorganization and streamlining, including any proposed legislation to bring such about. The report, separate from the Secretary's comments concerning the Roles and Missions Commission's report, should be delivered to the appropriate committees of the Congress not later than May 1, 1996.

The committee believes that many of the recommendations in the Report of the Commission on Roles and Missions merit careful consideration. For example, the Commission on Roles and Missions made a specific recommendation that the Secretary of Defense create an objective integration element within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Such an integration element could be a Chief of Staff or Director of the Defense Staff with the function of ensuring integration and coordination so as to facilitate unity of effort of OSD. This function could be accomplished, for example, by assigning additional duties to the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The committee notes that the Roles and Missions Commission made several recommendations concerning the organization and roles of the Service secretariats and service staffs. The study directed by the committee should make recommendations concerning the advisability of maintaining the current layering of civilian and uniformed service staffs or propose changes to make these staffs more effective.

The committee believes that the primary focus of the Office of the Secretary of Defense should be the formulation and review of policy and that operational issues should be the primary function of the Joint Staff. The Roles and Missions report recommended the Secretary of Defense develop a directive clarifying the scope of responsibilities and relationships for the OSD staff. Such a directive could assist in reducing redundancy and improving responsiveness to new and evolving missions.

Finally, the committee notes that the Roles and Missions Commission recommended that the Secretary of Defense direct that additional analytical and technical resources be provided to the Joint Staff to assist the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, particularly with respect to expansion of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

In a separate but related effort, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review and report on the actual size of the management headquarters within the Department of Defense, including the military services, not later than March 1, 1996. As the operating forces are being reduced, there is a perception that management headquarters are growing. In the past when the Congress has directed reductions in management headquarters, personnel and spaces have been transferred to field operating agencies and

activities without any substantive change in their activities or responsibilities. This directed review and report should include the management headquarters and all field operating agencies or activities. The report should include a description of actions planned or implemented as a result of the study and any recommended legislative changes which would assist the Department in achieving improved readiness, effectiveness and efficiency.



## **TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS**

#### **Section - 1002. Disbursing and certifying officials.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the designation and appointment of disbursing and certifying officials within the Department of Defense (including the military departments, defense agencies and field activities). This provision would strengthen internal controls by providing a separation of duties between personnel who authorize payments (certifying officials) and personnel who make payments (disbursing officials). Liability for payment authorized would be at the source of origination (the certifying official), which is more in line with normal financial procedures.

This provision supports the department's financial management consolidation efforts by defining the responsibilities and liabilities of disbursing and certifying officials. Relief from liability is provided for in appropriate cases where accountability for the loss is determined and a diligent effort to collect money owed to the government has been made.

#### **Section - 1003. Defense modernization account.**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Defense Modernization Account to encourage savings within DOD, and make those savings available to address the serious shortfall in funding for modernization.

Under the proposed legislation, the Secretary of Defense could place in the Defense Modernization Account funds saved from achieving economies and efficiencies in procurement programs and installation management. In order to encourage savings by the military departments and DOD components, funds placed in the account would be reserved for use by the department or component that generated the savings.

Funds placed in the account could be used only for modernization of an existing system, modernization of a system that is the subject of an ongoing procurement, or increasing the quantity of a procurement in order to achieve a more cost-efficient production rate. No funds could be made available from the account except through established reprogramming procedures, including applicable congressional approval requirements. Reprogramming procedures could not be used to exceed statutory funding or quantity ceilings applicable to the program. The amount that could be reprogrammed in any one year for DOD as a whole could not exceed \$500 million. Amounts more than \$500 million could not be made available except through legislation authorizing and appropriating the funds.

The committee believes that this provision will provide an important incentive for the military departments and DOD components

to achieve savings, and will provide a means for directing such savings to the urgent shortfalls in modernization funding.

**Section - 1004. Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1995.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the emergency supplemental appropriations enacted in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-6). This supplemental provided funding for fiscal year 1995 expenses related to military operations in Southwest Asia, Haiti, Cuba, Somalia, Bosnia, and Korea.

**Section - 1005. Limitation on use of authority to pay for emergency and extraordinary expenses.**

In January 1995, the Department of Defense notified Congress that \$4.7 million had been obligated from operation and maintenance accounts for the purchase and shipment of heavy oil to North Korea, in partial fulfillment of U.S. commitments under the U.S.-North Korea Nuclear Framework Agreement concluded on October 21, 1994. This obligation was incurred under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 127 to pay emergency and extraordinary expenses of the Department of Defense which cannot be anticipated or classified.

The administration advised Congress that this defense spending authority was invoked because Department of State funds normally used for foreign aid were not available in this case because of the long-standing statutory prohibition on using foreign assistance funds to aid terrorist nations. North Korea is included on the Department of State's list of nations that support or engage in international terrorism.

Although the exercise of the emergency and extraordinary expenses authority cited above does not require prior consultation with Congress, the committee is concerned that the administration apparently chose voluntarily not to discuss this matter with Congress in advance of taking the unusual step of using defense funds for foreign aid. The committee is particularly concerned that such aid was provided to North Korea from Department of Defense funds rather than Department of State foreign assistance funds.

Therefore, the committee supports a provision that requires prior notifications to Congress for any use of the emergency and extraordinary expenses authority in excess of \$500,000, except in cases where the Secretary of Defense determines that such advance notification would compromise national security.

**Section - 1006. Transfer authority regarding funds available for foreign currency fluctuations.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a foreign currency fluctuation account for the military personnel appropriation. This authorization is limited to the fiscal year 1993 and subsequent year appropriations. Overseas allowances are subject to currency fluctuations and this authority will give the military departments flexibility to manage the military personnel appropriation.

**Section - 1007. Report on budget submission regarding reserve components.**

The committee believes that the National Guard and the other reserve components should be adequately equipped in order to perform effectively the missions required of them both in peace and war.

As the active components of our military services have been downsized over the past several years, reliance on our reserve components has grown. The Bottom-Up Review relies on the enhancement of National Guard brigades in order to execute the "two nearly-simultaneous major regional conflict" strategy.

As a result of shortfalls of modern weapons and equipment in the reserve components and the lack of adequate resources requested for National Guard and Reserve equipment in annual budget submissions, the committee has supported over several years initiatives originating within the Congress to provide more modern weapons and equipment for National Guard and Reserves. While the committee believes this support has done a great deal to enhance the capabilities and effectiveness of reserve components, it is apparent that the Department of Defense has grown to rely on annual congressional increases for National Guard and Reserve equipment and does not include in annual budget requests adequate resources for reserve components.

The committee is also concerned that the reserve components do not receive appropriate priority for the allocation of military construction projects and notes that a similar practice of annual increases by the Congress has ensued.

The committee intends that the National Guard and Reserves should be adequately resourced by the DOD. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a special report to the congressional defense committees at the same time as the fiscal year 1997 budget submission, describing measures taken within DOD to ensure that the reserve components are appropriately funded, and listing the major weapons and items of equipment as well as the military construction projects provided for the National Guard and Reserves.

**SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS**

**Section - 1011. Iowa class battleships.**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to restore at least two *Iowa* class battleships to the naval register, and to retain them in its strategic reserve, available for reactivation, until he is prepared to certify that the Navy has replaced the potential shore fire support the battleships could provide with an operational surface fire support capability that equals or exceeds it. The discussion of naval surface fire support of this report sets forth in Title II the rationale for this recommendation in more detail.

**Section - 1012. Transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer eight FFG-7 Class guided missile

frigates to various countries. The Chief of Naval Operations has certified that these naval vessels are not essential to the defense of the U.S. Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with the transfer will be charged to the recipient.

### **SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES**

#### **Section - 1021. Revision and clarification of authority for Federal support of drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the National Guard.**

#### **Section - 1022. National Drug Intelligence Center.**

#### **Section - 1023. Assistance to Customs Service.**

The budget request for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities totals \$680.4 million, plus \$131.5 million for OPTEMPO which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. These numbers compare with \$714.2 million for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, and \$199.1 million for OPTEMPO in the military services' budgets in the fiscal year 1995 budget request.

The committee is advised that approximately 70 percent of the illegal drugs entering the United States comes mainly by air into Mexico and is then transported across the southwest border, primarily by trucks and automobiles. Since Mexico is not assigned to any of the combatant commands, the committee recommends that the Commander, SOUTHCOM or the Commander, USACOM, be assigned responsibility for Mexico, if only for counterdrug and drug interdiction purposes.

The committee continues to believe that the development and employment of effective non-intrusive inspection devices at key border entry points would provide significant deterrence and seizure capabilities. The committee has strongly supported these efforts over the past five years. Results of tests of these devices continues to be encouraging. The advanced X-ray at Otay Mesa, CA successfully completed tests and has been turned over to the U.S. Customs Service. The committee continues to support a strategy of developing mobile detection systems, with different technologies for deployment to test sites, for demonstration and evaluation. If successful, these systems will provide effective coverage of a large number of ports with a limited number of inspection systems.

The committee believes that investment in non-intrusive inspection devices will yield much higher payoff than other DOD efforts to assist law enforcement agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would provide necessary authority for the procurement of these devices by DOD or transfer of funds from DOD to Customs Service for this purpose. The committee also recommends \$25.0 million for the procurement and deployment of non-intrusive detection devices. In turn, the Commissioner of Customs has agreed to provide \$12.0 million for the additional procurement of such devices, and has committed to operate and maintain all these devices with Customs resources. The committee expects these devices to be procured and deployed as soon as possible at entry points along the southwest border.

The committee is pleased with the progress of the Gulf States Counterdrug Initiative (GSCI), and recommends an increase of \$2.0 million to enhance GSCI efforts in Mississippi to bring those operations up to the level of those in Alabama and Louisiana. The committee commends the Department of Defense and the Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support for their support of the GSCI program and encourages the DOD to continue to provide necessary funding for this program in the future.

The committee is aware of a number of initiatives which would enhance counterdrug and drug interdiction operations in the source countries, and recommends \$15.2 million for development and procurement of the following items/systems: refurbishment and relocation of U.S. ground-based radars, high frequency secure communications among allied (Andean Ridge) nations, night vision goggles and global positioning systems, FAA flight plan computers, podded radars, direction-finding capability, and secure tactical field and aircraft radios. The committee cautions DOD to ensure that all applicable laws are observed in the execution of these programs, including, in particular, section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 374 note).

The committee notes that the National Drug Intelligence Center (NDIC) is an activity operated by the Department of Justice but totally financed by the DOD. The committee recommends a provision which would prohibit further DOD funding of NDIC. If the Department of Justice chooses to operate NDIC with DOJ funds, the Secretary of Defense may continue to provide DOD intelligence personnel to support intelligence activities at NDIC as long as the number of personnel provided by DOD does not exceed the number provided to support intelligence activities at NDIC on the date of enactment of this bill.

The committee recommends deletion of funding for community outreach programs within the DOD Interdiction and Counterdrug Program.

The committee recommends a provision which would revise and clarify authority for federal support of drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the National Guard.

*Drug Interdiction & Counterdrug Activities, Operations and Maintenance (in thousands of dollars)*

	<i>Thousands</i>
Fiscal Year 1996 Drug and Counterdrug Request .....	\$680,400
Source Nation Support .....	\$127,300
Dismantling Cartels .....	\$64,300
Detection and Monitoring .....	\$111,700
Law Enforcement Agency Support .....	\$279,300
Demand Reduction .....	\$97,800
Reductions	
Community Outreach Programs .....	\$8,236
National Drug Intelligence Center .....	\$34,000
Increases	
Non-Intrusive Inspection Devices, Procurement .....	\$25,000
Gulf States Counterdrug Initiative .....	\$2,000
Source Nation Support Initiatives .....	\$15,236
Recommendation .....	\$680,400

**SUBTITLE D—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAMS**

**Section - 1031. Continuation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.**

The committee recommends a provision that would reaffirm the prohibition of the closure of the University, and establish minimum staffing levels.

**Section - 1032. Additional graduate schools and programs at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional graduate schools and programs at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. This provision would permit the Board of Regents to establish a graduate school of nursing at the University.

**Section - 1033. Funding for basic adult education programs for military personnel and dependents outside the United States.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military continuing education programs of the armed services and adult members of their families stationed or residing outside the United States. This provision would authorize funding of the same literacy and citizenship programs now available to persons residing in the United States.

**Section - 1034. Scope of education programs of Community College of the Air Force.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9315 of title 10, United States Code to limit the scope of the Community College of the Air Force to Air Force personnel.

**Section - 1035. Date for annual report on Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would change the date on which the annual report on selected reserve educational assistance program is due to the Congress from December 15 to March 1 of each year.

**SUBTITLE E—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION**

**Section - 1041. Cooperative Threat Reduction programs defined.**

**Section - 1042. Funding matters.**

**Section - 1043. Limitation relating to offensive biological warfare program of Russia.**

In 1991, the Congress established the Nunn-Lugar Program, now called the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program, authorizing the Department of Defense to assist the Soviet Union and its successor countries to destroy their weapons of mass destruction

and reduce the threat posed by the proliferation of these weapons. To date, the Congress has approved \$1.25 billion to achieve the objectives established for the program.

The fiscal year 1996 budget included a request for \$371.0 million in the operation and maintenance account of the Department of Defense to continue activities to denuclearize and reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction in the countries of the former Soviet Union.

The committee recommends a reduction of \$6.0 million to the budget request for fiscal year 1996. The committee is concerned about reported problems with achieving CTR program objectives, including: progress in full implementation of audit and examination agreements to determine that CTR funds are being used for their intended purposes; Department of Defense funding of housing for Russian military officers; and uncertainties regarding the successful evaluation of the technology which Russia has selected for destruction of its chemical weapons stockpile. At the same time, the committee takes note of the Secretary of Defense's written rebuttal of these criticisms. The committee continues to be concerned about Russia's compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and recommends a provision that would require the President to certify Russia's compliance with the BWC.

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to facilitate the dismantlement and destruction of strategic offensive weapons in the states of the former Soviet Union and military and defense exchanges between the U.S. and the countries of the former Soviet Union. The committee also supports joint business partnerships formed between U.S. industry and defense enterprises and partners in the former Soviet Union to engage defense enterprises associated with the research, development and production of strategic offensive arms to private, peaceful commercial activities.

The committee recommends an amendment to Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 to allow funds authorized to execute the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to be used to reimburse the military personnel appropriations accounts for pay and allowances paid to reserve component personnel while they are engaged in military-to-military or defense contacts authorized in the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program.

#### **SUBTITLE F—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS**

##### **Section - 1051. Cooperative research and development agreements with NATO organizations.**

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical and conforming amendment to section 2350b of title 10, United States Code, to make it consistent with action taken in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, which amended section 2350a.

##### **Section - 1052. National security implications of United States export control policy.**

The increased use of commercial-off-the shelf technologies by the Department of Defense and the military services, and the relax-

ation of export controls on dual-use items and sensitive military technologies, has caused the committee great concern. Lowering export controls on dual-use items and technologies may place current U.S. technologies and defense capabilities at risk. In particular, the committee is concerned about the export of satellite, satellite-related technologies, and services.

The committee is also troubled by the administration's efforts to support the inclusion of countries as members of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), and consulting with Congress about the administration's efforts, only after it is a *fait accompli*. Recently, the administration has made overtures of support to a number of countries whose records on the sale of space launch vehicle (SLV) technology is at variance with the goals of the MTCR regime.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Department of Defense to provide a detailed report on its role in the review of licenses for dual use technologies.

The report shall include the following:

- (1) administration plans to revise its export control policy on dual-use items and militarily critical technologies which could have adverse consequences for national security;
- (2) The process for resolving disputes between the Department of Defense, Department of State and Department of Commerce, over licensing requirements for particular items, or whether to grant a license to a particular country, so that export policy serves both United States national security interests as well as U.S. economic interests.

#### *Review of export licenses for biological pathogens*

The committee is concerned about exports of biological and medical samples that could be used to support a biological warfare program. Because the Department of Defense must prepare for military operations in areas or against nations with known or suspected biological warfare programs, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should take an active role in reviewing and approving export licenses for class 2, 3, and 4 biological pathogens with a potential for use in biological warfare program.

Additionally, the committee believes that copies of all export license requests for class 2, 3, and 4 biological pathogens to countries with known or suspected biological warfare programs, even if denied, should be made available to the appropriate intelligence community elements to facilitate the full and ongoing evaluation of those programs.

#### **Section - 1053. Defense export loan guarantees.**

During a period of reduced funding for purchases of weapon systems and other defense equipment, defense exports make a significant contribution to the preservation of the industrial and technology base supporting national security. Such exports are a major factor in preserving jobs for some of the most skilled American workers. The international defense market, however, is very competitive, and the ability of a defense company to offer better-than-market financing can be decisive for the consummation of an export sale. In fact, to an increasing extent countries are now requir-

ing the provision of export loan guarantees as a precondition for submitting a bid for the sale of defense articles. For that reason, most foreign defense suppliers have access to government-subsidized loan guarantees for the export of defense equipment.

In order to provide the same advantage to U.S. defense companies, the committee recommends a provision that would establish a loan guarantee program in the Department of Defense for the export of defense articles, services, or design and construction services. Countries eligible for loan guarantees under this section include the members of NATO, major non-NATO allies, the democratic states of Eastern Europe, and the member nations of Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). The obligations under the program would be paid from a revolving fund financed through exposure fees charged to the recipients of the loan guarantees.

#### **Section - 1054. Landmine clearing assistance program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$20.0 million in operation and maintenance accounts for the Department of Defense to carry out humanitarian landmine clearing activities during fiscal year 1996. The committee also terminates the use of Department of Defense funds to carry out this activity after fiscal year 1996. The committee believes that this activity is more appropriately funded through the international affairs budget function. Additionally, the committee requires that the Secretary of Defense certify 30 days in advance of obligation of funds that the involvement of personnel in this activity fulfills military training requirements.

The committee also recommends a provision that would amend the current definition of landmine to clarify that "remotely operated devices" are not included for the purposes of the landmine export moratorium.

#### *Landmine Convention*

The United States military services have identified land mines as a significant threat to future force projections and military operations other than war. As a result, the United States, through the services have provided training and education assistance for humanitarian landmine activities, to include the development of technology for mine detection, classification, mapping, and neutralization to regions such as Africa, Asia and Latin America. In March 1995, the Senate provided its advice and consent to ratification of the Convention on Conventional Weapons (Treaty Document 103-25). In providing its support for ratification of this treaty, the committee identified a number of concerns related to future amendments to the Convention at the upcoming September 1995 Review Conference.

The committee is concerned about possible administration plans to amend the Convention to establish a verification and compliance commission. The committee believes a large, expensive bureaucracy should not be established and that careful consideration be given to the precedent-setting nature of an enforcement commission.

Lastly, the committee also believes that command-detonated claymore-type mines must be excluded from the coverage of any fu-

ture amendments intended to tighten restrictions on the use of landmines.

The committee urges the administration to continue to encourage more nations to ratify the Convention, particularly undeveloped nations where internal conflicts are on the rise, and where the use of landmines and booby-traps are likely.

**Section - 1055. Strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel.**

The committee recommends a provision which expresses the sense of Congress supporting continued cooperation between the United States and Israel in military and technical areas; in particular, in missile defense systems. This provision calls for the elimination of unnecessary barriers to collaboration between the two allies in order to maintain Israel's qualitative edge over potential adversaries in conventional weaponry and missile defenses.

The committee believes that both the United States and Israel have benefitted from this collaborative effort. The committee recognizes that Israel is engaged in a peace initiative that could pose increased risks to its security. Maintaining Israel's defense qualitative edge is thus more critical now than perhaps at any other time. However, the committee also notes that U.S. national security concerns, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, must limit cooperation in certain technical areas.

**Section - 1056. Support services for the Navy at the Port of Haifa, Israel.**

The Navy relies heavily on the Port of Haifa, Israel to support fleet operations in the eastern Mediterranean. Sixth Fleet ships operating in that region conduct most of their port calls in Haifa. The Navy has completed an initial phase of upgrades to enhance the support services available at Haifa.

The committee recommends a provision expressing the sense of Congress that the Navy should pursue a follow-on phase of upgrades to improve these services; and ensure that such support remains available in the future as commercial activities continue to expand at Haifa. For example, the port uses a water taxi system to transport personnel from larger ships moored away from the piers. Measures to enhance safety of the water taxi system are of particular interest to the committee. The committee notes that 21 U.S. sailors died in 1990 when their water taxi capsized. The committee believes that a modernized water taxi system could prevent another such accident.

The committee directs the Navy to begin discussions promptly with Port of Haifa and other local officials. The committee expects the Navy to use these discussions to develop detailed plans for the next phase of support services upgrades. Plans should include, at a minimum, safety of water taxi service available to the Sixth Fleet at Haifa. The Navy is directed to report periodically to the committee on its progress in developing these plans.

**Section - 1057. Prohibition on assistance to terrorist countries.**

As noted in report language accompanying the bill section on "Limitation on Use of Authority to Pay for Emergency and Extraordinary Expenses," the committee is troubled by the use of the department's Emergency and Extraordinary Expenses account to pay for the purchase and shipment of heavy oil to North Korea, a nation listed by the Department of State as supporting international terrorism. Although this obligation was incurred to fulfill a U.S. commitment to North Korea under the Nuclear Framework Agreement, the committee believes, nevertheless, it was a questionable use of defense funds.

Consequently, the committee recommends a provision, similar to language in the annual foreign assistance legislation, which would prohibit the use of any funds available to the Department of Defense to assist nations on the terrorism list.

**Section - 1058. International military education and training.**

The IMET program is central and cost-effective to the success of U.S. regional security strategies. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commanders in Chief (CINCs) of the regional combatant commands have testified repeatedly that the IMET program is, dollar-for-dollar, the best tool in establishing security relationships with friendly nations. Because of today's fast-breaking and sometimes unpredictable developments, IMET contributes to more inter-operability and smoother coalition-building with other nations. From fiscal year 1988 through fiscal year 1993, annual IMET appropriations ranged from \$47.4 million to \$42.5 million. Then, in fiscal year 1994, funding was precipitously cut in half, to \$21.3 million, with only a modest recovery to \$25.5 million in fiscal year 1995.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense, upon the recommendation of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or a regional combatant CINC, to provide up to \$20.0 million for the provision of international training and education to countries allied and friendly to the United States. This amount is authorized to be funded from amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance for defense-wide activities and is subject to the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This would help to return IMET closer to traditional funding levels.

**Section - 1060. Implementation of arms control agreements.**

The fiscal year 1996 budget request for arms control implementation is based on assumptions regarding the dates on which treaties will likely enter into force and includes funds for the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA), the military services, and defense agencies. To date, a number of treaties and agreements have not been ratified by all signatories, thus resulting in a delay in the date of entry into force. Those treaties and agreements not yet entered into force include the Open Skies Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention, START II, and the U.S.-Russia Bilateral Destruction Agreement. As a result, the committee recommends a reduction of

\$12.0 million in the O&M account for OSIA, and reduction of \$6.0 million to the Army, \$7.0 million to the Navy, and \$8.0 million to the Air Force O&M accounts for arms control compliance activities as a result of reduced requirements in fiscal year 1996.

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (H. Rept. 103-357) directed the Department of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees in writing 30 days prior to U.S. agreement to any recommendations of the various consultative commissions that would result in either a technical change to the treaty or agreement affecting inspection and monitoring provisions, or that would result in increased costs of implementation.

The department's notification to the Congress of agreement to recommendations of the consultative commissions made by treaty partners or by the United States has been erratic at best. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of defense funds to reimburse expenses that signatories, other than the United States, are obligated to incur pursuant to treaties or agreements with the United States which have entered into force, where the Congress has not received 30 days notice prior to agreement between the parties in the consultative commission.

Furthermore, the committee remains concerned that the arms control consultative commissions are being used to facilitate changes or modifications to arms control treaties and agreements, such as inspection or monitoring provisions, or obligations of the parties, which should be brought to the Senate for its advice and consent.

**Section - 1061. Sense of Congress on limiting the placing of United States forces under United Nations Command or Control.**

The committee recommends a provision expressing the sense of Congress on placing U.S. forces under the operational control of the United Nations for the purpose of conducting peace operations.

The administration's policy on peace operations, spelled out in Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD-25) in May 1994, places considerable emphasis on U.N. peacekeeping and peace enforcement as a major foreign policy tool of the United States. The administration's preference for acting under the U.N. rather than unilaterally (or through other, more limited multi-lateral arrangements) is usually justified on the grounds that it reduces the burden to the U.S. by spreading costs among U.N. member nations. However, this redoubled commitment to the U.N. has led to a marked increase in the number and scope of peace operations undertaken by the U.N. Thus the potential reduction in the burden borne by the U.S. is offset by the proliferation of extended and costly operations. Moreover, the U.N., with the full support of the U.S. government, has in many cases taken on tasks which exceed its capabilities. The results have ranged from disappointing to disastrous.

Furthermore, the administration's emphasis on the U.N. as a key component of U.S. foreign and security policy suggests confusion over the legitimacy of the unilateral use of force by the United States. The administration appears to believe that activities under

U.N. authority give global legitimacy to mediating disputes, demobilizing armed factions, arranging cease fires, or providing emergency and humanitarian relief. Conversely, the administration's actions suggest a belief that unilateral U.S. actions are less legitimate and less justifiable than actions taken under the auspices of the U.N.

This belief in the superiority of U.N. action over unilateral U.S. action has logically and inevitably led to a willingness to place U.S. forces under the operational control of U.N. in peacekeeping missions. However, inherent deficiencies in U.N. command and control arrangements, combined with the lack of mission clarity inherent in peace operations, have undermined the success of some peacekeeping missions, and contributed to the endangerment and loss of life of participating personnel.

Consequently, the committee supports the section expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. forces should not be placed under operational control of the U.N. without close and prior consultation with Congress; should only be placed under qualified commanders and clear, effective command and control, and then only when clearly in the national interest; and that U.S. forces should not be placed under the operational control of foreign commanders in peace enforcement missions except in the most extraordinary circumstances.

#### **SUBTITLE G—REPEAL OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

##### **Reduction of reporting requirements**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate 67 statutory reports recommended for elimination by the Department of Defense under section 1151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

#### **SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS**

##### **Section - 1081. Global positioning system.**

The committee has received the reports on the Global Positioning System (GPS) prepared by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) and the National Research Council (NRC), pursuant to a provision the committee recommended in the Fiscal Year 1994 National Defense Authorization Act. The committee expresses its deep appreciation to the participants from both groups for their comprehensive reports.

The committee also acknowledges the recent findings and recommendations of the Defense Science Board (DSB), which will soon issue its own report on GPS. With a few salient exceptions, the DSB and NAPA/NRC reports contain similar recommendations. Both recommend that the Department of Defense begin immediately to prepare for situations in which GPS signals are denied, either as a result of U.S. or foreign jamming. Both recommend that DOD prepare for widespread availability of differential GPS. Both also urge the military to move rapidly to heavy, if not exclusive, reliance on the encrypted P(Y) code. Although the DSB and NAPA/NRC reports differ on the timetable for suspending the use of the

Selective Availability (SA) feature (NAPA/NRC calls for immediate suspension), both indicate that DOD must prepare for the day when SA is turned off.

The committee generally accepts the findings and recommendations from these reports, with one exception: the committee believes that an immediate suspension of SA, as recommended in the NAPA/NRC reports, would be both premature and risky. The committee agrees that the SA function should be eliminated by a *date certain*, and before the end of this decade. The committee further agrees that, in the interim prior to termination of the SA function, DOD must undertake a vigorous research and development program focused on two interrelated objectives. First, DOD needs to develop methods to jam or otherwise counter potential enemy use of GPS signals to target U.S. forces and installations within a theater of operations. Second, DOD needs to develop methods to improve the performance of our GPS-equipped weapons platforms, and, even more important, the effectiveness of our GPS-aided weapons, against hostile efforts (or even the effects of our own denial actions) to jam or degrade high-precision GPS signals.

Accordingly, the committee increases the requested RDT&E funds for the GPS Block IIF program by \$10.0 million in program element 0604480F for the development of a comprehensive plan, and to initiate those R&D activities necessary to insure effective use of high-precision GPS signals by U.S. forces, and effective denial of the use of those signals by potential enemies. To ensure that this matter is taken seriously, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to turn off SA by May 1, 1996 unless the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a plan for achieving a capability to deny hostile use of GPS without hindering our own ability to exploit GPS, and for substantially improving the jam-resistance of our GPS-aided weapons and platforms. The Secretary's report should address the full range of recommendations issued by the National Research Council and the Defense Science Board in their respective studies, including the recommendations to add another GPS signal to the Block IIR and Block IIF satellites, and to improve the operational control segment. The committee believes that these recommendations, if implemented, would enhance the military, civilian, and commercial utility of the system at modest cost, and help to ensure that GPS will not face meaningful competition in the future.

**Section - 1082. Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems.**

The committee has reviewed the findings and recommendations of the administration's Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). The NPR recommends reductions to the B-52 bomber force beginning in fiscal year 1996, and the scrapping of four Trident submarines beginning in 2000, if the START II Treaty has been ratified and is on track to enter into force. As part of the entry into force of the Treaty, the U.S. would make an irrevocable declaration that its accountable sea-based forces consist of 14 Trident submarines, each containing 24 launchers, with each launcher containing 5 reentry vehicles (RVs). The committee is concerned that those NPR recommendations appear to be cost-effective *only* under the assump-

tion that the START II Treaty will be ratified and enter into force *and* that there will be no *further* arms reductions treaties.

The planned retirements recommended in the NPR of 28 of the 94 B-52 bombers during the next fiscal year, and four of the 18 Trident submarines beginning in the year 2000 (with each remaining Trident missile to carry five RVs), would clearly retain nearly the same total weapons loading as would be permitted under the START II Treaty if there were *no* retirements of delivery systems, and would reduce the long-term operating cost. However, the required backfitting of Trident II missiles into the four West Coast Trident submarines to be retained would eliminate most of those potential savings in operating costs until well after the turn of the century. Thus, if the START II Treaty were implemented promptly, not abrogated, and not superseded by further arms control agreements, long-term savings would accrue.

Other futures are possible, indeed, more probable, given the uncertainties of the post-Cold War world. For example, the NPR argues that its reduced force structure would provide an adequate "hedge" capability against the possibility of a failure of democracy in Russia. Yet it is clear that a force structure containing all 94 B-52s and all 18 Trident submarines would provide both higher force survivability and a larger number of available weapons than the NPR force structure. Thus, the larger force structure would be more effective than the NPR force, should international events force us to increase our nuclear deterrent.

Another possible future is that the START II Treaty will be ratified and enter into force on (roughly) the timetable contained in the Treaty. In this instance, it may be judged likely that there will be *further* arms control negotiations. Should such negotiations begin, the U.S. will be entering them from a position in which it has just *unilaterally* retired four Trident submarines as a part of its implementation of START II, plus the retirement during 1996 of 28 B-52 bombers. It is unlikely that *any* negotiating partner would give the U.S. side any credit for our prior unilateral reductions. Thus, it is entirely possible that U.S. negotiators could be pressed during "START III" negotiations to agree to *lower* limits on precisely those weapons systems that were unilaterally and unnecessarily retired while the START II Treaty was being implemented. This could even lead to a situation in which the U.S. would face the prospect of retiring one or more of the Trident submarines that had just undergone a costly backfit of Trident II missiles.

Thus, the committee concludes that the NPR recommendations appear to be cost-effective only under the narrow assumption that the START II Treaty is rapidly implemented, adhered to faithfully, and not superseded by more restrictive treaty limits. In that case, modest long-term savings would begin to accrue sometime after the turn of the century. Under *other*, more plausible scenarios, however, the NPR would clearly be less cost-effective than retaining the largest force structure consistent with the terms of the START I and START II Treaties. The committee does not regard the possibility of modest savings in the long-term as an adequate rationale for the selection of an inferior deterrent posture.

Given these uncertainties, the committee proposes several actions. First, the committee recommends a provision expressing the

sense of Congress that no strategic nuclear delivery system should be retired until START II enters into force. This provision also prohibits the retirement, or preparation for retirement, of such delivery systems during fiscal year 1996. Second, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to fully fund all activities necessary for the backfitting of Trident II missiles into at least four West Coast Trident submarines on the schedule recommended in the NPR. The committee recommends a provision to repeal the existing prohibition on backfit of Trident submarines. Third, the committee directs the Department of the Navy to continue to fund both in its fiscal year 1997 budget and in the Future Years Defense Program adequate operational support for Trident I missiles to insure the option of retaining all 18 Trident submarines on full operational status, assuming backfits of the final four submarines with Trident II missiles would be scheduled following the completion of the first four conversions.

The committee is also concerned by the administration's failure to prepare a plan for maintaining the nuclear weapons necessary for a credible upload hedge. The committee notes that this was an integral part of the NPR recommendation and is critical to the maintenance of a credible hedge. Unfortunately, to date the Department of Energy has failed in its responsibility to support such a hedge. The committee believes that maintaining 3,500 active warheads pursuant to the START II limitations is only half of a credible plan. In order to have a serious and credible hedge capability, in addition to the active stockpile, DOE must maintain an inactive stockpile that is ready to be promptly uploaded onto existing delivery systems. This inactive stockpile must be maintained at a level no lower than that which would be required to promptly and fully upload all existing strategic nuclear delivery systems in today's inventory. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require DOE to maintain, and remanufacture as necessary, sufficient warheads to be able to implement the upload outlined above.

**Section - 1083. National Guard Civilian Youth Opportunities Pilot Program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for the National Guard Youth Opportunities program through 1997. No funding was authorized by this provision.

**Section - 1084. Report on Department of Defense boards and commissions.**

The committee is concerned over growth in the number of congressionally mandated boards and commissions that may not merit the department's continued support, either through funding or manpower. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a list to Congress that identifies those boards and commissions that are deemed desirable for retention and compatible with efficient management, and those that are not. In each case, the Secretary shall also describe the level of funding and manpower required, and provide a brief summary of the reasons for the proposed retention or dissolution of such boards.

**Section - 1085. Revision of authority for providing Army support for the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics.**

The committee has included a legislative provision that would clarify the Army's relationship with the foundation and the National Science Center Discovery Center, a non-profit organization. The committee is pleased with the progress made to establish the discovery center as a national center dedicated to communication and electronics. The committee urges the center to expedite its transition to self-supporting status through entry fees. The committee also directs the Army to establish revised or new memorandums of agreement with the center and the foundation to implement this new legislation.

**Section - 1086. Authority to suspend or terminate collection actions against deceased members.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3711 of title 31 United States Code to rescind the requirement to initiate and pursue collection action against the estates of service members who die on active duty while indebted to the government. The provision would provide the Secretary of Defense discretionary authority to suspend or terminate collection actions when a service member dies while indebted to the government and the Secretary determines that collection action is inappropriate.

**Section - 1087. Damage or loss to personal property due to emergency evacuation or extraordinary circumstances.**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not acting as part of the Department of Defense, to waive the settlement and payment limitations in certain instances up to \$100,000 per claim. The current maximum is \$40,000. This authority would be available when the claims concern damage or loss of personal property, and the Secretary concerned determines that such claims arose from an emergency evacuation or other extraordinary circumstances. The provision would assist service personnel in obtaining appropriate compensation in instances similar to the evacuation of Clark Air Force Base, without the need for special legislation.

**Section - 1088. Check cashing and exchange transactions for dependents of United States Government personnel.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize United States disbursing personnel to extend check-cashing and currency exchange services to the dependents of military and civilian personnel at government installations that do not have adequate banking facilities. The provision would require that the dependent's sponsor provide written authorization to enable the dependent to present checks. The sponsor would be responsible for any loss incurred by the government as a result of a dishonored check.

**Section – 1089. Travel of disabled veterans on military aircraft.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit veterans eligible for compensation for a service-connected disability the same entitlement to space-available transportation as retired members of the Armed Forces.

**Section – 1090. Transportation of crippled children in Pacific rim region to Hawaii for medical care.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit space-available transportation of crippled children in the Pacific Rim region to Hawaii for medical care in non-military medical facilities.

**Section – 1091. Student information for recruiting purposes.**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the Sense of the Senate that educational institutions, including secondary schools, should not deny military recruiters access to their campuses or schoolyards.

Across the nation, military recruiters are facing an increasingly difficult time attracting quality individuals to military service. In view of this challenging environment, the Congress has been very responsive in terms of increased funding for recruiting and advertising.

It has long been recognized that high school graduates are the single most important source of enlisted recruits. To permit public high schools and community colleges to deny access to military recruiters while authorizing significant amounts of tax dollars to support military recruiting and advertising is counterproductive, at best.

**Section – 1092. State recognition of military advance medical directives.**

The Patient Self-Determination Act (PSDA) (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(f)(1)) requires medical facilities that receive Medicaid and Medicare funds to establish procedures for handling patients' advance medical directives (AMDs), and to inform patients about their rights to make AMDs under state law. The PSDA left the substance of the law to the states, resulting in the adoption of different forms and procedural requirements.

Members of the armed forces and their families are subject to frequent travel from state to state because of reassignments and duty requirements. As a result, it is very difficult to ensure that a military member's AMD prepared in one state will be honored in another. In view of diverse state requirements and the inherently mobile military lifestyle, there is a need for uniform treatment of AMDs prepared for military personnel.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish in 10 U.S.C. 1044c a requirement that AMDs prepared by members of the armed forces, their spouses, or other persons eligible for legal assistance under section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, be recognized by the state where the member, spouse, or other person is located at the time of incapacitation.

**Section - 1093. Report on personnel requirements for control of transfer of certain weapons.**

On four previous occasions, the Congress has enacted legislation requiring the Departments of Defense and Energy to submit a report describing the personnel resources for implementing non-proliferation policy responsibilities relating to weapons of mass destruction. To date, the departments have not complied with any of these statutory requirements.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Departments of Defense and Energy to submit the report within thirty days of enactment of this Act and explain its noncompliance with previous reporting requirements.

**Section - 1094. Extension of period of Vietnam era.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 101(29) of title 38, United States Code, to extend the beginning of the "Vietnam Era" from August 5, 1964 to July 1, 1958. This provision would align the beginning of the Vietnam Era with the earliest date established by the Army for award of medals for U.S. personnel who engaged in combat action. The provision would only apply to those who served in the theater of operations. No benefits would accrue for periods before the date of enactment.

**OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

**Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)**

The budget request included \$68.0 million for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for fiscal year 1996. The committee denies authorization of appropriations for the civil defense activities of FEMA. Based on an understanding that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) would transfer the civil defense program to domestic budget accounts in fiscal year 1996, the committee included a legislative provision (sec. 3411) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 to transfer all civil defense activities of FEMA out of the defense function to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

**Department of Defense space management and organization**

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Department of Defense to reorganize space management, which have resulted in the creation of a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Space, and plans for the consolidated management of DOD space systems and architectures. While this appears to be a positive step, the committee believes that DOD still has a long way to go to achieve a truly efficient space management structure. With certain conditions, the committee supports further integration of DOD and Intelligence Community space management structures and procedures. The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) must become increasingly responsive to the needs of the combatant commanders. At the same time, however, the committee is concerned that the NRO not be plagued by the Department of Defense's overly bureaucratic and cumbersome acquisition process.

As DOD centralizes oversight of space acquisition and planning, it must ensure that each of the military services is given adequate influence over space architectures and systems. While the Air Force manages the majority of the Department of Defense's space budget, the Army and the Navy are the largest warfighting consumers of space products. The committee is concerned that the needs and equities of the other services could be overwhelmed by the tendency of the large Air Force infrastructure and numerous space personnel to dominate newly created, jointly manned offices, particularly when those offices are located within the Air Force acquisition structure. This large infrastructure also makes the goal of merging DOD and NRO acquisition activities—while preserving the streamlined advantages of the NRO—more difficult.

The committee is not convinced that having the new DOD Space Architect reporting through the Air Force Acquisition Executive is the best means of achieving savings or efficiencies. The committee is concerned that strengthening Air Force control of space management will offset centralized oversight in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, dilute the other services' ability to influence space acquisition, and make it more difficult to merge the activities of DOD and the NRO. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 31, 1996, addressing the following issues: (1) progress to date in centralizing DOD space management; (2) the organizational structure that will be achieved upon completion of the DOD and intelligence community consolidation, and date consolidation will be completed; (3) how DOD plans to protect service-unique interests and other equities in the new centralized organization; (4) the reductions or savings in infrastructure and personnel that will be realized in transitioning to a new space management structure; and (5) the degree to which effectiveness and efficiency will be enhanced by the new structure and associated procedures.

### **Joint military intelligence program**

On April 7, 1995, the Deputy Secretary of Defense signed Department of Defense Directive Number 5205.9, which created the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP), a new budget and organizational category for intelligence programs, projects and activities within the Department of Defense (DOD). The Deputy Secretary of Defense is the JMIP Program Executive and Chair of the Defense Intelligence Executive Board (DIEB), which oversees JMIP resources and participates in the management of all DOD intelligence resources. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (ASD-C3I) is the executive secretary of the DIEB and is responsible for ensuring the consolidation of the JMIP budget. The JMIP budget occurs within the normal DOD Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System.

The JMIP presently consists of four component programs, each of which was formerly funded in the Tactical Intelligence and Related activities (TIARA) aggregation:

- (a) Defense Cryptologic Program (DCP).
- (b) Defense Imagery Program (DIP).
- (c) Defense Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy Program (DMCGP).

(d) Defense General Intelligence and Applications Program (DGIAP), which consists of five sub-programs, each of which was formerly funded in the TIARA aggregation:

- (1) Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program (DARP).
- (2) Defense Intelligence Counterdrug Program (DICP).
- (3) Defense Intelligence Agency's Tactical Program (DIATP).
- (4) Defense Space Reconnaissance Program (DSRP).
- (5) Defense Intelligence Special Technology Program (DISTP).

The JMIP was created with the intention of improving the oversight of selected defense-wide intelligence programs and resources. As stated in the JMIP Congressional Justification Books, "JMIP was established to focus on customers with joint, Defensewide needs."

The committee notes that the creation of the JMIP has raised a jurisdictional question in the Senate as to committee oversight responsibilities. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) shares authorization and oversight jurisdiction over the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP) with the Senate Armed Services Committee. The committee has sole authorization jurisdiction over TIARA programs, but receives—and welcomes—informal TIARA recommendations by the SSCI each year prior to its markup of the Defense Authorization Act. This year, the SSCI has chosen to treat the JMIP as the functional equivalent of the NFIP by including it in its markup of the Intelligence Authorization Act of 1996 and submitting a formal Schedule of Authorizations for the JMIP as well as for the NFIP.

While the committee values and welcomes the well informed views of the SSCI on the JMIP, as it does each year with TIARA programs, the committee regards the SSCI's markup of the JMIP as a serious infringement on the committee's clear and long-standing jurisdiction over the Department of Defense. The committee notes that each and every JMIP program is a former TIARA program and that the purpose of the JMIP is to serve multiple DOD consumers. The JMIP management is also strictly DOD, although some component managers have other responsibilities within the NFIP. The JMIP is also assembled as part of DOD's normal budgeting process. Stated simply, the JMIP is of DOD for DOD, and hence clearly and unquestionably within the sole authorizing jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee within the Senate. Accordingly, the committee intends to pursue such measures as appropriate to ensure that this year, and in the future, the JMIP is handled in the same manner as TIARA programs have always been handled. The committee looks forward to receiving the same superb support on JMIP as it has received from the SSCI on TIARA program for many years.

#### **Reusable launch vehicles**

The committee believes that a reusable single-stage-to-orbit (SSTO) launch vehicle should be a high priority for the United States. Such a launcher offers the potential for radically reduced costs as well as increased safety, reliability, and operability. It

would also make a significant contribution to restoring United States launch competitiveness.

At present, NASA is pursuing a reusable launch vehicle (RLV) known as the X-33. The X-33 effort at NASA is vitally important to the Department of Defense and to national security since it will provide warfighters highly responsive access to space. In the committee's view, DOD should be a direct participant in the X-33 program. The Department of Defense's own Space Launch Modernization Plan recommended that DOD have an equity participation in NASA RLV programs. The committee, therefore, urges the Secretary of Defense to consider options for participating in the NASA program, to include the provision of funding from the Department of Defense budget.

#### **Chinese military developments**

The People's Republic of China is emerging as an East Asian leader in economic growth and military power. Recent Chinese efforts to significantly enhance their naval and air capabilities have raised questions regarding the future of Chinese military and foreign policy objectives. The growth of Chinese power is the subject of major concern for the other nations of East Asia and for the United States.

In light of these developments, continued dialogue on security matters between the United States and the major nations of East Asia, including the People's Republic of China, is critical to promoting stability in the region and protecting American interests and the interests of our Asian allies. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue its efforts to engage senior Chinese defense officials in exchanges and other forms of dialogue.

#### **Private contracting for military assistance to Newly Independent Democracies of Eastern Europe**

The committee strongly supports military-to-military contacts with the newly independent states of Eastern Europe to assist their military establishments in making the transition to democracy, civilian oversight and more efficient forces. The committee also notes that military-to-military resources and IMET funds are severely limited.

The Department of Defense has the authority to contract with the private sector to provide foreign military assistance to the newly independent democracies of Eastern Europe. In fact, such assistance is currently being provided to the Republic of Albania to help in the reorganization of its military.

The committee believes private contracting offers great flexibility and can be a "force multiplier" in the military assistance mission. The committee encourages the department to use funds allocated for Partnership for Peace activities to expand its provision of privately contracted military assistance to newly independent democracies in Eastern Europe. In some cases, there are a number of retired servicemen with the skills and experience to be of particular assistance. The committee further encourages the department, in appropriate cases, to work with officials of the recipient nations in identifying retired service members that can be of assistance.

## **DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorization and related authority to support the military departments and defense agencies during fiscal year 1996. The administration's budget request is reflected in S. 728, as introduced by request. This division, as recommended by the committee, totals \$10,822,995,000 in authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

This authorization provides funding for construction and military family housing operations for the military services, the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the NATO infrastructure program. It also provides authorization for the three base closure accounts.

### **Committee Action**

The committee recommends an overall authorization for the Department of Defense military construction program that is above the administration's request for fiscal year 1996. For fiscal year 1996 the Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$6,579,073,000 for military construction, and \$4,125,221,000 for family housing construction and support. The committee recommends \$6,629,748,000 for military construction, and \$4,193,247,000 for family housing construction and support for fiscal year 1996.

The increase in the funding authorization focused on improving readiness and quality of life related facilities such as housing and working conditions. The committee added in excess of \$202.0 million for family housing and barracks construction or rehabilitation. These housing projects as well as other projects added to the administration's request met the stringent criteria established by the committee last year and included in a Sense of the Senate provision, section 2856 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

The committee supports deferring or realigning specific projects amounting to \$275.0 million. The most significant funding deferral is for chemical demilitarization facilities. The committee recommends the use of unobligated funds authorized for construction in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to proceed with construction at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas and Umatilla Army Depot Activity, Oregon. The committee recommends reallocating a portion of the requested funds to support additional projects such as new barracks, modernization or replacement of existing barracks, various family housing improvements programs, and critical mission facility requirements.

The committee also recommends deferring two land transfer transactions pending a review of the transfers by the General Serv-

ices Administration. It is the committee's view that in cases other than base closure land transactions the Federal Property Disposal Act of 1946, as amended, should be enforced.

The following table identifies the recommended fiscal year 1996 military construction projects:

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1994 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Child Development Center Complex	3,700		3,700
Alabama	Army Reserve	USARMC Jasper	Add/Alter O&S Training and Maintenance Building	2,500		2,500
Alabama	Air National Guard	Birmingham Mun Airport (ANG)	Alter KC-135 Aircraft Shops	4,400		4,400
Alabama	Air National Guard	Dannelly Field (ANG)	Fire Station	1,445		1,445
Alabama	Air Force Reserve	Maxwell AFB	Composite Maintenance Facility	3,608		3,608
Alabama	Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Dist Aviation	Vehicle Storage Shelter	3,350		3,350
Alabama	DDODS	Maxwell AFB	Manuel Elem School Addition/Alteration	5,479		5,479
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Alter Dormitory	3,850		3,850
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	MLSTAR Communications Ground Terminal	850		850
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Repair Aircraft Treasury	900		900
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Waiting Officers Quarters	7,350		7,350
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Aboveground Fuel Storage Tanks	2,500		2,500
Alaska	Air Force	Tin City Long Range Radar Site	USARMS Organizational Maintenance Shop Storage	4,779		4,779
Alaska	Army Reserve	Fl. Wainwright	Hospital Replacement Phase IV	28,100		28,100
Alaska	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Elmendorf AFB	Whole Barnabas Complex Renewal	16,000		16,000
Arizona	Army	Fl. Huebner	Alter Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility	1,000		1,000
Arizona	Air Force	DeWitt-Moynihan AFB	Dormitory	3,800		3,800
Arizona	Air Force	DeWitt-Moynihan AFB	Dormitory	5,200		5,200
Arizona	Air Force	Luke AFB	Dormitory	600		600
Arizona	Air National Guard	Tucson IAP	Add to and Alter Aircraft Support Equipment Shop	8,100		8,100
Arizona	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Luke AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,500		2,500
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac Phase II	40,000	(40,000)	2,500
Arkansas	Chemical Demilitarization	Pre Staff Arsenal	Consolidated Maintenance Facility	15,500		15,500
California	Army	Fl. Irwin	Regional Sewer System	3,000		3,000
California	Army	Presidio, San Francisco	Infantry Squad Battle Course	2,490		2,490
California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	11,940		11,940
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Child Development Center	3,000		3,000
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Multi-Purpose Machine Gun Range	3,800		3,800
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Physical Fitness Center	4,100		4,100
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility Acids	2,246		2,246
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	1,098		1,098
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Water Distribution System	1,410		1,410
California	Navy	MAS Lemoore	Engine Test Cell	7,600		7,600
California	Navy	MAS North Island	Berthing Wharf	56,650		56,650
California	Navy	MAS North Island	Controlled Industrial Facility	42,500		42,500
California	Navy	Naval Station, San Diego	Day Waste Collection and Treatment Facility	19,960		19,960
California	Navy	NAVCMD China Lake	Industrial Wastewater Collection and Treatment Fac	3,700		3,700
California	Navy	NAVCMD Point Mugu	Child Development Center	1,300		1,300
California	Navy	MCCOSC RDTEE Dr., San Diego	Test Facility Demolition	3,170		3,170

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1998 Request	Service Change	Service Authorized
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Landfill Closure	7,500		7,500
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Add to and Alter Anechoic Chamber	11,100		11,100
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Dormitory	10,800		10,800
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	F-22 Add to and Alter Engineering Test Facility	12,100		12,100
California	Air Force	Trevis AFB	Dormitories	10,500		10,500
California	Air Force	Trevis AFB	Dormitory	6,400		6,400
California	Air Force	Trevis AFB	MC-10 Add to Flight Simulator Facility	2,400		2,400
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit Fico	7,400		7,400
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Fire Station	2,000		2,000
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	SLFI - Chemical Test and Analysis Laboratory	4,000		4,000
California	Special Operations	MC AS, Camp Pendleton	Training Course Complex	5,200		5,200
California	Army Reserve	Perkasie BPTA	Battle Projection Center Training Building	5,868		5,868
California	Air National Guard	Sepulveda ANG Station	Replace Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	320		320
California	Air Force Reserve	March AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,550		1,550
California	Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Det Stockton	General Purpose Warehouse Replacement	15,000		15,000
California	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC, Point Mugu	Fuel Storage	750		750
California	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Fl. Irwin	Ambulatory Healthcare Clinic	6,800		6,800
California	Defense Medical Facilities Office	MCB Camp Pendleton	Environmental Health/Industrial Hygiene	1,700		1,700
California	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Vandenberg AFB	Life Safety/Seismic/Utility Upgrade	5,700		5,700
Colorado	Army	Fl. Carson	Sewer Treatment Plant Upgrade	8,100		8,100
Colorado	Army	Fl. Carson	Sanitary Sewer Line	1,750		1,750
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	Troop Support Facilities	5,500		5,500
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Add to and Alter Dormitory	3,000		3,000
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Fire Station	1,380		1,380
Colorado	Air Force	USAF Academy	Child Development Center	4,200		4,200
Colorado	Air Force	USAF Academy	Swampine Hangar	3,724	(13,724)	-
Colorado	Air Force	USAF Academy	Upgrade Facilities Heating System	4,950		4,950
Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Base Engineer Payments and Grounds Facility	450		450
Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Upgrade Heating Systems	850		850
Delaware	Air National Guard	Dover AFB	C-3 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	5,500		5,500
Delaware	Air National Guard	New Castle County AP	Fire Station and Aircraft Generation Unit	-	2,300	2,300
Delaware	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC, Dover AFB	Rapcon Hydrant Fuel System	15,554		15,554
Delaware	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Dover AFB	Life Safety Upgrade	4,400		4,400
District of Columbia	Army	Fl. Michler	Enhanced Barracks	5,500		5,500
District of Columbia	Army	Fl. Michler	National Defense University Phase 1	8,000		8,000
District of Columbia	Air Force	Walter Reed Medical Center	Firearm Center	-	4,300	4,300
District of Columbia	Air Force	Boiling AFB	Alter Dormitory	6,500		6,500
District of Columbia	Air Force	Boiling AFB	Honor Guard Dormitory	5,800		5,800
District of Columbia	Defense Intelligence Agency	Boiling AFB	Solar DMAC	498		498

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
District of Columbia	Defense Intelligence Agency		Perking DMAC	1,245		1,245
Florida	Navy	Bolling AFB	EOD Training Complex	14,200		14,200
Florida	Navy	Naval School EOD, Eglin AFB	Underwater Ordnance Disposal Training Facility	1,950		1,950
Florida	Navy	Naval School EOD, Eglin AFB	Child Development Center	2,565		2,565
Florida	Navy	MTTC Cony Station	Fire Training Facility	1,800		1,800
Florida	Air Force	Cape Canaveral AFS	Repair Runway	6,200		6,200
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Removels Dormitories	-	8,300	8,300
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,200		1,200
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	2,400		2,400
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Bombardier Storage/AMX Facility	1,550		1,550
Florida	Special Operations	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Helicopter Hangar (2)	5,500		5,500
Florida	Special Operations	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Squadron Operations/AMU MH-53	7,100		7,100
Florida	Special Operations	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Fuel Storage	2,400		2,400
Florida	Special Operations	DFSC, Eglin AFB	Close Combat Tactical Trainer Building	4,900		4,900
Florida	Defense Logistics Agency	FL Banning	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	33,000		33,000
Georgia	Army	FL Banning	Barracks Headquarters	3,150		3,150
Georgia	Army	FL Gordon	General Purpose Warehouse	2,600		2,600
Georgia	Army	FL Gordon	Deployment Staging Area (DAACG)	8,400		8,400
Georgia	Army	FL Stewart	Security Force Facility	2,450		2,450
Georgia	Navy	Strategic Weapons Facility, LANT	C-130 Aerial Delivery Facility	4,600		4,600
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	C-130 Aircraft Heatrack Facility	1,700		1,700
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	C-130 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance U	3,200		3,200
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Control Tower	2,700		2,700
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	680		680
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Repair and Extend Runway	-	12,300	12,300
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Upgrade Dormitory	-	11,000	11,000
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	JSTARs Aircraft Fuel System Maintenance Dock	6,900		6,900
Georgia	Air National Guard	Glynnco ANG Station	Replaces Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	320		320
Georgia	Air National Guard	Hunter ANG Station No. 2	Replaces Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	400		400
Georgia	Air National Guard	Savannah IAP	Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shops	1,300		1,300
Georgia	Defense Medical Facilities Office	FL Banning	Life Safety Upgrade	5,600		5,600
Georgia	DODDS	FL Banning	FL Middle School Addition	1,116		1,116
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Infantry Brigade Complex	-	35,000	35,000
Hawaii	Navy	Inlet Center Pacific, Pearl Harbor	Operations Building Alterations	2,200		2,200
Hawaii	Navy	Naval SURBASE Pearl Harbor	Berthing Pier	22,500		22,500
Hawaii	Navy	NAVCAMS EASTPAC, Honolulu	Fire Protection System	1,980		1,980
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Alter Dormitory	3,100		3,100
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Alter Transient Dormitory	3,050		3,050
Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Repair Airfield Pavements	4,550		4,550

State/Country	Branch/Agency	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change (8,000)	Senate Authorized
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Kaho Training Range (North Site)	8,000	8,000	-
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Large ACFT Maint. Hangar	800	-	800
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	9,850	-	9,850
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Plant	320	-	320
Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field (Boise Air Term)	Remove Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	-	4,000	4,000
Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field (Boise)	Upgrade Maintenance Hangar	-	-	4,000
Illinois	Navy	MTC Great Lakes	Uniform Issue Building	12,440	-	12,440
Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Dormitory	8,000	-	8,000
Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Global Reach Planning Center Visiting Quarters	4,700	-	4,700
Illinois	Air National Guard	ARRNG Marseilles Training Area	Training Site Utilities Upgrade ARNG	1,350	-	1,350
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shops	1,450	-	1,450
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Alter Aerial Port Training Facility	710	-	710
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Aircraft Deicing Facility	400	-	400
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Add to and Alter Squadron Operations Facility	970	-	970
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Add to Aircraft Parking Apron	630	-	630
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Add to Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	1,200	-	1,200
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria Airport	Joint Intelligence Training Center	3,300	-	3,300
Illinois	Army Reserve	FI Sheridan	Battle Protection Center Training Building	4,860	-	4,860
Illinois	Army Reserve	USARC Arlington Heights	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	-	10,846	10,846
Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Stouff Field (Indianapolis)	Fire Training Facility	1,500	-	1,500
Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Stouff Field (Indianapolis)	Upgrade Runway	-	4,000	4,000
Iowa	Air National Guard	Slaus City Gateway AP	Barracks Repair and renovation	-	15,300	15,300
Kansas	Army	FL Riley	Alter Dormitory	2,200	-	2,200
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Deicing Pad	1,150	-	1,150
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	KC-135 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance	8,100	-	8,100
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Alter B-1 Squadron Operations Facility	800	-	800
Kansas	Air National Guard	FL Leavenworth	Corps Simulation Center Phase II	4,400	-	4,400
Kansas	Air National Guard	Forbes Field	Composite Medical Training and Communications F	-	5,200	5,200
Kansas	Army Reserve	Olathe	Land Acquisition	539	-	539
Kansas	Army Reserve	USARC Topeka	Army Reserve Center with OMS/AMSA	6,487	-	6,487
Kansas	Air Force Reserve	McConnell AFB	KC-135 Operation and Training Facility	-	4,980	4,980
Kentucky	Army	FL Knox	Close Combat Technical Trainer Building	5,600	-	5,600
Kentucky	Air National Guard	W Kentucky Training Range	Training Complex, Phase II	-	4,656	4,656
Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	B-52 Training Complex	2,500	-	2,500
Louisiana	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC, Barksdale AFB	Replica Hydrant Fuel System	13,100	-	13,100
Louisiana	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Barksdale AFB	Life Safety Upgrade	4,100	-	4,100
Maryland	Navy	Naval Academy, Annapolis	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	3,600	-	3,600
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Dormitory	6,000	-	6,000
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	6,866	-	6,866

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Maryland	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Bethesda NMHC	Potable Water Line Replacement	1,300		1,300
Maryland	Defense Medical Facilities Office	WRAR, Forest Glen	Armed Forces Institute of Path Repository Add	1,550		1,550
Maryland	Defense Medical Facilities Office	WRAR, Forest Glen	Army Institute of Research Phase III	119,000	(92,000)	27,000
Maryland	National Security Agency	FL Meade	Critical Utilities Control, Phase I	3,301		3,301
Maryland	National Security Agency	FL Meade	FANX II Purchase	14,800		14,800
Maryland	National Security Agency	FL Meade	SPL Steam Generation Plant	632		632
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes Mun Airport	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	2,000		2,000
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Worcester ANG Station	Paint and Refueling Vehicle Maintenance Bays	350		350
Massachusetts	Naval Reserve	MCRTC Camp Edwards	Reserve Training Building	3,130		3,130
Michigan	Air National Guard	Sault Ste Marie	Upgrade Heating Systems	2,900		2,900
Michigan	Air National Guard	Sault Ste Marie	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer Main	-	520	520
Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena City RAP	Construct Airfield Pavements	-	6,400	6,400
Minnesota	Air National Guard	Minneapolis St. Paul IAP	Aircraft Deicing Facility	-		400
Minnesota	Air Force	Minneapolis St. Paul IAP	Upgrade Heating System	780		780
Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,150		1,150
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Keeler AFB	Upgrade Student Dormitory	6,500		6,500
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Keeler AFB	AVCRAD Equipment Electronic Test Facility	1,100		1,100
Missouri	Air National Guard	Guilford	Relocate Roads	-	10,200	10,200
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Add to and Alter Dock Fire Protection Systems	3,500		3,500
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Add to Flight Simulator Training Facility	4,100		4,100
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Aircraft Apron/Convey Road/Taxiway	1,500		1,500
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Aircraft Maintenance Dock/Hydrant Fueling Sys	15,500		15,500
Missouri	Defense Mapping Agency	DMA Aerospace Center	Replace Destroyed/Damaged Fac w/Land Acq	40,300		40,300
Montana	Army National Guard	FL Garrison	Latrine Additions	-	681	681
Montana	Army National Guard	Regional Airport Helena	Army Aviation Support Facility	-	12,506	12,506
Montana	Army National Guard	Camp Ashland	Military Education Facility and Administration Bldgin	-	1,408	1,408
Nebraska	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	600		600
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Transient Housing	-	9,550	9,550
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Visiting Quarters	9,900		9,900
New Jersey	Navy	NAWCAD Lakehurst	Child Development Center	1,700		1,700
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,600		1,600
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	KC-10 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance U	7,600		7,600
New Jersey	Air National Guard	Atlantic City Airport	Upgrade Sanitary and Water Systems	650		650
New Jersey	Air National Guard	McGuire AFB	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Facility	5,700		5,700
New Jersey	Air National Guard	Wentz Grove Range	Composite Range Operations Facility	1,100		1,100
New Jersey	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC, McGuire AFB	Replica Hydrant Fuel System	12,000		12,000
New Jersey	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	620		620
New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Plant	9,800		9,800
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution System	7,656		7,656

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,500		1,500
New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	Aircraft Corrosion Control Facility	1,800		1,800
New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	Air Aircraft Maintenance Hangar and Shops	900		900
New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	Composite Engine and NDI Shop	2,700		2,700
New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	LANTREN Maintenance Facility	620		620
New York	Army	Watervliet ARS	Oil Runoff Containment Facility	660		660
New York	Naval Reserve	NMCRB Buffalo	Reserve Training Building Addition	3,838		3,838
New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field	Composite Medical Training Facility	1,980		1,980
New York	Air National Guard	Niagara Falls IAP	Upgrade Runway Overrun	1,950		1,950
New York	Air National Guard	Niagara Falls IAP	Upgrade Storm and Sanitary Sewer System	400		400
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls IAP	Fuels Systems Maintenance Hangar	4,965		4,965
North Carolina	Air Force	Pepe AFB	C-130 Squadron Ops/AMU and Audiovisual Service	6,100		6,100
North Carolina	Air Force	Pepe AFB	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	2,150		2,150
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	830		830
North Carolina	Army	FL Bragg	Upgrade Area Complex (ADACG)	11,200		11,200
North Carolina	Army	FL Bragg	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	18,500		18,500
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Enhance Water Survival Training Tank	2,050		2,050
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Jet Engine Test Cell	7,730		7,730
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Missile Magazine	1,650		1,650
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Reactor Enriched Quarters	8,300		8,300
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Reactor Enriched Quarters	5,500		5,500
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp Lejeune	Infantry Platoon Battle Course	45,500		45,500
North Carolina	Navy	FL Bragg	Wastewater Treatment Plant (Phase II)	2,900		2,900
North Carolina	Special Operations	Hickory	Group Headquarters Building	2,713		2,713
North Carolina	Army Reserve	Grand Forks AFB	Reserve Center	8,500		8,500
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Dormitory	8,300		8,300
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	KC-135 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance	1,550		1,550
North Dakota	Army National Guard	Camp Greifon, Devils Lake	Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	4,100	2,050	2,050
Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Combined Support Maintenance Shop and Paint Shop	380		380
Ohio	Air Force	Blue Ash ANG Station	Upgrade Electrical Distribution System	320		320
Ohio	Air National Guard	Camp Perry ANG Station	Replace Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	310		310
Ohio	Air National Guard	Richlandwood ANGB	Replace Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	6,100		6,100
Ohio	Air National Guard	Richlandwood ANGB	Replace Underground Fuel Storage Tanks	4,230		4,230
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Squadron Operations Building	3,350		3,350
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Add to and Alter Electric Substation	1,000		1,000
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Construct Aircraft Parking Apron	72,403	(35,003)	37,400
Ohio	DFAS	Columbus Center	Upgrade Base Water Distribution System	6,300		6,300
Ohio	Army	FL Sill	Military Admin Facility (Phase I)			
Oklahoma	Army	FL Sill	Central Vehicle Wash Facility			

State/Country	Branch	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	Child Development Center	-	3,600	3,600
Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,200	-	1,200
Oklahoma	Air Force	Trinker AFB	Add to and Alter Dormitories	5,100	-	5,100
Oklahoma	Air Force	Trinker AFB	Corrosion Control Facility	-	11,400	11,400
Oklahoma	Army National Guard	Tulsa IAP	Organizational Maintenance Shop Phase I	2,400	-	2,400
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Will Rogers World Airport	Composite Communications Facility	1,900	-	1,900
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Will Rogers World Airport	Aerial Port Training Facility	2,550	-	2,550
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Will Rogers World Airport	Composite Fire Station	1,950	-	1,950
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Klamath Falls	Petroleum Operations Facility	400	-	400
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Klamath Falls	Operations and Training Facility	-	4,600	4,600
Oregon	Chemical Demilitarization	Unalaska Depot	Annular Demilitarization Fac Phase II	55,000	(55,000)	-
Pennsylvania	Special Operations	Onsted Field, Harrisburg IAP	Refueling Vehicle Shop	443	-	443
Pennsylvania	Special Operations	Onsted Field, Harrisburg IAP	Mobility Storage Warehouse	1,200	-	1,200
Pennsylvania	Special Operations	Onsted Field, Harrisburg IAP	Barracks/Dining Fac. Phase II	-	9,877	9,877
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Indiantown Gap Annex	Fuel Systems Maintenance Facility	5,332	-	5,332
Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Greater Pittsburgh IAP	Transport Control Facility	4,600	-	4,600
Pennsylvania	Defense Logistics Agency	Def Det New Cumberland	Strategic Maritime Center (Phase II)	-	18,000	18,000
Rhode Island	Navy	Naval War College, Newport	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	32,000	-	32,000
South Carolina	Army	Fl. Jackson	Army Strategic Maintenance Complex PH II	16,500	-	16,500
South Carolina	Army	MWS Charleston	Wharf Additions	9,200	-	9,200
South Carolina	Army	MWS Charleston	Beckner Enlisted Quarters	-	15,000	15,000
South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort MCAS	C-17 Add to Flight Simulator Facility	1,300	-	1,300
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	5,600	-	5,600
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Dormitory	5,600	-	5,600
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,300	-	1,300
South Carolina	Army National Guard	Estover	Region C Leadership Brigade Facility	-	15,229	15,229
South Carolina	DODDS	Fl. Jackson	Pierce Terrace Elem School Addition	576	-	576
South Carolina	Army National Guard	Camp Rapp	Training Site Bldg/Mess/Admin	-	2,631	2,631
South Carolina	Army National Guard	Rapid City	Aviation Support Facility Ramp	-	3,100	3,100
South Carolina	Army National Guard	Joe Foss Field	Base Supply Complex	4,000	-	4,000
South Carolina	Air Force	Arnold AFB	Upgrade Engine Test Facilities Refrigeration System	2,300	-	2,300
Tennessee	Air Force	McGhee Tyson Airport	Upgrade Fire Protection Systems	2,700	-	2,700
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	PMEC School Training Quarters	4,400	-	4,400
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Add to and Alter Base Engineer Maintenance Comp	960	-	960
Tennessee	Air National Guard	Memphis IAP	Add to and Alter Security Police Operations Facility	1,100	-	1,100
Texas	Army	Fl. Bils	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	48,000	-	48,000
Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	17,500	-	17,500
Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Whole Barracks Renewal	-	15,000	15,000
Texas	Air Force	Dyess Air Force Base	Dormitory Renovation	-	5,400	5,400

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Texas	Air Force	Kelly AFB	Wing Headquarters Facility	3,244		3,244
Texas	Air Force	Laguardia AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,400		1,400
Texas	Air Force	Randolph AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,200		1,200
Texas	Air Force	Randolph AFB	Upgrade Aircraft Lighting	1,900		1,900
Texas	Air Force	Reese AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,200		1,200
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Upgrade Aircraft Lighting	1,500		1,500
Texas	Air National Guard	Kelly AFB	Upgrade Heating and Cooling Systems	1,400		1,400
Texas	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	FL Base	THAAD 1st Obv Bn OTM Facilities	13,600		13,600
Texas	Defense Medical Facilities Office	FL Hood	Consolidated Troop Medical Clinic	5,500		5,500
Texas	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Lackland AFB	Emergency Department Addition/Alteration	6,100		6,100
Texas	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Reese AFB	Life Safety Upgrade	1,000		1,000
Utah	Air Force	Hill Air Force Base	Consolidated Range Dorm/Op Facility	-	8,900	8,900
Utah	Army National Guard	Camp Williams	Training Site Storage Facility	340		340
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	1,000		1,000
Virginia	Army National Guard	Denver	Armory Addition and Alteration	-	1,789	1,789
Virginia	Army National Guard	Camp Pendleton Md Res	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	2,000		2,000
Virginia	Army National Guard	Richmond IAP	Add to and Alter F-16 Aircraft Maintenance Complex	2,700		2,700
Virginia	Army	FL Eustis	Barracks Modern	-	11,000	11,000
Virginia	Army	FL Eustis	Deployment Training Facility	5,400		5,400
Virginia	Army	FL Meyer	Army Museum Land Acquisition	17,000	(17,000)	-
Virginia	Navy	Fleet & Intra Supply Cen, Williams	Bechtel Enlisted Quarters	6,140		6,140
Virginia	Navy	Fleet & Intra Supply Cen, Williams	Electrical Distribution System Alterations	2,250		2,250
Virginia	Navy	Henderson Hall, Avignon	Land Acquisition	-	1,900	1,900
Virginia	Navy	MCCOC Quantico	Ammunition Storage Facility	3,500		3,500
Virginia	Navy	Naval Hospital, Portsmouth	Bechtel Enlisted Quarters	9,500		9,500
Virginia	Navy	Naval Station, Norfolk	Oil Waste Collection System (Phase I)	10,580		10,580
Virginia	Navy	NWS Yorktown	Explosive Ordnance Disposal Operations Facility	1,300		1,300
Virginia	Special Operations	Dam Neck	Angible Ops Support Building	4,500		4,500
Virginia	Special Operations	NAS Little Creek	NSWG-2 Headquarters	6,100		6,100
Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Dist Depot - DDNV	General Purpose Warehouse Replacement	10,400		10,400
Virginia	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Northwest NAVSECGRUACT	Hospital Replacement Phase VII	4,300		4,300
Virginia	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Portsmouth Naval Hospital	Hospital Replacement Phase VII	71,900	(24,000)	47,900
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Consolidated Fuel Station	3,400		3,400
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Multi-Purpose Training Range-Yakima	8,500		8,500
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Rail Spur & Tank Trail-Yakima	3,200		3,200
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Tactical Equipment Shop	15,000		15,000
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation-Yakima	2,000		2,000
Washington	Navy	NUMC Division, Keyport	Metal Treatment Facility	5,300		5,300
Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Fuel Support Facilities	6,870		6,870

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Metal Preparation Facility Improvements	2,600		2,600
Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Alter Dormitories	7,500		7,500
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Dormitory	4,300		4,300
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit Fac	5,600		5,600
West Virginia	Navy	USCG, Sugar Grove	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and Mess Hall	-	7,200	7,200
Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Truxav Field	Alter Munitions Facilities	6,523		6,523
Wisconsin	Air National Guard	F E Warren AFB	Alter Dormitories	670		670
Wisconsin	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Upgrade Central Heat Plant	5,500		5,500
Wyoming	Army National Guard	Cody	Organizational Maintenance Shop	3,500		3,500
Wyoming	Army National Guard	Newcastle	Organizational Maintenance Shop	342		342
Wyoming	Army	Classified	Classified Project	348		348
CONUS	Navy	Classified	Supply Warehouses	1,900		1,900
CONUS	Air Force	Classified Location	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	1,200		1,200
CONUS	OSD	Classified Location	OSD Mission	700		700
CONUS	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Add to Messie Maintenance Shop	11,500		11,500
CONUS	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Dormitory	930		930
CONUS	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Sound Suppressor Foundation A	5,900		5,900
CONUS	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Sound Suppressor Foundation B	600		600
CONUS	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Sound Suppressor Foundation B	950		950
CONUS	Air Force	Vogelweh Annex	Child Development Center	2,600		2,600
CONUS	DODOS	Ramstein AB	Elementary/Junior High School Additions	19,205		19,205
CONUS	Air Force	Araucos RRS	Dormitory	1,950		1,950
CONUS	Navy	NAVCAMS WESTPAC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	2,250		2,250
CONUS	Navy	MPAC Guam	Waste/water Treatment Plant Upgrades	16,180		16,180
CONUS	Special Operations	Naval Station, Guam	SEAL Team Det Building, Guam	8,800		8,800
Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	11,300		11,300
Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Fire Protection System	870		870
Italy	Navy	Naval Support Activity, Naples	Operations Support Center	10,000		10,000
Italy	Navy	Naval Support Activity, Naples	Quality of Life Facilities (Phase III)	14,950		14,950
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Communications Maintenance Facility	1,400		1,400
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Squadron Operations Facility	950		950
Italy	Air Force	Gheddi RRS	Dormitory	1,450		1,450
Italy	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Naval Support Activity, Naples	Dispensary (Capodichino)	5,000		5,000
Italy	DODOS	NAS Sigonella	Elementary/High School Additions	7,595		7,595
Korea	Army	Cp Casey	Dining Facility	4,150		4,150
Korea	Army	Cp Hovey	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal A	7,300		7,300
Korea	Army	Cp Hovey	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal B	6,200		6,200
Korea	Army	Cp Peiham	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	5,600		5,600
Korea	Army	Cp Stanley	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	8,800		8,800

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1986 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Puerto Rico	Navy	Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads	Sanitary Landfill	11,500		11,500
Puerto Rico	Navy	NAVSECRUACT Subarea Secs	Road Improvements	2,200		2,200
Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	Add to and Alter Composite Support Facility	510		510
Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	Munitions Maintenance and Storage Complex	3,800		3,800
Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	Upgrade Security System	1,350		1,350
Puerto Rico	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP, Roosevelt Roads	Fuel Tankage	6,200		6,200
Spain	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC Rods	Hydrant Fuel System	7,400		7,400
Turkey	Air Force	Arkara AS	Long Period Seismic Array	3,000		3,000
Turkey	Air Force	Arkara AS	Short Period Seismic Array	4,000		4,000
Turkey	Air Force	Incirk AB	Child Development Center	1,600		1,600
Turkey	Air Force	Incirk AB	Upgrade Sewage Treatment Plant	2,900		2,900
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Add to Missile Maintenance Shop	1,820		1,820
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Add to and Alter Child Development Center	2,250		2,250
United Kingdom	National Security Agency	Menwith Hill Station	Warehouse Sprinklers	677		677
Outside the U.S.	Army	Classified Location - Outside U.S.	Strategic Logistic Initiative Prepo PH I	48,000		48,000
Outside the U.S.	Air Force	Classified Location - Outside U.S.	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	1,600		1,600
Outside the U.S.	Air Force	Classified Location - Outside U.S.	War Readiness Material Warehouses	15,500		15,500
Various Locations	Chemical Demilitarization	Various Locations	Planning And Design - Chemical Demilitarization	13,000		13,000
Various Locations	DFAS	Various Locations	Planning And Design - DFAS	8,600		8,600
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support	20,000		20,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Army	32,894	3,300	36,194
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Army	9,000		9,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Navy	46,477	2,297	48,774
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Navy	7,200		7,200
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design - Air Force	30,835	4,145	34,980
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Air Force	9,030		9,030
Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Special Operations	5,407		5,407
Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Army National Guard	2,900	2,100	5,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Army National Guard	5,300		5,300
Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design - Air National Guard	4,590	3,986	8,596
Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Air National Guard	4,100		4,100
Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Army Reserve	3,694	1,650	5,344
Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - Army Reserve	1,700		1,700
Worldwide Unspecified	Naval Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Naval Reserve	854		854
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - Air Force Reserve	2,700		2,700
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction Projects - OSD	11,037		11,037
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - AF Reserve	4,169		4,169
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation	50,000		50,000
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - OSD	13,000		13,000

State/Country	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 1998 Budget	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - BMDO	500		500
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction - OSD	23,007		23,007
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Medical Facilities Office	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design - DMFO	28,330		28,330
Worldwide Unspecified	NATO	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	NATO Security Investment Program	179,000		179,000
Worldwide Unspecified	BRAC II	BRAC Act Part II	Base Reassignment & Closure Part II	964,843		964,843
Worldwide Unspecified	BRAC III	BRAC Act Part III	Base Reassignment & Closure Part III	2,148,480		2,148,480
Worldwide Unspecified	BRAC IV	BRAC Act Part IV	Base Reassignment & Closure Part IV	784,569		784,569
Totals				6,572,774	56,974	6,629,748

State/County	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY % Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Alaska	Army	Ft. Wainwright	Neighborhood revitalization	-	7,300	7,300
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Housing Office and Maintenance Facility	3,000	-	3,000
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	80 Units	9,496	-	9,496
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	1 Unit	210	-	210
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	69 Units	10,000	-	10,000
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Community Center	1,436	-	1,436
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Housing Office	707	-	707
California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	240 Units	34,900	-	34,900
California	Navy	PWTC, Point Mugu	Housing Office/Self Help	1,020	-	1,020
California	Navy	PWTC San Diego	346 Units	49,310	-	49,310
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Housing Office	842	-	842
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	67 Units	11,350	-	11,350
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	143 Units	20,200	-	20,200
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Housing Office	900	-	900
California	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Housing Office	570	-	570
Colorado	Air Force	Boiling AFB	32 Units	4,100	-	4,100
District of Columbia	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Housing Office	500	-	500
Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Housing Office	860	-	860
Florida	Air Force	MedDL AFB	Housing Office	646	-	646
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	70 Units	7,947	-	7,947
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	52 Units	5,500	-	5,500
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	2 Units	513	-	513
Georgia	Air Force	Robins Air Base	Replace 83 FH Units	-	9,800	9,800
Hawaii	Navy	Naval Complex, Oahu	252 Units	48,400	-	48,400
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Housing Office	844	-	844
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	39 Units	5,193	-	5,193
Louisiana	Air Force	Barstow AFB	62 Units	10,299	-	10,299
Maryland	Navy	NAATC Patuxent River	Warehouse/Self Help	-	890	890
Maryland	Navy	US Naval Academy, Annapolis	Housing Office/Self Help	-	800	800
Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Replace 32 Units	-	5,200	5,200
Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	98 Units	9,300	-	9,300
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	72 Units	9,948	-	9,948
Missouri	Air Force	Nellis AFB	6 Units	1,357	-	1,357
New Mexico	Army	White Sands	Whole Neighborhood House Improvements	-	3,400	3,400
New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	1 Unit	225	-	225

State/Casualty	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 96 Request	Senate Changes	Senate Authorized
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	105 Units	11,000		11,000
New York	Army	USMA West Point	119 Units	16,500		16,500
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Community Center	1,003		1,003
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	104 Units	9,984		9,984
Ohio	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	1 Unit	204		204
Pennsylvania	Air Force	Wright Patterson AFB	66 Units	-	5,900	5,900
South Carolina	Navy	NSPCC Mechanicsburg	Housing Office	300		300
Texas	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Housing Maintenance Facility	715		715
Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Housing Maintenance Facility	580		580
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	67 Units	6,200		6,200
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Construct Management Office	500		500
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Replace Family Housing Maintenance Fac	600		600
Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Housing Office/Self Help (New Const)	520		520
Virginia	Navy	PWC Norfolk	320 Units	42,500		42,500
Washington	Army	FL Lewis	Housing Office/Warehouse	1,360		1,360
Washington	Army	McChord AFB	84 Units	10,800		10,800
Guam	Air Force	Anderson AFB	50 Units	9,504		9,504
Puerto Rico	Air Force	Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads	Housing Office	1,700		1,700
Turkey	Navy	Incirk AB	Housing Office	710		710
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	150 Units	10,146		10,146
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements/Army FH	14,200	12,012	26,212
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing/Army FH	243,840		243,840
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance/Army FH	634,292		634,292
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premiums/Army FH	11		11
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operations/Army FH	459,453		459,453
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning/Army FH	2,000	340	2,340
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Homeowners Assistance Program	75,586		75,586
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements/Navy FH	247,477	12,012	259,489
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing/Navy FH	103,582		103,582
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property/Navy FH	534,023		534,023
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premiums/Navy FH	82		82
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operating Expenses/Navy FH	410,842		410,842
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning/Navy FH	24,380		24,380
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements/Air Force FH	85,069	12,012	97,071
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing/Air Force FH	115,665		115,665

State/County	Service	Installation Name	Project Title	FY 96 Request	Seate Change	Seate Authorized
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property/Air Force FH	408,971		408,971
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Mortgage Insurance Premiums/Air Force FH	29		29
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operating Expenses/Air Force FH	324,548	50	324,548
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning/Air Force FH	8,989		9,039
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing/DIA FH	13,638		13,638
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operating Expenses/DIA FH	2,590		2,590
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements/DLA FH	3,722		3,722
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property/DLA FH	574		574
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operating Expenses/DLA FH	566		566
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements/NSA FH	50		50
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing/NSA FH	11,236		11,236
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property/NSA FH	223		223
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operating Expenses/NSA FH	1,640		1,640
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Private Sector Housing Ventures - FH	22,000		22,000
Totals				4,125,221	68,026	4,185,947

### Base closure and realignment accounts

The committee recommends authorization of \$3.9 billion in fiscal year 1996 for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Account 1990 that supports the recommendations of the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions.

The committee will continue to carefully monitor the justification for the construction projects funded within these accounts and the other cost elements of these accounts.

Although funding is not specifically limited to projects identified in its budget justification, the Department of Defense identified the following construction projects for fiscal year 1996 that it plans to fund from these accounts:

#### FY 1996 BRAC Military Construction Projects (In Thousands of Dollars)

Army: BRAC II Construction Fiscal Year 1996			
State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	Family Practice Clinic	2,250
California	Sacramento Army Depot	Reserve Center Reserve	2,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	Prime Care Clinic	4,300
Maryland	Adelphi Research Laboratory	Scale Model Facility	1,500
Massachusetts	Fort Devens	Ammo Supply Point	2,750
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Hospital Addition/Clinic	5,400
	Fort Jackson	Bachelor Officers Quarters Planning & Design	10,400 215
		<b>Total Army - BRAC II</b>	<b>160,890</b>
Army: BRAC III Construction Fiscal Year 1996			
State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Michigan	Detroit Arsenal	Mobility Center Laboratory	5,141
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	Operations & Training Facility	4,950
		<b>Total Army - BRAC III</b>	<b>10,091</b>

**FY 1996 BRAC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

**Navy: BRAC II Construction Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Aircraft Maintenance Facilities	38,230
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	Utilities Reconfiguration	13,000
Planning and Design			16,850
		<b>Total Navy - BRAC II</b>	<b>68,180</b>

**Navy: BRAC III Construction Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Naval & Marine Corps Reserve Center	Reserve Center Addition	7,800
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Aircraft Parking Apron	14,320
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Sachler Enlisted Quarters & Physical Fitness Center	10,780
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Maintenance Facility	18,210
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Training & Admin Facility	3,180
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	81,182
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Air Field Parking & Pads	47,552
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Sachler Enlisted Quarters	38,664
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Admin & Training Facilities	16,300
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Operational Support Complex	14,420
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Utilities Improvement	19,750
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Maintenance Facilities	22,840
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Naval Exchange Laundry & Dry Cleaning	2,440
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	Building Conversion	1,700
	Fleet Combat Trng Center, Pacific, San Diego	Medical Research Laboratory	688
	Fleet Training Center, San Diego	Applied Instruction Building	8,403
	Navy Public Works Center, San Diego	Public Works Shop	2,920
District of Columbia	Strategic Systems Program, Washington	Building Renovation	4,500
	Washington Navy Yard	Building Renovation	16,384
Florida	Naval Air Station, Pensacola	Candidate Training Building	27,100
	Naval Air Station, Pensacola	Sachler Enlisted Quarters	38,700
	Naval Aviation Depot, Jacksonville	Administrative Building	11,000
Hawaii	Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor	Utility System Modification	2,800
	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	Helicopter Landing Pad	1,250
	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	Maintenance Hanger Alterations	13,400
	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	Ordinance Facilities	2,800
	Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay	Aircraft Rinse Facility Modification	1,850
Illinois	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Sachler Enlisted Quarters	23,700
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Brig	420
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Child Development Center	1,700
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Senior Trainer School	2,690
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Medical Clinic Addition	6,090
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Training Building Renovations	3,250
	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	Fire Station	2,800
	Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes	Dental Clinic Alterations	9,898
	Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes	Medical Clinic Alterations	3,218
	Recruit Training Command, Great Lakes	Medical Clinic Addition	4,047
Maryland	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head	Explosive Test Facility	10,300
	Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River	Administrative Facilities	28,400
	Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River	Propulsion System Evaluation Facility	25,750
Nevada	Naval Air Station, Fallon	Battalion Unit Equipment Shop	1,080

	Naval Air Station, Fallon	Domestic Water Storage	2,230
	Naval Air Station, Fallon	Wastewater System Improvement	1,300
Tennessee	Engineering Development Center, Arnold Air Force Base, Tullahoma	Propulsion System Laboratory	51,406
	Naval Air Station, Memphis	Building Conversion	1,300
	Naval Air Station, Memphis	Building Conversion	7,400
	Naval Air Station, Memphis	Installation of Telephone Switch	5,010
Texas	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Aircraft Support Facilities	19,888
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Administrative & Supply Building	880
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Administrative/Supply Building Alterations	4,730
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Building Alterations & Additions	9,523
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Child Development Center	2,010
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Jet Engine Test Cell	13,840
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Medical & Dental Clinic	4,510
	Naval Air Station, Fort Worth	Reserve Training Building	17,300
Virginia	Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	Underway Replenish Operator Trng. Fac.	4,300
	Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico	Marine Corps Manpower Center	17,408
Washington	Naval Weapons Station Detachment, Port Hadlock	High Explosive Magazine	5,100
	Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton	Parking Garage	14,400
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Aircraft Parking Apron Alterations	4,500
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Engine Maintenance Shop Addition	4,300
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Fight Simulator Building Addition	4,080
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Ground Support Equipment Shop	3,680
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Hanger Alteration	4,680
	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	Sensitive Storage Facility	2,200
Midway Island	Naval Air Facility	Demolition	3,000
		Total Navy - BRAC III	746,731

Navy: BRAC III Family Housing Fiscal Year 1996

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	Family Housing (Community Center)	1,332
Florida	Naval Air Station, Pensacola	Family Housing	10,780
Illinois	Naval Public Works Center, Great Lakes	Family Housing	13,580
Rhode Island	Naval Engineering Training Center, Newport	Demolish Family Housing	2,000
Washington	Naval Submarine Base, Bangor	Family Housing	4,840
		Total Navy - BRAC III Family Housing	32,542

**FY 1996 BRAC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

**Air Force: BRAC II Construction Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Vandenberg AFB	Site Utilities	2,900
Colorado	Buckley ANGB	Enlisted Dormitory	5,800
Maryland	Fort Meade	AFIS Audio Visual School	14,000
North Carolina	Pope AFB	Munitions Storage Complex	4,450
Ohio	Rickenbacker ANGB	Alter Base Maintenance Shops	1,050
	Rickenbacker ANGB	Alter Support Shops	1,250
	Rickenbacker ANGB	Alter Fencing & Utilities	620
	Rickenbacker ANGB	Alter Fuel System Maint. Dock	600
	Rickenbacker ANGB	Jet Fuel Storage/Distribution	9,100
Wright-Patterson AFB	NECAP Complex	5,500	
Oklahoma	Altus AFB	Flight Simulator/Academic Facility	10,000
Texas	Goodfellow AFB	Base Pavements	1,000
	Leckland AFB	Alter Technical Training	2,250
	Randolph AFB	Base Streets	1,700
	Sheppard AFB	Base Roads	1,800
	Sheppard AFB	Central Preparation Kitchen/Bakery	1,800
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Conventional Munitions Complex	2,100
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Add/Alter BCE Complex	2,000
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Add/Alter Maintenance Shop	2,900
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Isolate Utilities/Fence	880
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Alter Vehicle Maintenance	500
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Airmen Dining Hall	2,400
	Bergstrom Air Reserve	Base Supply Warehouse	2,900
<b>Total Air Force - BRAC II</b>			<b>80,100</b>

**Air Force: BRAC II Family Housing Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Oklahoma	Altus AFB	Family Housing	18,500
<b>Total Air Force - BRAC II Family Housing</b>			<b>18,500</b>

**Air Force: BRAC III Construction Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	March AF Reserve Base	Alter Wing HQ/Admin	1,350
	March AF Reserve Base	Alter Medical Training Facilities	1,550
	March AF Reserve Base	Alter Weapons Storage	1,850
	March AF Reserve Base	BCE Maintenance Shop/Storage	970
	March AF Reserve Base	Alter Dining Hall	1,100
	March AF Reserve Base	Isolate Utilities/Perimeter Fence	2,250
	March AF Reserve Base	Alter Support Facilities	300
	Trevi AFB	Upgrade Roads	300
	Trevi AFB	Combat Camera	9,900
	Florida	MaeDill AFB	Isolate Utilities
Louisiana	Barksdale AFB	NAP Complex	2,800

Massachusetts	Westover AF Reserve Base	Alter Aero-Medical Training	485
New Jersey	McGuire AFB	Upgrade Roads	1,400
	McGuire AFB	Add/Alter Aero-Med. Ser. Clinic	1,950
New York	Griffis AFB	NEADS Support Facility	1,900
	Griffis AFB	10th Mountain Complex ANG	3,150
	Griffis AFB	Alter Consolidated Leg. Fac.	3,750
North Dakota	Minot AFB	AGE Corrosion Control	600
South Carolina	Shaw AFB	Special Operations Facility	5,400
Texas	Leckland AFB	IAAPA Student Officers Quarters	4,250
	Leckland AFB	IAAPA Tech. Training Classroom	4,250
	Leckland AFB	IAAPA Enlisted Dormitory	8,100
		Total Air Force - BRAC III	60,806

**Air Force: BRAC III Family Housing Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
New Jersey	McGuire AFB	Family Housing (142 Units)	15,900
		Total Air Force - BRAC III Family Housing	15,900

**Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC III Construction Fiscal Year 1996**

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Ohio	Defense Electronic Supply Center, Dayton	Renovate of Operations Space	10,664
		Total DLA BRAC III	10,664



## **TITLE XXII—NAVY**

### **Section - 2205. Authorization of appropriations**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 to authorize the \$10.0 million appropriated for the Large Anchoic Chamber Facility at the Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River, Maryland in the Military Construction Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1995. This authorization would permit the Navy to proceed with award of a construction contract in the amount of \$30.0 million for the first phase of the \$61.0 million project.

### **Section - 2206. Authority to carry out land acquisition project, Norfolk Naval Base, Virginia.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2201(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire 191 acres of land in Hampton Roads, Virginia. This acquisition is in addition to the land acquisition at Damneck, Virginia, authorized in that Act.

The committee directs the Secretary of Navy to make every attempt possible to acquire both parcels of land using the previously authorized \$4.5 million. If additional funds are required, the committee expects the Secretary to utilize cost variation and reprogramming procedures.

### **Section - 2207. Acquisition of land, Henderson Hall, Arlington, Virginia.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire a 0.75 acre parcel of land located at Henderson Hall, Arlington, Virginia. The parcel, which is currently occupied by an abandoned and vandalized mausoleum, is required to construct a public works complex to support the Headquarters Battalion, United States Marine Corps. The provision would authorize the demolition of the mausoleum and the use of appropriated funds to remove and provide appropriate disposal of the remains abandoned in the mausoleum.

The provision would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to obtain architectural, engineering and facility design services for future construction of a public works facility.



## **TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES**

### **Chemical munitions disposal facilities**

The budget request included \$108.0 million for construction of chemical agent disposal facilities in Pine Bluff, Arkansas (\$40.0 million) and Umatilla, Oregon (\$55.0 million) and planning and design activities (\$13.0 million) at various locations where chemical agent disposal facilities are to be built. The committee recommends a reduction of \$95.0 million to the budget request. The Army, as Executive Agent of the program for the Department of Defense, has informed the committee that \$132.5 million remains unobligated from funds authorized for construction in fiscal years 1994 and 1995. The unobligated funds have been set aside for construction of the Anniston chemical munitions disposal facility, pending the outcome of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommendation on Fort McClellan, Alabama, and issuance of environmental permits by the State of Alabama. The committee directs the Department of Defense and the Army to use these unobligated funds for the construction of facilities in Pine Bluff and Umatilla.



## TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

### Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing

#### **Section - 2801. Special threshold for unspecified minor construction projects to correct life, health, or safety deficiencies.**

#### **Section - 2802. Clarification of scope of unspecified minor construction authority.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2805 of title 10, United States Code to include as a minor military construction project any military construction intended solely to correct a life, health, or safety deficiency if the approved cost is equal to or less than \$3.0 million. The provision would authorize the expenditure of operation and maintenance funds to carry out projects to correct a life, health, or safety deficiency costing no more than \$1.0 million.

The provision would also clarify the definition of minor military construction by making it consistent with the definition of minor military construction found in section 2801 of title 10, United States Code.

#### **Section - 2803. Temporary waiver of net floor area limitation for family housing acquired in lieu of construction.**

The committee recommends a provision that would waive for a five year period beginning in fiscal year 1996 the net floor area limitation established in section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, if existing family housing is acquired in lieu of construction.

#### **Section - 2804. Reestablishment of authority to waive net floor area limitation on acquisition by purchase of certain military family housing.**

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent section 2826(e) of title 10, United States Code, that allows a waiver for a 20 percent increase in the square footage limitation when acquiring, through purchase, military family housing units for members of the Armed Forces in pay grades below O-6.

#### **Section - 2805. Temporary waiver of limitations on space by pay grade for military family housing units.**

The committee recommends a provision that would waive section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, for housing authorized for construction for five years beginning in fiscal year 1996. The waiver would permit the construction of family housing units without regard to space limitations as long as the total number of housing units is the same as authorized by law.

**Section - 2806. Increase in number of family housing units subject to foreign country maximum lease amount.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828(e) of title 10, United States Code, to increase from 300 to 450 the number of military family housing units allowed to exceed the \$20,000 per year lease threshold for military family housing in foreign countries. The provision would also increase from 220 to 350 the number of units the Secretary concerned may waive to exceed the maximum lease threshold of \$25,000 per year.

**Section - 2807. Expansion of authority for limited partnerships for development of military family housing.**

The committee recommends a provision that would expand to each of the military services the limited partnership authority provided to the Department of the Navy by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. The provision would also extend the expiration of the authority to September 30, 2000.

**Section - 2809. Authority to convey damaged or deteriorated military family housing.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to sell, at fair market value, family housing facilities at non-base closure installations which have deteriorated beyond economical repair or are no longer required. The sale may include the parcel of land on which the family housing facilities are located.

The provision would direct that the proceeds from the sale of the property be used to replace or revitalize housing at the existing installation or at another installation. The provision would also require the Secretary concerned to notify Congress before proceeding with conveyance of family housing facilities under this authority.

**Section - 2810. Energy and water conservation savings for the Department of Defense.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2865 of title 10, United States Code to include water conservation in the Department of Defense's comprehensive energy conservation plan.

**Section - 2811. Alternative authority for construction and improvement of military housing.**

The committee recognizes that living conditions for single military service members and military families are in many cases inadequate. Many of these housing units and quarters are over 30 years old and have received minimal funding for maintenance, repair, or modernization. The Department of Defense has found almost 60 percent of these units to be substandard.

The committee is concerned that these housing conditions may result in low retention rates for the military services, and believes that adequate housing is an integral part of the overall readiness of the Armed Forces.

The committee supports the efforts of the Secretary of Defense in recognizing the military housing problems and realizing that drastic improvements are required. The Secretary found that cor-

recting housing deficiencies will take several decades using current construction practices and budget processes. To address these funding and process problems, the committee recommends a legislative provision, supported by the Secretary of Defense, which would allow the military services to utilize several existing and new authorities to stimulate private sector financing of military housing construction and revitalization projects. The legislative provision would allow the military services to combine several authorities to tailor a funding strategy to a specific location and local economic conditions. The provision would waive the unit size and type limitations, and use local construction standards as a basis for sizing family housing. The Department would be authorized to provide up to 35 percent of the development cost in cash, either as debt or equity. Where land or buildings are part of the government's contribution to the project, the total cash and property may not exceed 45 percent of the development cost.

The provision would also establish a Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund, which would be used as the sole source to finance costs associated with the acquisition of housing and supporting facilities. The authorities provided in this provision would expire on September 30, 2000.

In addition to recommending legislative provisions to improve the quality of military housing, the committee supports a funding increase in the military services' family housing improvements accounts and additional barracks and dormitory military construction projects.

**Section - 2812. Permanent authority to enter into leases of land for special operations activities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the authority provided in section 2680 of title 10, United States Code which grants the Secretary of Defense the authority to lease property required for special operations activities conducted by the Special Operations Command. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Congress by March 1 of each year which identifies each leasehold interest acquired using the authority provided in this section during the previous year.

**Section - 2813. Authority to use funds for certain educational purposes.**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2008 of title 10, United States Code to authorize the Department of Defense to continue to use appropriated funds for repair, maintenance, and construction of Department of Education school facilities located on military installations.

**Subtitle B—Defense Base Closure and Realignment**

**Section - 2821. In-kind consideration for leases at installations to be closed or realigned.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Service Secretaries to accept in-kind services (improvements, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration services) on any portion

of the installation from a lessee in lieu of cash rents for leases of property that will be disposed of as a result of a base closure or realignment.

**Section - 2822. Clarification of authority regarding contracts for community services at installations being closed.**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Service Secretaries to use less formal agreements in addition to formal contracts when obtaining certain caretaker services at military installations being closed.

**Section - 2823. Clarification of funding for environmental restoration at installations approved for closure or realignment in 1995.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to fund environmental restoration at installations selected for closure by the 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission with funds authorized for the Defense Environmental Restoration Account for fiscal year 1996. After fiscal year 1996, environmental restoration for these installations must be funded using the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Account.

**Section - 2824. Authority to lease property requiring environmental remediation at installations approved for closure.**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to enter into long-term lease agreements while any phase of environmental restoration is on going at a closing military installation.

**Subtitle C—Land Conveyances**

**Section - 2831. Land acquisition or exchange, Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to acquire, through exchange or gift, a parcel of property consisting of 1,100 acres located adjacent to the eastern end of Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina and extending to Stamey Livestock Road in Sumter County, South Carolina. In the event of land exchange, the Secretary would be required to determine that it is in the best interest of the Air Force; and, that the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed would not exceed the fair market value of the parcel to be acquired.

**Section - 2832. Authority for Port Authority of State of Mississippi to use certain Navy property in Gulfport, Mississippi.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into an agreement with the Port Authority in the State of Mississippi for joint use of up to 50 acres of property located at the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi for a period of not more than 15 years. The

agreement would require the Port Authority to pay to the Secretary of the Navy fair market rental value for the use of the land.

**Section - 2833. Conveyance of resource recovery facility, Fort Dix, New Jersey.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer, without reimbursement, the Resources Recovery Facility at Fort Dix, New Jersey to Burlington County, New Jersey. In return Burlington County would provide refuse and steam service to Fort Dix at a rate negotiated by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the appropriate federal or state regulatory authorities.

**Section - 2834. Conveyance of water and wastewater treatment plants, Fort Gordon, Georgia.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without reimbursement, to the City of Augusta, Georgia, water and wastewater treatment plants located at Fort Gordon, Georgia. In exchange the City would provide water and sewer services to Fort Gordon at a rate negotiated by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the appropriate federal and state regulatory authorities.

**Section - 2835. Conveyance of water treatment plant, Fort Pickett, Virginia.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without reimbursement, to the Town of Blackstone, Virginia, the water treatment plant located at Fort Pickett, Virginia. In exchange the Town would provide water and sewer services to Fort Pickett at a rate negotiated by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the appropriate federal and state regulatory authorities.

**Section - 2836. Conveyance of electric power distribution system, Fort Irwin, California.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without reimbursement, to the Southern California Edison Company, California, the electrical system located at Fort Irwin, California. In exchange the Company would be required to maintain and operate the system and provide electrical services to Fort Irwin at a rate negotiated by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the appropriate federal or state regulatory authorities.

**Section - 2837. Land exchange, Fort Lewis, Washington.**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, two parcels of land located on the Fort Lewis Military Reservation, Pierce County, Washington to the Weyerhaeuser Real Estate Company, Tacoma, Washington. In return Weyerhaeuser would convey to the Army approximately .39 acres, plus improvements, located within the boundaries of Fort Lewis. Weyerhaeuser would also be required to provide infrastructure improvements and other considerations to

ensure that the value of its share of property is no less than the value of the property conveyed by the Army.

#### **Subtitle D—Transfer of Jurisdiction and Establishment of Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of Agriculture approximately 19,000 acres of land located at the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant to establish the Midewin Tallgrass Prairie. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without compensation, to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs 910 acres of land at Joliet Army Ammunition Plant to establish a national cemetery.

The provision would further authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the County of Will, Illinois 425 acres of land at Joliet Army Ammunition Plant to be used for a landfill. As a part of this conveyance, the County of Will would be required to permit the federal government use of the landfill at no cost.

The provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, 1,900 acres and 1,100 acres of land located at the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant to the Village of Elwood, Illinois and the City of Wilmington, Illinois, respectively, to establish industrial parks. All proceeds from any future sale of these parcels or portions of these parcels shall be remitted to the Secretary of the Army.

#### **Subtitle E—Other Matters**

##### **Section - 2861. Department of Defense laboratory revitalization demonstration program.**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a test program to allow the heads of selected defense laboratories greater flexibility to undertake facility modernization initiatives. The purpose of the program is to reduce the amount of time required to upgrade research and development capabilities at Department of Defense laboratories. The committee recognizes that the highly technical nature of facility requirements at the laboratories impose construction costs relative to these facilities consistently higher than other types of construction.

For test program laboratories, the provision would raise the minor construction threshold from \$1.5 million to \$3.0 million for projects that the Secretary of Defense may carry out without specific authorization in law. The provision would also raise the threshold for minor military construction projects requiring prior approval of the Secretary of Defense from \$500,000 to \$1.5 million. Finally, the provision would raise, for the selected laboratories, the threshold from \$300,000 to \$1.0 million for the value of any unspecified military construction project for which operation and maintenance funds may be used.

The provision would provide for the expiration of the test authority on September 30, 2000. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to designate participating laboratories before the test may begin, establish a review procedure for each project to be funded

under this section, and report to Congress on the lessons learned from the test program one year before the program is terminated.

**Section - 2862. Prohibition on joint civil aviation use of Miramar Naval Air Station, California.**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from entering into any agreement that would provide for the regular use of Naval Air Station Miramar, California by civil aircraft.

**Section - 2863. Report on agreement relating to conveyance of land, Fort Belvoir, Virginia.**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the Congress on the current status of the negotiations between the Secretary of the Army and Fairfax County, Virginia on the use of the Engineer Proving Grounds, Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The committee notes that it has been six years since the conveyance of the property was authorized in section 2821 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991. The committee believes that it is necessary for the Secretary to make a final determination as to whether the current reuse plans are feasible or whether alternative plans are preferable. The provision would require the Secretary of the Army to submit the report to the Congress within 60 days of enactment of this Act.

**OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

**Planning and design**

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the military services conduct planning and design activities for the following projects:

	<i>(\$000s)</i>
USA:	
Pohakuloa Training Site, HI, Road Improvement .....	2,000
USAF:	
Eielson AFB, AK, Boiler Rehabilitation .....	300
Fallon Air Base, NV, Galley and Child Care Center .....	200
USAR:	
Manchester, PA, Armed Forces Reserve Center, AMSA, Organizational Maintenance Shop .....	1,650
ARNG:	
Fort Harrison, MT, Training Site Support Facility .....	785
Lincoln, NE, Medical Facility .....	200
ANG:	
Robins AFB, GA, B-1 Site Improvements, Utility Upgrade .....	270
Nashville, TN, Squadron Operations Facility .....	360
Burlington IAP, VT, Squadron Operations Facility .....	225

The committee notes that these projects are required to correct facility deficiencies which impact readiness, quality of life, and productivity. The committee urges the Service Secretaries to make every effort to include these projects in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

**Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center, Fort Lawton, Washington**

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Army did not request funding for phase II construction of the Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center, Fort Lawton, Washington. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 authorized the funds for phase I construction, with the understanding that funding for the subsequent phases would be included in the budget request. The committee believes that the Center will enhance the training and administration of the reserve units in the area and urges the Secretary of the Army to include funding for phase II in the fiscal year 1997 military construction request.

**Fire fighting training system, Department of the Army**

The committee is aware of a need to provide environmentally and individually safe training for uniformed and civilian firefighters. Due to violations on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations several Army Fire Fighting Training sites have been closed, and the remaining few are scheduled to be shut down in the next 18 months. There are computer-controlled, natural gas/propane systems in operation in other services which safely replicate the required training environment and satisfy all EPA requirements. The committee believes that the Department of the Army should develop a program to replace the remaining 12 sites in regions where multiple commands can take advantage of a single site. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to identify the appropriate locations in which sites should be placed, and urges that the necessary military construction funds to support the construction of these sites be included in the Army military construction program over a four-year period. The committee directs that the Secretary submit the list of the recommended locations to the committee by January 1, 1996.

**Repair of unsafe bridges**

The committee understands that there are serious structural problems impacting the safety and carrying capacity of bridges on Army installations. The committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of the Army use funds authorized for Real Property Maintenance, Army to correct deficiencies identified in the following structures:

Railroad Trestles, Hawthorne Army Ammunition Plant, Nevada; and, Vehicular Bridges, Fort Knox, Kentucky.

**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95-91). The title would authorize appropriations in four categories: weapons activities; defense environmental restoration and waste management; materials support and other defense programs; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The fiscal year 1996 budget request for the Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities totaled \$11.2 billion. Of the total amount requested, \$3.5 billion was for weapons activities, \$6.0 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, \$1.4 billion for other defense activities, and \$198.4 million for defense nuclear waste management.

The committee is concerned with the Department of Energy's apparent unwillingness to invest funds appropriately to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of the strategic nuclear weapons stockpile and to acquire a viable near-term nuclear weapons refabrication and manufacturing infrastructure. According to the Department of Defense Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) the United States will continue to depend on a deterrent nuclear force, including a rapid upload hedge capacity, for a long period of time. It is the committee's view that in order to maintain a reliable, safe and effective nuclear force, adequate funding is necessary to ensure that the enduring stockpile, including both active and inactive weapons, be maintained in a state of full readiness indefinitely into the future. The committee's actions reflected in this bill are to redirect the Department to focus its resources and emphasis on a stockpile management program geared to the near-term refabrication and certification requirements of the NPR. These include meeting full refabrication and tritium production requirements, tritium recycling, and pit remanufacturing for the entire enduring stockpile. This will ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile and the long-term credibility of U.S. nuclear deterrence in the post-cold war world. The committee recommends authorization of the budget request, totalling \$11.2 billion, including \$3.6 billion for weapons activities, \$6.0 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, \$1.3 billion for

other defense activities, and \$198.4 million for defense nuclear waste management.

The following table summarizes the request and the committee recommendation:

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES</b>			
<b>WEAPONS ACTIVITIES</b>			
<b>A. Stockpile stewardship</b>			
1. Core stockpile stewardship	948,548	-948,548	0
Operating expenses	67,355	-67,355	0
Capital equipment	0	1,065,903	1,065,903
Operations & Maintenance			
Construction:			
GPD -101 General plant projects, various locations	12,500	-12,500	0
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, phase VI, various locations	2,520		2,520
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National laboratory	8,400		8,400

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	<u>FY 1996</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Senate</u>
	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change to</u>	<u>Authorization</u>
		<u>Request</u>	
96-D-104 Process and environmental technology laboratory, SNL	1,800		1,800
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL	6,600		6,600
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL	9,940		9,940
94-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, phase V, VL	12,200		12,200
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, NV	15,650		15,650
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization,			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
phase III, various locations	6,200		6,200
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, phase II, VL	17,995	0	17,995
<b>Total, Construction</b>	<b>93,805</b>	<b>-12,500</b>	<b>81,305</b>
<b>Total, Core stockpile stewardship</b>	<b>1,109,708</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>1,147,208</b>
<b>2. Inertial fusion</b>			
Operating expenses	195,349	-195,349	0
Capital equipment	7,918	-7,918	0
Operations & Maintenance		193,267	193,267
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility, TBD	37,400	0	37,400
<b>Total, Inertial fusion</b>	<b>240,667</b>	<b>-10,000</b>	<b>230,667</b>

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996	Senate	Senate
	Request	Change to	Authorization
	Request	Request	Authorization
<b>3. Technology transfer/education</b>			
<b>Operating expenses</b>			
Technology transfer	225405	-225405	0
Education	20000	-20000	0
<b>Total, Operating expenses</b>	<u>245405</u>	<u>-245405</u>	<u>0</u>
<b>Capital equipment</b>	4,000	-4,000	0
<b>Total, Technology transfer</b>	<u>249,405</u>	<u>-249,405</u>	<u>0</u>

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>4. Marshall island/Dose reconstruction</b>			
Operating expenses	6,330	-6,330	0
Capital equipment	470	-470	0
Operations and Maintenance		6,800	6800
	<u>6,800</u>	0	<u>6,800</u>
<b>Total, Marshall island/Dose reconstruction</b>			
	<u>1,606,580</u>	-221,905	<u>1,384,675</u>
<b>B. Stockpile management</b>			
Operating expenses	1,762,168	-1,762,168	0
Capital equipment	33,290	-33,290	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	2,111,858	2,111,858
Construction:			
Core stockpile management			
Stockpile support facilities			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
GPD-121 General plant projects, various location	10,000	0	10,000
<b>Production Base</b>			
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance Program (FCAP), various locations	8,660	0	8,660
96-D-127 Refabrication & Production Facility (SRS)	0	15,000	15,000
<b>Total Production Base</b>	18,660	15,000	33,660
<b>Environmental, safety and health</b>			
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex plant	600	0	600
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers, for			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
ozone protection, Y-12 plant	3,100	0	3,100
96-D-126 Tritium Loading Line Modifications, Savannah River Site, South Carolina	0	12,200	12,200
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrades, Y-12 plant	6,300	0	6,300
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant	8,700	0	8,700
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant	5,500	0	5,500
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant	2,000	0	2,000

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	<b>FY 1996 Request</b>	<b>Senate Change to Request</b>	<b>Senate Authorization</b>
94-D-128 Environmental safety and health analytical laboratory, Pantex plant	4,000	0	4,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant	7,200	0	7,200
<b>Total, Environmental, safety and health</b>	<b>37,400</b>	<b>12,200</b>	<b>49,600</b>
<b>Safeguards and security</b>			
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant	13,400	0	13,400
<b>Nuclear weapons incident response</b>			
96-D-125 Washington measurement operations facility, Andrew Air Force Base, MD	900	0	900

**Reconfiguration**

93-D-123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration

### Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
various locations	41,065	0	41,065
<b>Total, Construction</b>	111,425	27,200	138,625
<b>Total, Stockpile management</b>	1,906,883	343,600	2,250,483
<b>C. Program direction</b>			0
Weapons program direction - OE	136,169	-136,169	0
Capital equipment	1,887	-1,887	0
Operations	118,000	118,000	118,000
<b>Total, Program direction</b>	138,056	-20,056	118,000
<b>Subtotal, Weapons activities</b>	3,651,519	101,639	3,753,158
<b>Adjustments</b>			
Use of prior year balances	-86,344	0	-86,344

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Streamline DOE Contractors (undistributed)	-25,000	0	-25,000
Total, Adjustments	-111,344	0	-111,344
<b>TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>3,540,175</b>	<b>101,639</b>	<b>3,641,814</b>

**DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

A. Corrective activities  
 Construction:

93-D-103 Environment, safety and health improvements, weapons R&D complex, LANL	3,406	0	3,406
<b>Total, Corrective activities</b>	<b>3,406</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,406</b>

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>B. Environmental restoration</b>			
Operating expenses	1,575,973	0	1,575,973
<b>C. Waste management</b>			
Operating expenses	2,196,766	-2,196,766	0
Capital equipment	91,500	-91,500	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	2,181,266	2,181,266
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects, various locations	30,728	-15,000	15,728
96-D-400 Replace industrial waste piping, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO	200	0	200
96-D-401 Comprehensive treatment & management plan immobilization of miscellaneous wastes, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	1,400	0	1,400

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	<u>FY 1996</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Senate</u>
	<u>Request</u>	<u>Change to</u>	<u>Authorization</u>
		<u>Request</u>	
96-D-402 Comprehensive treatment & management plan building 374/774 sludge immobilization, Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site, Golden, CO	1,500	0	1,500
96-D-403 Tank farm service upgrades, Savannah River, S	3,315	0	3,315
96-D-405 T-Plant secondary containment & leak detection upgrades, Richland, WA	2,100	0	2,100
96-D-406 K-Basin operations program, Richland, WA	26,000	0	26,000
96-D-409 Advance mixed waste treatment facility, Idaho National Engineering Lab, Idaho	0	5,000	5,000
96-D-410 Specific manufacturing characterization			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
facility assesment and upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho	0	2,000	2,000
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service, WIPP, New Mexico	4,314	0	4,314
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	4,600	0	4,600
95-D-406 Road 5-01 reconstruction, area 5, NV	1,023	0	1,023
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL	4,445	0	4,445
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS	282	0	282

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	11,000	0	11,000
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	9,400	0	9,400
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex, Richland, WA	5,500	0	5,500
94-D-417 Intermediate-level and low-activity waste vaults, Savannah River, SC	2,704	0	2,704
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	3,900	0	3,900
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
system, Richland, WA	19,795	0	19,795
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation facility, Richland, WA	31,000	0	31,000
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	19,700	15,000	34,700
92-D-171 Mixed waste receiving and storage facility, LANL	1,105	0	1,105
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations	1,100	0	1,100
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA	2,000	0	2,000

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	<b>FY 1996 Request</b>	<b>Senate Change to Request</b>	<b>Senate Authorization</b>
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID	1,428	0	1,428
90-D-178 TSA retrieval enclosure, ID	2,606	0	2,606
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA	800	0	800
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,500	0	11,500
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	8,885	0	8,885
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
management, Savannah River, SC	1,000	0	1,000
<b>Total, Construction</b>	<b>213,330</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>220,330</b>
<b>Total, Waste management</b>	<b>2,501,596</b>	<b>-100,000</b>	<b>2,401,596</b>
<b>D. Technology development</b>			
Operating expenses	367,587	490,510	490,510
Capital equipment	22,923	-367,587	0
Construction:	22,923	-22,923	0
<b>Total, Technology development</b>	<b>390,510</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>490,510</b>
<b>E. Transportation management</b>			
Operating expenses	0	16,158	16,158
Capital equipment	15,918	-15,918	0
	240	-240	0

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Total, Transportation management	16,158	0	16,158
Total, Program direction	0	0	0
F. Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization			
Operating expenses	1,413,987	-1,413,987	0
Capital equipment	53,397	-53,397	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	1,463,384	1,463,384
Construction:			
GP-D-171 General plant projects, var. locations	34,724	-20,000	14,724
96-D-458 Site drainage control, Mound Plant, Miamisburg, OH	885	0	885
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,539	0	1,539

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
96-D-462 Health physics instrument laboratory, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	1,126	0	1,126
96-D-463 Central facilities area (CFA) craft shop Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	724	0	724
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrades, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,952	0	4,952
96-D-465 200 Area sanitary sewer system, Richland, W	1,800	0	1,800
96-D-470 Environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,500	0	3,500

96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996	Senate	
	Request	Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Site, Aiken, SC	1,500	0	1,500
96-D-472 Plant engineering & design, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	4,000	0	4,000
96-D-474 Dry Fuel Storage Facility, INEL		15,000	15,000
96-D-475 High Level Waste Volume Reduction Demo (Pentaborane), INEL		5,000	5,000
96-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,000	0	2,000
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	2,900	0	2,900
95-D-156 Radio trunking system, Savannah River, SC	6,000	4,000	10,000

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
95-D-454 324 Facility compliance/renovation, Richland, WA	3,500	0	3,500
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, Idaho	8,382	0	8,382
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	5,000	0	5,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	5,074	0	5,074
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, WA	1,000	0	1,000
94-D-415 Idaho national engineering laboratory			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
medical facilities, INEL, ID	3,601	0	3,601
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	2,940	0	2,940
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade, Phase I & II, Savannah River, South Carolina	7,130	0	7,130
93-D-172 Idaho national engineering laboratory electrical upgrade, INEL, ID	124	0	124
92-D-123 Plant fire/security alarm system replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, CO	9,560	0	9,560
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force			

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, CO	7,000	0	7,000
92-D-181 Idaho national engineering laboratory fire and life safety improvements, INEL, ID	6,883	0	6,883
91-D-127 Criticality alarm & plant annunciation utility replacement, Rocky Flats plant, Golden, CO	2,800	0	2,800
<b>Total, Construction</b>	<b>128,644</b>	<b>4,000</b>	<b>132,644</b>
<b>Total, Nuclear materials and fac. stabilization</b>	<b>1,596,028</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,596,028</b>
<b>G. Compliance and program coordination</b>			
Operating expenses	65,551	-65,551	0
Capital equipment	700	-700	0
Operations & Maintenance	0	66,251	66,251

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Construction:			
95-E-600 Hazardous materials training center, Richland, Washington	15,000	0	15,000
<b>Total, Compliance and program coordination</b>	<b>81,251</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81,251</b>
I. Analysis, education, and risk management			
Operating expenses	155,616	157,022	157,022
Capital equipment	1,406	-155,616	0
	0	-1,406	0
<b>Total, Analysis, education, and risk management</b>	<b>157,022</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157,022</b>
<b>Subtotal, Defense environment restoration &amp; waste mgmt</b>	<b>6,321,944</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,321,944</b>
Savannah river pension refund	-37,000	0	-37,000
Use of prior year balances	-276,942	0	-276,942

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL REST. &amp; WASTE MG</b>	<b>6,008,002</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,008,002</b>
<b>A. Other national security programs</b>			
1. Verification and control technology			
a. Nonproliferation and verification R&D	0	163,500	163,500
Operating expenses	212,642	-212,642	0
Capital equipment	13,500	-13,500	0
<b>Total, Nonproliferation &amp; verification R&amp;D</b>	<b>226,142</b>	<b>-62,642</b>	<b>163,500</b>
<b>b. Arms control</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>147,364</b>	<b>147,364</b>
Operating expenses	138,391	-138,391	0
Capital equipment	23,973	-23,973	0
<b>Total, Arms control</b>	<b>162,364</b>	<b>-15,000</b>	<b>147,364</b>

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	Senate	
	FY 1996	Senate
	Request	Change to Request
		Authorization
c. Intelligence	0	42,336
Operating expenses	40,936	-40,936
Capital equipment	1,400	-1,400
<b>Total, Intelligence</b>	<b>42,336</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total, Verification and control technology</b>	<b>430,842</b>	<b>-77,642</b>
<b>2. Nuclear safeguards and security</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>83,395</b>
Operating expenses	86,121	-86,121
Capital equipment	3,395	-3,395
<b>Total, Nuclear safeguards and security</b>	<b>89,516</b>	<b>-6,121</b>
<b>3. Security investigations - OE</b>	<b>33,247</b>	<b>-8,247</b>
<b>4. Security evaluations - OE</b>	<b>14,707</b>	<b>0</b>

83,395  
25,000  
14,707

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>5. Office of nuclear safety</b>			
Operating expenses	0	15,050	15,050
Capital equipment	24,629	-24,629	0
	50	-50	0
	<u>24,679</u>	<u>-9,629</u>	<u>15,050</u>
<b>Total, Office of nuclear safety</b>			
<b>6. Worker and community transition</b>	100,000	0	100,000
<b>7. Fissile materials control and disposition</b>			
Operating expenses	0	70,000	70,000
Capital equipment	69,500	-69,500	0
	500	-500	0
	<u>70,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>70,000</u>
<b>Total, Fissile materials control and disposition</b>			
<b>8. Emergency Management</b>	0	0	0

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
 [Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
<b>Total, Other national security programs</b>	<b>762,991</b>	<b>-101,639</b>	<b>661,352</b>
<b>B. Naval reactors</b>			
1. Naval reactors development	0	659,168	659,168
a. Plant development - OE	127,000	-127,000	0
b. Reactor development - OE	327,851	-327,851	0
c. Reactor operation and evaluation - OE	135,517	-135,517	0
d. Capital equipment	43,000	-43,000	0
e. Construction:			
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	6,600	-6,600	0
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	11,300	0	11,300

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	4,800	0	4,800
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY	3,900	0	3,900
92-D-200 Laboratories facilities upgrades, various locations	0	0	0
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	3,000	0	3,000
<b>Total, Construction</b>	<b>29,600</b>	<b>-6,600</b>	<b>23,000</b>
f. Program direction - OE	19,200	-19,200	0

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**

[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
Total, Naval reactors development	682,168	0	682,168
2. Enrichment materials - OE	0	0	0
<b>Total, Naval reactors</b>	<b>682,168</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>682,168</b>
Savannah river pension refund	0	0	0
Use of prior year balances	-13,000	0	-13,000
<b>Total, Adjustments</b>	<b>-13,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-13,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS</b>	<b>1,432,159</b>	<b>-101,639</b>	<b>1,330,520</b>
<b>DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL</b>			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	198,400	0	198,400

**Fiscal Year 1996 Department of Energy National Security Programs**  
[Amounts in thousands of dollars]

	FY 1996 Request	Senate Change to Request	Senate Authorization
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	11,178,736	0	<u>11,178,736</u>

**Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations****Section - 3101. Weapons activities.**

The committee recommends authorization of \$3,641,814,000 for weapons activities, an increase of \$101,639,000 above the Department of Energy budget request, for the following activities: \$1,384,675,000 for stockpile stewardship activities; \$2,250,483,000 for stockpile management activities; and, \$118,000,000 for program direction of all Atomic Energy Defense Activities authorized by Title XXXI. The committee recommends approval of the department's request for a reduction of \$111,344,000 for use of prior year balances and contractor streamlining.

*Congressional guidance on stockpile stewardship*

The Congress expressed serious concern over the stockpile stewardship program in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1995. The report stated, "The conferees are troubled that the Department of Energy (DOE) did not request sufficient funds for fiscal year 1995 to support the stockpile stewardship plan developed by the administration. This underfunding cannot continue without seriously undermining the department's ability to fulfill its ongoing stewardship responsibilities. Therefore, the conferees direct the Department to request funds for fiscal year 1996 that are consistent with the stockpile stewardship program plan developed by the Administration . . .". Despite last year's congressional direction, there was only a small funding increase in the fiscal year 1996 budget request for weapons activities. Furthermore, based on the DOE National Security Five Year Budget Plan, which projects unallocated cuts of more than \$1.2 billion per year in fiscal year 1997 and out-years against Atomic Energy Defense Activities, even this increase may not be sustained. These unallocated cuts are in addition to the DOE projected cuts in the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to request sufficient funds to meet all of the requirements of the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). The committee also directs DOE not to spread any generalized reductions in its Office of Management and Budget (OMB) passback against Atomic Energy Defense Activities in general, and against weapons activities in particular.

*Stockpile confidence concerns*

The committee is concerned that science-based stockpile stewardship (SBSS) is insufficient to maintain confidence in the enduring stockpile. DOE and laboratory witnesses have acknowledged in hearings before the committee and other congressional committees that there are no guarantees that the SBSS methodology will work. The scientific challenges are significant, with the likelihood of success of the stewardship program uncertain, and the timeframe for achieving its ultimate objective long. The committee is concerned about sole dependence on this approach for future stockpile confidence, and the absence of a strategy for maintaining stockpile confidence in the near-term.

*Stockpile confidence strategy*

A key unresolved issue is whether SBSS will include testing and/or hydronuclear experiments. The committee understands that this issue is unresolved within the administration. However, the committee is concerned about current trends. For example, readiness to conduct an underground nuclear test program at the Nevada Test Site has fallen to three years, despite the administration's stated policy to be ready to conduct such a program within 6 months. Many in the weapons community believes that hydro-nuclear tests are a cost effective means of maintaining the stockpile. The committee seeks to determine whether treaty-compliant hydronuclear experiments would be a cost effective means of maintaining stockpile confidence. The committee wishes to determine the appropriate yield levels for such testing. The committee believes that combining these experiments now with the predictive capability of the experimental physics facilities and computational advances proposed by the SBSS program is the only practical option for preventing the near term deterioration of stockpile confidence and is, therefore, a prudent measure. This near-term deterioration of confidence in the enduring stockpile is not addressed by the Department of Energy's evolving stockpile stewardship strategy. On this basis, the committee directs DOE to prepare to implement such a program and to prepare a report on the value of hydronuclear tests focused on the near-term as well as long-term requirements of the Nuclear Posture Review.

*Stockpile confidence: testing strategy*

The committee also expresses its concern about the safety, reliability, and readiness of our nuclear weapons. The committee strongly endorses a policy that allows for at least sub-kiloton experiments. The committee recognizes that the administration is currently negotiating a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in an effort to preclude or make more difficult the spread of nuclear weapons. However, the committee notes that sub-kiloton hydronuclear experiments are not particularly suitable for bomb development or giving foreign military planners confidence in a nuclear weapon design. They are the type of experiments required to insure that a nuclear weapon, once produced, is safe and reliable.

*Maintaining integrity of test readiness capability*

In the meantime, the committee remains concerned about the readiness of the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The committee urges DOE to give full consideration to maintaining the readiness of the NTS before planning or implementing any management restructuring or realignments. Finally, to insure continued test readiness, including for sub-kiloton tests, the committee authorizes an additional \$50.0 million above the administration request for Stockpile Stewardship for the laboratories and the Nevada Test Site.

*Reemphasis on maintaining the stockpile is required*

The committee is concerned that the Department of Energy's emphasis on SBSS has led to the neglect and underfunding of the Stockpile Management Program. This neglect and underfunding are especially apparent when sized against the clear requirements

of the NPR. The committee is concerned that weapons engineering, manufacturing capabilities, and required production capacity are inadequate to meet the requirements of the NPR, in particular the requirement to maintain a hedge against post-Cold War threats. The committee finds that DOE investments and programs are insufficient in these areas and are not compatible with the U.S. nuclear deterrent strategy. The committee directs the Nuclear Weapons Council to provide by April 15, 1996 a plan to meet the stockpile management requirements of the NPR, and to update that report on an annual basis. It also directs DOE to reactivate the defense program status of those portions of the Savannah River Site devoted to tritium recycling, and to establish a pit remanufacturing plant there sized to the requirements of the post-NPR active and inactive stockpile.

*Conclusions from the Nuclear Posture Review*

The committee's hearing records indicate that the current DOE strategy does not appear to be compatible with the requirements of the NPR. The NPR's requirements include the ability to: (a) maintain nuclear weapon capability; (b) demonstrate the capability to refabricate and certify weapons in the enduring stockpile; (c) maintain the capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads for the enduring stockpile; (d) assure an adequate science and technology base; and (e) assure an upload hedge for tritium production. The committee's recommendations provide a basis for meeting these requirements.

*Tritium production strategy*

The committee expresses a particular concern about inadequate production and supplies of tritium. Tritium, a naturally decaying isotope, is an absolutely essential ingredient to the performance of nuclear weapons. The committee believes that we cannot risk depending solely on development of accelerator technology to provide this crucial material. The committee directs DOE to assess nuclear reactors which can perform multiple functions, ranging from tritium production, to plutonium disposition, to electrical power production. Research and development on producing tritium in current domestic, commercial reactors is funded as an emergency back-up option for the future. The committee also requests a study on foreign tritium sources.

*Human resources for the weapons activity mission*

Highly skilled nuclear weapons scientists and production engineers are leaving their positions in the weapons complex and are not being replaced. The committee is concerned that personnel programs to alleviate this situation are not working. For this reason, the committee directs the Department of Energy to institute a decentralized defense programs fellowship program within the weapons program of each laboratory and site.

*Technology partnerships*

The committee has emphasized on a number of occasions that the funds authorized for national security programs of the Department of Energy are available for technology partnerships to the ex-

tent they contribute directly to the national security mission. Specifically, the primary objective of technology partnerships funded by stockpile stewardship or by stockpile management resources should be to meet the requirements of those programs. Industry benefit is secondary. These criteria of the DOE weapons support agreements should be applied to both the laboratories and the production sites. The committee has misgivings about a separate "technology transfer" line item managed at the DOE headquarters level, rather than at the laboratory or production site level. The committee therefore recommends the weapons activities "technology transfer" line item be eliminated.

The committee does not intend the consolidation of these line items to encourage the laboratories to pursue a go-it-alone, duplicative approach to developing dual-use technologies critical to stockpile stewardship and stockpile management. However, the committee does intend to insure that all stockpile stewardship research and development funds are used to meet mission needs and are not diverted to peripheral "industrial competitiveness" activities directed from DOE headquarters. In particular, the committee disapproves the DOE request for \$14.9 million for new projects within the New Generation Vehicle Initiative. Elements of manufacturing and computation related partnerships which can be reoriented toward concrete weapons program requirements may be considered for retention, based on the overall priorities of the weapons program and its specific requirements. The committee believes that planning and implementing partnerships in laboratory organizations which are separate from the weapons directorates is counterproductive to the weapons mission.

#### *Inertial confinement fusion*

The committee recommendation for inertial confinement fusion (ICF) is \$230.7 million, a \$10.0 million reduction to the budget request. Inertial fusion seeks to provide a laboratory-scale, controlled thermonuclear capability. The ICF program investigates weapons physics and other high-energy-density phenomena important to the SBSS program. It is one of several essential components to assure the nation's nuclear deterrent in the absence of underground testing of weapons secondaries. The committee commends the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories for progress on the NOVA laser. The committee notes the timely, on-budget completion of the OMEGA upgrade at the University of Rochester. The committee urges DOE to move quickly to a cryogenic target capability on OMEGA as a means of enhancing confidence in the performance of the National Ignition Facility. The committee asks the National Academy of Sciences to form another ICF Panel to provide an update of its 1990 report to the Congress by May 30, 1997.

#### *National Ignition Facility*

The National Ignition Facility has a good probability of achieving controlled thermonuclear fusion in the laboratory based on a thorough, long-term program of scientific breakthroughs and engineering demonstrations. Such developments may prove to be a significant part of the U.S. nuclear weapons program, especially in a no test/few test environment.

*Stockpile Management*

The committee recommends a substantial increase to the DOE request for the Stockpile Management Program by \$343.6 million, to enable the Department of Energy to immediately prepare the manufacturing capacity to rebuild the aging stockpile. A properly sized manufacturing capacity and infrastructure to rebuild the stockpile to meet the requirements of the NPR must be in place by the year 2002. That capacity must include both active and inactive stockpiles. The committee has concluded that, by focusing almost exclusively on long range science, DOE has overlooked the essential fact that the stockpile is the basis for nuclear deterrence. Therefore, the first priority is to deal directly with the refabrication and certification of the nuclear weapons stockpile as the primary mission of the program. The committee believes that the weapons laboratories are inadequate to deal with the refabrication capacities required by the active and inactive stockpiles. Therefore, the committee directs \$100.0 million be provided to enhance the manufacturing infrastructure and modernize the manufacturing technology of the Pantex Plant, the Kansas City Plant, the Savannah River Plant, and the Y-12 Plant to meet the refabrication requirements of the enduring stockpile by the year 2002. In particular, the Pantex Plant is to restore its weapons integration capacity to those levels required by the NPR for each type of weapon which reaches its design life in the period 2002-2013; similarly, the Y-12 plant is to restore its capacity to build weapons secondaries to those levels required by the NPR during this same period. The Savannah River Plant is to begin installing in existing structures the capability to refabricate and modify as needed weapons pits and primaries (functions formerly carried out at the Rocky Flats Plant) and to achieve a capacity which meets the numerical requirements of the entire enduring stockpile. The Kansas City Plant is to develop its non-nuclear components manufacturing capability to supply all the requirements of the nuclear weapons stockpile from 2002 to 2013. The committee also allocates \$145.0 million to enhance near term and long-term stockpile production, maintenance, surveillance activities and to develop active surveillance methods by 2002. In this set of activities, the three nuclear weapons laboratories are to establish a strong technical support and liaison relationship with the four production plants to assure that the most modern and reliable equipment is installed at the production plants for both production and surveillance purposes. This includes development on a cooperative basis by the laboratories and the plants, of a family of active microelectronic sensors to provide early detection of physical and chemical changes in a nuclear weapon. An additional \$20.0 million is approved to develop the dual revalidation technique recently conceived. This technique uses two independent teams from the DOE, in coordination with the Department of Defense to baseline the detailed design parameters of each weapon type in the enduring stockpile and to measure any changes in that baseline via measurements over time. Finally, the committee authorizes \$43.6 million for a cooperative effort between the three weapons laboratories and the four production plants which will lead to the installation of advanced computerized manufacturing processes at the four production sites by the year 2002. This equipment is to provide a detailed

quality control record of the manufacturing process for each nuclear weapon and nuclear weapon type.

**Section - 3102. Environmental restoration and waste management.**

This section authorizes the administration's request of \$6.0 billion for the activities of the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (EM) program as follows: corrective activities, \$3.4 million; environmental restoration, \$1,576.0 million; waste management, \$2,401.0 million; technology development, \$490.5 million; transportation management, \$16.2 million; nuclear materials and facilities stabilization, \$1,596.0 million; compliance and coordination, \$81.2 million; analysis, education and risk management, \$157.0 million. The committee approved the DOE request for a reduction in the amount of \$313.9 million for use of prior year balances and for the Savannah River pension refund.

*Assessment of Environmental Waste Management Program*

The Department of Energy recently published a baseline report which estimates that the total cost of the EM Program will be between \$120 billion and \$350 billion over 75 years. The committee reviewed the assumptions behind this range of estimates and assessed the influence of the "risk aversion factor" raised in the Galvin Report. The 75-year baseline report assumes no significant use of advanced technology, which partially explains the huge cost estimate. Overall, the committee questions the assumptions and analysis underlying this report. The committee continues to have concerns related to program funding, performance, and priorities.

*Providing the tools for a solution*

The committee notes that the United States no longer reprocesses spent nuclear fuel. The administration eliminated the Integral Fast Reactor Program last year. The committee believes that DOE must consider using the available tools to reduce high level nuclear waste to a manageable volume, while minimizing the risk to human health and safety. The committee recommends \$100.0 million above the fiscal year 1996 budget request for technology development to fund electrometallurgical processing at Argonne West and to accelerate the processing of nuclear materials at the canyons at Savannah River, including processing for space and nuclear weapons missions. DOE should also use these funds to initiate programs at INEL and the Savannah River Site to assess and demonstrate high leverage technology related to corroding spent fuel rods. Characterization and processing of high level waste at the Hanford site should also be addressed.

The committee urges DOE to emphasize staffing headquarters and field operations with experts in nuclear engineering and nuclear waste disposal. Further, the committee notes that all federal staffing in the fiscal year 1996 request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities is aggregated under Weapons Activities. The resources for EM program direction shall be listed separately, beginning with the fiscal year 1997 budget submission.

**Section - 3103. Other defense activities.****Section - 3142. Authority to reprogram funds for disposition of certain spent nuclear fuel.**

The committee authorizes \$1,330,520,000 for other defense activities, a reduction of \$101,639,000 from the fiscal year 1996 DOE request. The programs authorized are:

Verification and control technology .....	\$353,200,000
Nuclear safeguards and security .....	83,395,000
Security investigations .....	25,000,000
Security evaluations .....	14,707,000
Office of Nuclear Safety .....	15,050,000
Worker & community transition .....	100,000,000
Fissile materials control .....	70,000,000
Naval Reactors .....	682,168,000

*Korean reactor reprogramming*

The committee provides reprogramming authority to the Secretary of Energy to complete efforts to safely store and safeguard spent nuclear fuel in North Korea. Activities for which reprogramming authority is provided include: storage pool treatment and stabilization, canning and storage of spent fuel to meet International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguard standards, and further disposition of spent nuclear fuel. The committee notes that a reprogramming of \$10.0 million in fiscal year 1995 funds was approved for this purpose.

The committee is supportive of cost share partnerships with U.S. industry, known as the Industrial Partnering Program, to provide long-term engagement for former Soviet weapons scientists, engineers, and technicians in non-weapons science and commercial activities.

*Arms Control*

The committee recommends a reduction of \$15.0 million to the fiscal year 1996 budget request for material protection, control, and accounting (MPC&A), international security safeguards, and capital equipment activities. The committee supports efforts of the Department of Energy to implement MPC&A systems at selected facilities in the Newly Independent States (NIS).

The reduction to the budget request for fiscal year 1996 is not made with prejudice. The committee directs the department to report to the Congress within 30 days of the enactment of this Act on the plans to implement and utilize the funds provided for MPC&A programs in the Former Soviet Union (FSU). Additionally, prior to obligation of funds, the committee directs the Department to notify the Congress 30 days prior to obligation of funds. Concurrent with the 30 day notification of obligation to Congress, the committee requires that the notification include a certification by the Secretary that an audit and examination agreement has been agreed to by the recipient FSU country, and implemented to ensure that the funds used for these activities are accounted for and used for the purposes for which they were authorized.

*Nonproliferation and verification research and development*

The committee recommends a decrease of \$62.6 million to the fiscal year 1996 DOE budget request. The committee guidance to DOE is to focus the program on more specific near-term needs, rather than on a generalized long-term technology base. The committee also recommends the development of forensic capabilities to detect and track shipments of nuclear weapons material. In addition, the Department of Energy should broaden involvement in this area to encompass the entire laboratory complex by including Savannah River Site, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, the Argonne National Laboratory and, where appropriate, industry.

**Section - 3104. Defense nuclear waste disposal.**

The committee recommends authorization of the budget request of \$198.4 million for defense nuclear waste disposal activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1996.

The committee directs that the increase requested above the fiscal year 1995 level be shared by the Savannah River Site and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, which DOE has designated as the interim storage sites for corroding spent fuel rods from a variety of other Department of Energy sites. The designation of these sites by DOE included no provision for the proper technological solution to the problem of near and long-term processing and storage of spent nuclear fuel. As a result, this has been a controversial issue within the states involved.

**Section - 3105. Payment of penalties assessed against Rocky Flats Site.**

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Energy to pay civil penalties assessed against the Rocky Flats site in Colorado. The committee does not regard this authorization as establishing a precedent for routine payment of fines and/or civil penalties. The committee recognizes that the Department of Energy, under previous administrations, entered into a number of legally enforceable agreements for cleanup and remediation that are now clearly impossible to fulfill. Those agreements are the basis for the assessed fines and penalties. The committee does not believe that the diversion of scarce DOE funds to pay fines and penalties advances either site cleanup or public health and safety. The committee intends to address this issue next year.

**Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions****Section - 3121. Reprogramming.**

This provision would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in amounts that exceed, in a fiscal year, the lesser of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of \$1 million above the amount authorized for the program. The prohibition of such a reprogramming will stand until the Secretary of Energy has notified the congressional defense committees of the intent to perform such a reprogramming, and a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the reprogramming request is received by each defense committee. Should the Department demonstrate that it has improved its procedures for handling reprogramming re-

quests, the committee would consider returning to a more flexible reprogramming statute in the future.

**Section - 3122. Limits on general plant projects.**

This provision would limit the initiation of "general plant projects" authorized by the bill if the current estimated cost for any project exceeds \$2.0 million.

**Section - 3123. Limits on construction projects.**

This provision 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 the amount authorized for the project or 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 appropriate committees of Congress, and the report must be before the committees for 30 legislative days. This provision also specifies that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under \$5 million.

**Section - 3124. Fund transfer authority.**

This provision would authorize funds 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 provision would limit to no more than five percent the amount of funds that may be transferred between authorizations in the Department of Energy that were authorized pursuant to this act.

**Section - 3125. Authority for conceptual and construction design.**

The committee recommends a new provision that would limit the Secretary of Energy's authority to request construction funding until the Secretary has certified a conceptual design. If the estimated cost of completing the conceptual design is greater than \$3.0 million, the Secretary must submit a request to the congressional defense committees for the funds needed to do the conceptual design. This request for conceptual design funds must be submitted before the funding request for the proposed construction project is submitted to the Congress. This provision provides an exception in the case of emergency planning, design and construction activities, and does not apply to construction projects with a total estimated cost under \$2.0 million. Within the amounts specified by this title, the Department of Energy (DOE) may carry out construction design, including architectural and engineering services, on a project if the cost for such a design does not exceed \$600 thousand. Construction design estimates above this amount must be authorized by law. This provision recognizes the need for careful planning and early scrutiny of construction projects.

**Section - 3126. Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities.**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Energy to utilize available funds for any national security program construction project, provided 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 provision would authorize, subject to the provisions of appropriation acts and section 3121 of this bill, amounts appropriated pursuant to this bill 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 provision would authorize, subject to a provision of an appropriation act, amounts appropriated for operating expenses or for plant and capital equipment to remain available until expended.

**Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations****Section - 3131. Tritium production.****Section - 3132. Plutonium disposition.**

The committee has been critical of the Department of Energy's lack of progress in establishing a long-term source for tritium, necessary to maintain the nation's nuclear deterrent capability. The committee is aware that the Department of Energy is reviewing the costs of alternative tritium production technologies, including reactor options and an accelerator option.

The committee is concerned that, despite guidance from the Congress, the Department of Energy is not giving rigorous and balanced consideration to the use of multipurpose reactors. That option could provide the required levels of tritium production, for the disposition of surplus weapons plutonium and for the co-production of revenue-producing electric power. Studies by the department and those of various private organizations indicate that multipurpose reactors are technically practical, can be employed in the needed time frame, and would afford significant economic benefits.

Furthermore, the committee is concerned that DOE is not performing a proper engineering systems analysis and attendant cost analyses. The committee directs DOE to pursue parallel risk reduction activities for the next three years. DOE should begin three-year parallel risk reduction research and studies for both multipurpose reactor options and for accelerator production of tritium. A total of \$50.0 million in fiscal year 1996 is directed for this purpose. Both privatized and government funded alternatives shall be considered. Congressional hearings will be conducted to review this issue.

The committee further directs DOE to do an integrated systems analysis and environmental assessment of the combined tritium production mission and plutonium disposition mission, with attendant cost analyses. The result of this effort shall be compared with the results of the environmental assessments of each separate mission. This will enable the Congress to determine the major cost-benefits and technical risk reductions associated with the multipurpose reactor and accelerator methods. DOE is also directed to assemble a group of independent reactor and accelerator experts to assess the objectivity and completeness of the process described in this provision.

The committee recognizes that the eventual success of the long-term tritium source program will be dependent upon a skilled work-force and community support for the operation of such a facility. The committee strongly recommends that the logical, cost effective site for the tritium production mission would be an existing, already paid-for, tritium recycling infrastructure.

**Section - 3133. Tritium recycling.**

The committee notes that a large capital investment has been made over the years on tritium gas recycling at the Savannah River Site. It also notes that the conference report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1995 contained a provision which prohibited DOE from moving the tritium recycling work from the Mound Laboratory to any other location, except the Savannah River Site. The committee directs DOE to refrain from duplicating or establishing parallel tritium recycling capability other than at the Savannah River Site. However, it recognizes that tritium-related inertial fusion target work and tritium related research work may be done at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

**Section - 3134. Manufacturing infrastructure for refabrication and certification of enduring nuclear weapons stockpile.**

The committee directs DOE to halt the implementation of its strategy to reduce the weapons complex to the three nuclear weapons laboratories. This strategy is driven by the pressure to reduce federal budgets and was arrived at without sufficient cost analysis and consideration of the impact on national security. The committee believes that the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) recommendations on the DOE infrastructure require that the U.S. maintain the actual manufacturing capacity to refabricate and recertify old weapons, and maintain the ability to design and manufacture new weapons.

*Weapons Refabrication Strategy*

The committee directs DOE to increase investments in the Y-12 plant, the Pantex Plant, the Kansas City Plant, and the Savannah River Site's tritium and plutonium handling capabilities. These are the remaining locations with the capacity to begin remanufacturing the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. Projected annual needs for weapons refabrication will far exceed the mini-production capabilities of the weapons laboratories.

*Defense Programs Planning Council*

The committee further urges the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs to form a balanced planning council which will include the directors of the nuclear weapons production facilities named above, along with the three national nuclear weapon laboratory directors. Federal field offices should not serve as buffers between DOE headquarters and these nuclear weapons production facilities.

*Integrated weapons refabrication plan*

The committee directs DOE to develop an integrated program plan geared to the requirements of the NPR and the refabrication milestones, from the year 2002 to 2013. The plan should be made available to the committee no later than March 30, 1996. This plan shall be updated annually.

**Section - 3135. Hydronuclear experiments.**

As defense budgets decline, the emphasis of U.S. weaponry programs has turned to testing. Testing both existing and new weapons is essential to insure both safety and reliability. The committee finds that the one defense component that is not currently being tested is the nuclear warhead.

The committee believes that the ability to do experiments involving high explosives and plutonium are absolutely critical to providing the kind of stockpile stewardship necessary to guarantee the safety and reliability of the enduring nuclear stockpile. The committee has directed the Department of Energy to produce a report presenting the costs and benefits of various levels of experimentation and testing in section 3165 of this title. In the meantime, the committee has concluded that new activities at the weapons laboratories and at the Nevada Test Site aimed at preparing for actual experiments need to be funded at the \$50.0 million per year level. Actual experimental activities will be needed to prevent the near term decline in stockpile confidence.

**Section - 3136. Fellowship program for development of skills critical to the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex.**

The committee perceives the need for additional aggressive efforts by the nuclear weapons laboratories and the production sites, including the Savannah River Site, to work with academic scientists and engineers engaged in research which is closely related or directly relevant to ongoing research and program needs in the nuclear weapons program. The committee believes that the current and potential graduate students and postdoctoral fellows of these academicians are an important source of future personnel for the nuclear weapons program. For this reason, the committee designated \$20.0 million for this purpose in fiscal year 1996, and for each fiscal year thereafter. These resources would support the salaries of these graduate students and postdoctoral candidates, in whole or in part, while participating in weapons relevant research and engineering science activities at their academic institution or at the laboratory or site administering the fellowship.

Because the committee believes that a decentralized program is in order, responsibility for recruiting the best students from Ameri-

ca's science and engineering graduate schools should be left largely to the key scientists within the weapons program. The weapons director within each laboratory or site should allocate research fellowships to be awarded by scientists within his directorate based on a balanced judgement between the requirements of the program for specific personnel in the near and long-terms, and the opportunity to recruit world class candidates as future employees of the nuclear weapons program.

The director of each laboratory and production site, and the head of each corresponding Department of Energy field office shall exercise appropriate oversight of this fellowship program to ensure the effectiveness of the program. This oversight function shall also examine the selectees and the selection process to assure that selections are based on merit and program need, and that no abuses, such as nepotism, occur. The Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs shall allocate the resources for these fellowships in a balanced manner among the three nuclear weapons laboratories and the four production sites ( Kansas City, Pantex, Savannah River, Y-12). The data base for this allocation shall be the projected requirements for specific types of critical personnel which each laboratory and each production site shall present to the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs.

The goal of this program is staffing the long-term U.S. nuclear weapons program. This goal is to be stated explicitly to potential candidates and given to them in written form. Candidates are also to be limited to U.S. citizens. Emphasis should be on acquiring the best recruits for the U.S. weapons program, not the most. Acceptance of a fellowship shall be accompanied by a written commitment to work in the nuclear weapons program. The commitment should hold a recipient liable for payment of the cost of the fellowship, if the individual declines employment for a reasonable, specified period within the nuclear weapons program.

**Section - 3137. Effect of issuance of environmental impact statements on use of funds for certain Department of Energy facilities.**

The committee finds that all of the facilities funded by this authorization (1) can be independently justified on national security grounds or on grounds of meeting environmental requirements; (2) that each such facility will have completed or will have to complete its own environmental impact statement; and (3) that going forward with the construction and/or operation of each such facility will not bias the outcome of any planned or ongoing programmatic or site specific environmental impact statement.

On this basis, the committee does not wish the Department of Energy to make internal administrative decisions to halt or delay the construction or operation of projects which have completed all of their individual National Environmental Policy Act requirements through and including the record of decision. In particular, such projects should not be halted or delayed by internal DOE administrative decisions because such facilities may come under the umbrella of site-wide or programmatic environmental impact statements aimed at assessing an aggregation of facilities or a major federal strategy.

**Section - 3138. Dual-axis Radiographic Hydrotest Facility.**

The Department of Energy is scheduled to complete all National Environmental Policy Act documentation for the DARHT facility before October 30, 1995. The committee has determined that DARHT is of significant importance to national security and can be independently justified under any future nuclear weapons strategy, including any potential stockpile stewardship and management strategy. The committee requires the Secretary of Energy to proceed with this schedule by producing the environmental impact statement and the record of decision for the DARHT project by October 30, 1995. The committee has also determined that the construction and operation of DARHT will not prejudice the outcome of the site-wide Los Alamos environmental impact statement nor will it prejudice the outcome of any stockpile stewardship and stockpile management environmental impact statement (EIS) because it does not preclude reasonable alternatives for that programmatic EIS.

**Section - 3139. Limitation on use of funds for certain research and education purposes.**

The committee prohibits the Department of Energy and its contractors from diverting any Atomic Energy Defense Activities funds to the Laboratory Directed Research and Development Program. The committee believes that the scientific challenges embodied in the stockpile stewardship program represent a sufficiently wide variety of major scientific unknowns that it is more than sufficient to maintain the laboratories' cutting edge, while keeping a sufficiently tight focus on the weapons programs' pressing needs.

**Section - 3140. Processing of high level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel rods.**

The committee provides a \$100.0 million increase to the budget request for technology development in the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program and directs the Department of Energy to assess the best technological solutions for problems associated with the disposition of spent nuclear fuel. The options to be assessed include nuclear waste reprocessing, conventional chemical processing of nuclear waste, direct disposal of spent nuclear fuel in a geologic repository, and vitrification processes with and without separation of materials. This should include the beginning of conceptual engineering evaluations and life-cycle cost analyses.

Specifically, \$2.5 million shall be used for electrometallurgical processing activities at Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and/or Argonne West; \$15.0 million for research and development at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory on processing, storage and disposition of non-aluminum clad spent nuclear fuel rods; \$15.0 million for research and development at the Savannah River Site on processing, storage, and disposition of aluminum-clad spent nuclear fuel rods. The balance of the \$100.0 million increase in technology development should be used for reactivation and development of high level nuclear waste processing technology at the Hanford Reservation, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory and/or Argonne West, and at the Savannah River Site.

**Section - 3141. Department of Energy Declassification Productivity Initiative.**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority for the Department of Energy to use up to \$3.0 million of funds authorized for other defense activities in fiscal year 1996 for the Declassification Productivity Initiative (DPI).

**Section - 3143. Protection of Workers at Nuclear Weapons Facilities**

The committee recommends authorization of \$10.0 million from the operations and maintenance resources of the Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program to carry out activities related to worker protection at nuclear weapons facilities. This provision allows the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program to develop criteria and to train workers engaged in hazardous substances response or emergency response actions.

**Subtitle D—Transfer of Jurisdiction Over Department of Energy National Security Functions****Section - 3151. Plans for transfer of jurisdiction over Department of Energy national security functions.**

This section requires the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense to jointly produce two alternative national plans. One plan is to describe in detail the transfer of the responsibility and functions of the 053 account (Atomic Energy Defense Activities) from the U.S. Department of Energy to the U.S. Department of Defense. The other plan is to describe the same aspects of such a transfer to a new independent establishment. The transfer would include all federal and contractor personnel and institutions which receive significant amounts of Atomic Energy Defense Funds to carry out the missions of this Title.

The primary reason for the committee taking this action is to preserve the focus of these institutions on their primary national security functions of nuclear weapons research, development, testing, production and surveillance.

**Subtitle E—Other Matters****Section - 3161. Responsibility for Defense Programs Emergency Response Program.**

The committee is concerned about efforts to consolidate all DOE emergency response functions under the responsibility of a DOE official outside of the purview of the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs. The committee believes that this emergency response function is an essential part of the Defense Programs stockpile maintenance responsibility. The committee has determined that the Defense Programs emergency response function, including federal personnel, and contractor capabilities should remain under the authority of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Stockpile Management and Support.

**Section - 3162. Requirements for Department of Energy weapons activities budgets for fiscal years after fiscal year 1996.**

The conference report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 expressed concerns regarding the Department of Energy's budget submission for fiscal year 1995. The committee observes that the fiscal year 1996 submission has not effectively resolved those concerns. In particular, discrete weapons programs need to be costed out and explained from year to year on the same line. The committee directs that each DOE laboratory and site develop a fiscal year 1996 weapons activities program plan. This plan should be provided to the Congressional defense committees no later than December 31, 1995, and annually every year thereafter. This plan should serve as the basis for the fiscal year 1997 congressional budget submission.

**Section - 3163. Enduring nuclear weapons stockpile.**

The committee points out that a ready inactive stockpile is essential if the "upload hedge" called for in the Nuclear Posture Review is to have any real meaning in the context of the "lead" and "hedge" strategy embodied in the Nuclear Posture Review. The committee believes that maintaining sufficient warheads on presently deployed platforms is only one element of a credible plan. In order to have a serious and credible hedge capability, DOE must maintain an inactive stockpile that is ready to be uploaded onto existing delivery systems. The committee directs the Department of Energy to put in place a production infrastructure of sufficient capacity to deal with at least all end of design life rebuilds, gas fills, and limited life component replacements, test and quality control units for both the active and inactive stockpiles.

**Section - 3164. Report on proposed purchases of tritium from foreign suppliers.**

The committee urges the Department of Energy to explore the possibility of purchasing foreign-produced tritium to insure an adequate supply of tritium should the presently proposed production methods fail. The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to prepare and submit a report not later than May 30, 1997 on the feasibility of foreign tritium purchases. The report shall be in unclassified form, with a classified annex.

**Section - 3165. Report on hydronuclear testing.**

The committee continues to be concerned about the safety and reliability of the nation's stockpile of nuclear weapons over the long-term.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to make available \$9.0 million from funds authorized for the preparation of a comprehensive report by the directors of the two nuclear weapons design laboratories on the relative costs and benefits of alternative limits on the permitted levels of hydronuclear testing, to include: 4 pounds, 400 pounds, 4,000 pounds, and 40,000 pounds of yield (TNT equivalent). The committee requests the preparation of a single report, with additional and/or dissenting views by each director as they deem appropriate. The report shall be delivered to the con-

gressional defense committees, the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, and the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command for their comments thereon, not later than February 1, 1996. Arms control considerations need not be included in the report by the laboratory directors.

**Section - 3166. Master plan on warheads in the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile.**

The Department of Energy has failed to develop a requirements-based plan for stockpile stewardship and for stockpile management. For this reason, the Department of Energy is not in a position to develop a detailed plan for assuring the safety, reliability and effectiveness of the enduring stockpile. The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to prepare and submit a master plan that describes the proposed refabrication and certification of warheads for an enduring stockpile, and the capability to design, fabricate, and certify new warheads. The plan shall include details of the full manufacturing capacity needed to deal with refabricating and certifying the entire active and inactive stockpiles between the years 2002 and 2013. This plan shall be submitted to the Congress not later than March 15, 1996.

**Section - 3167. Prohibition on international inspections of Department of Energy facilities pending certification of protection of restricted data.**

The committee is concerned that the Department of Energy intends to permit inspections of U.S. nuclear weapons facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency without adequately safeguarding sensitive nuclear weapons design information. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit such inspections, unless protection of such sensitive data is certified by the Secretary of Energy.

**OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST**

**Merger of operating and capital resources into one category**

The committee recommends merging the distinct categories of operating funds and capital funds into one category called "operation and maintenance" for the purposes of dealing with future Department of Energy budget submissions. The committee directs the Department of Energy to continue to reflect capital equipment separately in financial and accounting reports.

**Nuclear stockpile dismantlement**

The committee is aware of no concrete evidence that the Russian Federation is dismantling a specific number of nuclear warheads at a specific rate. On the other hand, the U.S. is attempting to dismantle up to 2,000 per year. The committee wishes to continue a program of corresponding nuclear dismantlement with the Russian Federation, but in a manner that insures that both stockpiles are reduced at the same level, the same rate, over the same period of time. The committee directs the Intelligence Community to provide a report on this subject in both classified and unclassified forms to

the Congress, no later than May 30, 1996. This report shall be updated annually.

#### **Nuclear reactor safety in Ukraine**

Two of the fourteen "reaktory bolshoi moshchnosti kanalnye" (RBMK) graphite moderated reactors, known in the United States as light water graphite reactors (LWGR) currently in operation in Ukraine are similar in design to the reactor which caused great disaster in Chernobyl. The operation of these fourteen reactors is critical to the economic well-being of Ukraine. However, they all fail in major ways to meet international safety standards.

The committee recommends that the Department of Energy, in coordination with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), report to the Congress on the safety issues which need to be addressed, and possible recommendations. The report should include the following: the feasibility of obtaining alternative energy sources; the loss of trained nuclear reactor operators; and the likelihood of operator error or accidents. The report should also assess the need for computerized monitoring and more reliable communications networks.

#### **Accountability for civilian nuclear materials**

Concerns regarding the proliferation of nuclear weapons continue to increase. It is imperative that nuclear materials necessary to produce nuclear weapons are kept from countries with proliferation risk. To achieve this objective, it is necessary to insure adequate physical protection of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, in this country and abroad. The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Energy to collect and analyze data on the production, transportation, storage, and disposition of nuclear materials in peaceful activities worldwide.

The committee supports the efforts of the Department of Energy's Office of Nonproliferation and National Security international nuclear analysis program, which tracks and accounts for nuclear materials worldwide.



## **TITLE XXXIII—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES**

### **Section - 3301. Sale of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (Elk Hills).**

The committee recommends a provision to offer National Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (NPR-1) for sale by competitive bid in fiscal year 1996. The reserves were established in the early 1900's to assure availability of oil fuels for the Navy, which was converting its vessels from coal to oil prior to World War I. In 1976, Congress enacted the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act (P.L. 94-258) which ordered production from the fields at the maximum efficient rate.

The committee believes that the rationale for the NPR has faded in light of developments subsequent to the Arab oil embargo. The likelihood of a sustained interruption in supply has fallen, and the market has shown itself to be responsive in pricing and allocating oil during periods of uncertain supply. The committee is concerned about the long-term implications of government participation in the commercial oil business. Furthermore, the committee is required under the reconciliation instructions in the FY 1996 Budget Resolution to achieve \$1.5 billion in savings in direct spending within the committee's jurisdiction, which this provision would satisfy.

The provision would require the Secretary of Energy to obtain credible appraisals of the value of the field before setting a minimum acceptable price. In addition to standard industry considerations, the valuation must include infrastructure included in the sale, the estimated quantity of petroleum and natural gas in the reserve, and the anticipated revenue stream that the Treasury would receive if it were not sold.

The Secretary could not accept bids lower than the minimum acceptable price and could not enter into a contract for sale until the end of a 31 day period following notification to Congress. In the event only one credible offer is made, the Congress must approve the sale by a joint resolution.

The Secretary would be required to finalize equity interests between the federal government and Chevron U.S.A. Production Company within three months of enactment of this Act.

In response to a potential legal claim by the California State Teachers Retirement Fund, the provision would set aside seven percent of the net proceeds in a contingent fund. Any such claim must be resolved by a court of competent jurisdiction in order to be considered valid.

The Secretary would be required to maintain full production of NPR-1 until the sale is consummated. In the event the Secretary is not able to comply with the deadlines included in this provision, the Secretary and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget would be required to notify the congressional defense committees and submit a plan of subsequent action.

**Section - 3302. Study regarding future of Naval Petroleum Reserves (other than Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1).**

The committee recommends a provision which would require the Secretary of Energy to study options for the management of the NPR.

## **TITLE XXXIV—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE**

### **Section - 3401. Authorized uses of stockpile funds.**

This provision would authorize the Stockpile Manager to obligate \$77.1 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transfer Fund during fiscal year 1996 for the authorized uses of funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

### **Section - 3402. Disposal of obsolete and excess materials contained in the National Defense Stockpile.**

This provision would authorize disposal of excess materials from the National Defense Stockpile. Under current law, the Stockpile Manager cannot dispose of excess materials unless the proposed disposal has been reviewed by the Market Impact Committee and included in the Annual Materials Plan or a revision of the Plan. The committee expects that many of these disposals will require long sale programs in order not to disrupt markets and producers.

### **Section - 3403. Disposal of chromite and manganese ores and chromium ferro and manganese metal electrolytic.**

This provision would require the granting of right of first refusal, for certain disposals, to domestic ferroalloy upgraders.

### **Section - 3404. Restrictions on disposal of manganese ferro.**

This provision would require that certain grade manganese ferro may not be disposed of until the disposal of lower grade inventory material has been completed.

### **Section - 3405. Excess defense-related materials: transfer to Stockpile and disposal.**

This provision would direct the transfer of suitable, uncontaminated DOE inventory items to the National Defense Stockpile for disposal.

The DOE has determined that numerous commodities purchased for defense purposes are now excess. Congress established controls for disposal of such commodities in order to obtain best value for the government and prevent undue market disruption. DOE has no such system for disposals and would expend considerable funds to duplicate the Stockpile operation.

Prior to transfer of any non-radioactive materials that are listed in the National Defense Stockpile inventory, the DOE must obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense on the advice of the National Defense Stockpile Manager. Materials will then be disposed of in accordance with the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The committee anticipates this transfer would avoid duplication of effort, yield savings for not having to store these items, and dis-

pose of the excess inventory efficiently without undue market disruption.

**TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION**

Title XXXV would authorize expenditures from the Panama Canal Revolving Fund for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal and would also authorize the Panama Canal Commission to expend funds for the purchase of replacement vehicles. In no case can a replacement vehicle cost more than \$19,500.

## LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

### DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

By letter dated April 20, 1995, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 743 to the Committee on Armed Services on April 27, 1995. Executive Communication 743 is available for review at the committee. Senators Thurmond and Nunn introduced this legislative proposal as S. 727, by request, on April 27, 1995. The statement made by Senator Thurmond upon introduction of S. 727, together with the text of the legislation, appear in the *Congressional Record* of April 27, 1995 on pages S5805-5832.

By letter dated April 24, 1995, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 862 to the Committee on Armed Services on May 4, 1995. Executive Communication 862 is available for review at the committee. Senators Thurmond and Nunn introduced this legislative proposal as S. 728, by request, on April 27, 1995. The statement made by Senator Thurmond upon introduction of S. 728 appears in the *Congressional Record* of April 27, 1995 on pages S5832-5834.

### COMMITTEE ACTION

In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

In favor: Senators Thurmond, Warner, Cohen, McCain, Lott, Coats, Smith, Kempthorne, Hutchison, Inhofe, Santorum, Nunn, Exon, Kennedy, Glenn, Robb, Lieberman, and Bryan.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Bingaman, and Byrd.

Vote: 18-3.

The other roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the mark-up have been made public and are available at the committee.

## FISCAL DATA

Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-510) requires that the report accompanying each bill reported by a Senate committee contain certain information on five-year cost projections.

The letter received in compliance with this statutory requirement is shown below. The bill is an annual authorization and does not, within its own terms, generate costs beyond fiscal year 1996 even though the funds authorized to be obligated by this act may not be expended for several years in the future. The fiscal year authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.



COMPTROLLER

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
1100 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1100



Honorable Strom Thurmond  
Chairman  
Committee on Armed Services  
United States Senate  
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-510), the chart below provides an estimate of how appropriations attendant to the FY 1996 Authorization Request will expend.

Estimated Expenditures  
(\$ in Millions)

FY 1996 Request:	\$178,221
FY 1996	98,733
FY 1997	44,678
FY 1998	18,222
FY 1999	8,463
FY 2000	3,737
Beyond	4,388

Sincerely,

John J. Hamre

Enclosure

cc:  
Honorable Sam Nunn  
Ranking Democrat

**CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE**

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

**REGULATORY IMPACT**

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

**CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW**

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

## ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. McCAIN

I strongly commend Senator Thurmond for his expertise and leadership in crafting the Fiscal Year 1996 Defense Authorization bill. His considerable legislative experience was apparent in his successful efforts to resolve the great number of difficult issues which came before the Committee during our deliberations on this bill.

On most issues, I support the Committee's recommendations. Enhanced quality of life for our military personnel and their families, near-term military readiness, and additional funding for ballistic and cruise missile defense programs were given high-priority in the Committee's recommendations. In particular, I believe the Committee correctly chose to allocate to force modernization programs the majority of the additional \$7 billion in defense budget authority provided in the FY 1996 Budget Resolution.

There are, however, a number of particular matters of concern with respect to the Committee's recommendations.

#### *Reductions in Non-Defense and Low-Priority Military Programs*

The Committee endorsed many of the recommendations of the Readiness Subcommittee to eliminate over \$1 billion in funding for non-defense and low-priority military programs from the defense budget, in order to make funds available for higher priority military requirements. In addition to increasing funding for near-term readiness requirements, savings generated by these cuts were used to fund the F-117X development program, M1 Abrams tank upgrades, and the Cruise Missile Defense Initiative.

However, several of the subcommittee's recommendations were overturned by the full Committee, which restored \$234 million of the cuts in non-defense programs.

For example, among these reversals of the subcommittee's recommendations was the restoration of \$15 million to fund DOD support of the Atlanta Olympics. The subcommittee recommendation would have allowed assistance by DOD, provided that the organizing committee reimbursed the Department for its costs if the Olympics realized a profit at the end of the games. Still, the Committee voted to earmark \$15 million for the Olympic games and rejected the subcommittee proposal to require reimbursement from profits.

Obviously, we still have a long way to go in stripping non-defense funding from the defense budget. The credibility of those who support a strong national defense is badly damaged when the taxpayers are asked to pay for programs with defense dollars which do little or nothing to enhance our national security. I intend to propose amendments on the Senate floor to reverse some of these decisions and restore the subcommittee's recommendations.

*Military Construction*

I am pleased that the Committee adhered to the stringent criteria adopted in last year's Defense Authorization bill for evaluating Members' requests for additional military construction projects.

Because the Readiness Subcommittee was able to find savings within the military construction budget, we added over \$200 million in high-priority projects which were not included in the President's budget request. Each of these projects met the established criteria.

I am concerned, however, that the full Committee chose to authorize an additional \$125 million for military construction above the total amount requested in these accounts. While all of these additional projects met the established criteria, I believe that these additional funds should have been used for higher priority requirements in other accounts.

*Funding for Contingency Operations*

Unfortunately, the Committee chose not to respond to Secretary Perry's urgent request for \$1.2 billion to pay for ongoing contingency operations in Iraq, Cuba, and Bosnia during the coming fiscal year. Funding for these operations was not included in the FY 1996 budget request, as had been directed by Congress.

While many may not support the continuation of these operations, neither are they prepared to take action in Congress to terminate them. Therefore, the costs of conducting the operations must be paid.

The Committee authorized only \$125 million of the additional \$7 billion allocated to defense in the budget resolution to pay for these ongoing operations. Lacking adequate funding but operating under an agreed U.N. mandate, the Department of Defense must submit a supplemental funding request to Congress. While the supplemental request is being prepared and until its approval by Congress, the Department will continue to use training and maintenance funds to pay for the operations.

The Committee is fully aware of the deleterious effect on military readiness of diverting operation and maintenance funding for contingency operations. I deeply regret the Committee's decision to put off action on these must-pay bills.

*F-22*

In my view, excessive concurrency and weight problems in this program argue strongly for slowing down its development. I supported the initial staff recommendation to reduce funding for the F-22 program by \$600 million, which the Committee voted to restore in its final recommendations.

*B-2*

In a strong vote, the Committee defeated efforts to add funding for additional B-2 bombers. The Department of Defense has repeatedly insisted that the current fleet of 20 aircraft is sufficient to fulfill operational requirements in the two Major Regional Contingencies upon which force planning of the future is predicated. Buying additional bombers, at a cost of \$36 billion over the next

ten years, would be a waste of scarce defense resources for aircraft without a clear mission requirement in the post-Cold War world.

#### *Attack Submarine Programs*

Unfortunately, the reasoning which led the Committee to reject additional funding for the B-2 bomber program did not extend into the Committee's action on attack submarine programs. The Committee chose to authorize funding for the third *Seawolf* submarine—another costly relic of the Cold War—and to delay cost-saving competition for the follow-on New Attack Submarine until sometime in the next century. I disagree strongly with both of these recommendations.

I have long opposed the *Seawolf* program both because of its exorbitant cost and its lack of a necessary military mission.

Overall, the *Seawolf* program has already cost nearly \$11 billion, or more than \$5 billion per submarine. Since the contracts for the first two *Seawolf* submarines were originally signed, their procurement cost has increased by \$1.4 billion. The third *Seawolf* submarine is estimated to cost more than \$2.4 billion, slightly more than last year's estimate.

Because of these increasing costs, the Congress included in last year's defense authorization legislation a cost cap on procurement of the first two *Seawolf* submarines. As a result of the legislative cost cap, the Navy instituted a new program management team, which has been successful so far in containing the costs of these two submarines, and hopefully, no further taxpayer dollars will be required to finish these two submarines. However, the cost cap would not apply to a third submarine, if one is authorized, which could therefore cost much more than the \$2.4 billion currently estimated by the Navy.

The Committee report flatly states that the Navy's argument of an operational requirement for the SSN-23 was not compelling as a reason to build another *Seawolf* submarine. At a hearing before the Committee, the General Accounting Office witness testified that the intelligence analysis upon which the Navy based its claims of a growing Russian submarine threat was incomplete and, in some cases, disputed within the intelligence community. At the same hearing, the Congressional Research Service witness testified that a third *Seawolf* submarine is not necessary to fulfill the Joint Chiefs of Staff requirement for 10 to 12 stealthy attack submarines by the year 2012. Thus, military requirements do not support authorization of an additional submarine.

Essentially, I believe the Committee's authorization of \$1.5 billion to complete the third *Seawolf* submarine amounts to a capitulation to the administration's submarine industrial base arguments. It is clear from the Committee's explanation of its recommendation to authorize the third *Seawolf* submarine that cost considerations took second place to industrial base arguments. No other reasoning could explain the Committee's action.

The Navy's stated policy is to maintain the two nuclear-capable shipyards currently in operation in the U.S.—Newport News in Virginia and Electric Boat in Connecticut. Under this policy, Newport News would build only carriers (although it is capable of build-

ing submarines) and Electric Boat would build only submarines (and is not capable of building carriers).

However, separate analyses by the Navy and by Newport News Shipbuilding Company demonstrate that maintaining one nuclear-capable shipyard is cheaper than maintaining two yards. For the period FY 1996 to 2012, the Navy estimates savings of \$1.9 billion, while Newport News estimates \$5.8 billion.

Yet, the Committee chose to endorse, at least through the end of this century, that part of the administration's industrial base policy which requires maintaining two nuclear-capable shipyards. The Committee explicitly directed that the first New Attack Submarine be built at Electric Boat, but in a departure from the administration's policy, then directed that the second would be built at Newport News.

The Committee appeared to support the concept of competition for submarine procurement, but then chose to delay implementing cost-saving competition between the two shipyards until sometime in the next century. Under the Committee's recommendation, however, future competition for the third and later submarines will not necessarily result in a "winner-take-all" contract award, which could mean that both shipyards would stay in business indefinitely.

Essentially, the Committee kicked the can down the road, granting one submarine contract to each shipyard without addressing future competition. The bottom line is that the taxpayers will see no savings from competition until the next century, if at all.

Because of this arbitrary delay in imposing competition for submarine procurement, the Committee found it necessary to accept the Navy's contention that building the third *Seawolf* submarine at Electric Boat was required to maintain Electric Boat shipyard as a viable competitor in the future. Thus, the Committee authorized \$1.5 billion for the SSN-23—an overly expensive submarine for which the threat will not materialize in the foreseeable future.

A more than adequate alternative to procuring a third *Seawolf* submarine and beginning the New Attack Submarine program in FY 1998 as planned is extending the service life of the existing attack submarine force.

Currently, as of May 1, 1995, the U.S. attack submarine force consists of 83 SSNs. The Bottom Up Review stated a long-term requirement for a force of only 45 to 55 attack submarines. In order to reduce the current force to the required levels, the Navy plans to retire, rather than refuel, a substantial portion of the SSN-688 class submarines. The Navy plan would mean scrapping submarines with an average of 18 years of service life remaining.

The cost of buying a replacement submarine far exceeds the cost of refueling existing submarines, as well as the estimated savings from decommissioning existing submarines. For example, \$1.5 to \$2 billion is the estimated cost of a New Attack Submarine, while the estimated savings from early decommissioning of an SSN-688 is only \$600 to \$700 million. Clearly, if the newest of the Navy's SSN-688 class submarines were retained in inventory throughout their remaining service life, the Bottom Up Review requirement for 45 to 55 attack submarines could be met well into the next century—at a cost much less than the cost of buying the SSN-23 and buying New Attack Submarines on a non-competitive basis.

Terminating the *Seawolf* program and deferring a decision on a follow-on attack submarine program would provide needed time to reassess the need for and the design of a follow-on program. Such a decision, however, requires that we clearly face the stark reality of declining defense budgets in the future—budgets which require tough decisions about sustaining duplicative infrastructure at the cost of billions of dollars.

The real question is, how much is enough? How much of our scarce defense dollars are we willing to spend to maintain two shipyards capable of producing nuclear-powered submarines? I cannot support spending another \$1.5 billion on a third *Seawolf* submarine, nor can I support procurement of a non-competitive follow-on submarine when our existing submarine force remains capable and can be maintained into the next century.

Spending \$1.5 billion, as requested in the FY 1996 budget, to complete the third *Seawolf* submarine is a waste of money on a militarily unnecessary jobs program. I intend to propose amendments during Senate consideration of this legislation to strike funding for the third *Seawolf* program and to allocate these funds to higher priority military requirements.

#### *Missing Service Personnel provisions*

Section 1023 of the FY 1995 National Defense Authorization Act directed the Secretary of Defense to review current law related to missing service personnel and report to Congress on recommended changes. In addition to offering the required recommendations, the Department of Defense accommodated the Committee's concerns by agreeing to several changes that went considerably beyond the scope of the initial Section 1032 recommendations.

In their legislative recommendations, the Committee has gone as far as the Congress should on this issue. I believe the Committee and the Department of Defense have agreed on a course of action that will improve current procedures without imposing a new and cumbersome bureaucracy on the Department, the Services, and commanders in the field.

However, the report language accompanying the bill does not accurately reflect the intention of the bill language in one key aspect. The recommended provision would not prohibit the Department of Defense from declaring a serviceman dead when there are obvious indications that he is indeed dead, including the passage of time. Contrary to the report language, the bill language does not confer immortality on MIAs. Further, I do not share the editorial characterization of the accounting system as "insensitive and unresponsive." Whereas this may have been true many years ago, the Department of Defense and the Services have since taken extensive measures to make the system "sensitive," "responsive," and most important, workable.

I urge my colleagues to steadfastly oppose ill-advised amendments to the language recommended by the Committee, and I expect to work together to oppose the provisions in the House bill which, in my view, are unwise and unworkable.

*Service Academy Directives*

Finally, the report includes a discussion about recent DOD directives concerning the Service Academies. I strongly support the Committee's reservations and direction stated in that language.

Briefly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the DOD directives relating to the Service Academies with a view toward rescinding or revising those sections that impose unnecessary restrictions on the appropriate authority of the Service Secretaries or Academy Superintendents. The Committee properly states that the DOD directives in question have gone too far and have infringed upon the statutory authority of the Service Secretaries to provide for the training and education of cadets and midshipmen. The Board of Visitors of the three Service Academies are predominantly made up of Members of Congress and provide the appropriate oversight of the Service Academies as their mission.

Historically, the responsibility for and the authority over the Service Academies is vested in the hands of the Service Secretaries, and it is a well-recognized view that the Service Secretaries should retain that oversight. DOD directives which attempt to somehow constrain or restrict Service Secretaries or to promote uniform oversight and management of all the Service Academies would have a serious negative effect on the timeless notions of the Service Academies' mission—honor, integrity, loyalty, and courage.

*Conclusion*

Because I believe the major provisions of this bill will enhance the security of our nation in the future, I voted to report the Committee's recommendations to the Senate. I will work with the Committee to ensure that the bill is not amended on the floor to weaken or reverse any of its very positive provisions. I believe, however, that there are some areas in which the bill could be improved, particularly those discussed above, and I intend to offer or support amendments that would strengthen the bill.

Because of the need to balance the federal budget and reduce our nation's massive federal debt, the debate in the future will focus ever more narrowly on "guns versus butter". We cannot continue to fund every new program with a unique or interesting capability. Instead, we must thoroughly assess our national security interests and then carefully select only those programs which are directly relevant to protecting those interests and which are affordable in the shrinking defense budgets of the future. If we don't make the hard choices in entering into commitments with our allies and friends, and if we then fail to prioritize among weapons systems to enable us to support those commitments, we will fail in our most basic responsibility—protecting the security of the American people.

JOHN MCCAIN.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. EXON

The Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act reported out by the Senate Armed Services Committee represents a regrettable and potentially harmful U-turn that will, unless corrected, return the United States to the confrontational Cold War policies of the 1980s before the fall of the Soviet empire.

While much in the committee bill is laudable and will greatly enhance the readiness and capabilities of our armed services, I am fearful that these constructive elements of the authorization bill will be offset by misguided efforts to defend against threats that do not exist and hostile attempts to scuttle international agreements intended to enhance our security through peaceful means. As originally drafted, this bill attempted to abolish the Department of Energy, gut the Cooperative Threat Reduction program responsible for the removal of over 2500 Russian nuclear warheads, prevent the administration from carrying out a number of important nuclear non-proliferation agreements relative to North Korea and the former Soviet Union, and purchase unwanted B-2 bombers at a potential cost totalling tens of billions of dollars.

While the majority of the committee was successful in overturning these and other astonishing hardline recommendations, many provisions remain in the reported bill that would return us to the Cold War mentality of yesteryear. Among the most objectionable of these reversals are bill provisions that advocate violation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, add over \$500 million in "Star Wars" missile defense funding, endanger ratification of the START II Treaty, resurrect at least two battleships at a cost of a half-million dollars a year, and mandate the resumption of nuclear weapons testing.

The \$50 million provided for subkiloton nuclear weapons testing is a particularly mischievous add-on to the President's budget. The mandate is in violation of existing law (i.e. the FY 1993 Energy and Water Appropriations Bill) which states that all proposed nuclear tests be included in the annual administration report on our nation's nuclear weapons stockpile and the need, if any, to conduct tests. Specifically, the bill violates the provision of law that states "only the numbers and types of tests specified in the report . . . may be tested." In short, the bill totally negates the process already in existence for proposing and approving, with congressional concurrence, new nuclear tests. More central to the point is whether these subkiloton tests are needed. No safety or reliability problem is known to exist with any of our nation's nuclear weapons to justify new tests. On this point, there is no disagreement. Administration officials from the laboratories all the way up to the President are unanimous in this opinion. There is no explanation in the committee bill as to which warheads are to be tested, why they are to be tested, or how many tests are to be conducted. Absent a known

safety and reliability problem, the primary purpose for the resumption of testing, according to majority committee staff, is to maintain worker expertise at the Nevada Test Site, though there is no testimony to suggest flight of workers is occurring or, if it was, that the authorized funds would stem their departure.

The true reason for the committee's actions is a basic belief that we should test for the sake of testing even if it means (or in the hopes of ?) undermining the U.S. efforts in Geneva to negotiate a Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) Treaty. As part of the administration's nuclear non-proliferation policy, the U.S. has spent two years laying the groundwork for a permanent extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and an agreement on a CTB. The NPT extension was approved this spring with the nuclear powers, including the U.S., recommitting themselves to a prompt agreement on a test ban. The committee bill looks to bust the U.S. testing moratorium, renege on these commitments made during the NPT conference, and undermine our efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons around the world. The cumulative effect will be to weaken, not enhance, our national security. For this reason, I will move to strike the \$50 million add-on for the resumption of nuclear testing when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

In summary, I am concerned with the tone and substance of the bill. The level of micromanagement placed on the Pentagon and the Department of Energy is unprecedented and harmful to our nation's standing in the international community. Many of the committee initiatives are driven by a desire to defend against a superpower threat to U.S. security that simply does not exist. At a time when our one-time enemies are now allies and the world community is committed more than ever before to the peaceful resolution of conflicts, the committee bill is at odds with reality and in strong need of amendment before it can properly serve our nation's security interests.

J. JAMES EXON.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

The FY 1996 Defense Authorization Bill reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee has serious weaknesses that should be corrected by the full Senate. Our goal is to develop a post-Cold War military that gives us the capability to defend our nation at home and our vital interests abroad, with a sufficient margin to deal with unforeseen dangers and contingencies, but without resorting to wasteful and unnecessary programs in this era of heavy pressures on all aspects of the federal budget.

I commend the committee for its decisive vote to reject further funding for procurement of B-2 bombers, and to allocate funds proposed earlier for B-2 procurement to other pressing defense needs. Further expenditures on this capable yet exceedingly costly system would burden a defense budget already stretched thin by current modernization needs. As Secretary Perry made clear to the committee, procurement of additional B-2s is not needed or wanted by the Department, and the committee deserves credit for accepting this recommendation.

In addition, the committee voted, but by only an 11-10 majority, to protect the right of women serving overseas in the armed forces to choose abortion by guaranteeing continued access to safe abortions in U.S. military hospitals if they pay for the procedure themselves. The committee was right to reject a blanket prohibition on abortions at U.S. military hospitals overseas. The committee's action avoids an unacceptable situation in which military women seeking to exercise their constitutional right to choose to terminate their pregnancy would be required to use potentially unsatisfactory foreign medical facilities, or else return to the United States at substantial expense. I urge the full Senate to preserve the committee's action.

Unfortunately, the committee bill also contains several provisions that would seriously undermine our efforts to achieve nuclear arms control and prevent nuclear war. That goal has been a fundamental part of our national security since World War II. It is also the cornerstone of the international non-proliferation regime we are attempting to develop now to protect our security in the post-Cold War era and prevent nuclear conflict in the years ahead.

One of the most objectionable aspects of the committee bill is its threat to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972. Since the U.S. and the Soviet Union signed this landmark treaty, it has been a major part of U.S. nuclear arms control policy. By insuring that nuclear arsenals remain effective deterrents, the ABM Treaty has brought stability to the nuclear relationship for the past quarter century.

Some believe that the end of the Cold War and the relaxation in military tensions between the U.S. and the nations of the former Soviet Union have made the ABM Treaty obsolete. But the nature

of nuclear weapons and their massive destructive power has not changed. To discard the ABM Treaty would harm the U.S.-Russian strategic relationship, and jeopardize the opportunity for further arms control progress between the two strongest nuclear powers.

In spite of this plain rationale, the committee has produced a bill that takes initial steps to deploy a multi-site national missile defense, even though it would be a clear violation of the ABM Treaty, and even though the Secretary of Defense has testified that the United States faces no missile threats that would make this costly system a worthwhile investment in our national security. In unilaterally undermining the ABM Treaty, we would start spending billions of dollars to deploy a defense against potential enemies whose missiles cannot reach our shores. Clearly, there are more responsible ways to spend scarce defense dollars, and to deal with threats of nuclear attack and nuclear terrorism.

The committee bill ignores an important characteristic of the ABM Treaty—its built-in adaptability to changing military realities. The treaty allows the signatories to deploy theater missile defenses, and U.S. development of such defenses is yielding systems that may have significant capability to defeat strategic offensive missiles. As a result, the Clinton Administration has entered into negotiations with Russia to determine which systems will be permitted under the ABM Treaty. In addition, the treaty provides for updates to maintain its relevance by discussions and clarifications through the Standing Consultative Commission, through amendments negotiated at treaty-mandated 5-year review conferences, or through special negotiating sessions.

The bill, however, contains an unjustifiable provision that prevents the effective negotiation of any boundary between theater and strategic defensive systems. This provision would deny the President the power to negotiate this clarification of the treaty in a way that will best serve our national security. By attempting to achieve by legislative mandate what the President should negotiate, the committee is undercutting the basic constitutional allocation of treaty-making powers between the President and Congress. Rather than giving the President the flexibility to negotiate this kind of all-important issue, Congress would be legislating a negotiating position while negotiations are underway. This step sets a dangerous general precedent for the future, and could result in the collapse of the ABM Treaty.

The committee bill also fails to give adequate support to one of the President's most important aspects of our foreign policy—his commitment to achieve a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests. His recent success in obtaining international agreement for a permanent extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is one of the administration's most important achievements. In securing this extension, the administration made a commitment to seek a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible, hopefully by the end of 1996. Many of the nations that initially opposed permanent extension of the NPT eventually agreed to the extension, provided that the nuclear powers move expeditiously to negotiate and sign a nuclear test ban.

By adding funds to support U.S. nuclear tests, and by asserting that these tests are necessary to ensure the safety and reliability

of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, the committee undermines that commitment and ignores the views of many experts that our present technology is clearly sufficient to guarantee a safe and reliable nuclear arsenal without further U.S. nuclear tests of any size. A Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an essential part of international nuclear non-proliferation efforts, and therefore an essential part of the all-important goal of preventing nuclear war. Congress should support the President's effort to achieve this goal, not undermine it.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. GLENN

As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, I supported the majority of the recommendations adopted in this bill but I must express my concern over some of the funding decisions made in the Subcommittee and adopted by the Full Committee. I supported the bill, particularly the increases made in the areas of Depot Maintenance, Real Property Maintenance and Base Operations. I agree that these actions are necessary to maintain the so-called "near term" readiness of armed forces.

My concerns relate to the proposals to eliminate or reduce funding for a number of programs requested in the President's budget. For example, the Subcommittee proposed to eliminate or reduce funding for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, Arms Control Implementation, Civil Military Cooperative Action programs, Junior ROTC, the Defense Acquisition University Scholarship program, Humanitarian Assistance, Overseas Disaster Relief, Weather Reconnaissance, the Civil Air Patrol and Security for the 1996 Olympics.

While funding for all of these programs was requested in the President's budget, elimination of funding or reductions in funding to these programs was proposed at the Subcommittee either because they were considered to be lower priority programs or because the programs were considered "non-defense" defense spending that did not contribute sufficiently to our war fighting capabilities.

In many cases, the Subcommittee's rationale for proposing reductions was that the function performed by DOD would more properly be performed by another agency of government. My concern is that when the budget resolution cuts domestic discretionary spending by \$10 billion and increases defense spending by \$7 billion, the likely consequence of eliminating DOD funding without making provision for the programs elsewhere in the budget is tantamount to outright elimination of those programs.

I was pleased that funding for the majority of these programs, particularly those programs that fell within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee, was restored by the Full Committee. I note, however, that funding for DOD participation in two important programs, Humanitarian Assistance and Overseas Disaster Relief, was eliminated.

Certainly every effort must be made to insure that taxpayer dollars are well spent. The programs outlined above were requested by the President and have received bipartisan support in Congress in the past. They are not "added" programs or "earmarked" funding.

In my judgement, before we eliminate an ongoing program that is in the budget and which has received bipartisan support, we need to ask the following questions:

- (1) is this an important federal government function?
- (2) if so, would immediate termination of DOD funding disrupt an important government function?
- (3) does the program contribute to or degrade DOD capabilities?
- (4) does it make operational and budgetary sense for civilian agencies to develop a duplicative capability?
- (5) if the capability is to remain with DOD, but the function is within the responsibility of another agency, should we ensure that the other agency has sufficient funding to pay DOD for its costs?
- (6) if either the operational or funding responsibility is to be transferred to a civilian agency, what transitional provisions are needed in terms of time and funding?

In many cases, DOD may have unique capabilities to perform functions that would be very costly to duplicate in the civilian sector. The Committee implicitly recognized DOD's unique capabilities in one area by funding aerial and sea surveillance operations for the drug interdiction program. This program has little direct relevance to DOD's war fighting capability, yet the Committee provided over \$800 million for DOD's role in the counterdrug effort.

To exclude DOD from participating in other legitimate federal functions when DOD may be the best suited to perform the function simply because the activity does not directly involve war fighting, would be wasteful in my view. I am hopeful that the question of funding for DOD's participation in the Humanitarian Assistance and Overseas Disaster Relief programs can be revisited before passage of the final version of the bill.

I also regret that the Committee chose not to use some of the additional \$7 billion it received from the budget resolution to fund our Fiscal Year 1996 current and ongoing "Southern Watch," "Provide Comfort," "Deny Flight," "Sharp Guard" and "Provide Promise" operations in Iraq and Bosnia. Secretary Perry wrote to the Committee to request that these operations, with an estimated FY 1996 cost of \$1.2 billion, be funded with the additional funds the Committee received.

Even though these kinds of requests are normally considered through a supplemental funding request, I believe the Committee missed an opportunity to avoid future funding problems. Ignoring these costs now under the assumption that they will be funded through a supplemental 6 months from now will degrade our near term readiness because these operations will be financed out of the Operations & Maintenance accounts until a supplemental is approved. Moreover, if offsets are required, there is a good chance it will adversely affect the increases proposed in the modernization accounts because those increases will likely be used to pay for the costs of the supplemental.

I question the Committee's recommendation to change active duty obligation for our military service academy graduates from six to five years. Since 1991, when the obligation requirement was raised from five to six years, all three academies have met their recruiting goals without lowering their acceptance standards. To change a policy that would lower our "return on investment"—we

currently budget over \$1 billion each year for military service academies—seems ill-advised.

I also have serious concerns over other actions taken by the Committee that I will address in further detail when the bill comes to the floor. First, the bill requires the United States to deploy a multiple-site national ballistic missile defense network by the year 2003, an action that would violate the ABM Treaty. Second, the bill requires “preparations to commence” explosive hydronuclear testing, an action that will serve only to frustrate the achievement of a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and to erode international support for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Third, the Committee majority has slashed the Department of Energy’s budget request for arms control and nonproliferation verification activities. And fourth, the bill provides new funds for plutonium reprocessing activities.

JOHN GLENN.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. LIEBERMAN

This bill represents the concerted efforts of a Senate committee to do what is best for our nation and our national security. I am proud to have been part of this work and appreciate the leadership that the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee as well as the Subcommittee Chairmen and Ranking Members demonstrated throughout the process of writing the bill. I support this bill and believe, in particular, that the provisions pertaining to the maintenance of a strong and viable submarine industrial base serve the national interest. I am concerned, however, that report language could lead one to believe that military requirements were not adequately considered in the decision to authorize the third *Seawolf*, SSN-23.

It is undeniable that the Cold War is over and that the US military must adjust—and is already adjusting—to a changing security environment. The Navy's submarine forces have been at the forefront of this adjustment; attack submarine levels are being cut by 50 percent and submarine construction by 90 percent. I fear that we have cut too much and too fast, since in the realm of submarine capabilities there are major certainties at work. Today, Russia has in the water about six submarines with fourth-generation quieting technology. Approximately the same number are under construction. These are facts that are generally agreed upon by the entire US intelligence community. I will focus later on differences that the General Accounting Office asserted exist among US intelligence agencies. There is no disagreement that these very quiet submarines are at sea today and more are under construction.

Building the SSN-23 represents the most critical and timely contribution the US can make to address both the Russian challenge and the expanded threat of highly capable diesel submarines armed with "smart" standoff weapons. Much focus has been placed on the force level requirement for quiet submarines set for 2012 by the Joint Staff. This requirement is for 10 to 12 advanced generation submarines that possess *Seawolf*-level quieting. There are equally valid military requirements for new generation submarines in the time period prior to 2012.

In a June 19, 1995 letter to the Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff described the critical near-term military need for the SSN-23, saying:

"Cancellation [of the SSN-23] would deprive our armed forces of a needed military capability to counter the growing number of deployed improved AKULA class submarines which are quieter than our improved 688 attack submarines."

This concern reflects the fact that Russian submarine building did not taper off as anticipated in 1993. The fact is that the threat is evolving in such a manner that submarines like the *Seawolf* will become even more important to national defense in the future than

they were during the Cold War. Our submarine construction program must introduce our newest generation submarines at a rate that counters this military challenge. By endorsing the Navy's submarine building plan, Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili acknowledge the pivotal role the SSN-23 plays as a warfighting, as well as an industrial, bridge to the New Attack Submarine class.

Completing SSN-23 leverages over \$920 million already invested in specialized *Seawolf* components, delivers to the US Navy the best submarine in the world and does so at the lowest cost of any submarine we could buy before the end of the century. SSN-23 is also the critical link in executing the two nuclear-capable shipyard policy—a policy that supports cost control. But beyond the preservation of the industrial base, sound business practices and preserving long-term competition, completing the third *Seawolf* satisfies compelling military requirements in preserving our maritime superiority.

A second issue to which I have already referred is the question of disagreement among intelligence community estimates on the nature of the submarine threat facing the United States. The General Accounting Office has indicated that there is a significant disagreement. This is a distortion of the consensus on the nature of what confronts the submarine force of the future.

There is no disagreement that the Russian Navy has a number of Improved AKULA-class submarines in the water today that are quieter at tactical operating speeds than the best submarine currently in the US inventory.

There is also no disagreement that the Russian navy is returning to submarine operating patterns last seen in the mid-1980s. While Russian surface operations have been radically curtailed, we are observing deployments of a submarine force capable of world-wide operations once again. This includes operations in the Western Atlantic.

Finally, there is no disagreement that the Russian Navy has laid down and will launch in the next year or so the lead ship of a new class of submarines which will be even quieter than the AKULA, better armed and with improved sensors. The lead ship has been named the Severodvinsk, the first true multi-mission submarine in the Russian inventory. All our intelligence agencies agree on the design and capabilities of this very sophisticated class of submarines.

The underlying reality is that the Russian political and military leadership seems to have decided that they want to keep Russia a global military power. In order to do so, they can scale down many military capabilities and programs, but there are several key components critical to military power that must be maintained and expanded. Leading this list is submarines.

The disagreement which exists among intelligence agencies is at the margin. It is about the capability of the Russians to continue to build these advanced submarines at the present rate. Some analysts say that they will continue to build at demonstrated production rates—thus giving them sixteen or more high-quality submarines in the first decade of the next century. Other analysts, taking a more optimistic view, believe economic difficulties will force the Russians to curtail their production rates—perhaps pro-

ducing only a dozen. The disagreement is, thus, by what ratio will US submarine forces be outnumbered over the next fifteen years?

I feel compelled to make a final comment on the compromise language which has been developed for competing the next class of submarines to be produced in this country—the New Attack Submarine. I agree with the report language accompanying this bill that “competition in shipbuilding is an effective means to minimize cost to the government.” Such competition must be rigorous and real—based on the whole range of factors which would normally be considered by any buyer about to make a major purchase. The price offered must be a reasonable and realistic price which provides taxpayers the best value for their dollar and delivers the product with the quality which has been contracted for according to the agreed upon schedule.

The bill language which directs the Secretary of the Navy to ensure such a competition for the New Attack Submarine, in my view, recognizes the importance of these principles. It is with this understanding that this language has my full support.

JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN.

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. BRYAN

While I supported reporting the Fiscal Year 1996 Defense Authorization bill to the Senate, I feel it is important to express my deep concerns related to certain provisions contained in the legislation.

The Department of Energy is currently undergoing an extensive review of the best way to fill our tritium production needs into the next century. There is broad agreement that this issue must be urgently addressed to maintain the United States' nuclear deterrence capability.

There are differing views regarding the best and most cost-effective technology for tritium production. Scientists at the Department of Energy are in the process of identifying the best technology, whether it be accelerator or reactor, as well as determining the best site for tritium production.

I am concerned that this legislation attempts to prejudge the appropriate technology, while also delaying the date when a final technology decision can be made. By requiring further studies beyond the extensive studies currently being undertaken by the Department of Energy, and by directing tritium production funding to two separate technologies, this bill could put at risk our readiness to produce tritium when it is needed. We should not be tying the hands of the Department of Energy on an issue of this importance.

I also do not support report language in this legislation stating that the best site for tritium production would be the site with tritium recycling infrastructure. The Department of Energy has identified five potential sites for tritium production, and this legislation is certainly not the best place to determine which site is most appropriate, given the wide variety of issues that must be taken into account. I personally feel the Nevada Test Site would be the best site for a tritium production accelerator. The Nevada Test Site has a long history of supporting the nation's nuclear deterrent, and producing tritium for the enduring stockpile is consistent with the history and appropriate for the ongoing mission of the NTS.

RICHARD H. BRYAN.

## MINORITY VIEWS OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN

The FY 1996 Defense Authorization bill reported by the Armed Services Committee is out of step with the priorities of the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of Defense and the President. The bill funds numerous programs in excess of national security requirements, leaves ongoing military operations without dedicated funding, and adopts policy actions that could endanger our security by provoking proliferation and undermining arms reduction agreements.

### PENTAGON WASTE

There is no sudden, increased threat to justify the hefty boost of over \$7 billion dollars in defense spending above the President's request. While other agencies are taking sharp cuts in high-priority programs, the Committee has failed to act to cut wasteful spending at the Pentagon despite substantial evidence to support significant reductions in overhead.

The Committee heard testimony that DOD cannot properly match its disbursements with its obligations, and the GAO found "substantial risk that (1) fraudulent or erroneous payments may be made without being detected." The DOD itself has determined that it has about \$30 billion in "problem disbursements". The DOD Inspector General estimates that every year DOD pays private contractors approximately \$500 million that it does not owe them; GAO estimates that figure to be closer to \$750 million. The DOD Inspector General estimates that in the last eight years, DOD has ordered some \$7 billion worth of goods and services beyond the amount appropriated. And DOD is still spending approximately \$20 billion each year on new supplies, a figure that has remained relatively constant for the last several years, even as force structure has declined substantially. Moreover, \$1.7 billion of the \$19.8 billion FY 1996 request is for items that DOD admits are excess to its needs.

The Governmental Affairs Oversight Subcommittee heard testimony that DOD could save \$700 million each year processing travel vouchers if it adopted the average industry practices, and \$800 million to \$1 billion if it met private industry's best practices for processing travel vouchers.

The Committee did not take action to fix these inefficiencies. As long as Congress keeps funding the department's inefficiencies, there is no incentive for DOD to make the necessary fixes.

### ONGOING OPERATIONS

While the bill provides billions of dollars for procurement programs not requested by the Pentagon or the President, it leaves unfunded over \$1.1 billion in known expenses for ongoing military operations like the no-fly zones in Iraq and Bosnia and Cuban Refugee security activities. If this gap is not addressed in the final bill,

the very readiness and training accounts that members of the Armed Services Committee have raised alarms about will be placed directly at risk.

The Committee also refused to establish and fund a DOD requested fund for Contributions to International Peacekeeping, even though the Senate approved the exact same provision last year. Such a dedicated fund would further protect O&M readiness accounts from being temporarily utilized for near-term expenses of multinational peace operations in which U.S. combat forces participate.

#### MISSILE DEFENSES

On no set of programs are the Committee's actions more objectionable than in the area of missile defenses and nuclear warhead activities. The Congress should reject the return to the Cold War and to "Star Wars."

The bill makes it the policy of the United States to violate the ABM treaty, a cornerstone of our strategic security for 25 years, by moving "to deploy \* \* \* a multi-site national missile defense." This is not a question of interpretation; a multi-site national missile defense is explicitly prohibited by the treaty. This is a provocative move that could wreck the landmark arms reduction treaties achieved by President Bush, and spark a buildup of offensive weapons—the opposite of what we have been trying to achieve. As the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shalikashvili wrote on June 28, in opposition to the bill's provisions: "we must assume such unilateral U.S. States legislation could harm prospects for START II ratification by the Duma and probably impact our broader security relationship with Russia as well."

This program is in direct opposition to the current Congressional consensus for continuing research on NMD that is consistent with the ABM Treaty, while preserving the option to deploy if the threat increases, and seeking ABM Treaty understandings or changes that are mutually agreeable between the U.S. and Russia.

There is no new danger of missile attack on the continental U.S. to justify the crash program for National Missile Defense contained in this bill. DIA Director General Clapper testified this year that "we see no interest in or capability of any new country reaching the continental United States with a long range missile for at least the next decade." The bill nearly doubles funding for National Missile Defense (NMD), creating a highly-concurrent, rush deployment program. Deploying a multi-site NMD system by 2003 will require tens of billions of dollars in the next five years, but the bill does not identify any source of these funds.

The assault on the ABM Treaty is continued in the bill's provisions regarding Theater Missile Defenses. The Bill declares a unilateral interpretation of the ABM Treaty by asserting a demarcation between theater missile defense (TMD) systems (non-strategic) and ABM systems (strategic), and then declares that the ABM Treaty does not apply to ABM systems, "unless and until" they are tested against strategic ballistic missile targets. Such tests are, of course, strictly prohibited by the ABM Treaty.

The bill even goes so far as to say that the demarcation ceases to apply "when" a TMD system is tested against a strategic target.

On a party line vote the committee rejected an amendment that would have prohibited the use of FY 96 funds to conduct such a Treaty-violating test. One can only conclude that the committee's majority members want to violate the ABM Treaty as early as possible.

The bill prohibits the executive branch from adopting any other interpretation, even though this demarcation issue is the subject of ongoing discussions between the U.S. and Russia. In a further affront to the foreign policy-making powers of the Presidency, the legislation would effectively bar the administration from even discussing any alternative, let alone attempting to negotiate clarifications in that treaty with the Russians.

The Senate once defeated an effort by the Reagan Administration to unilaterally reinterpret the ABM Treaty. This bill seeks the same result the Senate previously prevented.

#### NUCLEAR WEAPONS PRODUCTION COMPLEX

In a return to Cold War policies, the bill also funds major initiatives to resume and expand nuclear weapons materials production and warhead manufacturing activities as if the Cold War had never ended, earmarking funds for facilities and projects that have not been requested by the administration. The bill also makes cuts in vital funding for arms control verification and non-proliferation research, and for safeguarding warheads that Russia is retiring.

The Committee wants the U.S. to keep its entire stockpile of inactive reserve warheads—the same ones we have removed to comply with START I—ready to be redeployed on our missiles and bombers as a “hedge” against uncertainty in Russian arms control compliance or reductions. But Russia is ahead of the U.S. in its compliance with START I and shows every sign of continuing its good record. The Committee's action could instead jeopardize reductions in START I and START II that are a real source of security to the U.S.

Today there are fewer missiles and warheads in the former Soviet Union capable of being launched at the U.S. than during the past 15 years. That number will decline dramatically with the entry into force and implementation of START II. But the Committee would reverse all these security gains and return us to the dangers of the Cold War for no reason. The bill also includes funding for hydronuclear tests that the administration did not request, a provocative move at this sensitive moment in Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty negotiations, when the U.S. is trying to dissuade tests by other countries and conclude a final treaty to halt testing.

The basic premise of these funding increases and policy changes is flawed. The safety and reliability of our nuclear deterrent is being maintained, and can be maintained in the future without nuclear weapons tests. If safety problems arise with a warhead that remains in the stockpile, current law allows the President to certify that tests are required to install safety devices in it. But no such problem has been discovered. In 1992 we had Congressional testimony that the Air Force, Navy, DOD and DOE had all concluded “that there is not now sufficient evidence to warrant our changing either warheads or propellants” in a warhead because of safety concerns. There has been no testimony to the contrary.

Some of our best scientists have concluded that we do not need to conduct small "hydronuclear" tests. In August 1994, DOE and DOD's scientific advisory group, JASON, concluded that:

Since hydronuclear tests would be potentially more valuable to proliferants \* \* \* it would be in our national interests to forego them.

The very limited added value of hydronuclear tests \* \* \* have to be weighed against costs, and against the impact of continuing an underground testing program at the Nevada Test Site on U.S. non-proliferation goals. On balance we oppose hydronuclear testing.

Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary testified to the Armed Services Committee earlier this year that she agrees with those conclusions. By pushing such tests, the Committee threatens to undercut President Clinton's strong policy against nuclear testing and for effective curbs on nuclear proliferation.

#### OTHER PROVISIONS

The Committee also earmarked funding for equipment that the National Guard did not request, instead of following the current Senate practice of providing funding in broad, generic categories to meet the priorities of the Guard and Reserve. This reversal of a "good government" practice will result in equipment purchases driven by individual state or district interests of particular Members of Congress. It is an example of bad government and does not serve the national interest.

I am concerned about the efficacy and wisdom of a new Defense Modernization Account established by this bill. Although I agree with the motive behind this effort, creating an additional incentive for the services to generate savings from efficient program management, this method is unfair and could be abused. No other department of government is allowed to keep unobligated balances that would otherwise expire, and then use those funds to procure items or services that Congress has not expressly authorized. And although this new account is crafted to try to avoid a repeat of the abuses of the DOD "M" accounts, I believe the protections are inadequate. The laws Congress has passed establishing new buying practices and requiring more efficient procurement should provide all the incentive needed. If programs can be completed for less money, Congress should authorize less money, or rescind unobligated balances and return funds to the treasury.

The Committee did take some important actions to improve the bill, removing over \$670 million in funding for additional B-2 bombers and F-16 aircraft not requested by the Pentagon. The Committee also voted against a provision that would have prohibited women in the military stationed overseas from getting abortions in military hospitals with their own money. But these improvements do not outweigh my disappointment in the Committee's action on the overall measure.

CARL LEVIN.

## MINORITY VIEWS OF MR. BINGAMAN

It was not lightly that I cast my first vote in thirteen years against a defense authorization bill prepared by the Armed Services Committee. But this bill is by far the worst in those thirteen years both in its substance and in the process by which it was put together.

If one looks for unifying themes in the committee's actions, three are clear: first, bringing back the Cold War if at all possible, second, pork, and third, stealing from the future. In some cases, such as the Department of Energy's defense programs budget, all three themes come together in a particularly stark fashion.

### REVIVAL OF COLD WAR

Recently President Yeltsin submitted the START II Treaty to the Duma for its consent to ratification. How will this bill "help" in the process of winning Russian approval of START II? Let us count a few of the ways: the bill commits the United States to deploying a multi-site anti-ballistic missile (ABM) defense by 2003 (with an interim capability by 1999) in violation of the ABM Treaty and adds hundreds of millions of dollars in pursuit of that goal; the bill revives the space-based chemical laser program in the mistaken hope that this will allow the United States to dominate space in the long run while providing a second layer of missile defense; the bill unilaterally resolves the theater missile defense (TMD) demarcation line currently under negotiation with the Russians by defining TMDs as those defenses tested against targets traveling less than five kilometers/second or against targets with a range of less than 3500 kilometers; the bill limits the President's ability to retire strategic weapons systems before START II is ratified; the bill proposes a nuclear weapons manufacturing complex sized to meet the needs of a hedge stockpile far above the active START II stockpile of 3500 weapons; and the bill proposes to resume hydronuclear testing (with yields up to hundreds of tons of TNT). The actions by our "conservatives" will undoubtedly play into the hands of Russian "conservatives" bent on unraveling START II and other arms control efforts. The only thing attempting to be conserved by this transnational alliance of convenience is the Cold War, the end of which has been problematic for what President Eisenhower termed the military-industrial complexes of both nations. The provisions in the bill entitled "the Missile Defense Act of 1995" would alone justify a Presidential veto of this bill.

### READINESS A PRIORITY?

The committee had \$7 billion to spend above the President's request thanks to the budget resolution conference report passed as the committee was marking up the defense bill. This is the first

time in my thirteen years on the committee that the committee was marking above a Presidential request.

One might have expected the additional funds to be used to address the long litany of "readiness" problems which Republicans have employed as a justification for adding funds to the defense budget while drastically cutting back the rest of government in pursuit of a balanced budget. Yet the Readiness Subcommittee received no net additional funding. All of the additions in real property maintenance, base operations, and other readiness accounts made by the subcommittee were offset by reductions in spending for activities not deemed defense enough, such as humanitarian assistance, foreign disaster relief, and the Civil Air Patrol.

Secretary Perry told the committee that his highest priority for additional funding was \$1.2 billion to cover the expected costs of four ongoing military operations: Enhanced Southern Watch in southern Iraq, Provide Comfort in northern Iraq, Cuban refugee support at Guantanamo, and Bosnia (Operations Sharp Guard, Deny Flight and Provide Promise). These are bills which we know we will have to pay, if not now, then in a supplemental appropriation later. No one in Congress is attempting to end these operations with the possible exception of Bosnia. But even in the case of Bosnia we face far higher costs under all of the alternative options being put forward. So Secretary Perry's request for Bosnia operations (\$363 million of the \$1.2 billion total) is a floor on the likely costs in fiscal year 1996.

If readiness were indeed a central goal of the committee, one might have expected that paying these bills would be the first thing the committee would address. By doing so we would be preventing the inevitable raiding of the operations and maintenance accounts until a supplemental is passed next year. Instead, the committee allocated only \$125 million to the Secretary's highest priority for additional funding, enough to cover about one tenth of the FY96 costs. Even this small amount would have been lost had Senator McCain not blocked half of a list of \$250 million in military construction add-ons which had been put together outside his oversight as subcommittee chairman. Unfortunately, the other half was approved.

#### PORK

Where did the \$7 billion go if not to readiness? Aside from ballistic missile defense, it went largely to hardware of interest to members of the committee: for example, a \$1.3 billion amphibious assault ship, two Aegis cruisers bought on the installment plan, three different families of trucks, F/A-18 fighters, a Navy variant of the F-117 stealth attack plane, Apache, Kiowa, CH-53 and Comanche helicopters, a National Guard package of specific weapons system earmarks totaling more than \$750 million, and last, but not least, an attack submarine deal which Senator McCain has called "submarines for everybody."

Taxpayers are demanding that Congress reduce the federal deficit. That has been the first priority in Washington since this Congress convened. Needless to say, there will be many options available during floor debate on this bill to contribute to deficit reduc-

tion rather than “weapons for everybody” to extrapolate my Arizona colleague’s phraseology to cover the whole bill.

#### TRAIN WRECK IN FUTURE YEARS

The current bonanza of weapons system add-ons cannot be sustained in future year budgets. The military draw-down called for in the Bottom Up Review is almost over. Adequately paying, housing and training 1.45 million active duty service members in future years will require ever greater expenditures for personnel, military construction and operations and maintenance and further squeeze the procurement and research budgets.

Defense experts of both parties have pointed to a train wreck in the defense budget before the end of the decade. Either the Bottom Up Review force structure, driven by the need to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies, will have to be sharply reduced (and its planning assumptions modified) or modernization funds will dry up.

The committee is silent on this fundamental tradeoff we will soon be facing. If the committee’s priority really is “weapons systems for everybody,” then the committee should be honest about the necessity for another drawdown to the 1.0 million active duty level Daniel Goure of the Center for Strategic and International Studies testified would be needed or the 1.2 million level Andrew Krepinevich of the Defense Budget Project estimated would be needed to restore balance between force structure and modernization.

#### RESEARCH NOT A PRIORITY

One area that clearly is not a priority for the committee is long-term research. This is another example of not planning for the future. Research was not mentioned in the list of priorities handed out by the chairman of the committee before the mark-up. Accordingly, the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee was the only subcommittee to be assigned a reduction from the President’s budget. The reduction was over \$300 million.

It is as if the committee is taking our lead in technology for granted at precisely the time when we can least afford such hubris. Critical military and dual-use technologies are inevitably spreading around the globe, driven increasingly by the commercial marketplace. Many nations, most notably Japan, Germany and other western European countries, approach us in scientific and technological competence. Russia has long been a scientific leader held back by its industrial infrastructure. Within a decade or two, many other nations, such as China and India, could join us at the leading edge of science and technology.

The Revolution in Military Affairs is being driven by technology, but we have no monopoly on the critical technologies underlying that revolution as we did for much of the Cold War period. Cutting funding for the Pentagon’s science and technology base from a request that was itself a significant cut from the previous year is the wrong thing to be doing. It is unfortunately consistent with the low priority being afforded research and development by the Congressional budget resolution in the civilian agencies as well. We will not long remain a superpower in the twenty-first century if we cripple federal research investments.

The Technology Reinvestment Project took much of the cut allocated to the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee. The cut in this competitive, cost-shared effort to leverage the private sector's much larger investments in technologies critical to the Pentagon makes no sense, particularly in light of the lavish spending elsewhere in the bill for pork.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY BUDGET A DISASTER

It is hard to know where to begin in listing the problems with the committee's mark for the Department of Energy's defense activities. The proposal put before the Strategic Subcommittee in mark-up was alarming to say the least. In the course of full committee deliberations the absolutely worst elements of the package—for example, an annual cap of 1000 on dismantling obsolete nuclear weapons at Pantex and a ban on paying political appointees out of DOE defense program funds—were removed. But much that was dismaying remained in the bill as reported.

There is nothing in the committee's hearing record to support the changes made by the committee in the DOE budget request. Typically the record strongly supports the administration's proposals. Yet the committee in case after case substituted its judgement for that of technical experts and weapons laboratory directors and short-circuited ongoing decision-making processes in the executive branch designed to reach informed decisions.

The bill includes provisions on tritium production and plutonium disposition which mandate a multi-purpose reactor solution to these problems. The tritium production provision would allow research on accelerator production of tritium only if a \$25 million reactor program, carried through engineering design, were first initiated. The plutonium disposition provision earmarks an additional \$25 million for the reactor program for a total of \$50 million. It is clear that these provisions are intended to preempt executive branch decisions in the ongoing programmatic environmental impact statements on these subjects. The bill thus attempts to block any decisions favoring an accelerator approach to tritium production and an alternative approach to plutonium disposition, perhaps along the lines of the National Academy of Sciences (Panofsky panel) recommendations.

The bill includes a provision mandating tritium recycling be carried out at Savannah River and limiting Los Alamos to research activities. The bill adds \$12.2 million to initiate a tritium recycling at Savannah River to implement the committee's decision. Again these actions are designed to preempt executive branch decision-making on this matter through the stockpile stewardship programmatic environmental impact statement (PEIS) currently underway.

The bill includes a series of provisions on nuclear weapons manufacturing capabilities that are fundamentally flawed. These provisions are premised on the unfounded notions that the science-based stockpile stewardship program, carefully developed over the past two years by the DOE Defense Programs Office and currently being further developed in the PEIS, will provide insufficient manufacturing capability and that the program's focus on maintaining competence and capabilities at the laboratories is wrong.

The bill's weapons manufacturing provisions specifically exclude the laboratories from the manufacturing infrastructure, specifically assume that the present design lifetimes for nuclear weapons cannot be extended, and specifically earmark funds for a series of projects whose full costs are unknown, but will certainly run well over a billion dollars. Notable among these is a weapon primary pit refabrication/manufacturing and reuse facility at Savannah River. Overall, about \$350 million was added for this stockpile management initiative laden with pork and built on a foundation unsupported by any testimony or thoughtful analysis.

The committee did not stop there in its assault on the laboratories and the stockpile stewardship program. It proceeded to eliminate the laboratory-directed research and development (LDRD) program and the technology partnership program. The LDRD program, under which the laboratory directors use up to six percent of their budgets to fund basic research, produces 60 percent of the published research papers of lab scientists. It is the essential tool by which the laboratories renew themselves and attract and retain the world-class people needed to ensure the safety and reliability of the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. The technology partnership program is critical to achieving the goals of the stockpile stewardship program in areas ranging from advanced computation to electronics to materials and manufacturing. With few exceptions, it differs from the core weapons R&D program only in its leveraging of private sector R&D investments.

The elimination of these programs will cripple the laboratories' ability to carry out their central roles in ensuring the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The bill talks of the need for "absolute assurance" of the safety and reliability of the stockpile. One wonders how weakening the laboratories and driving out their best people will contribute to achieving this goal.

The committee also cut funding for arms control verification and nonproliferation research by \$63 million and funding for putting Russian nuclear weapons material under better safeguards and security by \$15 million. These cuts are striking in light of the seriousness of the problems we face in these areas. It is clear that they were made to pay for the stockpile management initiative. Reducing the nuclear danger through these programs lost out to building up excess nuclear weapons manufacturing capacity.

The committee increased funding for hydronuclear testing (and contemplates testing of devices with yields up to hundreds of tons of TNT) while simultaneously admitting that it does not understand the costs and benefits of such testing and requiring a report on that matter. Obviously, this is not the ideal way to make decisions on an issue with such profound consequences. Unfortunately, this make-decisions-now, get-the-facts-later approach is consistent with the decision-making throughout the DOE title of the bill.

#### CONCLUSION

The test for whether I can support a defense authorization bill is whether on balance it advances our nation's security. This bill, as reported by the committee, does not meet that test. The nation would be better off if it did not become law.

Reviving the Cold War and “weapons for everybody” are not the appropriate foundation for a twenty-first century security policy for this country. Because this bill is flawed in so many dimensions, it will undoubtedly require extensive debate and numerous amendments when it comes before the full Senate. I look forward to participating in that debate and offering some of those amendments.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

