Calendar No. 543

106TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
106–292

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2549]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 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

MAY 12, 2000.—Ordered to be printed
Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 2000

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Calendar No. 543

106TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 106–292

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2549]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 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

MAY 12, 2000.—Ordered to be printed
Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 2000

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
64–303 WASHINGTON : 2000

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(106th Congress, 2d Session)

JOHN WARNER, Virginia, *Chairman*

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, Chairman *Emeritus*
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
BOB SMITH, New Hampshire
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
RICK SANTORUM, Pennsylvania
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado
TIM HUTCHINSON, Arkansas
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama

CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
MAX CLELAND, Georgia
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
JACK REED, Rhode Island

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

CONTENTS

Purpose of the Bill 1
Committee Overview and Recommendations 2
Explanation of Funding Summary 14
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations 21
Title I—Procurement 21
Explanation of tables 21
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 22
Chemical demilitarization program (sec. 107) 24
Subtitle B—Army Programs 25
Multiyear procurement authority for certain Army and Navy programs (sec. 111) 45
Army transformation (sec. 112) 45
Other Army Programs 49
Army Aircraft 49
Utility aircraft 49
UH–60 Blackhawk 50
Longbow 50
Kiowa Warrior 51
Avionics support equipment 51
Aircrew integrated systems 51
Army Missile 51
Army tactical missile system—system summary 51
Stinger modifications 51
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles 52
Carrier modifications 52
Breacher system modification 52
Heavy assault bridge system modifications 52
Machine gun, squad automatic weapon 53
Mark–19 grenade launcher 53
M4 carbine modifications 53
Army Ammunition 53
Procurement of ammunition, Army 53
Armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative 53
Other Army Procurement 54
Family of medium tactical vehicles 54
Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams 54
Secure mobile anti-jam reliable tactical terminal 55
Army data distribution system 56
Area common user system modification program 56
Forward area air defense ground based sensor 56
Night vision 56
Forward area air defense command and control 57
Striker-command and control system 57
Standard integrated command post system 57
Lightweight maintenance enclosure 57
Roller, vibratory, self-propelled 57
Deployable universal combat earth mover 58
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 59
CVNX–1 nuclear aircraft carrier program (sec. 121) 83
Arleigh Burke-class destroyer program (sec. 122) 83
Virginia-class submarine program (sec. 123) 84
ADC(X) ship program (sec. 124) 85
Refueling and Complex Overhaul Program of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier (sec. 125) 85
Other Navy Programs 86
Navy Aircraft 86

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Navy Programs—Continued
Navy Aircraft—Continued
Airborne low frequency sonar 86
SH–60 helicopters 86
CH–60 helicopters 86
UC–35 aircraft 86
C–40A aircraft 86
T–45 aircraft 87
Joint primary air training system 87
KC–130J 87
EA–6B aircraft automatic flight control system 87
AV–8B precision targeting pod 88
F–18 modifications 88
AH–1W series 88
H–1 series 88
P–3 aircraft modifications 89
Tactical aircraft moving map capability 89
Navy Weapons 90
Joint standoff weapon 90
Weapons industrial facilities 90
Mark 48 advanced capability torpedo modifications 90
Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition 90
Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 90
Laser-guided bomb components 90
Training ordnance 90
Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion 90
Shipbuilding overview 90
LHD–8 advance procurement 93
Other Navy Procurement 94
AN/WSN–7 inertial navigation system 94
Surveillance and security for military sealift ships 94
Integrated condition assessment system 95
AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radar 95
Side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers 95
Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System 95
Aviation life support 96
Gun fire control radar performance improvements 96
Cruiser smart ship 96
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system 97
Civil engineering support equipment 97
Marine Corps Procurement 97
Night vision 97
Radio systems 97
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 98
Repeal of requirement for annual report on B–2 bomber aircraft program (sec. 131) 114
Other Air Force Programs 114
Air Force Aircraft 114
EC–130J 114
Joint primary aircraft training system 114
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system 114
B–52H aircraft modifications 115
A–10 aircraft integrated flight and fire control computer 115
F–15 aircraft modifications 115
F–16 aircraft modifications 115
C–17 simulator 116
Defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft modifications 116
ALE–50 towed decoys 116
Compass Call 117
Defense airborne reconnaissance program 117
Air Force Missile 117
Global Positioning System 117
Titan space boosters 117
Medium launch vehicle 118
Air Force Ammunition 118
Procurement of ammunition, Air Force 118

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Air Force Programs—Continued
Other Air Force Procurement 118
Combat training ranges 118
Night vision goggles 118
Defense-Wide Programs 119
Advanced SEAL delivery system design enhancements 124
Special operations forces small arms and support equipment 124
Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defense Enhancement Kits 125
Communications assistance for law enforcement act 125
Subtitle E—Other Matters 125
Pueblo Chemical Depot chemical agent destruction technologies (sec. 141) 125
Other Items of Interest 126
Acquisition programs at the National Security Agency 126
Army aviation 126
C–5 aircraft upgrades 127
Electronic digital compass system 127
Single channel ground and airborne radio system 128
Soldier's portable on-system repair tool 128
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 129
Explanation of tables 129
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 130
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, And Limitations 131
Fiscal year 2002 joint field experiment (sec. 211) 131
Nuclear aircraft carrier design and production modeling (sec. 212) 132
DD–21 class destroyer program (sec. 213) 133
F–22 aircraft program (sec. 214) 136
Joint strike fighter (sec. 215) 137
Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (sec. 216) 139
Unmanned advanced capability aircraft and ground combat vehicles (sec. 217) 141
Army space control technology (sec. 218) 142
Russian American Observation Satellites program (sec. 219) 143
Joint Biological Defense Program (sec. 220) 143
Report on biological warfare defense vaccine research and development programs (sec. 221) 144
Subtitle C—Other Matters 145
Mobile offshore base (sec. 241) 145
Air Force science and technology planning (sec. 242) 145
Additional Matters of Interest 147
Army 147
Counter-terrorism basic research 156
Composite materials 156
Advanced missile composite components 156
Smart truck initiative 156
Portable hybrid electric power system 156
Thermoelectric power generation 156
Operational support 157
Equipment readiness 157
Fuel cell auxiliary power units 157
Big Crow program office 157
Army Space and Missile Defense Command Simulations 158
Aero-acoustics instrumentation 158
Acoustic technology research 158
Missile defense flight experiment 158
Radar power technology 158
Scramjet acoustic combustion enhancement 158
Space and missile defense battle lab 158
Supercluster distributed memory technology 159
Tactical High Energy Laser 159
Anti-malarial research 159
Electronic warfare development 159
Threat simulator development 159
Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program 159
Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor 160

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued
Army—Continued
Communications and networking technologies 160
Navy 161
Free electron laser 171
Biodegradable polymers 171
Bioenvironmental hazards research 171
Nontraditional warfare initiatives 171
Communications, command, and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance 171
Cognitive research 172
Ceramic and carbon based composites 172
Nanoscale sensor research 172
Littoral area acoustic demonstrations 172
Computational engineering design 172
Advanced water-jet technology 173
Composite helicopter hangar door 173
Composite modules for ship hull construction 173
Laser welding and cutting 173
Supply chain best practices 174
Virtual test bed for reconfigurable ship 174
Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare 174
Marine Corps advanced technology transition 175
Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships 175
Trident SSGN design 175
Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology 176
Submarine composite sail 176
Joint command and control ship 176
Shipboard simulators for Marine Corps operations 177
Navy common command and decision system 177
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle 178
Marine Corps ground combat/support system 178
Extended range guided munition 178
Nonlethal research and technology development 179
Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative ... 179
Parametric airborne dipping sonar 179
Multi-mission helicopter upgrade development 180
Power node control centers 180
Ship manpower reduction initiative 180
SPY–3 and volume search radars 181
Acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf insertion of multi-purpose processor 181
Submarine antenna technology improvement 181
Submarine common architecture 182
Advanced tactical software for submarines 182
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system 182
Navy single integrated human resources strategy 182
Marine Corps research university 183
Reentry system applications program 183
Joint tactical combat training system 183
F–14 tactical reconnaissance 183
Software interoperability process tools 184
Satellite communications systems integration initiative 184
Distributed engineering plant 184
Air Force 186
Laser processing tools 196
Resin systems for Air Force applications 196
Thermal protection systems 196
Aeronautical research 196
Polyphenylene benzobisoxozole membrane fuel cell 196
Variable displacement vane pump 197
High frequency active auroral research 197
Space survivability 197
Aluminum aerostructures 197
Hyperspectral research 197
Fiber optical control technology 197

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued
Air Force—Continued
Low cost launch technology 197
Micro-satellite technology 198
Miniature satellite threat reporting system 198
Next generation composite launch vehicle payload fairings and shrouds 198
Solar orbital transfer vehicle 198
Space maneuver vehicle 198
Upper stage flight experiment 198
Space Based Laser program 199
Airborne laser program 199
Rocket systems launch program 200
Wideband gapfiller military satellite communications 200
B–2 advanced technology bomber 200
Milstar satellite communications 200
F–15E squadrons 200
Hyperspectral system development 200
Extended range cruise missile 200
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system 201
Lighthouse cyber security 201
Dragon U–2 201
Defense-Wide 202
Advanced photonic composites research 211
Infrasound detection capability basic research 211
Personnel research initiative 211
Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research 211
Chemical and biological defense basic research 211
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization funding and programmatic guidance 212
Bio-defense research 214
Hybrid sensor suite 214
High definition systems 214
Three dimensional structures research 215
Biological agent sensor technologies 215
Blast mitigation testing 215
Facial recognition access control technology 215
Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force detector technologies 215
Consequence Management Information System 216
Reactive materials 216
Complex systems design 216
Competitive sustainment initiative 216
Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability at U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) 217
Integrated data environment technology 217
Demonstration/validation of technology for the remediation of unexploded ordnance at active, inactive, closing, transferred, and transferring ranges 217
Next generation anthrax vaccine 218
Remote Ordnance Neutralization System 218
Cyber attack sensing and warning 218
Information Operations Technology Center 218
Trusted RUBIX 218
Virtual worlds initiative 218
Intelligent spatial technologies for smart mapping systems 219
Joint Mapping Tool Kit 219
Information assurance testbed 219
Joint course of action analysis and targeting support for information operations 219
Advanced lightweight grenade launcher 219
Management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers 220
Augmented reality fire-fighting training 221
Other Items of Interest 221
Aircraft carrier modernization 221

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Other Items of Interest—Continued
Advanced ship hull demonstrators 221
Crusader 222
Future ship technology research and development 222
Joint training and experimentation 223
Joint operational test bed system 224
Maritime patrol aircraft 224
Patriot theater missile defense 224
Prophylactic pharmaceuticals 225
Radiation hardened electronics investment strategy 225
Small arms fire control system 226
Transition of successful research projects into the acquisition system 226
Title III—Operation And Maintenance 227
Explanation of tables 227
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 228
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303) 261
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 261
Impact aid for children with disabilities (sec. 311) 261
Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment Teams (sec. 312) 261
Subtitle C—Humanitarian and Civic Assistance 261
Increased authority to provide health care services as humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 321) 261
Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allowances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec. 322) 262
Subtitle D—Department of Defense Industrial Facilities 262
Codification and improvement of armament retooling and manufacturing support programs (sec. 331) 263
Centers of industrial and technical excellence (sec. 332) 263
Effects of outsourcing on overhead costs of centers of industrial and technical excellence and ammunition plants (sec. 333) 264
Revision of authority to waive limitation on performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 334) 264
Subtitle E—Environmental Provisions 265
Environmental restoration accounts (sec. 341) 265
Payments of fines and penalties for environmental compliance violations (sec. 342) 265
Annual reports under Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (sec. 343) 267
Modification of authority for indemnification of transferees of closing defense property (sec. 344) 267
Payment of fines or penalties imposed for environmental compliance violations at certain Department of Defense facilities (sec. 345) 267
Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with the former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia (sec. 346) 268
Environmental restoration activities (sec. 347) 268
Ship disposal project (sec. 348) 269
Report on the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program (sec. 349) 269
Report on Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (sec. 350) 269
Subtitle F—Other Matters 269
Effects of worldwide contingency operations on readiness of certain military aircraft and equipment (sec. 361) 269
Realistic budgeting for readiness requirements of the Army (sec. 362) 270
Additions to plan for ensuring visibility over all in-transit end items and secondary items (sec. 363) 270
Performance of emergency response functions at chemical weapons storage installations (sec. 364) 271
Congressional notification of use of radio frequency spectrum by a system entering engineering and manufacturing development (sec. 365) 271
Monitoring of value of performance of Department of Defense functions by workforces selected from between public and private workforces (sec. 366) 272
Suspension of reorganization of naval audit service (sec. 367) 272

Page

Title III—Operation And Maintenance—Continued
Subtitle F—Other Matters—Continued
Investment of commissary trust revolving fund (sec. 368) 272
Economic procurement of distilled spirits (sec. 369) 272
Resale of armor piercing ammunition disposed of by the Army (sec. 370) 273
Damage to aviation facilities caused by alkali silica reactivity (sec. 371) 273
Reauthorization of pilot program for acceptance and use of landing fees charged for use of domestic military airfields by civil aircraft (sec. 372) 273
Reimbursement by civil air carriers for support provided at Johnston Atoll (sec. 373) 273
Review of costs of maintaining historical properties (sec. 374) 273
Extension of authority to sell certain aircraft for use in wildfire suppression (sec. 375) 274
Overseas airlift service on Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft (sec. 376) .. 274
Additional Matters of Interest 275
Army 275
Real property maintenance 275
Excess carryover-defense working capital fund activities 275
Foreign currency fluctuation 276
Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements 276
Army equipment maintenance 277
Battlefield mobility enhancement system 277
Army aviation spares 277
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 277
Navy 277
Navy spares 277
Ship depot maintenance 278
Oceanography 278
Training range upgrades 278
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 278
Navy information technology center 278
US Navy Call Center 279
Marine Corps 279
USMC initial issue 279
USMC equipment maintenance 279
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 279
Air Force 280
Air Force base operations 280
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 280
Air Force readiness spares packages 280
Air Force nuclear, biological and chemical defense 280
Defense-Wide 281
Mobility enhancements 281
Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) 281
Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative) 281
Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program 282
Domestic preparedness center 282
Cultural and historic activities 282
Defense Travel System 283
Command information superiority architecture program 283
Guard and Reserve Components 284
Air Force Reserve equipment maintenance 284
National Guard initial issue 284
Distributed mission trainer 284
Miscellaneous 284
Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic affairs 284
Other Items of Interest 285
Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Charlestown, Rhode Island 285
Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund 286
Inventory of financial management and feeder systems 286
Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistics support (JCALS) program 287
Mechanization of Contract Administration Service 287

Page

Title III—Operation And Maintenance—Continued
Other Items of Interest—Continued
National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence 287
Pesticide contamination at the former Fort Devens, Devens, Massachusetts, and other closed and active military installations 288
Revised requirements for report on Defense use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier 289
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 291
Subtitle A—Active Forces 291
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 291
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 291
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 291
End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) 292
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 292
Fiscal year 2001 limitation on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) . 292
Increase in number of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 415) 293
Subtitle C—Other Matters Relating to Personnel .....
Strengths 293
Suspension of strength limitations during war or national emergency (sec. 421) 293
Exclusion of certain reserve component members on active duty for more than 180 days from active component end strengths (sec. 422) 293
Exclusion of Army and Air Force medical and dental officers from limitations on strengths of reserve commissioned officers in grades below brigadier general (sec. 423) 293
Authority for temporary increases in number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades (sec. 424) 293
Temporary exemption of Director of the National Security Agency from limitations on number of Air Force officers above major general (sec. 425) 293
Subtitle D—Authorization of Appropriations 294
Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 431) 294
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 295
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 295
Eligibility of Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for position vacancy promotions (sec. 501) 295
Promotion Zones for Coast Guard Reserve Officers (sec. 502) 295
Time for release of officer promotion selection board reports (sec. 503) 295
Clarification of authority for posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 504) 295
Inapplicability of active-duty list promotion, separation, and involuntary retirement authorities to reserve general and flag officers serving in certain positions designated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 505) 295
Review of actions of selection boards (sec. 506) 296
Extension to all Air Force biomedical sciences officers of authority to retain until specified age (sec. 507) 297
Termination of application requirement for consideration of officers for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List (sec. 508) 297
Technical corrections relating to retired grade of reserve commissioned officers (sec. 509) 297
Grade of chiefs of reserve components and directors of National Guard components (sec. 510) 297
Subtitle B—Joint Officer Management 298
Joint officer management (sec. 521—528) 298
Subtitle C—Education and Training 298
Eligibility of children of reserves for Presidential appointment to service academies (sec. 541) 298
Selection of foreign students to receive instruction at service academies (sec. 542) 298
Repeal of contingent funding increase for Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (sec. 543) 298
Revision of authority for Marine Corps platoon leader class tuition assistance program (sec. 544) 298

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Recruiting 299
Army recruiting pilot programs (sec. 551) 299
Enhancement of the joint and service recruitment market research and advertising programs (sec. 552) 299
Access to secondary schools for military recruiting purposes (sec. 553) 299
Subtitle E—Other Matters 300
Authority for award of Medal of Honor to certain specified persons (sec. 561) 300
Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 562) 300
Ineligibility for involuntary separation pay upon declination of selection for continuation on active duty (sec. 563) 300
Recognition by states of military testamentary instruments (sec. 564) 300
Sense of Congress on the court-martial conviction of Captain Charles Butler McVay, Commander of the USS Indianapolis, and the courageous service of its crew (sec. 565) 301
Other Items of Interest 301
Automated in- and out-processing of military personnel 301
Funeral honors for members of the uniformed services 302
Information related to alternatives to the Survivor Benefit Plan 302
Prevention of alcohol-related incidents 302
Study on the use of peyote by military personnel 303
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 305
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 305
Increase in basic pay for Fiscal Year 2001 (sec. 601) 305
Corrections for basic pay tables (sec. 602) 305
Pay in lieu of allowance for funeral honors duty (sec. 603) 305
Clarification of service excluded in computation of creditable service as a Marine Corps officer (sec. 604) 305
Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing (sec. 605) 305
Eligibility of members in grade E–4 to receive basic allowance for housing while on sea duty (sec. 606) 306
Personal money allowance for the senior enlisted members of the armed forces (sec. 607) 306
Increased uniform allowances for officers (sec. 608) 306
Cabinet-level authority to prescribe requirements and allowance for clothing of enlisted members (sec. 609) 306
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special Incentive Pays 306
Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) 306
Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 612) 307
Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 613) 307
Consistency of authorities for special pay for reserve medical and dental officers (sec. 614) 307
Special pay for physician assistants of the Coast Guard (sec. 615) 307
Authorization of special pay and accession bonus for pharmacy officers (sec. 616) 307
Corrections of references to Air Force veterinarians (sec. 617) 307
Entitlement of active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps to special pays and bonuses of health professional officers of the armed forces (sec. 618) 308
Career sea pay (sec. 619) 308
Increased maximum rate of special duty pay assignment pay (sec. 620) 308
Expansion of applicability of authority for critical skills enlistment bonus to include all armed forces (sec. 621) 308
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 308
Advance payments for temporary lodging of members and dependents (sec. 631) 308
Incentive for shipping and storing household goods in less than average weights (sec. 632) 309
Expansion of funded student travel (sec. 633) 309

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances—Continued
Benefits for members not transporting personal motor vehicles overseas (sec. 634) ... 309
Subtitle D—Retirement Benefits ... 309
Exception to high-36 month retired pay computation for members retired following a disciplinary reduction in grade (sec. 641) ... 309
Automatic participation in Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan unless declined with spouses' consent (sec. 642) ... 309
Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 643) ... 310
Retirement from active reserve service after regular retirement (sec. 644) ... 310
Same treatment for federal judges as for other federal officials regarding payment of military retired pay (sec. 645) ... 310
Subtitle E—Other Matters ... 310
Reimbursement of recruiting and ROTC personnel for parking expenses (sec. 651) ... 310
Extension of deadline for filing claims associated with capture and internment of certain persons by North Vietnam (sec. 652) ... 311
Settlement of claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay (sec. 653) ... 311
Eligibility of certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (sec. 654) ... 311
Authority to pay gratuity to certain veterans of Bataan and Corregidor (sec. 655) ... 311
Other Items of Interest ... 311
Adjustments to the Basic Allowance for Housing ... 311
Title VII—Health Care ... 313
Subtitle A—Senior Health Care ... 313
Extension of TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program (sec. 701) ... 313
TRICARE senior prime demonstration program (sec. 702) ... 313
Extension and expansion of demonstration project for participation of uniformed services personnel in the Federal Employee Health Benefit program (sec. 703) ... 313
Implementation of redesigned pharmacy system (sec. 704) ... 314
Subtitle B—TRICARE Program ... 314
Additional beneficiaries under TRICARE prime remote program in CONUS (sec. 711) ... 314
Elimination of copayments for immediate family (sec. 712) ... 314
Improvement in business practices in the administration of the TRICARE program (sec. 713) ... 314
Subtitle C—joint Initiatives With Department of Veterans Affairs ... 315
Tracking patient safety in military and veterans health care systems (sec. 721) ... 315
Pharmaceutical identification technology (sec. 722) ... 315
Medical informatics (sec. 723) ... 315
Subtitle D—other Matters ... 315
Permanent authority for certain pharmaceutical benefits (sec. 731) ... 315
Provision of domiciliary and custodial care for CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 732) ... 316
Medical and dental care for medal of honor recipients and their dependents (sec. 733) ... 316
School-required physical examinations for certain minor dependents (sec. 734) ... 316
Two-year extension of dental and medical benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members (sec. 735) ... 316
Extension of authority for contracts for medical services at locations outside medical treatment facilities (sec. 736) ... 317
Transition of chiropractic health care demonstration program to permanent status (sec. 737) ... 317
Use of information technology for enhancement of delivery of administrative services under the Defense Health Program (sec. 738) ... 317
Patient care reporting and management system (sec. 739) ... 318
Health care management demonstration program (sec. 740) ... 318
Studies of accrual financing for health care for military retirees (sec. 741) ... 318
Augmentation of Army Medical Department by reserve officers of the Public Health Service Corps (sec. 742) ... 318

Page

Title VII—Health Care—Continued
Other Items of Interest 319
Consultation with schools of pharmacy and nursing 319
Financial assistance for those beneficiaries requiring animal assistance 319
Health care benefits for retirees living overseas 319
Implementation of Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Department sharing initiatives 319
Notification of persons affected by unanticipated adverse outcomes of medical care 320
Special pays for military health care professionals 320
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters 321
Improvements in procurements of services (sec. 801) 321
Addition of threshold value requirement for applicability of a reporting requirement relating to multiyear contract (sec. 802) 322
Planning for the acquisition of information systems (sec. 803) 322
Tracking of information technology purchases (sec. 804) 322
Repeal of requirement for contractor assurances regarding the completeness, accuracy, and contractual sufficiency of technical data provided by contractor (sec. 805) 323
Extension of authority for Department of Defense acquisition pilot programs (sec. 806) 324
Clarification and extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 807) 324
Clarification of authority of Comptroller General to review records of participants in certain prototype projects (sec. 808) 325
Eligibility of small business concerns owned and controlled by women for assistance under the mentor-protege program (sec. 809) 325
Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec. 810) 325
Qualifications required for employment and assignment in contracting positions (sec. 811) 326
Defense acquisition workforce (sec. 812) 327
Financial analysis of use of dual rate for quantifying overhead costs at army industrial facilities (sec. 813) 328
Other Items of Interest 328
Application of Cost Accounting Standards to universities 328
Appropriate use of the government purchase card 329
Availability of contractor past performance information 329
Contracts for ancillary commercial services 330
Online auctioning 330
Performance goals and measures for quality of equipment and other products 330
Polyacrylonitrile carbon fibers 331
Procurements from the small arms production industrial base 332
Risk management in the acquisition of major systems 332
Technical data rights for items developed exclusively at private expense 333
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management 335
Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901) 335
Overall supervision of Department of Defense activities for combating terrorism (sec. 902) 335
National Defense Panel 2001 (sec. 903) 336
Quadrennial National Defense Panel (sec. 904) 337
Inspector General investigations of prohibited personnel actions (sec. 905) 337
Network centric warfare (sec. 906) 338
Additional duties for the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 907) 340
Special authority for administration of Navy Fisher Houses (sec. 908) 340
Organization and management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 909) 340
Responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program (sec. 910) 340
Supervisory control of Armed Forces Retirement Home Board by Secretary of Defense (sec. 911) 340
Consolidation of certain Navy gift funds (sec. 912) 341
Temporary authority to dispose of a gift previously accepted for the Naval Academy (sec. 913) 341

Page

Title X—General Provisions 343
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 343
Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000 (sec. 1002) 343
United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1003) 343
Annual OMB/CBO joint report on scoring budget outlays (sec. 1004) .. 343
Prompt payment of contractor vouchers (sec. 1005) 343
The repeal of certain requirements relating to timing of contract payments (sec. 1006) 344
Plan for prompt posting of contractual obligations (sec. 1007) 344
Plan for the electronic submission of documentation supporting claims for contract payments (sec. 1008) 344
Administrative offsets for overpayment of transportation costs (sec. 1009) 344
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 344
Extension and increase of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1011) 345
Recommendations on expansion of support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1012) 345
Review of riverine counter-drug program (sec. 1013) 346
Subtitle C—Strategic Forces 347
Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1015) 347
Plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1016) 348
Correction of scope of waiver authority for limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles (sec. 1017) . 348
Study and report on hardened and deeply buried targets (sec. 1018) .. 348
Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements 349
Annual report of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff on combatant command requirements (sec. 1021) 349
Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 1022) 349
Preparedness of military installation first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1023) 350
Date of submittal of reports on shortfalls in equipment procurement and military construction for reserve components in future years defense programs (sec. 1024) 351
Management review of defense logistics agency (sec. 1025) 351
Management review of defense information systems agency (sec. 1026) 352
Subtitle E—Information Security 352
Institute for defense computer security and information protection (sec. 1041) 352
Information security scholarship program (sec. 1042) 353
Process for prioritizing background investigations for security clearances for Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1043) 354
Authority to withhold certain sensitive information from public disclosure (sec. 1044) 355
Protection of operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 1045) 356
Subtitle F—Other Matters 356
Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 1051) 356
Eligibility of dependents of American Red Cross employees for enrollment in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools in Puerto Rico (sec. 1053) 356
Grants to American Red Cross for Armed Services Emergency Services (sec. 1054) 356
Transit pass program for certain Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1055) 356
Fees for providing historical information to the public (sec. 1056) 357
Access to criminal history record information for national security purposes (sec. 1057) 357
Sense of Congress on the naming of the CVN–77 aircraft carrier (sec. 1058) 357
Donation of civil war cannon (sec. 1059) 358
Maximum size of parcel posts transported overseas for Armed Forces Post Offices (sec. 1060) 358

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Other Items of Interest 358
Department of Defense export control procedures 358
Firefighting equipment 358
Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile 359
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Policy 361
Computer/electronic accommodations program (sec. 1101) 361
Additional special pay for foreign language proficiency beneficial for United States national security interests (sec. 1102) 361
Increased number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service (sec. 1103) 361
Extension of authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories (sec. 1104) 361
Work safety demonstration program (sec. 1105) 361
Employment and compensation of employees for temporary organizations established by law or executive order (sec. 1106) 362
Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1107) 362
Electronic maintenance of performance appraisal systems (sec. 1108) 362
Approval authority for cash awards in excess of $10,000 (sec. 1109) ... 362
Leave for crews of certain vessels (sec. 1110) 362
Life insurance for emergency essential Department of Defense employees (sec. 1111) 363
Civilian personnel services public-private competition pilot program (sec. 1112) 363
Extension, expansion, and revision of authority for experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1113) 363
Title XII—Matters Relating to Other Nations 365
Transfers of naval vessels to foreign countries (sec. 1201) 365
Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1202) 365
Repeal of restriction preventing cooperative airlift support through acquisition and cross servicing agreements (sec.1203) 366
Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training (sec. 1204) 366
Biannual report on Kosovo peacekeeping (sec. 1205) 366
Mutual assistance for monitoring test explosions of nuclear devices (sec. 1206) 367
Consolidated annual report on Cooperative Threat Reduction assistance and activities (sec. 1207) 368
Limitation on use of funds for construction of a Russian facility for the destruction of chemical weapons (sec. 1208) 368
Limitation on the use of funds for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program (sec. 1209) 368
Title XIII—Navy Activities on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico 371
Navy activities on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico (secs. 1301–1308) 371
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 373
Title XXI—Army 393
Summary 393
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 393
Family housing (sec. 2102) 393
Improvement to military family housing units (sec. 2103) 393
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) 393
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 projects (sec. 2105) 394
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1999 project (sec. 2106) 394
Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 1998 project (sec. 2107) 394
Authority to accept funds for realignment of certain military construction project, Fort Campbell, Kentucky (sec. 2108) 394
Other Items of Interest 395
Presidio Housing, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California 395
Title XXII—Navy 397
Summary 397

Page

Title XXII—Navy—Continued
Summary—Continued
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) ... 397
Family housing (sec. 2202) ... 397
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) ... 397
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) ... 397
Correction in authorized use of funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia (sec. 2205) ... 397
Title XXIII—Air Force ... 399
Summary ... 399
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) ... 399
Family housing (sec. 2302) ... 399
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) ... 399
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) ... 399
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies ... 401
Summary ... 401
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) ... 401
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) ... 401
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403) ... 401
Other Items of Interest ... 401
Certification of requirement for military construction projects, Manta Air Base, Ecuador ... 401
Planning and design, Defense Intelligence Agency ... 402
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security ... 403
Summary ... 403
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) ... 403
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) ... 403
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities ... 405
Summary ... 405
Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) ... 405
Other Items of Interest ... 405
Support for Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams ... 405
Title XXVII—Expiration and Extension of Authorizations ... 407
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701) ... 407
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1998 projects (sec. 2702) ... 407
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2703) ... 407
Effective date (sec. 2704) ... 407
Title XXVIII—General Provisions ... 409
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ... 409
Joint use military construction projects (sec. 2801) ... 409
Exclusion of certain costs from determination of applicability of limitation on use of funds for improvement of family housing (sec. 2802) ... 409
Replacement of limitations on space by pay grade of military family housing with requirement for local comparability of military family housing (sec. 2803) ... 409
Modification of lease authority for high-cost military family housing (sec. 2804) ... 410
Applicability of competitive policy to alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2805) ... 410
Provisions of utilities and services under alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2806) ... 410
Extension of alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2807) ... 411
Inclusion of readiness center in definition of armory for purposes of construction of reserve components facilities (sec. 2808) ... 411
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration ... 411
Increase in threshold for reports to Congress on real property transactions (sec. 2811) ... 411

Page

Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration—Continued
Enhancements to military lease authority (sec. 2812) 411
Expansion of procedures for selection of conveyees under authority to convey utility systems (sec. 2813) 412
Subtitle C—Defense Base Closure and Realignment 413
Scope of agreements to transfer property to redevelopment authorities without consideration under the base closure laws (sec. 2821) .. 413
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 413
Part I—Army Conveyances 413
Land conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois (sec. 2831) 413
Land conveyance, Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay, Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2832) 414
Land conveyance, Colonel Harold E. Steele, Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2833) 414
Land conveyance, Fort Lawton, Washington (sec. 2834) 414
Land conveyance, Vancouver Barracks, Washington (sec. 2835) ... 414
Part II—Navy Conveyances 415
Modification of land conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California (sec. 2851) 415
Modification of land conveyance, Defense Fuel Supply Point, Casco Bay, Maine (sec. 2852) 415
Modification of land conveyance authority, former Navy Training Center, Bainbridge, Cecil County, Maryland (sec. 2853) 415
Land conveyance, Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine (sec. 2854) 415
Part III—Defense Agencies Conveyance 415
Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Farmers Branch, Texas (sec. 2871) 415
Subtitle E—Other Matters 416
Naming of the Army missile testing range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll (sec. 2881) 416
Other Items of Interest 416
Report on Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 416
Report on requirement for Education Center at Fort Stewart, Georgia 417
Study on commercial leases 417
Study regarding the location of the National Museum of the United States Army 417
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 419
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 419
Atomic energy defense activities 419
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 421
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 434
Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102) 438
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 441
Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3104) 443
Energy employees compensation initiative (sec. 3105) 443
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3106) 443
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions 444
Reprogramming (sec. 3121) 444
Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122) 444
Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123) 444
Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124) 444
Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125) 444
Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126) 445
Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127) 445
Availability of funds (sec. 3128) 445
Transfer of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129) 445
Subtitle C—National Nuclear Security Administration 445

Page

Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued
Subtitle C—National Nuclear Security Administration—Continued
Term of Office of person first appointed as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (sec. 3031) 445
Membership of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 3132) 446
Scope of authority of Secretary of Energy to modify organization of National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3133) 446
Prohibition on pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3134) 446
Organization plan for field offices of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3135) 446
Future-years nuclear security program (sec. 3136) 447
Cooperative research and development of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3137) 447
Subtitle D—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 448
Processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3151) 448
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (sec. 3152) 448
Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program (sec. 3153) 448
Modification of counterintelligence polygraph program (sec. 3154) 453
Employee incentives for employees at closure project facilities (sec. 3155) 453
Subtitle E—Other Matters 454
Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3171) 454
Updates of report on nuclear test readiness postures (sec. 3172) 454
Frequency of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data and formerly restricted data (sec. 3173) 454
Form of certifications regarding the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3174) 455
Engineering and manufacturing research, development and demonstration by plant managers of certain nuclear weapons production plants (sec. 3175) 455
Cooperative research and development agreements for government-owned, government-operated laboratories (sec. 3176) 455
Commendation of Department of Energy and contractor employees for Exemplary Service in Stockpile Stewardship and Security (sec. 3177) 456
Other Items of Interest 456
Department of Energy participation in the Interstate Technology Reciprocity Council 456
Laboratory directed research and development 456
Report on Post-closure employee benefits at closure project facilities .. 457
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 459
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201) 459
Title XXXIII—Naval Petroleum Reserves 461
Minimum price of petroleum sold from the naval petroleum reserves (sec. 3301) 461
Repeal of authority to contract for cooperative or unit plans affecting Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (sec. 3302) 461
Title XXXIV—National Defense Stockpile 463
National defense stockpile (secs. 3401–3402) 463
Legislative Requirements 463
Departmental Recommendations 463
Committee Action 463
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 463
Regulatory Impact 463
Changes in Existing Law 464
Additional Views of Senators Levin, Kennedy, Bingaman, Robb, Landrieu and Reed 465
Additional Views of Senator Bingaman 468
Minority Views of Senator McCain 471

106TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
106–292

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 12, 2000.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 2000

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2549]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2001 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 2001;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 2001;

64–303

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 2001;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

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

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2001; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2001.

Committee overview and recommendations

The national security challenges that the United States will face in the new millennium are many and diverse—new adversaries, new battlefields, and new weapons. It is important that we remain vigilant, forward thinking, and prepared to address these challenges.

While the Department of Defense (DOD) must plan and allocate resources to meet future threats, ongoing military operations and deployments from the Balkans to Southwest Asia to East Timor continue to demand significant resources in the short term and the foreseeable future. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 provides funding guidelines and policy directives which will allocate some of the most critical readiness, modernization, and recruiting and retention problems facing our military, while addressing complex current and future challenges and threats to the nation's security.

For over a decade, our defense budget has been based on constrained funding, not on the threats facing the nation or the military strategy necessary to meet those threats. The result of this is evident today in continuing recruiting and retention difficulties, declining readiness ratings, and aging equipment.

Last year, the Congress reversed the downward trend in defense spending by approving a defense authorization bill which, for the first time in 14 years, included a real increase in the authorized level of defense spending. This year, the committee continued the momentum initiated last year by authorizing $309.8 billion for defense spending for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $4.5 billion over the budget request, and a real increase of 4.4 percent.

The committee's support for additional funding for defense is based on an in-depth analysis of the threats facing U.S. interests, and testimony from senior military leaders on the many shortfalls in the defense budget.

It is evident that the world remains a complex and violent place. The greatest threat to our national security today is instability; instability fueled by ethnic, religious, and racial animosities that have existed for centuries, but are now resulting in conflicts fought with the weapons of modern warfare. Many have turned to the United States, as the sole remaining superpower, to resolve the many conflicts around the world and to ensure stability in the future. However, this military power does not ensure our security. As Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet told the committee in January, "The fact that we are arguably the world's most powerful

nation does not bestow invulnerability; in fact, it may make us a larger target for those who don't share our interest, values, or beliefs."

U.S. military forces are involved in overseas deployments at an unprecedented rate. Currently, our troops are involved in over 10 contingency operations around the globe. At an October 1999 hearing of the Committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hugh Shelton, stated that, "Two factors that erode military readiness are the pace of operations and funding shortfalls. There is no doubt that the force is much smaller than it was a decade ago, and also much busier." Over the past decade, our active duty manpower has been reduced by nearly a third, active Army divisions have been reduced by almost 50 percent, and the number of Navy ships has been reduced from 567 to 316. During this same period, our troops have been involved in 50 military operations worldwide. By comparison, from the end of the Vietnam War in 1975 until 1989, U.S. military forces were engaged in only 20 such military deployments.

The fiscal year 2001 defense budget submitted by the administration was a positive development. Encouraging elements of the plan included full funding of the pay raise as directed by Congress last year, achieving the procurement goal of $60.0 billion a year, and initiatives to improve military health care. After careful examination, however, it was clear that many shortfalls remained that required action by the committee.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have testified that they have a remaining shortfall in funding of $9.0 billion for fiscal year 2000, a requirement for an additional $15.5 billion above the budget request to meet shortfalls in readiness and modernization for fiscal year 2001, and a requirement for an additional $85.0 billion in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The committee has provided additional funding to meet the most urgent requirements identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but remains troubled by the negative impact of the large number of contingency operations on our smaller military force. Unfortunately, there appears to be no end in sight for many of these operations.

The high operations tempo of our armed forces has a negative impact on recruiting and retention. Last year, the committee took action to provide a pay raise and a package of retirement reforms and retention incentives in an effort to recruit and retain highly qualified personnel. The committee also took action to require intense senior level management of the personnel tempo of the armed forces. The committee has received testimony that these changes are having a positive impact. This year the committee has focused on improving military health care for our active duty and retired personnel and their families.

The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the service chiefs have all highlighted the many problems associated with implementing a user-friendly health care program for active duty service members, military retirees, and their families. The committee strongly supported initiatives that ensure our active duty personnel and their families receive quality healthcare, and initiatives that begin to fulfill our commitment to military retirees. These initiatives include accelerating improvements in TRICARE, expanding TRICARE benefits to families of military personnel serv-

ing in the remote locations, increasing access to health care and providing pharmacy benefits for military retirees, and expanding the longstanding cooperative relationship between the DOD and the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Last year, NATO conducted its first large-scale, offensive military operation with the 78-day air war on behalf of Kosovo. The lessons learned from that operation, addressed during a series of committee hearings, highlighted not only shortfalls in weapon systems and intelligence programs, but also the complexities of engaging in coalition operations. As noted in the combined testimony of Operation Allied Force commanders, General Wesley Clark, Admiral James Ellis, and Lieutenant General Michael Short, the campaign ". . . required (that) we adapt (U.S.) military doctrine and strategy to strike a balance between maintaining allied cohesion, striking key elements of the Yugoslav armed forces, minimizing losses of allied aircraft, and maintaining collateral damage." Of paramount concern to the committee was applying the lessons learned from the air campaign over Kosovo to ensure the future preparedness of the U.S. armed forces. The committee added funding above the amount requested to address some of the most essential lessons learned from Kosovo.

Over 38,000 combat sorties were conducted during the Kosovo air campaign with no combat casualties. While the committee understands that no military operation is without risk, limiting the risk to military personnel is clearly an important goal. Every day, advances in technologies such as computing and telecommunications are being integrated into warfighting equipment.

The committee believes that the Defense Department must further pursue these technological advances in an effort to provide advanced warfighting capabilities, while at the same time limiting the risk to military personnel. To this end, the committee directed the DOD to aggressively develop and field unmanned combat systems in the air and on the ground so that within 10 years, one-third of our operational deep strike aircraft would be unmanned, and within 15 years, one-third of our ground combat vehicles would be unmanned. The committee has provided an additional $200.0 million for this initiative.

Personnel

This year the Personnel Subcommittee focused on some of the most pressing issues facing the DOD and the military services. Recruiting and retention, pay and compensation, personnel tempo, and health care are identified in every survey, poll and informal gathering of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines as the areas that affect decisions on joining or continuing to serve in the armed forces. The committee prioritized its efforts to address each of these issues.

When the Cold War ended and the nation began to reduce the active forces, it became clear that the pressures caused by the reduction in the number of medical personnel and facilities and the increase in medical costs made it almost impossible for the military health care system to meet its wartime missions, as well as fulfill its mission to provide health care to the families of active duty personnel and retired personnel and their families. As a result, in 1993 Congress directed the DOD to take the bold step of imple-

menting a nationwide managed care system in which the DOD partnered with the private sector to deliver health care. This system, known as TRICARE, is struggling with implementation problems. The committee devoted a significant amount of time and effort to examining TRICARE and determining how that system might be improved and made more efficient and effective.

On February 23, 2000, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced S. 2087, the Military Health Care Improvement Act of 2000, to address the most urgent medical needs of our active duty and retired personnel and their families. In addition to providing for improvements in the TRICARE program, this bill would provide, for the first time, an entitlement to military health care for Medicare-eligible military retirees and their families. The most significant benefit of this bill is a pharmacy benefit for Medicare-eligible military retirees. The committee has determined that access to prescription drugs is the single most critical unmet need of Medicare-eligible military retirees.

The committee has incorporated the provisions of S. 2087 and additional initiatives in this bill. The committee views this as only the first step toward providing a comprehensive health care benefit to all military health care system beneficiaries, including those who are Medicare-eligible.

The Personnel Subcommittee has made recruiting and retention a priority for each of the past three years. Despite efforts on behalf of recruiters, military leaders, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Congress, the disturbing trends of declining numbers and missed goals in both recruiting and retention continue.

While last year's legislative initiatives have slowed the decline, more needs to be done if we are to recruit and retain quality personnel to defend the nation's vital interests around the world. Once these young men and women have been trained in their military skills, it is essential that the services retain these developing military leaders so that we can benefit from their experience and use their abilities to train those recruits who will follow.

The committee recognizes that if the services cannot man the force with qualified, well-trained personnel, readiness will continue to suffer. The committee believes that the proposals, resources and policies recommended in this bill will assist the military services in recruiting and retaining the numbers of quality personnel required to meet the national military strategy.

Readiness and Management Support

Aging equipment, spare parts shortfalls, manning and experience gaps continue to manifest themselves in terms of declining mission capable rates and decreasing unit readiness ratings. According to the DOD Quarterly Readiness Report to the Congress, October through December 1999, ". . . the pace of contingency operations continues to stress the readiness of certain segments of the force." Most troubling are indications that problems are emerging in the readiness of forward deployed and first-to-fight units.

During the past year, the committee focused on the readiness of the armed forces to meet the challenges of today while preparing for those of tomorrow. Maintaining a ready force is particularly difficult if military personnel are not provided with sufficient opportunities to receive the training necessary to perform their difficult

missions. The committee notes the prohibition of live-fire training by Atlantic fleet units at Vieques is resulting in significant degradation of unit readiness. Ensuring that our armed forces receive the necessary training to make certain they have safe and successful deployments continues to be one of the committee's highest priorities.

The committee is also concerned with continuing reports of readiness problem as a result of the declining materiel condition of military equipment, primarily due to shortfalls in spare parts and increasing equipment age. The committee added significant resources to the defense budget in previous fiscal years to ensure that the current inventory of equipment was adequately maintained until the modernization programs could provide sufficient replacements. Unfortunately, with the pace of operations continuing to place strains on both maintenance personnel and supply availability, the increased funding has not prevented declines in materiel condition.

Military construction

Although the overall DOD request for fiscal year 2001 is more than $11.0 billion higher than the previous year, neither military construction nor family housing construction benefitted from this increase. In fact, the military construction and family housing Request is $400.0 million less than the administration's fiscal year 2000 incrementally funded military construction program, and $500.0 million less than the amount authorized in fiscal year 2000.

One noteworthy shortfall is that the budget request for fiscal year 2001 did not include construction contingency funds which are critical to correct design flaws or unforseen construction problems. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, service officials stated that the elimination of the $128.0 million for contingency construction will cause significant difficulty in executing construction programs.

The committee is deeply disturbed that for two consecutive years the Department has used budgetary gimmicks in funding the military construction program. The committee urges the Department to refrain from such practices in future years.

To correct the deficiencies in the budget request, the committee recommends an increase of $430.0 million for military construction. The focus of the additional funding is on quality of life projects and on critical projects for the reserve components, whose construction programs continue to be underfunded. In addition, the committee did include contingency construction funding for each project the committee added.

Emerging Threats and Capabilities

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued to provide an effective forum for highlighting such issues as the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, the ever increasing danger of terrorist attacks both in the United States and overseas, the impact of narco-trafficking on U.S. national security and regional stability, and the growing threat cyber-attacks on the military's critical information infrastructure. The committee continued its review and assessment of the Department's ability to respond to these threats. The committee believes it is of the utmost importance that the Department

prepare for these and other emerging threats through robust investments in technology and exploration of new warfighting concepts.

Unfortunately, the terrorist threat to our citizens and service members—both at home and abroad—shows no signs of diminishing. During the weeks leading up to the millennium celebrations, numerous individuals suspected of planning terrorist attacks directed against U.S. citizens were arrested in the United States and abroad. With the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the threat of a terrorist attack with a chemical, biological or nuclear weapon is increasing at an alarming rate. We, as a nation, must be prepared.

This committee will continue to play a leading role in ensuring that the DOD is adequately funded and structured to perform its critical role in the overall U.S. government's efforts to combat terrorism. Last year, the committee conducted a comprehensive review of the Defense Department's activities to combat terrorism, with the goal of making the Department's efforts in this critical area more visible and better organized; and of increasing the capabilities of DOD assets to assist in the event of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil involving the use of a weapon of mass destruction.

This year, the committee has taken action to build on last year's efforts by assigning overall policy and budgeting oversight of the DOD activities for combating terrorism to the assistant secretary of defense for special operations and low-intensity conflict; and by adding funding for the establishment of five new Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams to bring the total number of such teams to 32 by the end of fiscal year 2001.

During the post-Cold War decade, the U.S. government has spent over $4.7 billion in the former Soviet Union to reduce the threat posed by the possible proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, weapons-usable nuclear materials, and scientific expertise. After nearly a decade of working in Russia and the other states of the former Soviet Union on this effort, the committee believes it is important to review what these programs have achieved. The committee is concerned that for the significant investment made in some areas, the return in terms of reducing the threat has been relatively small. For example, the General Accounting Office (GAO) found that $481.2 million has been spent since fiscal year 1993 on a program designed to secure weapons-usable nuclear material in Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union, but only seven percent of the total nuclear material identified as being at risk has been secured. The committee is troubled by the progress achieved in light of this significant investment.

In March 2000, the GAO testified that the costs associated with achieving threat reduction will continue to remain high due to Russia's inability to pay its share of the costs of these programs, Russia's reluctance to provide the United States with needed access to its sensitive facilities, and expanding program budget requirements. The committee recommends several initiatives to obtain greater Russian commitment and necessary access so that the programs will have a greater chance of attaining their intended threat reduction objectives.

In the area of chemical and biological warfare defense, the committee notes that the Department has continued to maintain

steady increases in funding since fiscal year 1996. The committee is concerned, however, that the Department's efforts to focus on the acquisition of the anthrax vaccine may be taking an inordinate amount of personnel and financial resources from other critical elements of the chem-bio defense program. While the Department's fiscal year 2001 request represents a nearly 20 percent increase for procurement of chemical and biological defense equipment and programs, a significant portion of this increase is to address issues associated with the anthrax vaccine acquisition program. The committee is concerned with the risks associated with continuing to support the current Anthrax acquisition strategy, and believes that the Department should develop an alternative plan to ensure that a vaccine will be available to meet ongoing and future requirements.

In the year since the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities was created, cyber threats to the United States, including the DOD, have increased dramatically. During the subcommittee's March 1, 2000 hearing on cyber-security, the DOD reported that computer attacks on Defense Department systems increased from under 6,000 in 1998 to over 22,000 in 1999. There is every indication that this trend will continue.

The committee remains concerned that many important information assurance programs designed to protect against such cyber-attacks, remain underfunded by the DOD. At the March 1, 2000, subcommittee hearing, witnesses from the Department once again confirmed that such funding shortfalls remain significant, and presented a list of almost $500.0 million in unfunded requirements in this area.

Due to the expanding nature of the cyber threat, the committee recommends increased funding for important information assurance initiatives. In particular, the committee recommends initiatives in the area of information assurance training and education. The committee agrees with the conclusion contained in the National Plan for Information Systems Protection, which was released by the White House in January, that ". . . within the Federal Government, the lack of skilled information systems security personnel amounts to a crisis." The committee also recommends funding increases to support information assurance research and development, and procurement of critical information assurance tools and detection devices.

The committee continued its examination of joint experimentation and the prudent transformation of our armed forces to defend against current and future threats to our national security. While encouraged by the progress made by U.S. Joint Forces Command in the area of joint experimentation since its activation with an expanded charter on October 1, 1999, the committee is concerned with the slow pace of robust experimentation, noting that the first true joint field experiment is not scheduled until 2004. Additionally, the committee is concerned that there is not yet an institutionalized process to rapidly integrate lessons learned into the overall service and defense-wide requirements process. During a hearing before the subcommittee on April 4, 2000, the Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, indicated that a review was underway to revise and strengthen this joint requirements process. At that same hearing, the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Com-

mand expressed interest in accelerating the pace of joint experimentation. These are welcome developments which the committee will follow closely.

It is a priority of the committee to maintain a strong, stable investment in science and technology in order to develop superior technology that will permit the United States to maintain its current military advantages, provide flexible options to future warfighters, and hedge against technological surprise. The military dimensions of the next century are likely to be so different from those on which the current force was built that an evolutionary approach—based on correcting near-term deficiencies—will not be sufficient to meet the need for change. We must ensure that our ongoing efforts to maintain current advantages in capability are complemented with bold action that can effect the true transformation required for the 21st Century force. For that reason, the committee has added approximately $200.0 million to the defense science and technology (S&T) program.

It has been an on-going concern that the current S&T planning process appears to focus on the "micro" issue of ensuring that individual projects address legitimate warfighting needs, rather than on the "macro" issue of prioritizing those needs and ensuring that sufficient S&T funding is made available to meet them. Both the Army and the Navy took ambitious steps this year to address that shortcoming in the S&T planning process by prioritizing their own needs on a "macro" basis, and realigning S&T funding to match new priorities.

The Air Force does not appear to have undertaken any comparable planning effort. The committee remains concerned with the serious decline in the Air Force technology investment and the lack of support for science and technology within the Air Force leadership. Critical investment decisions are being made based on numbers rather than need. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which requires the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a thorough review of the S&T program and to certify to Congress that the plans provided and the investments planned will meet their objectives for air and space superiority in the 21st Century and beyond.

Airland

The Airland Subcommittee focused on the impact of inadequate modernization accounts, testing and evaluation activities associated with developmental efforts, the Army transformation initiative and the status of tactical aviation programs.

The committee has conducted an in-depth analysis of the Army transformation initiative that was announced last fall. The committee advocates transformation and recognizes that heavy forces within the Army are difficult to deploy in support of the National Military Strategy. The Army Chief of Staff has challenged the status quo within the Army and initiated a process to transform the Army into a more lethal, lightweight, strategically relevant and deployable force that will be better suited to meet future defense challenges. While the committee has expressed support for the transformation initiative, the committee is concerned about the Army's ability to develop the objective force and field an interim force capability. The committee has particular concerns about the

operational capabilities of the interim force and the Army's acquisition strategy.

Given no significant change in projected Army modernization resources from the DOD, the committee is concerned that the Army will not have adequate resources to recapitalize the existing legacy force to maintain operational readiness, field an interim force capability, and conduct a robust research and development effort designed to lead to the objective force in fiscal year 2012. The committee believes the Army vision should more heavily focus on efforts for the objective force. Near-term interim forces can provide an operational capability available to respond to contingency operations while at the same time provide insights into future force requirements. The committee believes that least cost alternatives, including light, armored vehicles currently available within the Army, should be primarily considered in efforts to fill an interim force.

In response to last year's congressional direction, the Army issued revised aviation and armor system modernization plans in which significant steps have been taken to address long standing deficiencies in service modernization programs. While the committee remains concerned about the ability of future budgets to support these revised plans, the Army is commended for ensuring that these plans more adequately reflect the broad range of requirements that exist across the force.

The committee also focused on a range of tactical aviation issues. The budget request included almost $8.0 billion for continued development and procurement of the three new tactical fighter aircraft: the F/A–18E/F Super Hornet, the F–22 Raptor, and the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). The committee remains concerned about the overall affordability of these systems against the backdrop of increasing average aircraft age, required modifications of legacy aircraft, and precision guided weapon inventory shortages. Particular tactical aviation issues examined by the committee included: F/A–18E/F upgrade funding; F–22 flight test hours and the adequacy of test content; and, JSF validation, program cost growth, and technical challenges.

The lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict presented additional concerns that the committee addressed. In Kosovo after-action reviews, the committee repeatedly heard concerns expressed about low-density, high-demand weapon systems and platforms. Commanders reported having to conserve certain precision weapon systems to prevent depletion. Tactical electronic attack assets were seriously overtasked, as were intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) assets. The committee added over $700.0 million for programs supporting aircraft precision strike capability, aircraft survivability, and ISR assets.

The committee continues to be concerned about the impact that inadequate modernization funding will have on our ability to modernize our forces. Significant levels of unfunded requirements, as identified by the service chiefs, suggest that significant modernization shortfalls are likely to continue.

Seapower

The committee continued its focus on reviewing the adequacy of Navy and Marine Corps force structure and strategic lift to carry

out the National Security Strategy, and the ability of Navy and Marine Corps programs to support new operational concepts to influence events ashore, and from the sea.

Operational commanders presented compelling testimony to the subcommittee that indicated that their commands do not have enough ships and aircraft to shape the international environment and respond to crises within the required time frame. As stated by the Commander, U.S. Second Fleet, even with the current level of 316 ships, there ". . . are not enough resources to meet demands, and the cost of doing business is being borne increasingly by our sailors." The commanding general of the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force and the director of operations and logistics of the U.S. Transportation Command described similar impacts on the Marines and airmen in their command.

Operational commanders also pointed out that aging equipment translates into both operational and fiscal costs. Maintenance personnel routinely work long hours on shifts and into the weekends to keep equipment operational. This testimony was consistent with information gathered by the committee during visits to fleet units.

The Congressional Research Service testified before the subcommittee that the Navy requires a $12.0 billion annual ship construction budget, commencing in fiscal year 2001, to build an average of 8.6 ships per year to maintain a Navy force structure of at least 300 ships. While the Navy acquisition and requirements witnesses agreed with this assessment, the ship construction budget for fiscal year 2001 is only $11.7 billion and is projected to decrease in the outyears. In an effort to provide a long-term look at shipbuilding requirements and plans, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 directed the Secretary of Defense to deliver a long-range shipbuilding report to the Congress no later than February 1, 2000. Unfortunately, that report has yet to be provided.

The Transportation Command testified before the subcommittee that C–17 strategic lift aircraft procurement and C–5 strategic lift aircraft reliability were the two highest Transportation Command priorities, and that the Transportation Command has been unable to respond to all of the requests for strategic airlift support.

In addition to these findings, information obtained by the committee during the course of its deliberations revealed the following:

(1) the present Navy force structure of 316 ships is not sufficient to carry out the National Security Strategy, and the shipbuilding plan of 39 ships planned in the Future Years Defense Program is insufficient to recapitalize the fleet;

(2) changing the DDG–51 acquisition strategy from three to two ships per year is inconsistent with the Navy's previous industrial base studies, and counter to the emphasis on procurement efficiency and smart business decisions that save taxpayer dollars;

(3) the DD–21 destroyer is the key enabler to providing the Marine Corps fire support from the sea, and DD–21 will accomplish that mission at lower acquisition and operating costs compared to other destroyers;

(4) the Joint Chiefs of Staff study on attack submarine force structure states that the requirement for submarines may be significantly more than the 1997 Quadrenniel Defense Review level of 50 submarines;

(5) Marine Corps operational concepts require the capabilities included in new platforms, such as the LPD–17, LHD, and DD–21 ship classes and the performance of new equipment, such as the Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle(AAAV), the Landing Craft Air Cushion (LCAC), the V–22 Tiltrotor aircraft, and night vision and thermal imaging devices; and

(6) within ten years there will be insufficient helicopters to support the operational requirements of destroyers, aircraft carriers, mine warfare, and replenishment ships.

Versatility continues to be the hallmark of the Navy and Marine Corps. This year, maritime forces were moved rapidly between the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf for operations that ranged from war and peacekeeping in Kosovo to humanitarian relief for earthquake victims in Turkey.

The committee concluded that our Navy and Marine Corps forces are an inherently forward-deployed, combat credible, expeditionary force engaged in daily, round-the-clock operations to influence the world's security environment and support world-wide U.S. national security interests. The committee notes that in the 84 months that ended in September 1999, the Navy participated in 80 contingency operations around the world.

While there are insufficient funds to address all of the fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements identified by the service chiefs, the committee will continue to support efforts to identify, prioritize and take action within the constraints of the budget to fund the deficiencies identified by the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee will continue to highlight the risks associated with the budget constraints, and the resulting impact on the ability of our men and women of the armed forces to carry out their duties.

Strategic

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

On February 28, 2000, the Strategic Subcommittee held a hearing on national and theater missile defense programs. Based on this hearing, the committee concluded that the DOD continues to pursue a funding-constrained ballistic missile defense (BMD) program. Although the committee is pleased by Department's decision to substantially increase funding for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, the Strategic Subcommittee found that all of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's major defense acquisition programs remain underfunded. The committee recommends substantial increases in funding for ballistic missile defense programs and technologies, including the NMD program for risk reduction.

On March 8, 2000, the Strategic Subcommittee held a hearing on national security space issues. The committee identified a number of areas in which budget constraints have caused DOD to insufficiently fund key space programs and technologies. The committee also identified key areas of space technology development that require additional support, as addressed in detail elsewhere in this report.

One of the key findings of the Kosovo after-action reviews was that intelligence processing and dissemination does not always meet the requirements of warfighting forces. The committee has initiated efforts to provide funding and other assistance to ensure that relevant intelligence products are provided to military forces in a timely manner. In particular, the committee recommends funding increases for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency to improve the imagery tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination process.

Department of Energy National Security Programs

The committee has responsibility for oversight and authorization of over two-thirds of the Department of Energy's budget, including the National Nuclear Security Administration; weapons activities; defense environmental management; other defense activities; and defense nuclear waste disposal. The committee also authorizes funds for the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, an independent agency responsible for external oversight of safety at DOE defense nuclear facilities.

The committee held the first congressional hearing to assess the programs of the newly-established National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The committee identified a number of critical issues that must be addressed by the Congress, the Secretary of Energy, and the new NNSA administrator. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has failed to fully comply with the National Nuclear Security Administration Act, which was signed into law by the President as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Pubic Law 106–65).

In the area of weapons activities, the committee remains concerned that the Department has not prepared the long-term program or funding plan for the stockpile stewardship and management program, as directed last year by Congress. The committee notes that the DOD provides a FYDP plan to Congress each year with the annual budget request. The committee believes that DOE should provide comparable budgetary information to Congress.

The committee is concerned with the speculative nature of the science-based stockpile stewardship program. The committee received testimony from the three weapons laboratory directors that it may be as long as 15 years before the DOE stockpile stewardship program can be evaluated as an acceptable substitute for underground nuclear testing.

The committee remains concerned that the Department is moving too slowly in re-establishing pit manufacturing and tritium production capabilities. The committee further notes that the Department has not established any long-term requirements or plans for modernization of its aging weapon production plants.

In the area of environmental management, the DOE continues to make progress in focusing its resources on closure of a limited number of sites and facilities. However, the committee remains concerned that the request for science and technology development continues to decline, despite the Department's increased reliance on the application of innovative technologies at cleanup sites. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2001 request for technology development is the lowest in over eight years. The committee believes that a vigorous research and development program must be main-

tained if the Department is to meet its accelerated cleanup and closure goals.

The committee remains deeply concerned with proposals to establish a new, external regulation regime for DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee does not support such efforts. The committee notes that the only DOE defense facility to be placed under regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) required almost $500.0 million and three years to establish a new licencing process. The committee believes that placing additional DOE facilities under NRC regulation would not be beneficial or cost-effective. Such moves would waste scarce cleanup funds and jeopardize the pace of cleanup at DOE facilities. The committee believes that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) continues to provide comparable, independent safety oversight for all DOE defense nuclear facilities with an annual budget of less than $20.0 million a year.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2001 was $305.3 billion, of which $305.3 billion was for programs that require specific funding authorization.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2001 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 that 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 related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling $309.8 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution.

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
DIVISION A					
TITLE I					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,323,262	426,400	1,749,662	1,323,262	1,749,662
Missile Procurement, Army	1,295,728	86,600	1,382,328	1,295,728	1,382,328
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,874,638	240,500	2,115,138	1,874,638	2,115,138
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,131,323	93,000	1,224,323	1,131,323	1,224,323
Other Procurement, Army	3,795,870	272,700	4,068,570	3,795,870	4,068,570
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army					
Operation & Maintenance	607,200	(607,200)	0	607,200	0
Procurement	121,900	(121,900)	0	121,900	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	274,400	(274,400)	0	274,400	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,963,858	782,100	8,745,958	7,963,858	8,745,958
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,434,250	45,700	1,479,950	1,434,250	1,479,950
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,649	67,100	496,749	429,649	496,749
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	12,296,919	603,157	12,900,076	12,296,919	12,900,076
Other Procurement, Navy	3,334,611	43,700	3,378,311	3,334,611	3,378,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,171,935	9,100	1,181,035	1,171,935	1,181,035
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,539,602	428,769	9,968,371	9,539,602	9,968,371
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	638,808	28,000	666,808	638,808	666,808
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,061,715	(55,800)	3,005,915	3,061,715	3,005,915
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,699,127	25,400	7,724,527	7,699,127	7,724,527
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,275,308	(90,700)	2,184,608	2,275,308	2,184,608
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense-Wide					
Operation & Maintenance		607,200	607,200	0	607,200
Procurement		121,900	121,900	0	121,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation		274,400	274,400	0	274,400
Procurement, Defense Health Program	290,006	0	290,006	0	0

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	3,300	0	3,300	0	0
Total Procurement	60,563,409	3,005,726	63,569,135	60,270,103	63,275,829
TITLE II					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946	5,260,346	5,461,946
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865	8,476,677	8,665,865
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836	13,685,576	13,927,836
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142	10,238,242	11,052,142
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	201,560	21,500	223,060	201,560	223,060
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	37,862,401	1,468,448	39,330,849	37,862,401	39,330,849
TITLE III					
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,123,731	(95,200)	19,028,531	19,123,731	19,028,531
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,300,154	(46,000)	23,254,154	23,300,154	23,254,154
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,705,658	40,900	2,746,558	2,705,658	2,746,558
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,346,977	42,100	22,389,077	22,346,977	22,389,077
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,920,069	53,500	11,973,569	11,920,069	11,973,569
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,521,418	5,000	1,526,418	1,521,418	1,526,418
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	960,946	5,000	965,946	960,946	965,946
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	133,959	5,000	138,959	133,959	138,959
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859	1,885,859	1,890,859
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,182,335	40,000	3,222,335	3,182,335	3,222,335
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,446,375	4,500	3,450,875	3,446,375	3,450,875
Office of the Inspector General	144,245	0	144,245	147,545	147,545
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	0	8,574	8,574	8,574
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	0	389,932	389,932	389,932
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	0	294,038	294,038	294,038

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	0	376,300	376,300	376,300
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	23,412	0	23,412	23,412	23,412
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	186,499	0	186,499	186,499	186,499
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	836,300	9,000	845,300	836,300	845,300
Defense Health Program	11,310,423	91,300	11,401,723	11,600,429	11,691,729
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	458,400	0	458,400	458,400	458,400
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	64,900	(9,500)	55,400	64,900	55,400
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	4,100,577	0	4,100,577	4,100,577	4,100,577
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	108,746,081	150,600	108,896,681	109,039,387	109,189,987
REVOLVING FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Fund	916,276	0	916,276	916,276	916,276
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	0	388,158	388,158	388,158
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)	0	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)	0	0	0	(210,000)	(210,000)
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	1,154,434	0	1,154,434	944,434	944,434
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	109,900,515	150,600.0	110,051,115	109,983,821	110,134,421
TITLES IV-V-VI					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel	75,801,666	(169,400.0)	75,632,266	75,801,666	75,632,266
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	897,938	(116,859)	781,079 *	897,938	781,079
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	63,949	817,371	753,422	817,371
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	232,522	763,491	530,969	763,491
Military Construction, Defense-wide	784,753	(98,420)	686,333 **	784,753	686,333

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	122,499	181,629	59,130	181,629
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	111,627	161,806	50,179	161,806
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	10,784	92,497	81,713	92,497
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	16,103	21,988	38,091	16,103	38,091
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	17,822	32,673	14,851	32,673
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369	1,174,369	1,174,369
NATO Infrastructure	190,000	0	190,000	190,000	190,000
Total Military Construction	4,553,427	365,912	4,919,339	4,553,427	4,919,339
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	56,200	218,306	162,106	218,306
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	(19,911)	958,364	978,275	958,364
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	362,822	24,052	386,874	362,822	386,874
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	882,638	(1,071)	881,567	882,638	881,567
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	23,664	247,147	223,483	247,147
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	(18,846)	807,425	826,271	807,425
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	44,886	0	44,886	44,886	44,886
Total Family Housing	3,480,481	64,088	3,544,569	3,480,481	3,544,569

* *Reflects projects previously authorized in PL 106-65 (Fiscal Year 2000, Defense Authorization Act)*

** *Reflects reduction of FOLs proposed in the FY 00 Congressional Emergency Supplemental*

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

National Nuclear Security Adminstration					
Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800	4,594,000	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Secruity Actitivities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035	1,583,635	1,542,035
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824	4,551,527	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0	1,082,297	0

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	515,000	0	515,000	515,000	515,000
Other Defense Actitivities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322	555,122	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	0	112,000	112,000	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000	17,000	17,000
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)	(85,000)	(85,000)
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0	140,000	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500	18,500	18,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481	13,084,081	12,760,481
Recapitulation					
Department of Defense (Division A)	284,127,991	4,455,374	288,583,365	283,917,991	288,373,365
Department of Defense (Division B)	8,033,908	430,000	8,463,908	8,033,908	8,463,908
Net Other Funds	5,000	(5,000)	0	532,451	527,451
Transfer Authority sec 1001 [Memo Entry]	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Offsetting Receipts		0	0	(1,485,000)	(1,485,000)
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	292,166,899	4,880,374	297,047,273	290,999,350	295,879,724
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481	13,084,081	12,760,481
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	48,000	(48,000)	0	1,250,000	1,202,000
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	305,298,980	4,508,774	309,807,754	305,333,431	309,842,205

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE I			
PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,323,262	426,400	1,749,662
Missile Procurement, Army	1,295,728	86,600	1,382,328
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,874,638	240,500	2,115,138
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,131,323	93,000	1,224,323
Other Procurement, Army	3,795,870	272,700	4,068,570
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army			
Operation & Maintenance	607,200	(607,200)	0
Procurement	121,900	(121,900)	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	274,400	(274,400)	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,963,858	782,100	8,745,958
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,434,250	45,700	1,479,950
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,649	67,100	496,749
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	12,296,919	603,157	12,900,076
Other Procurement, Navy	3,334,611	43,700	3,378,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,171,935	9,100	1,181,035
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,539,602	428,769	9,968,371
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	638,808	28,000	666,808
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,061,715	(55,800)	3,005,915
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,699,127	25,400	7,724,527
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,275,308	(90,700)	2,184,608

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense-Wide			
Operation & Maintenance		607,200	607,200
Procurement		121,900	121,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation		274,400	274,400
Procurement, Defense Health Program	290,006	0	290,006
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	3,300	0	3,300
Total Procurement	60,563,409	3,005,726	63,569,135

Chemical demilitarization program (sec. 107)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide funding for chemical demilitarization in a Department of Defense (DOD) budget line. The budget request for the Army included $1.0 billion for the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction (CAMD) Program: $607.2 million for operations and maintenance; $121.9 million for procurement; and $274.4 million for research and development.

Section 1521(f) of title 50, United States Code, states that funds for this program shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department, but shall be set forth in the budget of the DOD as a separate account. The committee is concerned that funds for this program continue to be included in the Army budget accounts, despite the clear and direct statutory requirement to the contrary. Funding for this program should not be balanced against Army modernization plans or funding of continued military operations in the Balkans.

SUBTITLE B-ARMY PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
1	ARL (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	-	-	3	24,300	3	24,300
3	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR/ACS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ROTARY						
4	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	6	81,205	20	196,300	26	277,505
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(16,554)	-	-	-	(16,554)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,127	-	-	-	22,127
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
6	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	22,626	-	-	-	22,626
7	ARL MODS	-	6,553	-	-	-	6,553
8	AH1F MODS	-	423	-	-	-	423
9	AH-64 MODS	-	18,516	-	-	-	18,516
10	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	117,083	-	-	-	117,083
11	CH-47 ICH	-	57,630	-	-	-	57,630
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	26,200	-	-	-	26,200
13	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	11,903	-	-	-	11,903
14	OH-58 MODS	-	462	-	-	-	462
15	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	-	752	-	-	-	752
16	LONGBOW	-	744,846	-	158,000	-	902,846
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,392)	-	-	-	(35,392)

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	35,000	-	-	-	35,000
18	UH-1 MODS	-	4,297	-	-	-	4,297
19	UH-60 MODS	-	3,021	-	-	-	3,021
20	KIOWA WARRIOR	-	41,816	-	35,000	-	76,816
21	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	-	60,042	-	-	-	60,042
23	ASE MODS (SIRFC)	-	4,487	-	-	-	4,487
24	ASE MODS (ATIRCM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	GATM	-	10,073	-	-	-	10,073
26	MODIFICATIONS < $5.0M	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
27	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	-	15,167	-	-	-	15,167
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
28	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
29	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	13,900	-	13,900
30	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	11,926	-	-	-	11,926
31	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	3,490	-	5,900	-	9,390
32	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	74,144	-	-	-	74,144
33	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,419	-	-	-	1,419
34	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(7,000)		(7,000)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,323,262		426,400		1,749,662
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
1	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	7	29,801	-	-	7	29,801
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
2	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY (MYP)	2,200	296,962	-	-	2,200	296,962
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(11,599)	-	-	-	(11,599)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	3,754	387,959	-	-	3,754	387,959
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(15,711)	-	-	-	(15,711)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	MLRS ROCKET	-	9,413	-	-	-	9,413
7	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	66	188,689	-	-	66	188,689
8	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	-	15,044	100	77,400	100	92,444
9	ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY	55	230,334	-	-	55	230,334
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	3,547	-	-	-	3,547
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
11	PATRIOT MODS	-	22,929	-	-	-	22,929
12	STINGER MODS	-	21,838	-	15,200	-	37,038

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
13	AVENGER MODS	-	6,828	-	-	-	6,828
14	ITAS/TOW MODS (MYP)	-	64,562	-	-	-	64,562
15	MLRS MODS	-	16,499	-	-	-	16,499
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	20,785	-	-	-	20,785
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	-	2,394	-	-	-	2,394
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	-	969	-	-	-	969
19	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	-	1,341	-	-	-	1,341
20	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	-	3,144	-	-	-	3,144
21	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(6,000)		(6,000)
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,295,728		86,600		1,382,328
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	-	5,331	-	-	-	5,331
2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	-	359,389	-	-	-	359,389
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,006	-	-	-	20,006
4	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	-	12,098	-	-	-	12,098
5	HAB TRAINING DEVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
6	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	-	14,038	-	-	-	14,038
7	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	-	10,504	-	-	-	10,504
8	MEDIUM ARMORED VEHICLE FAMILY: MAVF	-	537,077	-	-	-	537,077
9	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
10	CARRIER, MOD	-	45,111	-	50,000	-	95,111
11	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	-	31,898	-	-	-	31,898
12	BFVS SERIES (MOD)	-	37,142	-	-	-	37,142
13	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	-	8,060	-	-	-	8,060
14	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	-	5	-	-	-	5
15	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	-	68,385	-	-	-	68,385
16	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	-	-	-	108,000	-	108,000
17	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	-	-	77,000	-	77,000
18	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	1,692	-	-	-	1,692
19	AVLB SLEP	-	15,252	-	(15,200)	-	52
20	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	36,098	-	-	-	36,098
21	M1A1D RETROFIT	-	891	-	-	-	891
22	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	16	36,149	-	-	16	36,149
23	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	551,828	-	-	-	551,828
24	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(213,406)	-	-	-	(213,406)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	174,445	-	-	-	174,445
25	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
26	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	135	-	-	-	135

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
27	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	9,250	-	-	-	9,250
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
28	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,196	12,449	-	-	1,196	12,449
29	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	-	-	4,280	18,300	4,280	18,300
30	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	581	11,835	386	8,100	967	19,935
31	M16 RIFLE	10,314	4,793	-	-	10,314	4,793
32	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	230	3,085	-	-	230	3,085
33	5.56 CARBINE M4	8,309	5,190	-	-	8,309	5,190
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
34	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,813	-	-	-	1,813
35	M4 CARBINE MODS	-	2,504	-	1,300	-	3,804
36	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	-	9,956	-	-	-	9,956
37	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)	-	495	-	-	-	495
38	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	-	3,507	-	-	-	3,507
39	M119 MODIFICATIONS	-	4,705	-	-	-	4,705
40	M16 RIFLE MODS	-	9,592	-	-	-	9,592
41	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	787	-	-	-	787
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
42	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,182	-	-	-	1,182
43	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	5,152	-	-	-	5,152
44	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	3,604	-	-	-	3,604
45	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	3,506	-	-	-	3,506
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SPARES						
46	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	29,105	-	-	-	29,105
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(7,000)		(7,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,874,638		240,500		2,115,138
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	-	97,758	-	-	-	97,758
2	CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	873	1,337	-	-	873	1,337
3	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	-	8,990	-	-	-	8,990
4	CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM993	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,487	-	-	-	2,487
6	CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	10,646	-	-	-	10,646
8	CTG CAL .50 API MK211 MOD 0	254	1,987	-	-	254	1,987
9	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,004	-	-	-	2,004
10	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	57,780	-	-	-	57,780
11	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	-	9,517	-	6,000	-	15,517
12	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	-	60,788	-	-	-	60,788
13	NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	5	8,397	-	-	5	8,397
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
14	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	-	28,673	-	5,000	-	33,673
15	CTG 81MM INFRARED (IR) ILLUM XM816	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
16	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	24	930	-	-	24	930
17	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE M931	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/MO FUZE	62	45,031	8	6,000	70	51,031
19	CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE M929 W/MO FUZE	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	26	24,969	-	-	26	24,969
	TANK AMMUNITION						
22	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	87	48,477	-	-	87	48,477
25	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	199	101,512	-	-	199	101,512
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
26	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	40	1,807	-	-	40	1,807
27	CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000
29	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CTG ARTY 105MM M927	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	-	130	-	-	-	130
32	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	-	14,682	-	-	-	14,682
33	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	-	14,907	-	-	-	14,907
35	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADA	117	47,674	-	-	117	47,674
36	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	175	35,178	-	10,000	175	45,178
37	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	164	27,432	-	20,000	164	47,432

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
38	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	-	67,005	-	-	-	67,005
	MINES						
39	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	-	3,892	-	-	-	3,892
40	MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	58	7,284	127	16,000	185	23,284
	ROCKETS						
42	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	-	152,767	-	-	-	152,767
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
44	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	16,603	-	-	-	16,603
45	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	20,260	-	-	-	20,260
46	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	13,067	-	-	-	13,067
47	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	3,053	-	-	-	3,053
	MISCELLANEOUS						
48	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	6,750	-	-	-	6,750
49	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	-	4,298	-	-	-	4,298
50	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	10,145	-	-	-	10,145
51	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	9,476	-	-	-	9,476
52	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	5,118	-	-	-	5,118
53	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	-	5,764	-	-	-	5,764
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
54	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	47,748	-	-	-	47,748

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
55	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,215	-	-	-	3,215
56	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	12,267	-	-	-	12,267
57	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	84,799	-	-	-	84,799
58	ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,719	-	20,000	-	24,719
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(5,000)		(5,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,131,323		93,000		1,224,323
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	374	12,135	-	-	374	12,135
3	SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,912	-	-	24	1,912
4	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	-	30,213	-	-	-	30,213
5	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	376	20,010	-	-	376	20,010
6	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	67	6,147	-	-	67	6,147
7	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	1,002	110,746	-	-	1,002	110,746
8	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	19	5,208	-	-	19	5,208
9	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	-	438,256	-	77,900	-	516,156
10	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPM	-	14,830	-	-	-	14,830
11	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	-	166,119	-	-	-	166,119
12	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	20	13,453	-	-	20	13,453
13	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	-	42,989	-	-	-	42,989
14	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
15	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	94	17,233	-	-	94	17,233
16	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SL	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	LINE HAUL ESP	362	27,054	-	-	362	27,054
18	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	28,910	-	-	-	28,910
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	-	1,853	-	-	-	1,853
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
20	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	12	2,263	-	-	12	2,263
21	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	35	834	-	-	35	834
22	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	989	-	-	-	989
23	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,021	-	12,500	-	13,521
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
24	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
27	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	13,096	-	-	-	13,096
28	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	5,553	-	-	-	5,553
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
29	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP	-	72,034	-	-	-	72,034
30	SHF TERM	-	38,307	-	-	-	38,307
31	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	3,475	-	-	-	3,475
32	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	21,439	-	-	-	21,439
33	SMART-T (SPACE)	-	48,594	-	(20,000)	-	28,594

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
34	SCAMP (SPACE)	-	4,261	-	-	-	4,261
35	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	-	9,286	-	-	-	9,286
36	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	1,489	-	-	-	1,489
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
37	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	10,355	-	-	-	10,355
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
38	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	-	32,675	-	32,600	-	65,275
39	SINCGARS FAMILY	-	18,340	-	-	-	18,340
40	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	-	972	-	-	-	972
41	ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	-	113,951	-	74,000	-	187,951
42	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	-	3,348	-	-	-	3,348
43	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONIC	-	4,374	-	-	-	4,374
44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	-	2,459	-	-	-	2,459
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	1,744	-	-	-	1,744
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	11,051	-	-	-	11,051
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	-	54,374	-	-	-	54,374
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	2,025	-	-	-	2,025
49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	3,945	-	-	-	3,945
50	ARMY DISN ROUTER	-	4,339	-	-	-	4,339
51	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	431	-	-	-	431
52	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	-	2,865	-	-	-	2,865

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	57,779	-	-	-	57,779
54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	18,836	-	-	-	18,836
55	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	65,975	-	-	-	65,975
56	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	-	65,412	-	-	-	65,412
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
57	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	869	-	-	-	869
58	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	19,604	-	-	-	19,604
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
59	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	66,671	-	-	-	66,671
60	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	183	26,753	-	-	183	26,753
61	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	-	9,571	-	-	-	9,571
62	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	4	37,789	-	-	4	37,789
63	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	-	66,415	-	-	-	66,415
64	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	44	20,030	-	-	44	20,030
66	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILIT	-	12,853	-	-	-	12,853
68	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS	-	2,833	-	-	-	2,833
69	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
70	TROJAN (TIARA)	-	4,264	-	-	-	4,264
71	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	224	-	-	-	224
72	CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA	404	1,939	-	-	404	1,939
73	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA)	-	484	-	-	-	484

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
74	SHORTSTOP	-	-	-	-	-	-
75	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	-	2,311	-	-	-	2,311
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
76	FAAD GBS	2	24,188	-	7,300	2	31,488
77	TARGET LOCATION OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
78	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	-	34,146	-	48,000	-	82,146
79	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYST	77	46,156	-	-	77	46,156
80	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	-	1,199	-	-	-	1,199
81	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	1,664	35,348	-	-	1,664	35,348
82	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	-	8,040	-	-	-	8,040
83	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-	14,405	-	-	-	14,405
84	PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (P	-	-	-	-	-	-
85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-	18,530	-	-	-	18,530
86	DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	1,660	60,802	-	-	1,660	60,802
87	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (L	29	7,093	-	-	29	7,093
88	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	73	1,652	-	-	73	1,652
89	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	36	7,341	-	-	36	7,341
90	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	7	7,018	-	-	7	7,018
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
91	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-	17,260	-	-	-	17,260
92	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	54,452	-	-	456	54,452
93	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-	972	-	-	-	972
94	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	333	27,411	-	-	333	27,411

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
95	FAAD C2	2	17,868	-	14,300	2	32,168
96	FAADC2I MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (A	-	4,859	-	-	-	4,859
98	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	-	17,153	-	-	-	17,153
99	STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33	19,084	17	8,000	50	27,084
100	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	-	1,010	-	-	-	1,010
101	LOGTECH	-	7,505	-	-	-	7,505
102	TC AIMS II	-	10,376	-	-	-	10,376
103	GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	92	8,410	-	-	92	8,410
104	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	-	26,558	-	-	-	26,558
105	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	176	22,935	-	-	176	22,935
106	STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	-	40,015	-	-	-	40,015
107	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	-	35,971	-	17,500	-	53,471
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
108	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	-	35,960	-	-	-	35,960
109	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	172,051	-	-	-	172,051
110	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	-	91,495	-	-	-	91,495
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
111	AFRTS	-	1,519	-	-	-	1,519
112	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	-	3,217	-	-	-	3,217
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
113	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	-	374	-	-	-	374
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
114	GEN SMK MECH:MTRZD DUAL PURP M56	48	11,369	-	-	48	11,369
115	GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	-	5,585	-	-	-	5,585
116	M6 DISCHARGER	-	-	-	-	-	-
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (SMOKE/OBSCURANT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
118	HEAVY DRY SUPT BRIDGE SYSTEM	4	19,224	-	-	4	19,224
119	RIBBON BRIDGE	-	15,669	-	-	-	15,669
120	FLOAT BRIDGE PROPULSION	5	1,942	-	-	5	1,942
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
121	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	2	688	-	-	2	688
122	METALLIC MINE DETECTOR, VEHICLE MOUNTED	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPM	-	5,206	-	-	-	5,206
124	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	-	993	-	-	-	993
125	BN COUNTERMINE SIP	-	7,442	-	-	-	7,442
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
126	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL UNITS (ECU)	150	6,348	-	-	150	6,348
127	FIRETRUCKS	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	-	12,580	-	-	-	12,580
129	FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	-	3,984	-	-	-	3,984
131	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	160	1,999	258	4,600	418	6,599
132	FORCE PROVIDER	3	22,263	-	-	3	22,263
133	FIELD FEEDING AND REFRIGERATION	-	11,976	-	-	-	11,976
134	AIR DROP PROGRAM	-	3,971	-	-	-	3,971

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
135	CAMOUFLAGE: ULCANS	-	-	-	-	-	-
136	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS-EQ)	-	1,909	-	-	-	1,909
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
137	FAMILY OF TANK ASSEMBLIES, FABRIC, COLLAPSI	-	2,489	-	-	-	2,489
138	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	7,120	-	-	-	7,120
139	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	-	13,516	-	-	-	13,516
140	PUMPS, WATER AND FUEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
141	HOSELINE OUTFIT FUEL HANDLING	50	5,878	-	-	50	5,878
142	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	-	5,618	-	-	-	5,618
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (POL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
144	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	40,727	-	-	-	40,727
145	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WATER EQ)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	-	31,567	-	-	-	31,567
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
147	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	169	9,650	-	-	169	9,650
148	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	144	6,042	-	-	144	6,042
149	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	-	5,078	-	-	-	5,078
150	STEAM CLEANER, TRAILER MOUNTED	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
151	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING	-	1,489	-	-	-	1,489
152	ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	70	4,671	80	5,000	150	9,671
153	COMPACTOR, HIGH SPEED	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
154	LOADERS	5	1,444	-	-	5	1,444
155	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	35	8,282	-	-	35	8,282
156	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	34	14,146	18	7,000	52	21,146
157	CRANES	-	6,089	-	-	-	6,089
158	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
159	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	-	89	-	-	-	89
160	CONST EQUIP SLEP	-	1,986	-	-	-	1,986
161	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	-	2,635	-	-	-	2,635
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
162	SMALL TUG	-	-	-	-	-	-
163	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON	-	-	-	-	-	-
164	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	LOGISTICS SUPPORT VESSEL (ESP)	1	6,638	-	-	1	6,638
166	CONTAINERIZED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
167	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	-	17,227	-	-	-	17,227
168	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 89 FOOT	-	-	-	-	-	-
169	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	-	6,722	-	-	-	6,722
	GENERATORS						
170	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	-	85,886	-	-	-	85,886
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
171	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER, 53,000 LBS	77	40,031	-	-	77	40,031
172	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	196	24,407	-	-	196	24,407
173	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	4	2,056	-	-	4	2,056
174	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)	-	1,231	-	-	-	1,231

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
175	CTC INSTRUMENTATION SUPPORT	-	81,845	-	-	-	81,845
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	-	91,937	-	-	-	91,937
177	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	-	81,160	-	-	-	81,160
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AV	-	14,744	-	-	-	14,744
179	FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	-	1,457	-	-	-	1,457
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	-	18,828	-	-	-	18,828
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	-	65,381	-	-	-	65,381
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	-	18,738	-	-	-	18,738
183	ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)	-	17,300	-	-	-	17,300
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
184	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	-	2,330	-	-	-	2,330
185	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	-	18,856	-	-	-	18,856
186	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)	-	-	-	-	-	-
187	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	-	7,399	-	-	-	7,399
188	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	-	28,008	-	-	-	28,008
189	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	-	2,367	-	-	-	2,367
190	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
191	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	-	24,344	-	-	-	24,344
192	MA8975	-	2,332	-	-	-	2,332
193	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA1						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
194	INITIAL SPARES - TSV	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OPA2						
195	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	-	42,401	-	-	-	42,401
	OPA3						
196	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	-	639	-	-	-	639
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(16,000)		(16,000)
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		3,795,870		272,700		4,068,570
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	274,400	-	(274,400)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	121,900	-	(121,900)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	607,200	-	(607,200)	-	-
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY		1,003,500		(1,003,500)		-

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

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Army to enter into multiyear procurement contracts for the Bradley A3 Infantry Fighting Vehicle, the UH–60L Blackhawk helicopter, and the CH–60S Seahawk helicopter. For the Bradley A3 Infantry Fighting Vehicle, the multiyear procurement authority is for a period not to exceed three years, beginning in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes the Army is scheduled to complete the initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) of the Bradley A3, and a subsequent milestone III review in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2000. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the Army successfully completes the IOT&E and milestone III review prior to awarding the multiyear contract.

Army transformation (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the objective force process, that describes the following:

(1) operational environments envisioned for the objective force;

(2) threat assumptions for objective force research and development efforts;

(3) potential operational and organizational concepts for the objective force;

(4) anticipated Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) and emerging requirements that will ultimately be reflected in a future operational requirements document (ORD) for the objective force;

(5) program schedule and projected research and development and procurement funding required to support proposed transformation activities through fiscal year 2012, and identification of specific adjustments made to Army programs in both the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and extended planning program to fund the transformation initiative and summarize anticipated investments by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in programs designed to lead to the fielding of a future combat system;

(6) joint warfighting requirements that will be supported by the fielding of the objective force, including a description of planned adjustments to war plans of the regional commanders in chief;

(7) changes to current strategic and tactical lift requirements resulting from the creation and fielding of objective forces; and

(8) the evaluation process that will support future decisions on the course of the transformation initiative leading to the objective force, including a description of operational evaluations and experimentation that will be used to validate the KPPs and ORD requirements associated with objective forces.

In addition, the committee has recommended additional funding, described elsewhere in this report, to support near-term acceleration of the future combat system research and development effort.

The Army has begun an effort to transform itself to meet the new security challenges that the nation faces today. The committee

agrees that the Army needs to transform into a lighter, more lethal, survivable and tactically mobile force. The committee believes that the Army must begin the transformation process and applauds the recognition that the force must be better positioned to meet the significant defense challenges in an uncertain and troubling future. It is clear that these challenges will require our armed services to think and act differently than in the past. The committee recognizes that the Army must be able to provide a mix of light, medium, and heavy forces. Future intervention scenarios will call for different capabilities, requiring that the Army be able to respond to a variety of national security missions, including mechanized warfare, defense of humanitarian sanctuaries, and peace enforcement.

The committee has a long history of supporting Army efforts to transform itself through the advanced warfighting experiment (AWE) process, the Army after next (AAN) activity, and the digitization initiative. The committee has also supported Army modernization activities that the Army later decided to terminate, including the armored gun system (AGS), liquid propellant technology for Crusader, Wolverine, Grizzly, Command and Control Vehicle, Prophet Air, Stinger Block II, and Army Tactical Missile System Block IIA.

The committee realizes that the Army has had several false starts and traveled up several "blind alleys" in pursuit of reforms since the end of the Cold War. The Chief of Staff of the Army also realizes that many previous "reforms" have only lasted as long as the tenure of the proponent Army Chief of Staff. He has said that he wants to achieve "irreversible momentum for change" so that the Army will continue on a path to the new objective force even after his tenure as Chief of Staff.

The committee commends the Chief of Staff for the actions he has taken to begin to transform the Army into a force more relevant to the diverse defense challenges of the new millennium. To achieve these reforms, the Army will have to implement innovative changes to force structure, modernization plans, and spending priorities.

The committee wants to support the Army's current efforts to achieve "irreversible momentum for change," but the committee wants to ensure this momentum is along the proper path, not another "blind alley." The best way to ensure that a transformation process will be reversed by future Army leadership is to start down the wrong path.

The committee strongly agrees with recommendations from a fiscal year 1999 Army Science Board Summer Study report on Enabling Rapid and Decisive Strategic Maneuver for The Army Beyond 2010, which included the following recommendations that:

(1) Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) experiment with alternative, available equipment and recommend, within 12 months, needed procurements;

(2) TRADOC and XVIII Airborne Corps develop split-based support options, to include necessary organizational redesign;

(3) The Army conduct an expeditionary experiment (possibly Joint Contingency Force AWE) and examine within 24 months improvements in early entry deployment and capability; and

(4) TRADOC examine both traditional platform centric solutions as well as non traditional "ensemble" solutions for future combat systems. Army concept experimentation is needed.

The committee finds the recommendations of the Army Science Board compelling.

The committee believes that the Army's transformation process must focus on the objective force, first and foremost. However, the committee notes that the current Army plans do not adequately address how, or if, the Army Science Board recommendations will be implemented.

The committee, therefore, directs the Army to establish a process of operational analysis, experimentation, and platform demonstrations that will serve to determine optimum organizational structures, equipment types and numbers, and operational concepts for the objective force. The committee directs that the Army fully integrate this process with the joint experimentation activities conducted by the Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Consistent with the committee's view that the objective force must be preeminent in the planning process, the committee believes that the interim capability adjustments that the Army is intending to pursue must not displace the attention and resources appropriate for the objective force. Army forces continue to age precipitously because the Army has not been able to afford sufficient modernization to support even the current force structure. Absent significant additional investment, the situation will only grow worse. The committee recognizes that the Army modernization program has not competed well for resources within the Department of Defense budget process. This fact alone makes it clear that the Army can ill afford a major misstep in pursuing the goal of transformation.

While pursuing the objective force capability, the Army must also focus on how it reforms in the mean time. The committee notes that there is great merit in Army plans to transform one heavy and one light brigade into a medium brigade configuration. The Army effort involves fielding interim brigade combat teams (IBCT) designed to bridge a perceived near-term capability gap. Actions designed to field IBCT's are focused on requirements for medium weight forces that are strategically deployable with a combat capability that exceeds those capabilities provided by existing light forces. The committee agrees that such a reconfiguration is necessary to provide insights into force structure, equipment, and tactics alternatives for full-spectrum operations while optimizing these forces for the challenges of peacekeeping.

In context of very limited resources, however, the committee believes that Army cannot afford to establish an interim medium force capability when the primary aim is to serve as a rotational peacekeeping force. The committee believes that an effective evaluation of alternatives and review of equipment evaluation data are critical to making informed funding decisions. The Army must further define and validate interim force operational concepts, force structure, equipment requirements, and funding alternatives before making acquisition commitments beyond the two brigades described in the Chief of Staff's transformation implementation letter. As the IBCT effort is clearly designed to provide an interim capa-

bility, the committee believes that life cycle cost factors should be a primary consideration in determining equipment solutions for IBCT requirements.

While the committee understands the established Army goal to achieve commonality among medium combat vehicle types and the perceived need for momentum, these should not be the primary objectives. Principal objectives should include: (1) focusing on fielding the objective force; and (2) ensuring that interim medium forces are formed based on least-cost alternatives that lead to the most combat ready and cost effective solution that ensures successful operations in a broad range of environments. The committee believes it is possible that the Army may already have equipment in the inventory that could meet the requirements established for the interim force and allow the service to focus more of its resources on developing the objective force.

Current acquisition policy requires the services to first explore the potential for existing equipment to meet emerging mission requirements. The use of existing equipment could allow the Army to avoid expensive new equipment acquisition costs, as well as a requirement to establish a new logistical support system that would result from the fielding of new equipment. The committee recognizes that the Army does not own a mobile gun system (MGS) that could meet IBCT requirements. Fortunately, the requirement for a MGS is relatively small. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army appears to be preparing to select a mobile gun system without conducting a performance and reliability evaluation of candidate systems.

Therefore, the committee believes it essential that the Army conduct an operational evaluation of alternative systems that explores, at a minimum, measures of operational and cost effectiveness between medium armored vehicles already in the Army inventory compared with any new system selected to meet IBCT requirements. The committee recognizes that this evaluation will be in addition to actions the Army has already identified in the acquisition strategy report for interim armored vehicles.

The committee's recommended provision would also support, on a track parallel to the objective force development activity, the fielding of three interim brigades through fiscal year 2003. This provision would provide guidance on analysis required to support the fielding of IBCTs and establish two additional reporting requirements for the results of that analysis. Moreover, the committee has supported the full budget request for the Army's plan to field a new armored vehicle family in the IBCTs.

The first report would be required to describe the Army's plans for conducting the side-by-side comparison of existing versus new hardware implementations. The provision would require that the Secretary of the Army:

> (1) provide a report, no later than February 1, 2001, on plans to conduct an operational analysis of medium armored combat vehicles that will be selected later in fiscal year 2000 to meet IBCT infantry battalion requirements compared with medium armored vehicles currently found in the Army inventory. The assessment will determine cost and operational effectiveness differences between new and existing medium armored combat

vehicles, and will be made on a comparative basis with at least one infantry battalion fielded with existing medium armored vehicles similarly structured to IBCT infantry battalions;

(2) submit the plan to the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, for review and comment;

(3) include the comments of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation as an attachment to the Army report;

(4) describe how the results of the operational evaluation will guide future acquisition decisions for additional interim brigade combat team equipment; and

(5) identify specific adjustments made to Army programs in both the FYDP and extended planning program to fund interim force fielding requirements. The second report would include the Army's analysis of the results of the side-by-side comparisons. This would require that the Secretary of the Army provide the results of the comparative operational analysis to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2002. Additionally, the provision would require that the Secretary of Defense certify that the conclusions of the operational analysis contained in the second report support the Army's proposed acquisitions for additional IBCT equipment in fiscal year 2003 and beyond.

The provision would limit obligations of the fiscal year 2001 funds to 60 percent of the total amount authorized and appropriated for the new armored vehicle family until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army submits the first report to the congressional defense committees. The provision would also limit obligations of the funds for fiscal year 2002 funds provided for the fielding of a second IBCT to 60 percent of the amount authorized and appropriated for the new armored vehicle family until 30 days after the date in which the Secretary of the Army submits the second report on the conclusions of the operational analysis.

The committee does not intend to impede current Army IBCT fielding plans, but believes that the comparative operational analysis will serve to strengthen the transformation process and might ultimately accelerate the fielding of future brigades at lower costs. The Army cannot be confident that what it is buying is what it needs, absent normally required testing and evaluation. The Army transformation process cannot afford more false starts.

OTHER ARMY PROGRAMS

Army Aircraft

Utility aircraft

The Army budget request included no funding for fixed-wing, medium range, utility aircraft, but these aircraft were included on the Army's unfunded priorities list. This aircraft is used for small unit movements to remote airfields, and is necessary to replace an aging system. The committee recommends an increase of $24.3 million for the procurement of three UC–35 aircraft.

UH–60 Blackhawk

The budget request included $81.2 million to procure six UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters. The committee has watched with great interest actions taken to revise an inadequate Army aviation modernization plan. While the committee still has several outstanding concerns about the overall viability of the Army plan, it is pleased to note decisions taken by the Army to retire both AH–1 Cobra and UH–1 Huey helicopters as soon as practicable. This action will ultimately result in a pure fleet of UH–60L Blackhawk helicopters for both active and reserve component utility helicopter requirements. These aircraft will provide a more capable fleet and support crew rotation requirements associated with military operations across the spectrum of conflict. The committee understands that the difficult decisions taken to address utility helicopter requirements have resulted in an increased requirement for UH–60L Blackhawk aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $196.3 million to procure 20 UH–60L aircraft, a total authorization of $277.5 million. The committee does not support the acquisition of UH–60Q medical evacuation helicopters in fiscal year 2001. Current Army plans call for the acquisition of these aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2002. The committee expects the Army to address outstanding UH–60L Blackhawk requirements in future budget requests.

Longbow

The budget request included $744.8 million for the acquisition of AH–64D Apache Longbow helicopters. The committee recognizes the AH–64 Apache helicopter as the most advanced and lethal attack helicopter in the world. The committee notes with concern that there is a range of known problems associated with the AH–64 Apache attack helicopter that have existed for the last several years. Program delays in providing for required improvements to correct system component deficiencies has, in part, resulted in aircraft groundings and serious questions about the long-term reliability of these critical aircraft. The committee applauds actions taken by the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army to thoroughly review and consolidate outstanding issues associated with the Apache program and address these deficiencies in a corrective action program. The committee recognizes that the Army had already identified a significant unfunded requirement to provide upgrades to existing critical components for fielded aircraft. In light of lessons learned from the operation in Kosovo and critical warfighting requirements that depend on the future viability of AH–64 aircraft, the committee believes it is essential to pursue immediate action designed to ensure the viability of these aircraft. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $158.0 million to support critical component upgrades, as identified in the Army's unfunded requirements list, a total authorization of $902.8 million for the Apache Longbow program. The committee expects the Army to budget for any additional upgrades that may be required after the ongoing program review is completed.

Kiowa Warrior

The budget request included $41.8 million for Kiowa Warrior upgrade requirements. The committee strongly supports actions intended to improve the nature and scope of training currently provided for Army aviators. The committee notes the significant action taken by the Army in the recently revised aviation modernization plan to address deficiencies in the training base associated with the Army aviation center at Fort Rucker, Alabama. New Army training plans will provide more flight training for new aviators and a corresponding need for additional TH–67 training aircraft. These aircraft have been identified as a near-term unfunded requirement for the Army. The committee supports this effort and recommends an increase of $35.0 million to procure 19 TH–67 aircraft, a total authorization of $76.8 million for the Kiowa Warrior line.

Avionics support equipment

The budget request included no funding for avionics support equipment. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for AN/AVS–6 (ANVIS) helmet mounted night vision devices. The committee has consistently supported the capability of the armed forces to operate effectively at night and during periods of reduced visibility. The committee recommends an increase of $13.9 million to procure 1,603 ANVIS devices to meet outstanding Army aviation requirements.

Aircrew integrated systems

The budget request included $3.5 million for aircrew integrated system equipment requirements. The committee was pleased to note the development of advanced laser eye protection (ALEP) visors produced through a Joint Service program designed to address battlefield eye protection requirements for military aviators. The committee supports this effort and believes these visors should be fielded to Army aviators as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $5.9 million for aircrew integrated systems, to procure 12,640 ALEP visors, a total authorization of $9.4 million.

Army Missile

Army tactical missile system-system summary

The budget request included $15.0 million for Army tactical missile system (ATACMS) fielding and production line shutdown. The committee notes a critical unfunded requirement for additional ATACMS block IA missiles necessary to meet the Army acquisition objective. Additionally, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has identified a requirement for additional ATACMS block IA missiles on the unfunded requirements list. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $77.4 million to procure 100 ATACMS block IA missiles necessary to meet war reserve, a total authorization of $92.4 million.

Stinger modifications

The budget request included $21.8 million for Stinger missile modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for

additional Stinger block I missile modifications necessary to meet Force Package 3 and 4 fielding requirements. These block I missiles have improved performance against advanced countermeasures and improved the accuracy of the Stinger system. The committee recommends an increase of $15.2 million to procure 651 Stinger block I missiles, a total authorization of $37.0 million.

Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles

Carrier modifications

The budget request included $45.1 million for M113 armored personnel carrier modifications. The committee notes the Army has over 17,000 M113 armored personnel carriers in the inventory today. The M113 has been in Army combat units for decades and requires upgrades necessary to improve mobility, reliability, and survivability. As these vehicles represent almost one-half of the tracked combat vehicle fleet, it is critical that they be upgraded as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million to modify 227 vehicles, a total authorization of $95.1 million.

Breacher system modification

The budget request included no funding for the Grizzly (M1 Breacher) system. The committee believes that critical mobility systems like the Grizzly armored engineer vehicle must be continued to correct critical operational shortfalls for deployed forces. Operations in Iraq, Somalia, and Bosnia continue to highlight the critical need for combat engineer equipment necessary to clear obstacles and support maneuver forces. The ability of our fast-moving M–1 Abrams tanks and M–2 Bradley fighting vehicles to operate successfully on the battlefield is dependant on the ability of these vehicles to maintain their momentum and speed of maneuver. Finally, the committee notes that a request for funds necessary to restore this program was one of the top Army unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $108.0 million to restore the Grizzly program. The committee expects the Army to ensure that this program is funded in future budget requests.

Heavy assault bridge system modifications

The budget request included no funding for the heavy assault bridge system modifications. The committee has noted with great concern decisions that terminated the effort to field the Wolverine heavy assault bridge. One of the major tenets of combat for our forces is movement at a rapid pace to ensure a decisive engagement that will result in the defeat of enemy forces. The Wolverine heavy assault bridge is a critical element on the battlefield to ensure the mobility of our forces. The committee believes that this program should be restored and that the armored vehicle launch bridge (AVLB) service life extension program (SLEP) effort should be terminated. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $77.0 million to restore the Wolverine heavy assault bridge program and a corresponding decrease of $15.2 million to the AVLB

SLEP program. The committee expects the Army to ensure that this program is funded in future budget requests.

Machine gun, squad automatic weapon

The budget request included no funding for the squad automatic weapon (SAW). The committee notes an outstanding requirement for an additional 4,280 weapons necessary to meet the Army procurement objective. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $18.3 million to procure 4,280 weapons and complete the acquisition of the SAW system, a total authorization of $18.3 million.

Mark–19 grenade launcher

The budget request included $11.8 million for Mark–19 grenade launchers. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional Mark–19 systems necessary to avoid a break in production prior to acquiring the total number of systems necessary to meet the acquisition objective. The committee recommends an increase of $8.1 million to procure 386 Mark–19 systems and avoid a break in production, a total authorization of $19.9 million.

M4 carbine modifications

The budget request included $2.5 million for M4 carbine modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional modular weapon systems (MWS) for the M4 carbine necessary to mount the weapons optical systems. The committee recommends an increase of $1.3 million to procure 7,201 MWS for the M4 carbine, a total authorization of $3.8 million.

Army Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Army

The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Chief of Staff of the Army identified a requirement of $242.9 million for ammunition programs that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. For the past several years, field commanders have expressed concern regarding the inadequate stocks of ammunition to support their training and war reserve requirements. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Army ammunition procurement:

Item	*Millions*
30 mm	$6.0
60 mm	5.0
105 mm M915	.15.0
120 mm M934	6.0
155 mm M107	10.0
MACS	20.0
Wide Area Munition	16.0
Subtotal	78.0

Armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative

The budget request included $4.7 million for the continuation of the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) program. The committee is aware this does not satisfy all proposals

that would reduce the operating costs of Army Ammunition plants. This program has had great success, saving the Army $37.0 million each year in program and operating costs, while preserving hundreds of jobs for skilled workers. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for this program. The committee expects these funds to be utilized in the most effective manner to ensure preservation of those facilities most likely to be required to fulfill the military's needs to support the national military strategy.

Other Army Procurement

Family of medium tactical vehicles

The budget request included $438.3 million to procure family of medium tactical vehicle (FMTV) trucks to replace an aging fleet of medium trucks found in the Army today. The Army has identified an unfunded requirement for additional FMTV trucks necessary to meet Force Package 2 fielding requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $77.9 million, to procure additional FMTV trucks necessary to accelerate the fielding of these trucks to reserve component units, a total authorization of $516.2 million.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team (WMD–CST) program. This funding will establish five additional WMD–CSTs and provide additional equipment for the WMD–CST program. The $25.0 million is authorized as follows: $3.2 million in military personnel; $7.5 million in Operations and Maintenance, Army; $1.8 million in Contamination Avoidance, Chemical Biological Defense Program, Procurement, Defense-Wide; and $12.5 million in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army.

The WMD–CSTs, formerly know as Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams, are comprised of 22 full-time National Guard personnel who are specially trained and equipped to deploy and assess suspected nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological events in support of local first responders. The committee recommends an increase of $21.0 million, included in the categories listed above, for the addition of five WMD–CSTs which will result in a total of 32 WMD–CSTs by the end of fiscal year 2001. The committee reaffirms the commitment it made last year to ultimately provide funding for the establishment of a WMD–CST in every state and U.S. territory.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million, included above in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army, for the purchase of two additional Unified Command Suites (UCS) and Mobile Analytical Labs (MALS) in order to provide the WMD–CST program with needed spare equipment. The committee is concerned that, under the Department of Defense's current plan for WMD–CSTs, no provision has been made to provide spare equipment for the teams. The committee understands that the spare UCSs and MALs that had been available for the initial 10 teams are being used to outfit the 17 teams authorized last year. Provision should be made for spare equipment to support a military capability that

must respond rapidly to a crisis. The committee also recommends an increase of $500,000, included above in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army, for the purchase of 35 tactical mobility systems for use by the WMD–CSTs to improve survey operations of potentially contaminated areas by rapidly moving Reconnaissance and Survey teams. This system would also facilitate the expeditious recovery of WMD–CST response force personnel who may become casualties.

The committee also expresses some concerns with the WMD–CST program. First, the committee is concerned with the Department's failure to formulate a plan and provide funding to rapidly deploy WMD–CSTs to each state and U.S. territory as recommended in the January 1998 DOD report entitled "Department of Defense Plan for Integrating National Guard and Reserve Component Support for Response to Attacks Using Weapons of Mass Destruction". Second, the committee is concerned with the Department's delay in submitting the reprogramming request necessary to stand up the 17 WMD–CSTs authorized in fiscal year 2000. As a result of this delay, very little of the funding authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2000 for the 17 additional teams has been spent. Third, the committee is concerned with the Department's decision to locate a second WMD–CST in California, while many states do not have a WMD–CST. The committee believes that each state and territory should be provided with a WMD–CST before additional capabilities are provided to a single state.

The result of this behavior by the Department is that vast areas of the United States are currently not covered by WMD–CSTs. If the Department had acted swiftly to deploy the 27 teams previously authorized and appropriated by Congress, the committee would have been in a position to provide funding for more than five additional teams in fiscal year 2001. Given the growing terrorist threat to the United States, the committee is troubled by the lack of urgency on the part of the Department to fund and field these teams.

Secure mobile anti-jam reliable tactical terminal

The budget request included $48.6 million for the Secure Mobile Anti-jam Reliable Tactical Terminal (SMART–T), the Army's secure, multi-channel satellite terminal used with the Milstar satellite communications system. In its report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (S. Rept. 106–50), the committee noted significant developmental problems associated with the SMART–T program and cited a review by the Department of Defense Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, which concluded that ". . . the SMART–T is not operationally suitable," and which recommended temporary cessation of production while the Army and the contractor sought to solve the problems. Unfortunately, significant problems remain and the Army does not currently believe that these problems can be resolved in time to award the currently planned production option. SMART–T fielding has been stopped pending the launch of the next Milstar II satellite. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in Army Other Procurement for SMART–T.

Army data distribution system

The budget request included $32.7 million for Army data distribution system (ADDS) requirements. The committee recognizes the critical role that the enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) plays in supporting Army digitization efforts. Future military operations will continue to demand more data throughput to meet the demands of a dynamic and complex battlefield. The Army has identified an opportunity to improve existing EPLRS systems that will ultimately result in five times the communications throughput currently available. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $5.3 million to support EPLRS software development requirements. The committee also notes that requirements for EPLRS equipment continues to grow as the Army works to digitize the force. The committee also recommends an increase of $27.3 million to procure 634 EPLRS systems and accelerate efforts to meet the Army acquisition objective for this system, a total authorization of $65.3 million for ADDS requirements.

Area common user system modification program

The budget request included $114.0 million for area common user system (ACUS) modification program requirements. The committee recognizes and supports ongoing efforts by the Army to digitize the force and enhance the situational awareness and warfighting effectiveness of our land forces. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for warfighter information network down-sized communications switches, which are mounted on high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles instead of the larger five ton trucks that housed older TTC–39D switching equipment. Additionally, the Army has additional requirements for high mobility DGM assemblages (HMDA) to support communications requirements for reserve component signal battalions. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure 27 down-sized communications switches and 229 HMDA devices. Additionally, the committee notes the successful use of TS–21 Blackjack facsimile machines throughout the force. The committee also recommends an increase of $14.0 million to accelerate the fielding of 2,901 TS–21 Blackjack secure facsimile machines. The committee recommends a total authorization of $188.0 million for the ACUS modification program.

Forward area air defense ground based sensor

The budget request included $24.2 million for forward area air defense (FAAD) ground based sensor (GBS) procurement. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement for additional Sentinel systems necessary to meet operational requirements and to obtain a minimum economic order quantity. The committee recommends an increase of $7.3 million, for a total authorization of $31.5 million, to support Sentinel production requirements and modifications for these critical systems.

Night vision

The budget request included $34.1 million for Army night vision devices. The committee has consistently supported night vision development and fielding efforts in recognition of service focus on

night operations. The committee notes that the Army identified significant unfunded requirements for night vision devices in fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends the following increases:

(1) $18.1 million to procure 5,000 AN/PEQ–2A and 10,000 AN/PAC–4C target pointer/aiming lights;

(2) $14.9 million to procure 18,600 AN/PVS–7 night vision binoculars; and

(3) $15.0 million for 25mm image intensification tubes for AN/PVS–4 and AN/TVS–5 night vision weapon scopes.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $82.1 million for night vision devices.

Forward area air defense command and control

The budget request included $17.9 million for forward area air defense (FAAD) command and control (C2) requirements. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement to upgrade existing FAAD hardware and software to meet evolving threat capabilities and operational requirements and to enable full materiel release of air defense brigade and higher headquarters prototype FAAD C2 systems. The committee recommends an increase of $14.3 million to support identified requirements for additional FAAD C2 hardware and software upgrades necessary to ensure the full materiel release of prototype systems, a total authorization of $32.2 million.

Striker-command and control system

The budget request included $19.1 million for the Striker system. The committee notes the current budget request will only procure 33 Striker systems, which will result in an inefficient rate of production. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million to procure additional Striker systems and achieve an economic procurement level, a total authorization of 27.1 million.

Standard integrated command post system

The budget request included $36.0 million to procure standard integrated command post systems (SICPS). The committee notes an opportunity to complete the fielding of these important systems to force package two units and support critical fielding requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $17.5 million to procure additional SICPS, a total authorization of $53.5 million.

Lightweight maintenance enclosure

The budget request included $2.0 million to procure lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME) units. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional funding for LME units to maintain minimum sustaining rates (MSR) for production. The committee recommends an increase of $4.6 million to procure 258 LME units and to meet MSR requirements, a total authorization of $6.6 million.

Roller, vibratory, self-propelled

The budget request included $4.7 million for self-propelled vibratory roller systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0

million to procure 80 vehicles necessary to meet the requirements of Army engineer units, a total authorization of $9.7 million.

Deployable universal combat earth mover

The budget request included $14.1 million for deployable universal combat earth movers (DEUCE). The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to procure 18 DEUCE vehicles, a total authorization of $21.1 million.

SUBTITLE C-NAVY PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	10	282,132	-	-	10	282,132
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(55,486)	-	-	-	(55,486)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	42	2,923,960	-	-	42	2,923,960
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(105,407)	-	-	-	(105,407)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	101,068	-	-	-	101,068
5	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	16	1,199,181	-	-	16	1,199,181
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(70,589)	-	-	-	(70,589)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	79,858	-	-	-	79,858
7	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	-	2,452	-	-	-	2,452
8	SH-60R	4	162,327	3	96,000	7	258,327
9	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	5	364,882	-	-	5	364,882
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(112,092)	-	-	-	(112,092)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	68,082	-	-	-	68,082
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
11	CH-60S (MYP)	15	238,457	3	63,000	18	301,457
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(73,386)	-	-	-	(73,386)
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	80,411	-	-	-	80,411
13	UC-35	-	-	6	48,600	6	48,600
14	C-40A	-	-	2	117,200	2	117,200

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
15	VP-3 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT	1	50,276	-	-	1	50,276
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
16	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	278,070	3	49,200	15	327,270
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,491)	-	-	-	(9,491)
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	5,142	-	-	-	5,142
18	JPATS	21	74,372	3	7,000	24	81,372
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
19	KC-130J	2	154,818	1	74,600	3	229,418
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
20	EA-6 SERIES	-	203,102	-	21,000	-	224,102
21	AV-8 SERIES	-	40,639	-	79,400	-	120,039
22	F-14 SERIES	-	30,481	-	-	-	30,481
23	ADVERSARY	-	6,947	-	-	-	6,947
24	F-18 SERIES	-	212,614	-	86,900	-	299,514
25	H-46 SERIES	-	16,556	-	-	-	16,556
26	AH-1W SERIES	-	9,758	-	4,000	-	13,758
27	H-53 SERIES	-	19,919	-	-	-	19,919
28	SH-60 SERIES	-	21,088	-	-	-	21,088
29	H-1 SERIES	-	2,642	-	27,500	-	30,142
30	H-3 SERIES	-	61	-	-	-	61
31	EP-3 SERIES	-	25,833	-	-	-	25,833

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
32	P-3 SERIES	-	60,710	-	87,200	-	147,910
33	S-3 SERIES	-	79,050	-	-	-	79,050
34	E-2 SERIES	-	18,485	-	-	-	18,485
35	TRAINER A/C SERIES	-	19,422	-	-	-	19,422
36	C-2A	-	2,596	-	-	-	2,596
37	C-130 SERIES	-	7,921	-	-	-	7,921
38	FEWSG	-	605	-	-	-	605
39	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	-	7,936	-	-	-	7,936
40	E-6 SERIES	-	60,687	-	-	-	60,687
41	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	-	7,632	-	-	-	7,632
42	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	-	4,134	-	-	-	4,134
43	T-45 SERIES	-	9,057	-	-	-	9,057
44	POWER PLANT CHANGES	-	17,062	-	-	-	17,062
45	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	41,889	-	-	-	41,889
46	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	-	71,620	-	9,300	-	80,920
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
47	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	941,553	-	11,200	-	952,753
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
48	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	312,411	-	-	-	312,411
49	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	8,642	-	-	-	8,642
50	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	13,015	-	-	-	13,015
51	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	37,088	-	-	-	37,088

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
52	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,158	-	-	-	12,158
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,508	-	-	-	1,508
54	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		7,963,858		782,100		8,745,958
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT II	12	472,859	-	-	12	472,859
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(38,927)	-	-	-	(38,927)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	28,801	-	-	-	28,801
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES			-	-		
3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,232	-	-	-	1,232
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
4	TOMAHAWK	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	ESSM	36	40,001	-	-	36	40,001
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
6	AMRAAM	75	38,943	-	-	75	38,943
7	JSOW	636	171,624	180	36,000	816	207,624
8	SLAM-ER	30	27,859	-	-	30	27,859
9	STANDARD MISSILE	86	170,365	-	-	86	170,365
10	RAM	-	23,067	-	-	-	23,067
11	HELLFIRE	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
12	PENGUIN	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	AERIAL TARGETS	-	58,891	-	-	-	58,891
14	DRONES AND DECOYS	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	-	14,902	-	-	-	14,902
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
16	SIDEWINDER MODS	63	27,532	-	-	63	27,532
17	HARM MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	-	50,690	-	-	-	50,690
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
19	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	21,269	-	7,700	-	28,969
20	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	-	180,291	-	-	-	180,291
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,754)	-	-	-	(9,754)
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
22	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,723	-	-	-	2,723
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
23	ASW TARGETS	-	3,180	-	-	-	3,180
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
24	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	-	7,141	-	-	-	7,141
25	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	-	38,926	-	2,000	-	40,926
26	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	-	1,960	-	-	-	1,960
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
27	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	23,740	-	-	-	23,740

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
28	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	-	14,955	-	-	-	14,955
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
29	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,842	-	-	-	1,842
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
30	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	-	909	-	-	-	909
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
31	CIWS MODS	-	964	-	-	-	964
32	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	GUN MOUNT MODS	-	4,779	-	-	-	4,779
35	MODS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER						
36	PIONEER	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
38	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	53,486	-	-	-	53,486
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,434,250		45,700		1,479,950
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	63,157	-	20,000	-	83,157

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
2	JDAM	672	24,390	-	-	672	24,390
3	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	-	-	9,600	-	9,600
4	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	11,508	-	-	-	11,508
5	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,230	-	6,500	-	11,730
6	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	50,600	-	26,000	-	76,600
7	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	26,461	-	-	-	26,461
8	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,635	-	-	-	10,635
9	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	39,293	-	5,000	-	44,293
10	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	JATOS	-	4,995	-	-	-	4,995
12	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	-	14,948	-	-	-	14,948
13	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	5,723	-	-	-	5,723
14	CIWS AMMUNITION	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	8,733	-	-	-	8,733
16	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,176	-	-	-	5,176
17	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	8,745	-	-	-	8,745
18	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	6,378	-	-	-	6,378
19	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	7,317	-	-	-	7,317
20	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	1,343	-	-	-	1,343
22	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300	-	-	-	1,300
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
23	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	23,456	-	-	-	23,456

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
24	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,039	-	-	-	2,039
25	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	40,945	-	-	-	40,945
26	.50 CALIBER	-	7,637	-	-	-	7,637
27	40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,034	-	-	-	2,034
28	60MM, ALL TYPES	-	688	-	-	-	688
29	81MM, ALL TYPES	-	4,981	-	-	-	4,981
30	120MM, ALL TYPES	-	7,633	-	-	-	7,633
31	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	3,931	-	-	-	3,931
32	9 MM ALL TYPES	-	2,657	-	-	-	2,657
33	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	8,358	-	-	-	8,358
34	STINGER SLEP	-	3,925	-	-	-	3,925
35	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	1,592	-	-	-	1,592
36	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	-	322	-	-	-	322
37	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	9,638	-	-	-	9,638
38	FUZE, ALL TYPES	-	249	-	-	-	249
39	NON LETHALS	-	4,480	-	-	-	4,480
40	AMMO MODERNIZATION	-	6,900	-	-	-	6,900
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	952	-	-	-	952
42	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300	-	-	-	1,300
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		429,649		67,100		496,749

SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY
OTHER WARSHIPS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	4,974,888	-	-	1	4,974,888
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(921,235)	-	-	-	(921,235)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	21,869	-	-	-	21,869
3	NEW SSN	1	2,019,503	-	-	1	2,019,503
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(816,491)	-	-	-	(816,491)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	508,222	-	-	-	508,222
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	705,228	-	-	-	705,228
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(1,787)	-	-	-	(1,787)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000
7	SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	210,414	-	-	1	210,414
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	72,277	-	-	-	72,277
9	DDG-51 (MYP)	3	2,795,581	-	-	3	2,795,581
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(82,022)	-	-	-	(82,022)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	356,843	-	143,157	-	500,000
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	460,000	-	460,000
12	LPD-17	2	1,489,286	-	-	2	1,489,286
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,700	-	-	-	20,700
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
14	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	ADC(X)	1	338,951	-	-	1	338,951
16	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	OUTFITTING	-	301,077	-	-	-	301,077
18	POST DELIVERY	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	LCAC SLEP	1	15,615	-	-	1	15,615
20	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	-	263,000	-	-	-	263,000
21	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		12,296,919		603,157		12,900,076
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	6,995	-	-	-	6,995
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	6,257	-	-	-	6,257
3	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GENERATORS						
5	OTHER GENERATORS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PUMPS						
6	OTHER PUMPS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PROPELLERS						
7	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	3,757	-	-	-	3,757

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
8	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
9	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	33,425	-	11,000	-	44,425
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
10	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	9,120	-	-	-	9,120
	PERISCOPES						
11	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	18,998	-	-	-	18,998
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
12	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	16,837	-	-	-	16,837
13	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	10,486	-	-	-	10,486
14	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	47,805	-	-	-	47,805
15	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,419	-	-	-	11,419
17	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	12,387	-	-	-	12,387
18	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	6,206	-	-	-	6,206
20	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	5,356	-	-	-	5,356
21	LCAC	-	3,559	-	-	-	3,559
22	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	16,589	-	-	-	16,589
23	HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	58,851	-	5,000	-	63,851
25	SURFACE IMA	-	2,010	-	-	-	2,010
26	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	4,852	-	-	-	4,852

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
28	REACTOR POWER UNITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	REACTOR COMPONENTS	-	203,365	-	-	-	203,365
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
30	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	-	5,649	-	-	-	5,649
31	EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SMALL BOATS						
32	STANDARD BOATS	-	2,696	-	-	-	2,696
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
33	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	3,302	-	-	-	3,302
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
34	OPERATING FORCES IPE	-	2,689	-	-	-	2,689
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
35	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	-	80,870	-	-	-	80,870
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
36	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
37	AN/SPS-49	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	RADAR SUPPORT	-	-	-	8,000	-	8,000
39	TISS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SHIP SONARS						
40	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	14,291	-	-	-	14,291
41	SSN ACOUSTICS	-	106,647	-	-	-	106,647

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
42	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	847	-	-	-	847
43	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	10,726	-	-	-	10,726
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
45	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	10,697	-	-	-	10,697
46	SSTD	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	29,869	-	-	-	29,869
49	SURTASS	-	5,516	-	-	-	5,516
50	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	6,213	-	-	-	6,213
51	CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
52	AN/SLQ-32	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	AN/WLR-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	3,901	-	-	-	3,901
55	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
56	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	-	61,524	-	-	-	61,524
57	COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
58	AN/WLQ-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	17,316	-	-	-	17,316
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
60	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
61	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	15,853	-	-	-	15,853
62	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	-	37,427	-	-	-	37,427
63	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCS	-	46,692	-	-	-	46,692
64	ATDLS	-	19,153	-	-	-	19,153
65	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	8,989	-	5,000	-	13,989
66	SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	16,863	-	-	-	16,863
67	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	9,607	-	-	-	9,607
68	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	9,046	-	-	-	9,046
69	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	15,356	-	-	-	15,356
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
70	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,341	-	-	-	1,341
71	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	21,390	-	-	-	21,390
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
72	MATCALS	-	4,294	-	-	-	4,294
73	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	7,945	-	-	-	7,945
74	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	18,510	-	-	-	18,510
75	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	30,549	-	-	-	30,549
76	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,705	-	-	-	6,705
77	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,124	-	-	-	5,124
78	FACSFAC	-	4,315	-	-	-	4,315
79	ID SYSTEMS	-	14,280	-	-	-	14,280
80	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	-	11,980	-	-	-	11,980
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
82	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	OSIS EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT (OED)	-	-	-	-	-	-
84	TADIX-B	-	32	-	-	-	32
85	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	2,735	-	-	-	2,735
86	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	-	-	-	-	-
87	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	-	47,022	-	-	-	47,022
88	RADIAC	-	8,308	-	-	-	8,308
89	GPETE	-	7,356	-	-	-	7,356
90	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,421	-	-	-	4,421
91	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
92	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	5,378	-	-	-	5,378
93	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,889	-	-	-	4,889
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
95	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
96	PORTABLE RADIOS	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	SINCGARS	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	-	185,143	-	-	-	185,143
99	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
101	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	-	30,909	-	-	-	30,909
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
102	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	-	31,433	-	-	-	31,433
103	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	-	77,957	-	-	-	77,957

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
104	ADVANCED VLF RECEIVER	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
105	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	-	252,695	-	-	-	252,695
107	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
108	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	-	2,460	-	-	-	2,460
109	NSIPS	-	1,785	-	-	-	1,785
110	JEDMICS	-	-	-	4,000	-	4,000
111	GCCS EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
112	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	-	176,132	-	-	-	176,132
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
113	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	-	46,563	-	-	-	46,563
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
114	SPECIAL DCP	-	14,964	-	-	-	14,964
115	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	-	17,188	-	-	-	17,188
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
116	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
117	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
118	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
119	PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	-	-	-	-	-	-
120	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
121	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
124	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	-	49,466	-	-	-	49,466
125	MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN $5 MILLIO	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
126	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,125	-	-	-	15,125
127	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	-	3,304	-	-	-	3,304
128	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	-	10,676	-	-	-	10,676
129	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	-	36,433	-	-	-	36,433
130	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	-	30,860	-	-	-	30,860
131	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	1,682	-	-	-	1,682
132	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	-	20,374	-	9,900	-	30,274
133	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	-	32,084	-	-	-	32,084
134	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
135	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,928	-	-	-	4,928
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
136	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	18,287	-	4,000	-	22,287
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
137	MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
138	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
139	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
140	NATO SEASPARROW	-	21,716	-	-	-	21,716

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
141	RAM GMLS	-	37,309	-	-	-	37,309
142	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	9,352	-	-	-	9,352
143	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	36,848	-	(17,500)	-	19,348
144	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	70,562	-	-	-	70,562
145	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,883	-	-	-	2,883
146	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	-	6,982	-	-	-	6,982
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
147	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,901	-	-	-	2,901
148	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	-	166,619	-	-	-	166,619
149	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	-	33,814	-	4,300	-	38,114
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
150	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	20,896	-	-	-	20,896
151	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	3,978	-	-	-	3,978
152	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,269	-	-	-	6,269
153	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,904	-	-	-	6,904
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
154	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	-	7,525	-	-	-	7,525
155	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET	-	-	-	-	-	-
156	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (CALIBRATION EQUIPMEN	-	-	-	-	-	-
157	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,613	-	-	-	5,613
158	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
159	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
160	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	7,941	-	-	-	7,941

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
161	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	31,557	-	-	-	31,557
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
162	ARMORED SEDANS	1	197	-	-	1	197
163	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	3	94	-	-	3	94
164	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	-	1,004	-	-	-	1,004
166	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	-	6,238	-	-	-	6,238
167	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	2,477	-	-	-	2,477
168	TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	10,458	-	10,000	-	20,458
169	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	-	51,615	-	-	-	51,615
170	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
171	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
172	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
173	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	22,154	-	-	-	22,154
174	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	3,433	-	-	-	3,433
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
175	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	7,646	-	-	-	7,646
176	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,196	-	-	-	5,196
177	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	4,081	-	-	-	4,081
178	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	-	144,885	-	-	-	144,885
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
179	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	1,562	-	-	-	1,562
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
180	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,592	-	-	-	15,592
181	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,076	-	-	-	2,076
182	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	7,386	-	-	-	7,386
183	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,993	-	-	-	15,993
184	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	25,003	-	-	-	25,003
185	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	22,247	-	-	-	22,247
186	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	9,629	-	-	-	9,629
	OTHER						
187	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
188	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	208,941	-	-	-	208,941
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		3,334,611		43,700		3,378,311
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	AAV7A1 PIP	170	83,372	-	-	170	83,372
2	RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM	-	4,930	-	-	-	4,930
3	LAV PIP	-	1,709	-	-	-	1,709
4	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	16	42,623	-	-	16	42,623
5	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	20,815	-	-	-	20,815

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
6	ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
7	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	3,891	-	-	-	3,891
8	ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER)	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	6,413	-	-	-	6,413
10	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLIO	-	415	-	-	-	415
	WEAPONS						
11	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	11,105	-	-	-	11,105
	OTHER SUPPORT						
12	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	-	1,347	-	-	-	1,347
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
13	EADS MOD	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	JAVELIN (MYP)	293	29,119	-	-	293	29,119
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS)	-	10,550	-	-	-	10,550
16	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	949	-	-	-	949
17	PREDATOR (SRAW)	698	43,355	-	-	698	43,355
	OTHER SUPPORT						
18	MODIFICATION KITS	-	3,598	-	-	-	3,598
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
19	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	4,714	-	-	-	4,714
20	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	8,241	-	-	-	8,241

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
21	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,960	-	-	-	11,960
23	MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	5,041	-	-	-	5,041
24	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	-	402	-	-	-	402
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
26	GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,676	-	-	-	4,676
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
27	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	14,351	-	2,700	-	17,051
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
28	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	-	8,320	-	-	-	8,320
29	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	-	80,656	-	-	-	80,656
30	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	-	9,507	-	-	-	9,507
31	MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	RADIO SYSTEMS	-	3,097	-	6,400	-	9,497
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	3,152	-	-	-	3,152
34	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	-	80,564	-	-	-	80,564
35	MOD KITS MAGTF C41	-	7,484	-	-	-	7,484
36	ITEMS < $2M MAGTF C41	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	ITEMS < $2M (OTHER)	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	-	3,152	-	-	-	3,152
39	INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	-	14,666	-	-	-	14,666
40	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	12,343	-	-	-	12,343

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
41	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	33	1,397	-	-	33	1,397
42	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	-	23,368	-	-	-	23,368
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
43	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	1,859	124,448	-	-	1,859	124,448
44	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (MYP)	2,027	325,582	-	-	2,027	325,582
45	LT TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT(LTVR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
47	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	12,684	-	-	-	12,684
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
49	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,809	-	-	-	3,809
50	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	2,704	-	-	-	2,704
51	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	-	7,651	-	-	-	7,651
52	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	-	655	-	-	-	655
53	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	9,325	-	-	-	9,325
54	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
55	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
56	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
58	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	5,317	-	-	-	5,317
59	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	5,741	-	-	-	5,741
60	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	36,311	-	-	-	36,311
62	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	5,846	-	-	-	5,846
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
63	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	1,914	-	-	-	1,914
64	TRAINING DEVICES	-	30,791	-	-	-	30,791
65	CONTAINER FAMILY	-	6,902	-	-	-	6,902
	OTHER SUPPORT						
66	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
68	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,591	-	-	-	5,591
69	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
70	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	25,382	-	-	-	25,382
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		1,171,935		9,100		1,181,035

CVNX–1 nuclear aircraft carrier program (sec. 121)

The budget request included $21.9 million for advance procurement and advance construction of long lead time components for CVNX–1. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure the nuclear aircraft carrier designated CVNX–1, and enter into a contract for the advance procurement and advance construction of that ship.

The Navy's long-term plan is to provide full funding for CVNX–1 in fiscal year 2006. There are a number of castings for the large machinery associated with an aircraft carrier propulsion plant that have a very long production lead time. To maintain the schedule for CVNX–1 and deliver these needed pieces of machinery as required by the construction sequence, the Navy needs to obligate funds for some of these components in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of the $22.0 million in advance procurement included in the budget request.

Arleigh Burke-class destroyer program (sec. 122)

The authorization request included a provision to extend the DDG–51 multiyear procurement authorization contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–208). The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) authorize the Secretary of the Navy to extend the 1997 multiyear contract to include the fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 DDG–51 procurements; (2) express that it is the sense of Congress that the most economical rate for procurement is three ships per year; and (3) direct the Secretary to update the Arleigh Burke (DDG–51) Class Industrial Base Study of 1993 and the Comptroller General to review this update.

The budget request included $356.8 million for advance procurement for DDG–51 ships. The committee received information that indicated that providing $500.0 million in advance procurement funds for DDG–51 would maximize savings to the taxpayers for procurement of six ships over a two year period: fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

The Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) shows that the Navy plans to buy only two DDG–51 destroyers per year over a three year period (fiscal years 2002–2004) and two destroyers (one DDG–51 and one DD–21) in fiscal year 2005. The Navy's Arleigh Burke (DDG–51) Class Industrial Base Study of 1993 stated that procurement of three destroyers per year could only sustain the destroyer industrial base if some additional, non-DDG–51 work, were available to each shipbuilder. The study also stated that at a rate of two ships per year, a very substantial amount of non-DDG–51 work would be required for each shipbuilder and risk to survival of one or both shipyards could be high.

The Navy testified that a proposal to build two DDG–51 ships per year would result in potential reductions in shipyard workforces and the workforce skill mix, and that maintaining the industrial base would be perilous. The committee concurred with the Navy's assessment regarding the industrial base at the time of the original study, and does not believe that the assumptions in

that study have changed enough to invalidate its conclusions for the situation the Navy faces today.

It is clear to the committee that stretching out this procurement will cause reductions in workforce skill mix that will result in higher costs for not only the DDG–51 ships, but also for other Navy work in the shipyards that build DDG–51 ships.

In fact, the budget request shows a dramatic cost increase of between $60.0 million and $100.0 million per ship when a projected procurement rate of two DDG–51 ships per year is computed. Therefore, buying six ships at a rate of two ships per year for three years will cost the taxpayers between $360.0 and $600.0 million more than buying the same ships over a two year period. The Navy appears to be willing to pay this premium in an attempt to partially accommodate the destroyer industrial base potential problems (as discussed above: three destroyers per year are required to maintain the industrial base) caused by delaying DD–21 one year.

The destroyer industrial base, which will also be required to build DD–21, should be maintained while maximizing cost savings to taxpayers by buying required ships at proven economical rates.

The Navy testified that the current shipbuilding budget is inadequate to recapitalize at the required rate to provide the number of ships needed to carry out the National Security Strategy. Therefore, the committee believes that every opportunity to save scarce ship construction funds should be considered. The Navy has documented over $1.4 billion in savings by buying three ships per year under the multiyear procurement authority provided by Congress. As discussed above, continuing the proven economical rate of three ships per year and use of multiyear authority would save additional taxpayer dollars on this program which the Navy intends to complete.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $143.2 million in advance procurement for DDG–51 to achieve the maximum savings for the taxpayer and to relieve some pressure on the underfunded shipbuilding account in future years.

The additional advance procurement, coupled with the savings to the taxpayer of buying six ships in two years instead of three years, should result in procurement of six ships on a two year multiyear contract for the approximate cost of five ships procured at a lower rate.

Virginia-class submarine program (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for up to a total of five *Virginia*-class submarines between fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2006. The provision would authorize the Secretary to continue the shipbuilder teaming arrangement authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). The provision would also authorize procurement of material in economic order quantity when cost savings to the taxpayers will result.

The current acquisition and construction strategies for the procurement of the first four *Virginia*-class submarines appears to be yielding positive results to date. However, the two shipbuilders have not yet completed the critical test of joining sections con-

structed in two separate shipbuilder facilities. In addition, the subsystems being developed by a number of subcontractors require continued oversight regarding cost and schedule excursions.

The committee notes the importance of the technology insertion approach of building submarines. This approach provides both the flexibility and opportunity to forward fit and refresh capabilities. Administration officials have supported this approach in testimonies before congressional committees.

Therefore, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with submission of the fiscal year 2002 President's budget to include the following:

(1) a plan for maintaining at least 55 attack submarines through 2015, and a plan for achieving a force of 18 *Virginia*-class submarines by 2015;

(2) assessments of savings to the program of production rates of two submarines per year, if that rate were to begin in fiscal year 2004 and construction were to continue at that rate in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter; and

(3) an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative contracting strategies including multiyear procurement and block buy with economic order quantity.

ADC(X) ship program (sec. 124)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure ADC(X)-class ships using the contracting authority most advantageous to the taxpayer. This ship program is important because ADC(X)-class ships will replace the auxiliary vessels that have the oldest average age in the active fleet.

The Navy intends to require at least two shipyards to construct ADC(X) class ships. The committee is concerned that this could result in higher risk in building, which could lead to delays and higher costs. The committee encourages the Navy to minimize the risks associated with constructing the ADC(X)-class ships.

Refueling and Complex Overhaul Program of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract and commence overhaul of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier during fiscal year 2001. The provision would also authorize the budget request of $703.4 million to commence the overhaul of CVN–69. The committee concurs with the Navy's intention to budget for nuclear aircraft carrier overhauls over a two year period and to commence the overhauls during the first year of authorization and appropriation of funds for that purpose.

OTHER NAVY PROGRAMS

Navy Aircraft

Airborne low frequency sonar

The budget request included $162.3 million for the procurement of four remanufactured SH–60R helicopters. The airborne low frequency sonar (ALFS) is a subsystem of the SH–60R. ALFS is a helicopter borne low frequency dipping sonar system that can be rapidly deployed from aircraft carriers and surface combatants to detect and track submarines both in blue water and the littorals.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for the procurement, installation, and spare parts for the ALFS resulting in a more efficient low rate initial production.

SH–60 helicopters

The budget request included $162.3 million for the procurement of four remanufactured SH–60R helicopters. The SH–60R remanufacturing scope includes the airframe, an avionics upgrade, service life extension and incorporation of engineering change proposals. It represents a significant improvement, providing the battle group with added protection in the coastal littorals and in regional conflicts. The Navy included the procurement of additional SH–60R helicopters on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $90.0 million for the procurement of three SH–60R helicopters.

CH–60 helicopters

The budget request included $238.5 million for the procurement of 15 CH–60S helicopters, less $73.4 million in advanced procurement from prior years. The primary roles of the CH–60S are to conduct vertical replenishment with external transfer of cargo and internal transfer of passengers ship-to-ship, ship-to-shore, and shore-to-ship, and to conduct day and night search and rescue. The Navy has included the procurement of additional CH–60S helicopters on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million for the procurement of three CH–60S helicopters.

UC–35 aircraft

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of UC–35 medium range operational support aircraft (OSA). The Navy and the Marine Corps intend to use this aircraft to modernize their OSA fleet. The Navy will purchase UC–35 aircraft to restore a portion of the capability that was lost when the Navy retired CT–39 aircraft without replacement. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have included the requirement for UC–35 aircraft on their unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $48.6 million for the procurement of six UC–35 aircraft, three each for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

C–40A aircraft

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of C–40A aircraft, although additional C–40A procurement is sched-

uled in the Future Years Defense Program, and is included on the Navy unfunded requirements list. The C–40A is being procured as a replacement for the aging C–9 to provide intra-theater logistics essential to maintaining the readiness of forward-deployed naval forces. Funding has been provided for five C–40A aircraft to date, with deliveries scheduled to commence in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $128.4 million for the procurement of two C–40A aircraft, including $11.2 million for spare parts.

T–45 aircraft

The budget request included $278.1 million for the procurement of 12 T–45 Goshawk aircraft, less advance procurement of $9.5 million from prior years. The T–45 Goshawk training system consists of aircraft, simulators, and academic materials required to train carrier-based naval aviators. Additional T–45 aircraft are included on the Navy unfunded requirements list.

The committee is concerned that the current budget request indicates the Navy may shut down the production line for the T–45 before the service acquires sufficient aircraft to offset attrition or accommodate any potential surge in pilot training rate. The committee recommends an increase of $49.2 million for the procurement of three T–45 aircraft, a total authorization of $327.3 million.

Joint primary air training system

The budget request included $74.4 million for 21 joint primary air training system (JPATS) aircraft for the Navy. The Navy has included additional JPATS aircraft on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the procurement of three JPATS aircraft for the Navy, a total authorization of $81.4 million.

KC–130J

The budget request included $154.8 million for the procurement of two KC–130J aircraft. The Marine Corps is facing a shortfall of aerial refueling aircraft as it uses up the remaining fatigue life of its KC–130F and KC–130R fleet. The Marine Corps has included the procurement of additional KC–130J aircraft on its unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $74.6 million for the procurement of one KC–130J aircraft, a total authorization of $229.4 million.

EA–6B aircraft automatic flight control system

The budget request included $203.1 million for modifications for the EA–6B aircraft. Although the budget request included no funds for automatic flight control systems (AFCS), a new AFCS for the EA–6B was included on the Navy unfunded priorities list. A new AFCS is required to replace the obsolete air navigation computer, and will provide the pilot with axis stability and attitude, speed, and altitude control. The new system will also improve reliability and maintainability for the EA–6B, the only tactical electronic jammer in use by the services. Heavily used in Operation Allied Force, the EA–6B is a high demand, low density platform. The

committee recommends an increase of $21.0 million for the procurement of EA–6B AFCS, a total authorization of $224.1 million.

AV–8B precision targeting pod

The budget request included $40.6 million for modifications to the AV–8B aircraft. The budget request included no funding for Litening II precision targeting pods, although they were included on the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The Litening II is a precision targeting system which allows the aircraft to acquire targets and deliver precision munitions. The Marine Corps currently has nine targeting pods on contract, funded through the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

Operation Allied Force demonstrated a continuing requirement for precision weapons and aircraft platforms capable of delivering them. The committee recommends an increase of $79.4 million to procure 47 Litening II precision targeting pods, a total authorization of $120.0 million in AV–8B aircraft modifications.

F–18 modifications

The budget request included $212.6 million for modifications to the F–18 aircraft, including $22.7 million for engineering change proposal 583 (ECP–583), which upgrades Marine Corps F/A–18A aircraft to a configuration with capabilities comparable to Lot 17 F/A–18C aircraft. This upgrade allows these F/A–18A aircraft to remain viable for use on the modern battlefield. Acceleration of this upgrade over what is currently included in the Future Years Defense Program is included in the Navy unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $86.9 million to upgrade 20 F/A–18A aircraft with ECP–583, a total authorization of $299.5 million.

AH–1W series

The budget request included $9.8 million for AH–1W series aircraft modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for four additional night targeting systems (NTS) for reserve component AH–1W series aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million, necessary to complete the last four aircraft upgrades with NTS devices. The committee recommends a total authorization of $13.8 million for AH–1W series aircraft modifications.

H–1 series

The budget request included $2.6 million for H–1 series aircraft modifications.

The Marine Corps is fielding AN/AAQ–22 UH–1N navigation thermal imaging systems (NTIS) to support operational enhancements to fielded aircraft. The committee supports this effort and believes these modifications should be completed as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to procure an additional 28 NTIS upgrades for UH–1N aircraft.

The Marine Corps plans to begin the induction of existing UH–1N aircraft into the remanufacturing process which will convert older aircraft into the future four bladed "November" (4BN) configuration. Due to a shortage of existing aircraft in the operational

fleet, the Marine Corps will have to use aircraft from operating squadrons to start the contractor conversion program. The committee would prefer to avoid such an effect on the operating squadrons. The Marine Corps has informed the committee that there are aircraft currently housed in the aerospace maintenance and regeneration center (AMARC) that could be used to begin the conversion process instead. The committee recommends another increase of $17.5 million to reclaim and convert 14 aircraft from AMARC necessary to initiate the remanufacturing process without impacting operational units. The committee, therefore, recommends a total authorization of $30.1 million for H–1 series modifications.

P–3 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $60.7 million for modifications to the P–3 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $87.2 million in P–3 modifications for two modifications included on the Navy unfunded priorities list, a total authorization of $147.9 million.

The budget request included $31.6 million for installation of previously procured anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) kits, along with associated support items, but did not include the procurement of any additional AIP kits. The AIP modification allows the P–3 to combat emerging third world, limited operations, surface, subsurface, and air threats with simultaneous multi-mission capabilities, a capability proven in Operation Allied Force. The committee recommends an increase of $44.1 million for the procurement of three P–3 AIP kits.

The budget request included $17.7 million for the P–3C Update III common configuration program, also known as the block modification upgrade program (BMUP). This program provides modern processing systems for the mission computer and acoustics sensors to achieve a common P–3C configuration with improved performance. The committee recommends an increase of $43.1 million for the conversion of five aircraft with BMUP kits.

Tactical aircraft moving map capability

The budget request included $71.6 million for common avionics changes, but included no funding for installation of the tactical aircraft moving map capability (TAMMAC) in the F/A–18C/D aircraft. TAMMAC is a modular hardware and software base system that helps the aircrew maintain situational awareness by providing a graphical presentation of the aircraft position and relative positions of targets, threats, terrain features, planned mission flight path, no fly zones, safe bases, and other objects. Funding for TAMMAC is included for the F/A–18C/D in the Future Years Defense Program, and it is included on the Navy unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $9.3 million to procure 80 TAMMAC units, the maximum annual rate for F/A–18C/D installations, a total authorization of $80.9 million for common avionics changes.

Navy Weapons

Joint standoff weapon

The budget request included $171.6 million for the procurement of 636 joint standoff weapons (JSOWs) for the Navy. The JSOW is a precision air-to-ground glide weapon capable of attacking a variety of fixed area targets in day, night, and adverse weather conditions. With the increased emphasis on the use of precision guided munitions demonstrated in Operation Allied Force, it is necessary to build up inventories of such weapons for use in contingencies. The committee recommends an increase of $36.0 million for the procurement of 180 JSOWs, a total authorization of $207.6 million.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included $21.3 million for various activities at government-owned and contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of $7.7 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Mark 48 advanced capability torpedo modifications

The budget request included $16.4 million for Mark 48 advanced capability (ADCAP) torpedo modifications. The Mark 48 ADCAP torpedo is the primary anti-ship and anti-submarine weapon for the submarine fleet. However, torpedo modifications are required for effective operations in the littorals. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for Mark 48 ADCAP modifications to field this improved capability in the submarine fleet as soon as possible.

Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps

The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Commandant of the Marine Corps recently identified a requirement for $69.8 million for ammunition programs, and the Chief of Naval Operations identified a requirement for $5.0 million for air expendable countermeasures, that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness—for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Navy and Marine Corps ammunition procurement:

Item:	*Millions*
20 mm	3.0
25 mm	3.5
2.75″ Rockets	9.6
MJU–52 Countermeasures	5.0
Subtotal	$21.1

Laser-guided bomb components

The budget request included $63.2 million for the procurement of general purpose bombs, with $29.2 million for the procurement of laser-guided bomb components. Laser-guided bombs provide the ability to conduct precision attacks while minimizing collateral

damage. Recent contingency operations have demonstrated the need for these weapons, and the Navy has included laser-guided bombs on its unfunded requirements list to augment critically low inventory levels. Operation Allied Force highlighted a dramatic increase in the percentage of precision guided munitions versus unguided munitions. The committee directs the Navy to create a separate line item for laser-guided bomb components in future budget submissions. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the competitive procurement of additional laser-guided bombs components, a total authorization of $83.2 million for general purpose bombs.

Training ordnance

The budget request included $50.6 million for practice bombs. The Navy unfunded priorities list includes a requirement for additional laser-guided bombs and associated ordnance to meet critical readiness and training needs. Recent contingency operations have highlighted a dramatic increase in the use of precision weapons. The committee directs the Navy to establish a separate line item for laser-guided bomb training ordnance in future budget submissions. The committee recommends an increase of $26.0 million for the procurement of additional laser guided bombs and associated ordnance to meet critical training and readiness requirements, a total authorization of $76.6 million for practice bombs.

Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion

Shipbuilding overview

The Navy and Marine Corps are a forward deployed force carrying out the National Security Strategy of shaping the international environment, responding to crises, and preparing for an uncertain future. Seventy percent of the world's population lives within 200 miles of coastline. The normal operating areas of Navy and Marine Corps forces, referred to as the littorals, thus have the potential to include numerous future hot spots around the world.

Navy and Marine Corps forces are an inherently forward deployed and combat credible expeditionary force engaged daily to influence the world's security environment and sustain our national security. Navy and Marine Corps forces do not rely on host country airfields, security, or lines of communication. Their capabilities range from humanitarian assistance and strengthening ties with other nations through international exercises to forcible entry and full scale war.

As was demonstrated in the past year, once forward deployed, Navy and Marine Corps forces respond immediately without extensive preparation time to a wide range of national tasks.

The committee has repeatedly received testimony that indicates the burden of inadequate force structure (ships and submarines) falls squarely on the shoulders of the men and women in uniform. The testimony indicates that even at the current fleet size of 316 ships, the Navy and Marine Corps have been ". . . stretched too thin." Under these circumstances, it is the people who man the ships that are being asked to bear a heavier burden to respond to

more contingencies than envisioned when the Quadrennial Defense Review decided that a force of about 300 ships would be adequate.

In recognition of the long term view that must be taken for shipbuilding, section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the Secretary of Defense to submit no later than February 1, 2000, a report on the long-range shipbuilding requirements of the Department of Defense. The report is required to include a statement of the ship types and the annual investment required through 2030.

The Secretary did not submit the report on the date required by law. Although Congress still waits for the report, the committee received testimony from a representative of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the various analyses CRS has conducted on supporting Navy force levels. The CRS analyses concluded that an annual ship procurement investment of about $10.0 to $12.0 billion and a procurement rate of 8.7 to 10.2 ships per year are required to maintain a fleet of about 300 ships. The CRS estimates did not consider the requirements of, or resources for, strategic sealift ships which have previously been funded in the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Navy witnesses concurred with the CRS conclusions on the annual investment and annual procurement rates required to maintain the fleet. The committee also agrees with the CRS conclusions, but recognizes that a $10.0 to $12.0 billion annual investment alone will not ensure the nation has the ships required to carry out the National Security Strategy.

The committee recognizes there are a number of different approaches to funding shipbuilding in the long-term. One approach would be to defer near-term investment, allow the average age of the force to increase, and permit a large backlog of ship purchases to accrue. This would match the pattern of recent years: we have been building ships at a much lower rate than 8.7 ships per year. However, the committee recognizes that, for every year that we invest less than $10.0 to $12.0 billion and buy fewer than 8.7 ships, we will have to invest more than $10.0 to $12.0 billion and buy more than 8.7 ships in a future year. Continuing at rates that are too low could result in unattainable ship procurement funding levels and will inevitably increase the burden on our men and women in uniform.

The committee also recognizes that, in addition to attaining the required annual investment, the Department of Defense (DoD) should consider more innovative procedures to ensure shipbuilding procurement funds are leveraged to attain the most efficient and productive results. For example, the Navy was persuaded that initiating funding early for CVN–77 would result in protecting the required worker skill base at the shipyard and result in savings. These savings were verified by a Rand Corporation analysis. Multiyear commitment of funding for the DDG–51 program also resulted in over $1.4 billion in savings compared to a normal annual procurement strategy.

In addition, research and development for shipbuilding programs provides an opportunity to drastically lower the life-cycle costs of building, maintaining, and operating ships. Ship research and development is an investment in not only the required war fighting

characteristics and capabilities, but also the economic feasibility of operating multi-purpose complex ships.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the DoD take the following actions to alter current budget practices to leverage scarce ship procurement funding when economic advantage or beneficial program stability can be achieved:

(1) include total ownership costs as an explicit independent variable when determining requirements for all future ship classes;

(2) maximize production efficiencies of economic order quantities for block buy and multiyear contract opportunities;

(3) maximize use of advance procurement to retain vendor base efficiencies and critical skill mix learning curve progress; and

(4) budget for auxiliary ships and strategic lift ships in the National Defense Sealift Fund.

The committee believes that the Navy should use specific criteria in evaluating the alternative budgeting approaches in items (2) through (4) above. These criteria are analogous to those specified for evaluating multiyear procurement programs in section 2306(b) of title 10, United States Code. These criteria include whether:

(1) the use of such alternative budgeting will result in savings in total contract costs;

(2) there is reasonable certainty that the need for the program will not change;

(3) there is reasonable expectation that the Navy will continue to budget for the program;

(4) the ship design is stable, and the technical risks are not excessive; and

(5) cost estimates are realistic.

The committee recommends action elsewhere in this report to increase the new ship procurement funding authorization to achieve potential savings of $1.1 billion in new ship construction and encourages the DoD to make the recommended budget process changes. The committee encourages the administration to submit legislative initiatives that would assist in leveraging shipbuilding research and development and procurement funding.

LHD–8 advance procurement

The budget request included LHD–8 advance procurement in fiscal year 2004 and full funding in fiscal year 2005 as part of the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP).

In the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (H. Rept. 105–736), Congress authorized $50.0 million for advance procurement of long lead materials for construction of LHD–8 in lieu of a future service life extension program for LHA–1. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) authorized the procurement and advance construction of components and authorized $375.0 million for that purpose as a confirmation that building LHD–8 was preferred to extending the life of LHA–1.

The Navy and Marine Corps included, as a priority, the $1.2 billion remaining cost for LHD–8 on their fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements priorities list.

The committee realizes that actual cost savings and price will depend on the final procurement funding profile.

The committee continues to be concerned that the FYDP plan would cause an unnecessary interruption of learning curve efficiencies and the loss of long-term vendor pricing economies. However, fiscal year 2001 advance procurement of LHD–8 would accomplish the following:

(1) save taxpayers between $500 and $630 million dollars by leveraging skilled labor force and vendor base efficiencies resulting from the continuous LHD construction for the past 16 years;

(2) provide the Marine Corps required warfighting improvements including landing craft, air cushion (LCAC) carrying capacity, improved ship stability, and enhanced communications capability;

(3) initiate life-cycle cost improvements for large deck amphibious ships including gas turbine main propulsion engines; and

(4) take action to address the annual shipbuilding investment required to maintain about 300 ships, mentioned elsewhere in this report, by spreading out the recapitalization of the five ships in the LHA–1 class which will turn 35 years old at a rate of one per year beginning in fiscal year 2011.

The committee reiterates its direction that the Navy structure any contract for LHD–8 to maximize these potential savings and to report same to the Congress. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $460.0 million to continue the advance procurement and advance construction of components for the LHD–8 amphibious ship.

Other Navy Procurement

AN/WSN–7 inertial navigation system

The budget request included $7.3 million for procurement of AN/WSN–7 ring laser inertial navigation systems. The AN/WSN–7 continuously and automatically determines and indicates a ship's position, attitude (heading, roll, and pitch), and velocity. This system replaces three legacy navigation systems and provides equipment commonality between surface combatants, submarines, and aircraft carriers. The annual operating cost of the AN/WSN–7 is projected to be only 10 percent of the cost of operating the legacy navigation systems it replaces. Therefore, accelerated procurement of the AN/WSN–7 could produce a substantial savings in maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to the budget request for the procurement and installation of additional AN/WSN–7 navigation sets.

Surveillance and security for military sealift ships

The budget request included no funding for thermal imaging surveillance and security for military sealift ships. Military sealift ships may operate independently in high threat areas. Thermal im-

aging capabilities could improve the ability of these ships to navigate and operate in reduced visibility while improving their overall self protection capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for thermal imaging surveillance and security procurement and installation on Military Sealift Command (MSC) ships.

Integrated condition assessment system

The budget request included $11.3 million for integrated condition assessment system (ICAS) for ships. The ICAS is a system that electronically monitors the operating parameters of machinery and electronic systems, thus reducing man-hours spent taking readings on equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for procurement and installation of ICAS equipment for surface ships.

AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radar

The budget request included no funding for procurement and installation of AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radars which would replace a number of aging radars on surface ships with one radar. The AN/SPS–73(V) is a commercial off-the-shelf radar which provides surface ships with a reliable, lower maintenance and lower life-cycle cost surface search radar capability. To capture the reliability and life-cycle cost savings, the Navy is replacing aging surface ship radars with the AN/SPS–73(V). The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement and installation of AN/SPS–73(V) radars.

Side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers

The budget request included no funding for side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers. Commercial off-the-shelf high resolution side-scanning sonars are available that would enhance the ability of forward deployed minesweepers to detect and classify sea mines located on the bottom of the ocean floor. These sonars have been used by Navy units with great success in locating aircraft wreckage. The Navy's experience with these sonars provides the basis for developing operational expertise to apply this technology to the challenging task of detecting and classifying bottom sea mines.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the procurement and installation of a side-scanning sonar in a forward deployed minesweeper to enhance the ability to detect and classify bottom mines.

Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System

The budget request included no funds for the Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System (JEDMICS), the designated Department of Defense standard system for management, control and storage of engineering drawings. This system is designed as an open, client-server architecture and is nearing full deployment for global access to the data in its repositories. However, the JEDMICS data available is not fully accessible to all clients using the joint technical data environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for procurement, integration and accreditation surveys to ensure JEDMICS is fully compliant with the joint technical data environment.

Aviation life support

The budget request included $20.4 million for aviation life support equipment. The committee continues to support efforts designed to improve the ability of Marine Corps flight crews to operate their aircraft at night by providing the most capable night vision systems available. The committee recommends an increase of $9.9 million to procure additional AN/AVS–9 night vision goggles which offer significant improvements over existing AN/AVS–6 goggles, a total authorization of $30.3 million.

Gun fire control radar performance improvements

The budget request included $15.6 million for AN/SPQ–9B gun fire control equipment (GFCE) procurement, installation, and engineering change proposals. The AN/SPQ–9B radar interface is the primary gun fire control radar for surface ships. The AN/SPQ–9B GFCE program provides a low cost product improvement to support both surface and sea skimming target engagements. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to develop and field engineering change proposals to improve the performance of the SPQ–9B radar.

Cruiser smart ship

The budget request included $47.9 million for programs referred to as "smart ship" programs. Of this amount $22.5 million is for smart ship equipment procurement and logistics for Ticonderoga-class cruisers.

The Navy's goal in introducing smart ship programs was to leverage technology to reduce the workload on sailors at sea. Prior year authorizations of funds for the smart ship program were originally justified by expectations that hardware and software installation would enable subsequent manpower reductions. Unfortunately, for the past five years, program delays and software problems have resulted in little progress toward achieving the Navy's goal.

The Navy is currently testing version 11 of the software and has stated that version 12 is required prior to further test and evaluation. The damage control assistant flooding and counter flooding software developed by a fleet sailor almost six years ago on a laptop computer has yet to be introduced as part of the smart ship software for the fleet.

Installation of smart ship equipment has not yet resulted in any personnel savings. The Chief of Naval Operations has instituted a policy which requires a waiting period of one year with smart ship equipment aboard before the Navy will consider realizing any end strength savings. The justification for the smart ship program appears to be evolving to a basis of installing the equipment for a potential reduction of workload on sailors.

The committee recommends a decrease of $17.5 million for procurement of smart ship equipment. The committee will assess, during the review of the fiscal year 2002 budget request, the progress

in testing and development of cruiser smart ship software and the results of the Navy's Smart Ship Steering Committee (SSSC). The SSSC is attempting to standardize procurement of hardware, software, and training for surface combatants, amphibious ships, aircraft carriers, and minesweepers.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $33.8 million for procurement and installation of the NULKA anti-ship missile decoy program. NULKA is a proven decoy against anti-ship missiles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million for the procurement of launcher systems and decoys to outfit the fleet with this key self-defense equipment.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million in the Navy operations and maintenance account for critical training on the NULKA system.

Civil engineering support equipment

The budget request included $10.5 million for light and medium duty tactical equipment used mostly by the Naval Construction Force (NCF), Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF), Naval Beach Group (NBG), and other special operating units. The light duty tactical vehicles are used for the movement of personnel and equipment. The medium tactical trucks are essential for rapid deployment of material to support combat construction of airfields, landing zones, road battle damage repair and rapid runway repair.

Heavy use of the equipment to support military and humanitarian assistance operations during the past decade have heavily strained the existing inventory of already over-aged civil engineering support equipment (CESE). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of civil engineering support equipment for the Naval Construction Force.

Marine Corps Procurement

Night vision

The budget request included $14.4 million for Marine Corps night vision equipment. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for the improved night/day fire-control observation device (INOD). The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million to procure INOD devices for the Marine Corps, a total authorization of $17.1 million for night vision devices.

Radio systems

The budget request included $3.1 million for Marine Corps radio system equipment. The committee notes outstanding requirements for additional enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) equipment necessary to provide network data distribution capabilities and enhance situational awareness. The committee recommends an increase of $6.4 million for additional EPLRS systems necessary to meet requirements associated with the acquisition objective, a total authorization of $9.5 million.

SUBTITLE D-AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F-22 RAPTOR	10	2,428,637	-	-	10	2,428,637
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(278,755)	-	-	-	(278,755)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	396,222	-	-	-	396,222
3	F-15A	-	24,290	-	-	-	24,290
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(24,290)	-	-	-	(24,290)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	F-16 C/D (MYP)	-	23,317	-	-	-	23,317
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(23,317)	-	-	-	(23,317)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
7	C-17 (MYP)	12	2,555,223	-	-	12	2,555,223
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(343,300)	-	-	-	(343,300)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	266,800	-	-	-	266,800
9	C-17 ICS	-	412,200	-	-	-	412,200
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
10	WC-130	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	EC-130J	-	-	1	90,000	1	90,000
12	C-130H	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	C-130J	2	208,051	-	-	2	208,051
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
14	JPATS	27	113,825	7	18,900	34	132,725
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
15	V-22 OSPREY	4	355,681	-	-	4	355,681
15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(19,915)	-	-	-	(19,915)
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	27,209	-	-	-	27,209
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
17	SMALL VCX	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	C-32A	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	C-32B FEST/DEST AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,548	-	-	27	2,548
21	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
22	TARGET DRONES	-	32,915	-	-	-	32,915
23	E-8C	1	296,342	-	-	1	296,342
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,732)	-	-	-	(35,732)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	46,000	-	46,000
25	E-8C ICS	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	HAEUAV	-	22,388	-	(22,388)	-	-
27	PREDATOR UAV	7	22,078	-	-	7	22,078
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
28	B-2A	-	21,723	-	-	-	21,723

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
29	B-1B	-	48,793	-	-	-	48,793
30	B-52	-	8,425	-	12,000	-	20,425
31	F-117	-	32,005	-	-	-	32,005
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
32	A-10	-	33,891	-	11,200	-	45,091
33	F-15	-	258,247	-	74,900	-	333,147
34	F-16	-	248,830	-	119,500	-	368,330
35	T/AT-37	-	83	-	-	-	83
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
36	C-5	-	95,401	-	-	-	95,401
37	C-9	-	3,271	-	-	-	3,271
38	C-17A	-	97,124	-	26,400	-	123,524
39	C-21	-	1,883	-	-	-	1,883
40	C-22	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	C-32A	-	23,568	-	-	-	23,568
42	C-37A	-	376	-	-	-	376
43	C-141	-	737			-	737
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
44	T-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	1,949	-	-	-	1,949
46	T-38	-	120,520	-	-	-	120,520
47	T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	89	-	-	-	89
48	T-43	-	4,929	-	-	-	4,929
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
49	KC-10A (ATCA)	-	55,370	-	-	-	55,370
50	C-12	-	1,521	-	-	-	1,521
51	C-18	-	345	-	-	-	345
52	C-20 MODS	-	5,235	-	-	-	5,235
53	VC-25A MOD	-	98	-	-	-	98
54	C-130	-	91,524	-	-	-	91,524
55	C-135	-	328,232	-	-	-	328,232
56	DARP	-	165,540	-	3,000	-	168,540
57	E-3	-	88,654	-	-	-	88,654
58	E-4	-	31,559	-	-	-	31,559
59	E-8	-	33,389	-	-	-	33,389
60	H-1	-	3,535	-	-	-	3,535
61	H-60	-	23,648	-	-	-	23,648
62	OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	28,214	-	-	-	28,214
63	PREDATOR MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
64	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	16,729	-	-	-	16,729
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
65	AIRCRAFT SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	-	356,856	-	-	-	356,856
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
66	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQ & FACILITIES	-	177,943	-	-	-	177,943
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
67	A-10	-	-	-	-	-	-
68	B-2A	-	18,603	-	-	-	18,603
69	B-2B	-	42,700	-	-	-	42,700
70	C-5	-	-	-	-	-	-
71	C-130	-	1,365	-	-	-	1,365
72	E-4	-	1,463	-	-	-	1,463
73	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,267	-	-	-	7,267
74	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	25,464	-	-	-	25,464
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
75	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	25,352	-	-	-	25,352
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
76	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	43,015	-	46,200	-	89,215
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
77	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	398,474	-	27,800	-	426,274
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
78	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,836	-	-	-	4,836
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						
79	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DARP						
80	DARP	-	98,410	-	8,000	-	106,410
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(32,743)		(32,743)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		9,539,602		428,769		9,968,371
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS	-	11,466	-	28,000	-	39,466
2	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	2.75 IN ROCKET, FLARE IR	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CARTRIDGES						
5	CARTRIDGES	-	70,090	-	-	-	70,090
6	5.56 MM	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30 MM TRAINING	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BOMBS						
12	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	32,731	-	-	-	32,731
13	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	30,745	-	-	-	30,745
14	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,400	-	-	-	1,400
15	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	GBU - 37	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	GBU-15	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	2000 LB HE BOMB MK-84	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
21	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	300	107,201	-	-	300	107,201
23	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	9,098	219,848	-	-	9,098	219,848
24	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	6,308	104,046	-	-	6,308	104,046
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
26	ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	MJU-10B	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CAD/PAD	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	LUU-19 FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	2,431	-	-	-	2,431
33	MODIFICATIONS <5M	-	196	-	-	-	196
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,806	-	-	-	7,806
	FUZES						
35	FLARES	-	37,432	-	-	-	37,432
36	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	-	9,342	-	-	-	9,342
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
37	SMALL ARMS	-	4,074	-	-	-	4,074
38	M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	M-9 PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		638,808		28,000		666,808
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	-	42,308	-	-	-	42,308
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
2	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	2,006	-	-	-	2,006
	TACTICAL						
3	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	174	90,828	-	-	174	90,828
4	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	-	96	-	-	-	96
5	AMRAAM	204	98,687	-	-	204	98,687
	TARGET DRONES						
6	TARGET DRONES	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
7	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,017	-	-	-	3,017
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER						
8	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	-	2,623	-	-	-	2,623
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
9	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	CONVENTIONAL ALCM	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
11	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	-	28,428	-	-	-	28,428
12	MM III MODIFICATIONS	-	375,129	-	-	-	375,129
13	AGM-65D MAVERICK	-	2,042	-	-	-	2,042
14	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	-	4,066	-	-	-	4,066
15	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	-	99	-	-	-	99
16	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $5.0M	-	99	-	-	-	99
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
17	MISSILE SPARES - REPAIR PARTS	-	44,026	-	-	-	44,026
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,736	-	-	-	25,736
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,765	-	-	-	9,765
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	-	196,937	-	(30,300)	-	166,637
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	13,404	-	-	-	13,404
22	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	1,478	-	-	-	1,478
23	INERTIAL UPPER STAGES(SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	-	68,582	-	-	-	68,582
25	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	-	106,356	-	-	-	106,356
26	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	-	22,770	-	-	-	22,770
27	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)	-	469,720	-	(10,000)	-	459,720
28	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	287,996	-	-	3	287,996
29	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	-	55,939	-	(10,000)	-	45,939
29	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
30	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	968,498	-	-	-	968,498
32	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	141,080	-	-	-	141,080
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(5,500)		(5,500)
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		3,061,715		(55,800)		3,005,915
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
1	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	16	254	-	-	16	254
2	STATION WAGON, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	BUSES	66	4,101	-	-	66	4,101
4	AMBULANCES	8	646	-	-	8	646
5	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	83	1,706	-	-	83	1,706
6	ARMORED SEDAN	1	200	-	-	1	200
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
7	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	-	17,593	-	-	-	17,593
12	TRUCK CARRYALL	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	5,869	-	-	-	5,869

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
14	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	-	13,435	-	-	-	13,435
15	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	TRUCK, UTILITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	CAP VEHICLES	-	768	-	-	-	768
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	29,235	-	-	-	29,235
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
19	HMMWV, ARMORED	-	5,586	-	-	-	5,586
20	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	-	5,042	-	-	-	5,042
21	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	18,373	-	-	-	18,373
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
22	TRUCK CRASH P-19	-	8,761	-	-	-	8,761
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	3,700	-	-	-	3,700
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
24	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	-	4,857	-	-	-	4,857
26	60K A/C LOADER	48	96,948	-	-	48	96,948
27	NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	34	24,144	-	-	34	24,144
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	4,530	-	-	-	4,530
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
29	TRUCK, DUMP	-	1,763	-	-	-	1,763
30	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQUIP	-	5,852	-	-	-	5,852
31	MODIFICATIONS	-	387	-	-	-	387
32	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	8,616	-	-	-	8,616
33	VEHICLE LEASES	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
35	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	-	23,346	-	-	-	23,346
36	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	491	-	-	-	491
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
37	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,572	-	-	-	1,572
39	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,530	-	-	-	5,530
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
40	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	58,663	-	-	-	58,663
42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	15,431	-	-	-	15,431
43	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST	-	33,515	-	-	-	33,515
44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	20,858	-	-	-	20,858
45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	602	-	-	-	602
46	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,447	-	-	-	1,447
47	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
48	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	74,771	-	-	-	74,771
49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	14,753	-	-	-	14,753
50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	8,495	-	-	-	8,495
51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	34,519	-	-	-	34,519

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	26,003	-	20,000	-	46,003
53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	1,584	-	-	-	1,584
54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	15,681	-	-	-	15,681
55	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	23,788	-	-	-	23,788
57	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	56,820	-	-	-	56,820
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
58	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	177,283	-	-	-	177,283
60	USCENTCOM	-	7,335	-	-	-	7,335
61	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	17,947	-	-	-	17,947
	DISA PROGRAMS						
62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	9,112	-	-	-	9,112
63	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPAC	-	-	-	-	-	-
64	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	2,674	-	-	-	2,674
65	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	39,094	-	-	-	39,094
66	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	-	92,714	-	-	-	92,714
67	MILSATCOM SPACE	-	53,027	-	-	-	53,027
68	SPACE MODS SPACE	-	25,959	-	-	-	25,959
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
69	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	-	101,222	-	-	-	101,222
70	COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	-	3,104	-	-	-	3,104
71	RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	16,630	-	-	-	16,630
72	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	2,005	-	-	-	2,005

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
73	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	3,227	-	-	-	3,227
74	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	74,301	-	-	-	74,301
75	CAP COM & ELECT	-	386	-	-	-	386
76	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,204	-	-	-	7,204
	MODIFICATIONS						
77	COMM ELECT MODS	-	54,372	-	-	-	54,372
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
78	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	10,106	-	-	-	10,106
79	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	1,105	-	-	-	1,105
80	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,541	-	-	-	9,541
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
81	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	2,833	-	8,000	-	10,833
82	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	6,744	-	-	-	6,744
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
83	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	15,118	-	-	-	15,118
84	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,241	-	-	-	9,241
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
85	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	-	-	-	-	-
86	FLOODLIGHTS	-	10,718	-	-	-	10,718
87	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,187	-	-	-	7,187
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
88	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	15,171	-	-	-	15,171
89	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	17,025	-	-	-	17,025

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
90	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	941	-	-	-	941
91	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	1,838	-	-	-	1,838
92	BLADDERS FUEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
93	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	6,037	-	-	-	6,037
95	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	-	8,259	-	-	-	8,259
96	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	-	50,021	-	-	-	50,021
97	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	6,217	-	-	-	6,217
99	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	25,350	-	-	-	25,350
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
100	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	-	38,629	-	-	-	38,629
101	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	-	2,975	-	-	-	2,975
102	DARP RC135	-	12,785	-	-	-	12,785
103	DARP, MRIGS	-	89,049	-	-	-	89,049
104	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-	5,794,849	-	-	-	5,794,849
105	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	-	136,317	-	3,800	-	140,117
106	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	8,985	-	-	-	8,985
107	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	1,148	-	-	-	1,148
108	MODIFICATIONS	-	177	-	-	-	177
109	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	11,294	-	-	-	11,294
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
110	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	31,636	-	-	-	31,636

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(6,400)		(6,400)
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		7,699,127		25,400		7,724,527

Repeal of requirement for annual report on B–2 bomber aircraft program (sec. 131)

Since the B–2 bomber is no longer in production, the committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1373), as amended by section 141 of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 213).

OTHER AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Air Force Aircraft

EC–130J

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of EC–130J aircraft, a high demand, low density asset. The EC–130 is used to conduct special missions such as psychological operations, civil affairs radio and television broadcasts, command and control countermeasures, and limited intelligence gathering. The Air Force is converting the inventory EC–130 aircraft to the EC–130J configuration. Procurement of additional EC–130J aircraft is on the Air National Guard unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $90.0 million for the procurement of one EC–130J aircraft.

Joint primary aircraft training system

The budget request included $113.8 million for the procurement of 27 joint primary aircraft training system (JPATS) aircraft. The Air Force has requested additional JPATS aircraft on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $18.9 million for the procurement of seven JPATS aircraft, a total authorization of $132.7 million.

Joint surveillance and target attack radar system

The budget request included no funding for advanced procurement of a 16th E–8C Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft or shutdown of the production line. Funding for either advance procurement or line shutdown was, however, included in the Air Force's unfunded requirements list.

JSTARS provides target information for pairing direct attack aircraft and standoff weapons against selected targets. JSTARS successfully supported Operation Allied Force. General Wesley Clark, Commander in Chief, Europe, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, stated that if he were able to have more of anything in support of this operation, it would have been another JSTARS.

The last Quadrennial Defense Review, however, recommended the Air Force inventory objective of JSTARS be reduced from 19 to 13, with the understanding that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would acquire four to six aircraft. This NATO acquisition did not materialize, and the budget request is for the 15th JSTARS aircraft.

The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $46.0 million, to be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, either for: (1) long lead funding for aircraft number 16, if the Department

requests funding for a 16th JSTARS aircraft in the fiscal year 2002 budget request; or (2) production line shutdown and last lot costs.

B–52H aircraft modifications

The budget request included $8.4 million for modifications to the B–52H aircraft. The budget request included no funding for ALQ–172 self-protection electronic countermeasures. The Air Force has included continued procurement of self-protection electronic countermeasure equipment for the B–52 on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in aircraft procurement, Air Force, for the ALQ–172 electronic countermeasures improvement program for the B–52H aircraft, a total authorization of $20.4 million.

A–10 aircraft integrated flight and fire control computer

The budget request included $33.9 million for modifications to the A–10 aircraft, but included no funds for procurement of the integrated flight and fire control computer (IFFCC). Although development of this capability is to be complete in fiscal year 2001, production funding would commence in fiscal year 2002 in the Future Years Defense Program. The IFFCC provides the processing power that handles fire control, flight control, digital terrain system, data link management, situational awareness, and cockpit control and display management. The A–10 IFFCC is included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $11.2 million for the procurement and fielding of IFFCCs for the A–10 aircraft, a total authorization of $45.1 million.

F–15 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $258.2 million for modifications to the F–15 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $74.9 million, a total authorization of $333.1 million. Both increases recommended by the committee are included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

The budget request included $37.3 million for upgrading F–15 engines from the F100–PW–100 to the F100–PW–220E configuration. This upgrade would significantly improve the reliability and maintainability of the engine, and has reduced the unscheduled engine removal rate by 35 percent. Procurement savings are achievable by accelerating this program. The committee recommends an increase of $48.0 million for additional F–15 engine upgrades.

The budget request did not include any funding for the procurement of BOL chaff and flare systems or countermeasures for the F–15 aircraft. The committee understands that the BOL countermeasure system is being evaluated under a foreign comparative test program, and that the system has been successfully integrated on other tactical aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $26.9 million for the procurement of BOL systems and countermeasures for the F–15 aircraft.

F–16 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $248.8 million for modifications to the F–16 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase

of $119.5 million in F–16 modifications, a total authorization of $368.3 million.

The committee also recommends a series of increases to address the fact that the budget request included no funding for other F–16 aircraft modifications. Each of these items were included on an Air Force or Air National Guard unfunded priority list.

The digital terrain system includes precise navigation capabilities and a ground collision avoidance system designed to prevent mishaps. The committee recommends an increase of $16.5 million for the digital terrain system. The committee understands that this amount of funding was removed from the budget request late in the cycle, so recommended offsets for this increase have been taken from other Air Force programs.

Precision targeting pods are the number one unfunded requirement for the Air National Guard. The committee recommends an increase of $34.0 million for the procurement of precision targeting pods.

Compared to other F–16 block aircraft, the thrust of the block 42 is relatively low. For this reason, block 42 F–16 aircraft have not been used in combat. The committee recommends an increase of $69.0 million for the retrofit of Air National Guard block 42 F–16 aircraft with F100–PW–229 engines.

C–17 simulator

The budget request included $97.1 million for modifications to the C–17 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $26.4 million for C–17 aircraft modifications, a total authorization of $123.5 million.

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of another C–17 cockpit system simulator. Procurement of an additional cockpit system simulator is necessary to meet projected aircrew training requirements, and the Air Force has included the procurement of this simulator on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $14.9 million for the procurement of a C–17 cockpit system simulator.

The budget request included no funding for the C–17 aircraft maintenance systems trainer (AMST), for which $3.5 million in long lead funding was provided in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends an increase of $11.5 million to complete procurement of the C–17 AMST.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft modifications

The budget request included $165.5 million for modifications to defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the procurement of Senior Year electro-optic reconnaissance system (SYERS) equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the procurement of SYERS equipment, a total authorization of $168.5 million.

ALE–50 towed decoys

The budget request included $43.0 million for war consumables, with $32.3 million dedicated to the procurement of ALE–50 towed decoys. The ALE–50 is a low cost radio frequency countermeasure

that provides increased survivability against semi-active guided missile threats. This countermeasure was credited with saving aircraft and lives during Operation Allied Force. Additional procurement of the ALE–50 is included on the Air Force unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $46.2 million for the procurement of additional ALE–50 towed decoys, a total authorization of $89.2 million for war consumables.

Compass Call

The budget request included $398.5 million for other production charges for the Air Force. Compass Call is the premier tactical airborne information warfare platform. In fiscal year 1993, funding for the block 30 Compass Call mission simulator was cut, and there is no training system fielded for the current configuration. Key Compass Call program content was lost in fiscal year 1999 due to Operation Allied Force costs, which were absorbed out of existing budget authority. Compass Call block 35 improved frequency coverage has been reduced. The committee, therefore, recommends increases of $23.7 million for the procurement of a Compass Call mission training system for block 30/35 aircraft and $4.1 million to provide a technology upgrade to the acquisition subsystem of Compass Call block 35, a total authorization of $426.3 million. Both of the increases recommended by the committee are included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program

The budget request included $98.4 million for the procurement of equipment for the defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), of which, $85.1 million was for equipment for the joint signals intelligence avionics family (JSAF). The committee understands this does not fully outfit the first U–2 aircraft with a complete JSAF unit. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of additional JSAF equipment for the U–2 aircraft.

Air Force Missile

Global Positioning System

The budget request included $210.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, and $250.2 in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for the Global Positioning System (GPS). The committee has recently received an amended budget request for the GPS system that reflects the Air Force's GPS modernization plan. The committee supports this effort. In order to properly align funds according to the amended budget request, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, and an increase of $10.7 million in PE 35165F.

Titan space boosters

The budget request included $469.7 million for procurement of Titan IV space boosters. Based on current projections, it appears that the Titan IV program may not require this full amount to execute its fiscal year 2001 requirements. Therefore, the committee

recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in Air Force Missile Procurement for Titan space boosters.

Medium launch vehicle

The budget request included $55.9 million for Medium Launch Vehicle (MLV) procurement. As a result of the Department of Defense's Global Positioning System (GPS) modernization plan, the Air Force now plans to delay a number of GPS block IIR launches. This delay reduces the procurement funding requirement for MLV during fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in Air Force Missile Procurement funds for MLV.

Air Force Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Air Force

The budget request included $11.5 million for the procurement of 2.75 inch rockets for the Air Force. The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force recently identified a requirement for $211.0 million for high priority munition programs, including 2.75 inch rockets, that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness—for training and in anticipation of conflict. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $28.0 million for 2.75 inch rockets.

Other Air Force Procurement

Combat training ranges

The budget request includes $26.0 million for procurement of equipment for combat training ranges, of which $18.4 million is for advanced threat upgrades. Realistic simulation of threats in training increases the survivability of our aircraft and aircrews in actual combat situations. The committee understands there are competing systems to fill the Air Force requirement for advanced threat emitters. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to procure additional advanced threat emitters for its combat training ranges, a total authorization of $46.0 million.

Night vision goggles

The budget request included $2.8 million for the procurement of night vision goggles (NVGs) and associated test equipment for aircrew, maintenance, and security personnel. There is a shortage of this equipment, and the Air Force has included procurement of additional NVGs on its unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement of additional NVGs and associated test equipment, a total authorization of $10.8 million.

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
1	MOTOR VEHICLES	-	321	-	-	-	321
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	-	64,872	-	-	-	64,872
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	-	23,191	-	-	-	23,191
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
5	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	11,535	-	-	-	11,535
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
6	MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECH	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	-	26,655	-	-	-	26,655
8	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	-	3,233	-	-	-	3,233
9	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	-	19,399	-	-	-	19,399
10	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	-	3,671	-	-	-	3,671
11	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	5,136	-	-	-	5,136
12	STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	-	2,469	-	-	-	2,469
13	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	14,429	-	-	-	14,429
14	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
16	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-	82,863	-	-	-	82,863
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
17	VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,714	-	-	-	4,714
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	28,171	-	-	-	28,171
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
22	PATRIOT PAC-3	40	365,457	-	-	40	365,457
23	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	-	74,530	-	-	-	74,530
24	C4I	-	3,975	-	-	-	3,975
25	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY						
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
27	VEHICLES	-	145	-	-	-	145
28	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	44,034	-	-	-	44,034
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
29	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	656	-	-	-	656
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS	-	4,695	-	-	-	4,695
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE						
31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE	-	1,546	-	-	-	1,546
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
32	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	68,480	-	-	-	68,480

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
33	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	2,364	-	-	-	2,364
34	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	10,403	-	-	-	10,403
35	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	4	8,533	-	-	4	8,533
36	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	13,871	-	-	-	13,871
37	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	26,237	-	-	-	26,237
38	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	2,186	-	-	-	2,186
	SHIPBUILDING						
39	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	-	33,477	-	3,300	-	36,777
39	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(7,977)	-	-	-	(7,977)
40	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,472	-	-	-	22,472
41	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	1,559	-	-	-	1,559
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
43	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	36,632	-	-	-	36,632
44	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	25,978	-	-	-	25,978
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
45	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	74,444	-	-	-	74,444
46	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	32,309	-	-	-	32,309
47	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	11,829	-	21,700	-	33,529
48	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	-	909	-	-	-	909
49	NAVAL SPC WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	-	14,511	-	-	-	14,511
51	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	11,780	-	-	-	11,780
52	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	5,801	-	-	-	5,801

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
53	DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	14,376	-	-	-	14,376
55	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	2,021	-	-	-	2,021
56	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	105,547	-	-	-	105,547
57	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	-	7,575	-	-	-	7,575
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
58	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	108,725	-	-	-	108,725
59	DECONTAMINATION	-	12,195	-	-	-	12,195
60	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	-	141,781	-	-	-	141,781
61	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	-	36,179	-	-	-	36,179
62	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	-	175,056	-	4,300	-	179,356
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9	490,358	-	(120,000)	9	370,358
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		2,275,308		(90,700)		2,184,608
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	-		274,400	-	274,400
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	-		121,900	-	121,900
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	-		607,200	-	607,200
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-WIDE		-		1,003,500		1,003,500
	Defense Health Program		290,006	-	-	-	290,006
	Office of the Inspector General		3,300	-	-	-	3,300

Advanced SEAL delivery system design enhancements

The budget request included $33.5 million for the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) Program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.3 million in the Defense Wide Procurement, Special Operations Command, ASDS account to fund design enhancements required to implement necessary changes and enhancements on subsequent ASDS production vehicles.

ASDS design enhancement costs are estimated to be $10.0 million. Special Operations Command has funded $6.8 million of ASDS design costs with savings in its ongoing ASDS developmental testing program. Full funding of these design enhancements could result in a $10.0 million reduction in procurement unit cost for the remaining five ASDS vehicles.

The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–301) required the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command (CINCSOCOM) to report on various aspects of the ASDS program, including whether the program should be elevated to a major acquisition program. The CINCSOCOM provided a report on technical aspects of the ASDS program, but failed to address whether the program had been reviewed by the Department of Defense (DOD), and why the program was not elevated to the category of a major defense acquisition. The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a report explaining why he decided not to elevate this program to a higher level of review, as was required.

Special operations forces small arms and support equipment

The budget request included $11.8 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Small Arms and Support Equipment, but did not include funding to continue procurement of SOF Body Armor Load Carriage System, the Modular Integrated Communications Helmet, or the SOF Peculiar Modifications to the M–4 Carbine. The Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command (CINCSOCOM), identified procurement of this improved body armor, improved helmets, and special modifications to individual weapons, as his highest set of priority unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001. The committee has followed developments in this area closely and is encouraged that equipment that will enhance the survivability, flexibility, and precision of our special operations forces is now available for general procurement.

The committee understands this equipment has been rigorously tested and fielded to some SOF elements. The committee applauds the efforts of CINCSOCOM to field this important equipment to all SOF operators. The committee recommends an increase of $21.7 million for SOF Small Arms and Support Equipment to be distributed as follows: $4.9 million for SOF Body Armor Load Carriage System; $4.7 million for SOF Modular Integrated Communications Helmet; and $12.1 million for SOF Peculiar Modifications to the M–4 Carbine. This represents approximately one-half of the funding requested by CINCSOCOM to fully equip all SOF operators. The committee further directs that CINCSOCOM fully evaluate the suitability of this equipment for all SOF operators across the wide

spectrum of activities conducted by SOCOM and report back to the defense committees of Congress his assessment of the suitability of these enhancements for all SOF operational elements and any recommendations for improvements to meet the unique needs of the various, diverse operational elements of SOCOM. Upon receipt of such an assessment, the committee would consider additional authorizations to complete procurement of this equipment for all SOF operators.

Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defense Enhancement Kits

The budget request included no funding for Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Defense Enhancement Kits. The Marine Corps continues to require the development of NBC force protection training and equipment support packages for deploying Marine Expeditionary Units. The NBC Defense Enhancement Kits will provide equipment to on-scene leaders to allow for isolation of NBC contaminated areas, agent detection and identification, and decontamination. The Marine Corps has a requirement for thirteen NBC kits; nine kits have been procured. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in the Chemical and Biological Defense Program for four NBC Defense Enhancement Kits to complete the planned acquisition.

Communications assistance for law enforcement act

The budget request included $120.0 million for the Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund, which was created as a result of the Communications assistance for law enforcement act of 1994. The committee is concerned that this may represent an inappropriate first step by the Department of Defense towards involvement in placing wiretaps on communications system of American citizens. Court-authorized wiretaps are, and should remain, the responsibility of law enforcement agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $120.0 million to the budget request for this activity.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Pueblo Chemical Depot chemical agent destruction technologies (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents at the Pueblo Chemical Depot either by incineration or any technology demonstrated by the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment on or before May 1, 2000.

Residents and leaders of communities surrounding the Pueblo Chemical Depot continue to voice concerns about delays in the destruction of chemical agents at the Pueblo depot and the attendant risk to community safety. The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has reported on several occasions about the risk associated with the prolonged storage of chemical agents and munitions. According to the NAS, this risk increases significantly with time.

Approximately eight percent of the total U.S. chemical weapons inventory is stored at the Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado. Com-

munity leaders have expressed support for the baseline incineration method and the technologies developed through the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program. This provision is intended to expedite destruction activities utilizing one of these technologies at the Pueblo Chemical Depot in the interest of community safety.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Acquisition programs at the National Security Agency

There are substantial challenges facing the National Security Agency (NSA) as it seeks to modernize its operations and infrastructure. The United States has relied on the NSA for vital information in the past, and will need a significant contribution from NSA as we face the new demands of the future.

The committee believes that the Director of the NSA is making significant progress in making fundamental reform within the agency. The committee encourages the Director to continue this important process.

Although the Director has indicated the need to improve the acquisition process, the committee has become concerned that the current acquisition management procedures may not provide sufficient structure, accountability, or visibility for these important programs.

The committee directs that NSA and the Department of Defense manage the current NSA modernization effort as though it were a major defense acquisition program, as defined in section 2430 of title 10, United States Code. The committee does not intend that these programs be merged into a single contracting vehicle, rather these programs should be elevated to a higher level of review to ensure that the overall modernization effort receives appropriate review and management attention within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Further discussion of this issue is included in the classified annex to this report.

Army aviation

The committee has been very pleased with Army efforts over the last year to revise outdated and incomplete aviation modernization plans. The committee applauds the outstanding efforts of active Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve leaders to establish a plan that will ultimately result in a seamless force of modernized aircraft. The most significant action taken will be that of retiring legacy UH–1 Huey and AH–1 Cobra aircraft by fiscal year 2004 and replacing these aircraft with UH–60 Blackhawks. Most of these aircraft, largely found in the reserve components, have reached the end of their useful life and must be retired as soon as practicable. The revised modernization plan will result in an aviation force structure that is common across both active and reserve components, will reduce the number of rotary wing platforms from seven to four, and will facilitate crew rotation requirements for the broad range of missions that will challenge the Army over the next decade.

The committee still has serious questions about the ability of the Army to fund some of the critical requirements in the revised plan.

In fact, despite congressional direction that the Secretary of the Army to fully fund the revised plan, the Army plan remains underfunded by at least $400.0 million each year.

C–5 aircraft upgrades

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support in March, 2000, the Secretary of the Air Force stated that the decision regarding the priority for upgrade of the C–5As or the newer C–5Bs was pending the results of the outsized and oversized cargo portion of the larger Joint Chiefs of Staff mobility requirements study 05 (MRS–05). The Air Force budget documentation, however, clearly indicates a schedule for upgrade of the C–5Bs before C–5As. The budget documentation also includes a plan to continue kit development options for two aircraft. The committee is concerned that the Air Force will upgrade the newer C–5Bs to optimize strategic airlift operational readiness rates in the near-term, with severe effects on the overall airlift force readiness in the not-too-distant future. This is one of several key decisions being delayed pending the results of MRS–05. Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report based on MRS–05 to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2000. The Secretary of Defense has asked for an extension of this requirement until September 30, 2000. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report by February 15, 2001, which contains the analysis to support the Air Force recommendation on sequence of C–5 aircraft upgrades based on the lift requirements outlined in MRS–05. The kit development efforts for the two aircraft should be for one C–5A and one C–5B. The analysis should project lift capabilities for ten years based on most likely operational readiness rates under the scenario of upgrading the C–5As before the C–5Bs and under the scenario of upgrading the C–5Bs before the C–5As.

Electronic digital compass system

The committee continues to support the Army digitization effort, which will establish a tactical internet for enhanced situational awareness. The output from the Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver on Army combat and tactical vehicles is key to the knowledge of friendly positions. GPS is generally an effective device, but has its limitations, such as susceptibility to blockages from terrain and foliage, enemy electronic countermeasures, including jamming, constellation misalignments, and multi-path errors. The committee is concerned that there is currently no backup to GPS, other than the enhanced position location reporting system, to ensure that critical situational awareness inputs to the tactical internet are not interrupted. This backup could be improved at modest cost by an electronic digital compass system, which can also provide steer-to navigation capabilities. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report assessing the utility and costs involved in integrating and procuring electronic digital compass systems for combat and tactical vehicles of the first digitized division and the digitized corps.

Single channel ground and airborne radio system

The committee is aware of outstanding requirements for additional single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) to provide necessary voice and data communications for a small number of Army National Guard units that are still operating with earlier generation equipment. The committee recognizes plans within the Department of Defense to begin an acquisition program that will procure the next generation joint tactical radio system. Unfortunately, these radios will not be available in the near-term and there are still units in the Army that must be modernized. The committee encourages the Army to review the plans and programs associated with communications fielding requirements and identify alternatives that will meet outstanding requirements as soon as practicable.

Soldier's portable on-system repair tool

For the last several years, the committee has monitored the fielding of the soldier's portable on-system repair tool (SPORT) and is aware that the current contract will expire in fiscal year 2001. SPORT is the on-system tester designed to augment the built-in test equipment of all major Army weapon systems, including the M1 Abrams, the M2 Bradley, the UH–60 Blackhawk, the Paladin, and the multiple launch rocket system. In addition, SPORT has served as a significant maintenance diagnostic tool for many other Army systems. The committee is concerned that any interruption in the fielding of SPORT could have a significant impact on overall readiness. The committee directs the Army to review outstanding requirements for SPORT equipment, identify an acquisition strategy designed to meet those requirements, and provide the Congress with a report on that strategy.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE II			
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	201,560	21,500	223,060
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	37,862,401	1,468,448	39,330,849

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Fiscal year 2002 joint field experiment (sec. 211)

The committee has worked closely with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to develop a credible, comprehensive joint experimentation program. The creation of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) on October 1, 1999, with an organizational element dedicated to joint experimentation, institutionalized this process. The committee has noted, with great interest, the strides made by USJFCOM in implementing this program.

The committee is encouraged that a joint experimentation program has been established, but was disappointed to learn that the first fully planned, joint field experiment is not scheduled until fiscal year 2004. While the need to carefully build this program is appreciated, this has to be balanced against the need for urgency. Many of the transformation concepts being explored by the respective services will have evolved considerably by 2004, without the benefit of experimentation and evaluation within a joint war fighting context.

The committee is concerned that familiar problems continue to plague joint operations. Many of the lessons learned in the recent Kosovo operation were noted in previous military operations. Combatant commanders continue to appear before the committee with recurring concerns, including: incompatible command and control; interoperability problems; no combat identification standard; insufficient strategic lift; insufficient intelligence assets (intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance); and inadequate theater-level force protection capabilities. While efforts appear to be underway to correct these deficiencies, questions are continuously raised regarding the priority and urgency assigned to these requirements, and the absence of a detailed, defense-wide strategy to guide transformation of our forces.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense plan in fiscal year 2001 and conduct in fiscal year 2002, a joint field experiment focused on exploring the most critical war fighting challenges at the operational level of war which will confront U.S. joint military forces. This experiment should incorporate elements of all military services and special operations forces. In addition, the Secretary of Defense is directed to ensure that each military service and U.S. Special Operations Command participate with elements representative of their future force concepts, e.g., Air Force Expeditionary Aerospace Force, Army medium-weight brigades, and Navy Forward from the Sea vision. The committee sees merit in each of these individual service initiatives, and believes that combining these concepts in a joint context has potential for improving our military capabilities, individually and collectively. The committee directs the services to adjust their fiscal year 2001 planning activities and fiscal year 2002 experimentation activities to accommodate participation in this experiment and evaluation of capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63727N to accomplish the necessary planning and preparation for this joint experiment in fiscal year 2001. The committee expects

the Department of Defense (DOD), the military departments and USJFCOM to include adequate funding in the fiscal year 2002 budget request to properly conduct this experiment.

The Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD War Fighting Transformation, published in August 1999, observed that there is no comprehensive DOD-wide strategy and road map for a coordinated transformation of our armed forces and that there are no apparent standards to measure progress. The committee recommends that the Secretary use the opportunity presented by this joint field exercise to accomplish the following: collect the data that will enable a more specific description of the desired attributes of the objective joint forces for Joint Vision 2010; establish the standards to measure progress; and establish achievable, affordable milestones.

Nuclear aircraft carrier design and production modeling (sec. 212)

The budget request included $38.3 million in PE 64567N for aircraft carrier contract design. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Navy to convert nuclear aircraft carrier design to a three-dimensional, computer based system. The budget request did not include funds specifically designated for this effort. However, minimal conversion of paper designs has occurred from funds designated for aircraft carrier research and development and shipbuilding and conversion. The Navy conversion effort thus far has proven to be cost-effective in saving taxpayer dollars.

The Navy intends to develop a three-dimensional product model for portions of CVNX–1. The committee also understands that the Navy intends to build certain sections of CVN–77 that will be major new designs derived from the CVN–76 baseline. The Navy recently made the decision that CVNX hulls will be based on the Nimitz-class hull design. Because of this decision, it may now be possible to achieve cost savings in designing, constructing, and modifying CVNX and sections of CVN–77 through use of a computer-aided design and product model. Such a product model might also be beneficial in supporting the Nimitz class ships in the fleet.

Major new construction shipbuilding programs, including the Flight IIA Arleigh Burke-class destroyer, the Virginia-class submarine, and the San Antonio-class amphibious ship, using the three-dimensional, computer-based product models have resulted in over $184.0 million savings. The Navy predicts that additional savings will continue to accrue throughout the life cycle of the ships when they are repaired and modified. These product models were developed and funded through the ship class' research and development and construction funds.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64567N to develop an electronic product model of the CVNX–1 and applicable sections of CVN–77 nuclear aircraft carrier design. The committee also directs the Navy to provide an analysis of the potential costs and benefits of extending this product model effort for use in supporting the Nimitz-class ships in the fleet.

DD–21 class destroyer program (sec. 213)

The budget request included $549.7 million for research and development for DD–21, the Navy's new destroyer program. The committee recommends authorization of the budget request for fiscal year 2001 and fully supports the DD–21 as the future destroyer required to replace Spruance-class destroyers and Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates. The committee concurs that the administration's research and development budget request is required to attain a fiscal year 2005 start of construction and that additional resources would most likely be required for a fiscal year 2004 construction start.

While the committee fully supports DD–21, the committee has not been provided adequate explanation of the following issues:

(1) the advisability of delaying the initial operational capability for three years;

(2) maintaining key capabilities required for completion of the mission of DD–21;

(3) the need for a one year delay in the start of construction of DD–21;

(4) the requirement for extending the construction performance period by two years; and

(5) the inclusion of all life-cycle maintenance in a non-competitive life-of-the-ship contract award.

Delaying the Initial Operating Capability

It would appear that the Navy has given a lower priority to the mission of DD–21, providing ordnance on target to influence the events ashore (land attack), than that of building a technologically superior ship in the first hull. The one year delay in the DD–21 program without analysis of technology insertion approaches, successful in previous ship procurement programs and presently being used in the CVN(X) and the Virginia-class attack submarine programs, requires additional explanation.

While Marine Corps witnesses testified that the two 155 millimeter guns on the DD–21 would be the first at-sea system to fully meet the Marine Corps requirements for fire support since decommissioning of the battleships, Navy witnesses did not provide information regarding the risks to the Marines caused by the one year delay in commencing construction and two year delay in delivery of the first DD–21.

Maintaining Key Capabilities

The Marine Corps has stated a requirement that all naval surface fire support weapon systems be easily sustainable via underway replenishment. The Navy apparently intends to provide the surface fire support with options that includes both gun-fired 155 millimeter ammunition and land attack missiles. The committee understands that the Navy is working with the contractor teams to specify underway replenishment requirements and fully supports the continued refinement of capabilities. The committee encourages the Navy to fully involve the Marine Corps with the review of requirements which affect Marine Corps concepts of operations in-

cluding whether the land attack missile at-sea resupply requirement is valid for the DD–21.

One Year Delay

The Navy has consistently emphasized the need for a destroyer which has lower procurement and operating costs than the present fleet of destroyers and frigates. In attempting to bring such a ship to reality, the Navy determined that manning the ship was the main cost driver in operating the ship. To reduce manning requirements, the Navy challenged two industry teams to develop a new destroyer design which would reduce total ownership cost. The Navy directed the two teams to include in their design proposal justification of the requirement for each member of the crew and consideration of the life-of-the-ship cost of maintaining each piece of equipment when determining what equipment would be included in their design.

Without the advantage of analysis, the Navy set a goal of a 95 person crew and a threshold of a 150 person crew. Consequently, the focus of design and scheduling efforts for the land attack destroyer, thus far, appear to have been on manning and total operating costs. Again, apparently without a thorough analysis, the Navy determined that the design teams could not produce a design which met the 95 person crew and life cycle costs criteria in time to commence construction in fiscal year 2004, the time frame both teams had been working toward. This determination resulted in the Navy submitting a Future Years Defense Program for DD–21 which would delay commencing construction of the first DD–21 for one year (from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005).

Extending the Construction Performance Period

The Navy determined that the original five year performance period (fiscal year 2004 through fiscal 2008) for building the first DD–21 would result in unacceptable risk for successful completion of the program. Therefore, the Navy budget supports a two year delay in the delivery of DD–21 (from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2010).

Non-competitive Award of Life-of-the-Ship Maintenance

The Navy intends to build 32 DD–21 land attack destroyers to replace the aging Spruance-class (DD–963) and Oliver Hazard Perry-class (FFG–7) destroyers. The Navy has discussed the possibility of awarding the winner of the phase II design competition not only the contract to build the first DD–21, but also a contract to provide life-cycle support for all DD–21 ships. The estimated value of a full support contract that includes all ship maintenance for the life of all DD–21 ships would be greater than the contract value for building all 32 ships. If such a maintenance contract were awarded, the winner of the full service support contract could be in a position to determine the ship repair contractors in fleet concentration areas that would be permitted to repair DD–21 ships. The committee believes that this could be a troubling divestiture to a contractor of what is inherently a government function. In addition, the committee is concerned that awarding a full service support

contract for maintenance of DD–21 may reduce the flexibility of the operational fleet commanders to maintain all the fleet ships based on a prioritization of overall fleet maintenance requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would:

(1) authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pursue a technology insertion approach to DD–21 that would commence construction of the first DD–21 in fiscal year 2004 followed by a fiscal year 2009 delivery;

(2) express the sense of Congress that there are compelling reasons to commence DD–21 in fiscal year 2004 followed by sequential construction of DD–21 destroyers until a total of 32 are built, and that the Secretary should consider the following when making his decisions regarding DD–21 procurement:

(a) the Marine Corps requires fire support which the Navy will be unable to provide until the DD–21 155 millimeter guns are introduced in the fleet;

(b) a technology insertion approach has been successful for other ship construction programs and is being used in the CVN(X) aircraft carrier and Virginia-class submarine programs;

(c) a stable configuration for the first 10 ships of the class could help ensure the greatest capabilities are provided at the lowest cost; and

(d) action to acquire DD–21 destroyers should be taken as soon as possible to realize fully the cost savings of construction and operation of DD–21 class destroyers when compared to construction and operation of other classes of destroyers;

(3) direct the Secretary to submit a report not later than April 18, 2001, on a plan, including the resources required, for pursuing a technology insertion approach to DD–21; and

(4) direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report not later than April 18, 2001, that discusses the following:

(a) the technical feasibility of commencing DD–21 construction in fiscal year 2004 with a delivery date in fiscal year 2009. For this section of the report, the committee suggests input by an independent entity, such as the Defense Science Board;

(b) an analysis of various contracting strategies for acquiring the first 10 ships of the DD–21 class;

(c) the effects on the destroyer industrial base and on the costs of other shipbuilding programs of delaying constructing the first DD–21 until fiscal year 2005, and of delaying the construction of the second DD–21 destroyer until 2007; and

(d) the effects on fleet maintenance strategies and on commercial maintenance facilities in fleet concentration areas of awarding a shipbuilding contractor team a maintenance contract which includes all maintenance actions above ships force and below depot maintenance levels.

The committee fully supports the DD–21 program and recognizes the difficulty the Navy faces in instituting an acquisition strategy that emphasizes private sector flexibility in meeting general Navy requirements for a complicated ship.

The committee encourages the Navy and the DD–21 program office to make maximum use of the expertise and facilities resident in Navy field activities for analysis, test, and evaluation of private sector proposals and designs.

F–22 aircraft program (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the F–22 program engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) cost cap by one percent, funds for which could only be obligated for testing requirements approved by the Defense Acquisition Executive and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. This provision will add a cushion to the development phase, as it nears completion, to ensure adequate testing has been accomplished. The Defense Acquisition Executive and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, would share the responsibility for ensuring that the expenditure of any funds above the EMD cost cap would be for testing purposes only.

The performance of the F–22, in testing to date, has been impressive. When introduced as the Air Force's air dominance fighter, it will be far and away the best fighter aircraft in the world. A comprehensive test program now is required to prevent costly retrofits later.

The budget request included $2.2 billion to commence low rate initial production of 10 F–22 Raptor aircraft, $396.2 million for advance procurement items for 16 more aircraft in fiscal year 2002, and $1.4 billion in PE 64239F for continuing F–22 EMD. The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has voiced concern that the congressionally mandated cost cap for the EMD Phase may drive the Air Force to reduce too much content from the F–22 test program. The committee echoes this concern.

The EMD and production cost caps were established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998. This action was taken after the Air Force canceled the manufacture of four preproduction verification aircraft and slowed aircraft production, transferring $2.2 billion from procurement to cover an EMD overrun. The purpose of the cost caps was to force the program to exercise a greater degree of fiscal discipline. In testimony before the AirLand Subcommittee, the Air Force has given the caps credit for exacting this discipline on both the government and the contractor teams. In its latest annual report on the F–22 program, the General Accounting Office concluded that: "the F–22 development program could still be managed within its cost limitation," but "[s]hould further significant cost increases materialize, the development program may need to be scaled back, or other ways may need to be found to reduce the costs."

In the past year, the F–22 program has implemented two structural fixes: the forward aft tail boom and a structural member in the flaperon. These occurrences are normal in any development program, but because flight testing constitutes the majority of the remaining EMD efforts, funding for fixing these occurrences is more difficult to find without reducing testing effort. The committee is concerned that if the program were to be scaled back due to cost increases in other areas, it would be testing that would be cut. The Air Force has already announced that testing efficiencies

have enabled it to reduce the actual flight test hours from 4,337 hours to 3,757 hours. It is not the committee's intent to prevent the service from finding further testing efficiencies, but rather to ensure the test program remains adequate.

Joint strike fighter (sec. 215)

The budget request for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program included $261.1 million to complete the concept demonstration phase, with $129.5 million in PE 63800F and $131.6 million in PE 63800N. The budget request also included $595.5 million to initiate the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase, with $299.5 million in PE 64800F and $296.0 million in PE 64800N.

The committee fully appreciates the critical need to modernize our aging fleet of legacy aircraft with aircraft possessing the capabilities promised by the JSF program. The purpose of the JSF program is to develop and field an affordable, highly common family of next generation strike fighter aircraft for the U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, the U.S. Air Force, and allies. The Navy variant (called CV) will be aircraft carrier capable, the Marine Corps variant will be capable of short takeoff and vertical landing (STOVL), and the Air Force variant will be of a conventional takeoff and landing (CTOL) design. Commonality within this family of aircraft is crucial to keeping the overall tactical aviation modernization plan affordable.

Two contractor teams are competing to win a competition to enter into the next phase of the program, the EMD phase. In addition to conducting design and risk mitigation activities, each contractor team is building two concept demonstration aircraft. Although these are not JSF prototypes, they are required to demonstrate key enabling performance criteria, such as slow speed handling characteristics for aircraft carrier approaches, and short takeoff and vertical landing for the Marine Corps variant.

Unfortunately, the schedule for flying the concept demonstrator aircraft has slipped for both of the contractor teams, primarily due to propulsion system problems. The committee understands that, if the program adheres to the current schedule, with no further delays, the STOVL variants will not fly until after the contractor teams deliver their proposals for EMD to the government. While the contractors may still be able to present additional test results to the government on these flights and on the STOVL design, the competitive environment will inevitably restrict the free flow of information after proposal delivery. This leaves uncertainty on the technical readiness of the program to enter EMD along the budgeted schedule.

The committee has also been apprized of a General Accounting Office (GAO) report on the JSF program that raises concerns about the level of maturity of the design at the point when the Department intends to make a decision to proceed into EMD. The GAO report specifically mentioned several enabling technologies whose technical risk will not have been reduced to an acceptable level before the planned transition to EMD.

In addition to the testing maturity, the committee has additional concerns about the nature of the acquisition strategy and how po-

tential changes in that acquisition strategy might affect the program. Many have questioned the advisability of continuing the current "winner-take-all" strategy for selecting the winning team for EMD on one of the largest defense programs in history. Losing outright could force one of the teams to leave the fighter development and production business, which would in turn leave the government in the position of depending on a single team for all future tactical aviation modernization. Recognizing the import of this situation, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics has commissioned a review of the currently approved JSF acquisition strategy. The Department of Defense has not completed this review, but expects to make a decision on the appropriate acquisition strategy within the next two months. The time spent making this decision could delay releasing the call for improvement (analogous to a request for proposal), the response to which will be the basis for making the final decision before proceeding to EMD.

The committee continues to be a strong advocate for the JSF program. The committee believes that the JSF program, with certain modest exceptions, has demonstrated how a joint service requirement development process should work and how a joint service program should be implemented. However, with so much at stake in this centerpiece of tactical aviation modernization, the committee believes that it would be terribly shortsighted for the Department to pursue a program that is driven by the calendar, and not by events.

The committee does not believe that it would be prudent to proceed into EMD without having conducted adequate testing, and reduced the data from that testing, for the competing demonstrator aircraft. This is particularly the case for the version possessing the highest technical risk, the STOVL version, which is also on the slowest track to testing.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Department to submit a report, before December 15, 2000, describing: (1) how the program may have been restructured to reflect any changes in the acquisition strategy; and (2) exit criteria that the Department has established to ensure that technical risks are at acceptable levels before the program enters into EMD.

In consonance with this recommendation, the committee also recommends no funding in support of the budget request for EMD funds, specifically a decrease of $595.5 million, including $299.5 million in PE 64800F and $296.0 million in PE 64800N, but recommends an increase of $424.2 million in demonstration and validation funds, including $212.1 million in PE 63800F and $212.1 million in PE 63800N.

The committee believes that the Department should use this time and funding to complete flight testing of the concept demonstrator aircraft, acquire the data from the test program, spend such funds as can be used to reduce risk for technologies that would need to mature during EMD, and define and implement a preferred acquisition strategy.

The committee is not interested in having the contractor team or teams sitting around waiting for the first day of fiscal year 2002. Indeed, the committee would support the Department's moving

past the concept demonstration tests with the fiscal year 2001 funds provided. Such activities could perhaps include even selecting a contractor team or teams to conduct various pre-EMD activities to begin planning for EMD. Such committee support, however, presumes that: (1) the Department will have provided the report required by the provision regarding acquisition strategy and technical risk exit criteria; and (2) the results of flight testing the STOVL variants will have been available to inform such decisions.

The committee is also not interested in having the contractors make additional unreimbursed investments in winning this program. The Department has informed the committee that it has recently modified the current JSF demonstration contracts to allow significant contractor investment in the concept demonstration phase. The committee recommends that the Department not propose any restructured program that would allow any further individual contractor investment beyond the levels envisioned by this modification. While the Department has made a reasonable case for implementing the current modification, the committee does not view additional contractor investment during the competition phase as conducive to smooth implementation of any potential acquisition strategy.

The committee is well aware of the considerable international interest in this program. The actions recommended by the committee should in no way be interpreted as a lack of support for the JSF or a lack of appreciation for the critical role that the JSF can play in tactical aviation modernization. At this critical juncture, however, the JSF program is too important to be rushed into the EMD phase until the program is ready to graduate. The committee believes that a more prudent technical and programmatic approach will, in the final analysis, strengthen the process of developing and fielding the family of aircraft that will dominate tactical aviation for the next half century.

Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (sec. 216)

The budget request included $109.2 million for the development of endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (HAE UAVs), of which $103.2 million was for the continued development of the Global Hawk HAE UAV. The Global Hawk is an advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD), nearing completion of its highly successful military utility phase, and preparing for its engineering and manufacturing (EMD) phase.

The budget request also included $22.4 million for the procurement of long lead items for the first two production Global Hawk HAE UAVs and one common ground station. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has studied the Global Hawk program, and has concluded that production in fiscal year 2001 would be premature. The GAO identified three reasons for arriving at this conclusion:

(1) Global Hawk has not yet begun a scheduled one year EMD phase;

(2) testing of a production representative Global Hawk system will not have been started; and

(3) during EMD, the Global Hawk design will be changing.

The committee strongly supports the continued development of the Global Hawk HAE UAV, but concurs with the GAO that long lead production for two additional HAE UAVs is premature. The committee recommends a decrease of $22.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, that would allow the Air Force sufficient time to use the EMD program to stabilize the final design.

Although one developmental Global Hawk HAE UAV was destroyed in a mishap, six other developmental Global Hawk HAE UAVs have either been delivered to the Air Force or are at varying stages of production. The Air Force has requested additional electro-optical and infra-red sensor payloads for the Global Hawk HAE UAV on its unfunded requirements list because there are not enough sensors to outfit all six of these Global Hawk HAE UAVs.

The six remaining ACTD HAE UAVs do not meet the operational requirement. The committee believes, however, that these aircraft are still excellent platforms for continuing development and expansion of the current HAE UAV operational concept. For example, advances in the production of active electronic scanned array (AESA) radars and the development of associated technologies, such as modular, scalable antennas could make this an appropriate time to further expand operational concepts to include an airborne surveillance capability. This may be preferable to merely buying more of the current sensor payloads that we know will not meet the Air Force's requirements. The committee also understands that Commander in Chief, Joint Forces Command, is interested in using the existing ACTD Global Hawk aircraft for experimentation after the Air Force begins producing HAE UAVs that meet the operational requirement.

The committee is well aware of how taxing recent operations have been on such low density, high demand units such as the E–3A Airborne Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft. The long endurance capability of the Global Hawk could make it an ideal candidate to substitute for such low density, high demand units as AWACS aircraft in certain situations, if it were to be outfitted with an appropriate payload. Such situations could include such lower threat environments as the area of responsibility of the Commander in Chief, Southern Command. Appropriate missions could include filling the air surveillance requirements in support of counter-drug operations off the coast of Central and South America.

The committee recommends an increase of $18.0 million in PE 35205F to extend the ACTD effort. The Air Force should use $12.0 million of this amount to acquire and integrate a non-developmental AESA radar on Global Hawk, and to demonstrate its operational viability in the Southern Command area of responsibility. This demonstration should be conducted as soon as practicable in fiscal year 2001, with participation and guidance from the Commanders in Chief of the Joint Forces and Southern Commands, to include requirements and scenario planning. To further this goal, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to coordinate a demonstration of the capability of the Global Hawk HAE UAV in an airborne surveillance role in the counter-drug effort, and to provide a report on the technical feasi-

bility and operational concept for using Global Hawk HAE UAVs in this role.

In the long-term, the Air Force should apply the remaining $6.0 million of this total to begin a concurrent development effort for an improved surveillance radar for potential use on the Global Hawk. The committee believes that this development effort should capitalize on the efforts detailed in the report delivered to Congress in April, 2000, on modular, scalable, active electronically scanned antenna (AESA)-based radar development activities.

Unmanned advanced capability aircraft and ground combat vehicles (sec. 217)

The challenges that the United States will face in the new millennium are diverse—new threats, new battlefields, and new weapons. Our armed forces must remain vigilant, forward thinking and prepared to address these challenges. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must exploit the opportunities created by the rapid pace of technological development to provide our men and women in uniform with the most advanced weaponry and leverage these developments in a way that minimizes the risk to those deployed in harm's way.

During the offensive military operation in Kosovo, U.S. forces carried out 78 days of round-the-clock operations and over 38,000 combat sorties with no combat casualties. The American people are coming to expect that military operations are casualty free. This is a factor that is more and more influencing the planning of military operations. How else do we explain bombing operations in Kosovo that largely restricted coalition pilots to altitudes between ten and fifteen thousand feet?

Limiting risk to our personnel is clearly an important goal and one of the most advantageous benefits of deploying unmanned combat systems and technologies. An initiative to expand the use of such technologies would allow the Department to aggressively pursue and field remotely controlled combat systems with this goal: within 10 years one-third of U.S. military operational deep strike aircraft will be unmanned and within 15 years one- third of all U.S. military ground combat vehicles will also be unmanned. It is not the intention of the committee to replace pilots and manned aircraft with unmanned combat systems, but to provide added capabilities to manned combat aircraft—added capabilities that would provide alternatives to sending military personnel into the highest risk missions.

Casualty aversion limits the flexibility of foreign policy. Taking full advantage of advances in technology will allow future administrations greater flexibility and, at the same time, reduce exposure of U.S. personnel. For these reasons, the committee recommends an increase of $200.0 million in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) to accelerate the technologies that will lead to the development and fielding of remotely controlled air combat vehicles by 2010 and remotely controlled ground combat vehicles by 2015. The committee has identified three promising programs, initiated by the services, in which to invest these funds:

Air Force Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV)

The committee recognizes the on-going joint Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)/Air Force unmanned combat air vehicle (UCAV) program, initiated in 1998. The committee notes that a small-scale demonstrator will flight test in the Spring of 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 62702E to accelerate risk reduction and "Concept of Operation" evaluation. The additional funds would be applied as follows: design, development of additional demonstrator vehicles; invest in low-cost commercial core engine derivative; demonstrate intelligent decision aids; validate suppression of enemy air defense(SEAD)/strike targeting in realistic environment; and fully validate multi-vehicle flight modes.

Navy Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle

DARPA and the Navy initiated a joint program this year to explore concepts for a Naval unmanned combat air vehicle (UCAV–N). The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million to be applied to a preliminary design of a UCAV–N demonstrator system suitable for ship-based SEAD/strike/surveillance missions.

Army Future Combat Systems (FCS)

In February 2000, the Army signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DARPA to develop a future combat system (FCS) to replace the current generation of armored combat vehicles. Although robotics is a key part of development, there is not a requirement for an autonomous, remotely-controlled vehicle in the current program. The committee recommends an increase of $121.3 million for the FCS program as follows: an increase of $46.3 million in PE 63005A to accelerate the enabling technologies for the FCS program, and an increase of $75.0 million in PE 62702A to add an unmanned, remotely-controlled aspect to the future combat system. The committee expects this requirement to be added to the MOA on FCS.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2001, on: (1) the schedule for this initiative; (2) the funding required for fiscal year 2002 and for the future years defense program; and (3) a description and assessment of the acquisition strategy for remotely-controlled air and ground combat vehicles.

Army space control technology (sec. 218)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $20.0 million for the Army's Kinetic Energy Anti-Satellite (KE–ASAT) program and $5.0 million for other Army space control technology development emphasizing temporary and reversible effects. The provision would limit the obligation of funds for space control technology, other than KE–ASAT, until the funds authorized for the KE–ASAT program have been released to the KE–ASAT program manager.

The committee directs the Commander of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) to use the $20.0 million authorized for the KE–ASAT program to advance the three existing KE–

ASAT kill vehicles and associated hardware to a point where a flight test could occur one year following any decision to do so. None of the funds authorized for the KE–ASAT program may be used to support research and development on capabilities to counter satellites in a non-destructive, reversible manner. The Commander of SMDC shall also begin planning and preparation for a KE–ASAT flight demonstration. The committee is aware that the Kodiak Island launch facility in Alaska is well suited to support a launch of a KE–ASAT test vehicle. The committee directs the Commander of SMDC to include an assessment of the Kodiak Island facility as part of the overall flight test planning and evaluation process.

The committee continues to support the KE–ASAT technology program. At the same time, the committee has also directed the Army to develop capabilities to counter satellites in a non-destructive, reversible manner. The committee does not view these two objectives to be incompatible.

Russian American Observation Satellites program (sec. 219)

As detailed elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization plans a two-satellite Russian American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should develop, and seek congressional approval of, a technology protection plan before proceeding with the RAMOS program, regardless of the program's structure and focus. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any funds for RAMOS until 30 days after the Secretary submits to Congress a report explaining how the Secretary plans to protect U.S. advanced military technology that may be associated with the RAMOS program.

Joint Biological Defense Program (sec. 220)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of funds to procure the vaccine for the biological agent anthrax until the Secretary of Defense: (1) notifies the congressional defense committees in writing that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved the current production facility of the anthrax vaccine for FDA-approved vaccine production operations; and (2) provides a report to the congressional defense committees that addresses contingencies associated with relying on the current manufacturer to produce the vaccine. The report will include recommended strategies to mitigate the risk of the loss of the current sole-source manufacturer of the vaccine and a budget to support these strategies. The report will also provide recommended strategies to ensure that an FDA-licensed anthrax vaccine can be procured should the sole-source manufacturer fail to obtain FDA approval to release stockpiled or newly produced vaccine, or the manufacturer terminates anthrax vaccine production permanently. The Secretary will report the funding requirements and the criteria for implementing these strategies.

In the Senate report accompanying S. 2060 (S. Rept 105–189), the committee noted that the anthrax vaccine is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and has been used by cattle

and sheep ranchers since the 1970s. The committee also emphasized the criticality of maintaining sufficient supplies of the vaccine to immunize U.S. military personnel against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

The Department of Defense (DOD) currently relies on a single-source manufacturer to supply the military services with the anthrax vaccine. The vaccine manufacturer, however, failed to maintain required FDA approvals for the vaccine production facility and the stockpiled vaccine. As a result, the DOD delayed the start of phase two of the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP). In addition, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) conducted audits of the manufacturer's financial capability in June 1999, and February 2000, and reported after both reviews that there is "* * * substantial doubt * * *" that the manufacturer will be financially able to continue performing on government contracts. The committee believes that it is incumbent on the Department to assess the implications of the FDA, DCAA, and other federal agency reviews of the current procurement plan, and to ensure that an effective plan is in place to provide a vaccine to immunize U.S. military personnel against the anthrax virus.

Report on biological warfare defense vaccine research and development programs (sec. 221)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to report on the progress of the Department of Defense (DOD) program to develop and procure vaccines for biological warfare agents. The Secretary will provide this report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2001. The report will include: an evaluation of the ability of the commercial sector to meet the vaccine requirements of the Department; a design for a government owned/contractor operated (GOCO) vaccine production facility at an alternative site determined by the Secretary; and a comparison of the costs and benefits of the current acquisition strategy, a GOCO facility at an alternative site determined by the Secretary, and other acquisition alternatives. The design recommendation for the GOCO facility at the alternative site determined by the Secretary will include: a recommendation, in consultation with the U.S. Surgeon General, on the possibility of the GOCO providing support for civilian vaccine requirements and the related impact on the operating costs of the GOCO vaccine production facility; and an analysis of the impact of international requirements for vaccines on the operating costs of the GOCO.

The biological warfare capability of the government of Iraq during Operation Desert Storm led to a requirement for vaccines to immunize military personnel against biological agents. Since that time, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) biological warfare threat list now includes over twenty biological agents that are in some stage of development, from basic research to production, by several countries. During this same period, the Department has initiated a mandatory program to immunize all active and reserve military personnel against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

During an April 14, 2000, hearing of the Subcommittee on Personnel, witnesses from the DOD and General Accounting Office identified many of the challenges associated with vaccine develop-

ment and acquisition. These challenges included the reluctance of large pharmacuetical companies to participate in vaccine development and production, the speculative costs associated with working with start-up commercial vaccine research and production companies, and the requirement to pay a premium to the private sector for vaccine research and development due to the relatively limited quantities of vaccines required by the DOD. The committee notes the recommendation of Project Badger in the early 1990s for a GOCO vaccine production facility and subsequent DOD plans and budgeting to construct a facility at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Based on the work that has already been done, the committee believes that the Secretary should give strong consideration to the Pine Bluff Arsenal as the site for the alternate facility. Given these issues, the committee believes a reevaluation by the DOD of the issues relating to vaccine development and production, and the merits of a GOCO facility at an alternative site are necessary at this time.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Mobile offshore base (sec. 241)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with the results of the operational utility cost-benefit analysis. The provision would also require the Secretary to designate a lead service and tentative program schedule if the Secretary decides to continue the MOB program.

The Senate report accompanying S. 1059 (S. Rept. 106–50) directed the Secretary of Defense to initiate an analysis of the operational utility of the mobile offshore base (MOB), and report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000. The analysis was to include the results of the technical feasibility studies, assessment of the operational utility versus the life-cycle cost of such a system, and a recommendation on whether to proceed with predevelopment or development activities. The report further directed that, if the recommendation were to proceed with the program, the Department of Defense should designate an executive service and provide an estimate of fiscally phased resources for program execution.

The Navy delivered a report to the congressional defense committees in April, 2000. This report, however, only detailed the technical work accomplished and described the effort that would need to be accomplished were the program to be initiated, along with cost estimates of the remaining effort. There was no mention of operational utility versus life-cycle cost, nor was there a recommendation on whether to proceed with the program.

Air Force science and technology planning (sec. 242)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the long-term challenges and short term objectives of the Air Force science and technology (S&T) program.

The committee was deeply disappointed by the science and technology budget proposed by the Air Force for fiscal year 2000. This

budget not only failed to measure up to the congressional goals established in section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), but also risked mortgaging the future of the Air Force by sacrificing long-term technological superiority in favor of short-term readiness. The science and technology budget proposed by the Air Force for fiscal year 2001 shows some improvement, but the committee remains concerned that the Air Force has made deep cuts to some programs without undertaking a comprehensive planning process to ascertain its long-term technology needs and how those needs can be supported by the science and technology program.

Over the last five years, the Department of Defense (DOD) has developed a coordinated planning process for S&T spending, known as the joint warfighting science and technology planning process. This process has helped DOD address redundancies and overlaps, and ensure that the S&T programs funded by the services are appropriately designed to meet the Department's warfighting needs. The result has been a significant improvement in the quality of the Department's science and technology budget submissions. As successful as it has been, however, the current S&T planning process appears to focus on the micro issue of ensuring that individual projects address legitimate warfighting needs, rather than on the macro issue of prioritizing those needs and ensuring that sufficient funding is made available to meet them.

Two of the three services have undertaken ambitious steps to try to address that shortcoming in the science and technology planning process by prioritizing their own needs on a macro basis, and realigning S&T funding to match new priorities. The Army has attempted to identify science and technology spending that is directly linked to the planned transformation of the force, and prioritized that spending over funding for incremental improvements to existing platforms. The Navy has undertaken to reevaluate all science and technology spending from the ground up and focus investments on areas designated as long-term Grand Challenges and more immediate Future Naval Capabilities. By focusing its spending in this way, the Navy hopes to avoid the usual practice of trying to fund a little bit of everything, and ensure that it will have critical mass in the areas that are most important to the Navy of the future.

In view of the serious cuts in the Air Force S&T budget and the danger that these cuts could undermine long-term technological superiority in key areas, the provision recommended by the committee would require the Air Force to undertake a comparable planning effort. This process must include not only the Air Force research community, but also the entire warfighter community, requirements community, and acquisition community. It is the committee's hope that the planning process—and the Air Force science and technology program—will be driven by the future needs of the Air Force, rather than the budgetary constraints of today.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Army

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,459	-	14,459
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	132,164	-	135,164
		Counter-Terrorism Research		3,000	
0601104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	54,365	-	54,365
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE		-	-
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	11,557	-	17,557
		Composite Materials		6,000	
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	20,722	-	20,722
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	7,226	-	7,226
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	31,080	-	31,080
0602270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	17,310	-	17,310
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	47,183	-	52,183
		Advanced missile composite component		5,000	
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	993	-	993
0602308A	12	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	30,479	-	30,479
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	63,589	-	67,089
		Smart Truck Initiative		3,500	
0602618A	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	49,750	-	49,750
0602622A	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,530	-	3,530
0602623A	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,415	-	5,415
0602624A	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,761	-	33,761
0602705A	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	23,869	-	25,369
		Portable Hybrid Electric Power Research		1,500	
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,465	-	20,465
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	12,386	-	12,386

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	15,786	-	15,786
0602720A	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	13,994	-	13,994
0602782A	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	23,314	-	23,314
0602783A	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	3,987	-	3,987
0602784A	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	42,344	-	47,344
		Thermoelectric Power Generation for Military Applications		1,000	
		Operational Support		4,000	
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	11,869	-	11,869
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	24,659	-	24,659
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,729	-	75,729
0602789A	29	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,338	-	1,338
0602805A	30	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,154	-	10,154
0603001A	31	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,469	-	15,469
0603002A	32	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,512	-	16,512
0603003A	33	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,810	-	28,810
0603004A	34	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,738	-	29,738
0603005A	35	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	148,114	-	206,414
		Equipment readiness		8,000	
		Fuel Cell Auxilary Power Units		4,000	
		Enabling Technologies for Future Combat Vehicle		46,300	
0603006A	36	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,505	-	28,505
		Big Crow		7,000	
0603007A	37	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,072	-	3,072
0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	12,217	-	12,217
0603013A	39	TRACTOR DIRT		-	-
0603017A	40	TRACTOR RED	984	-	984

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603020A	41	TRACTOR ROSE	10,892	-	10,892
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,889	-	5,889
0603122A	43	TRACTOR HIP	980	-	980
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEF/PRECISION STRIKE TECH DEMO	21,307	-	21,307
0603270A	45	EW TECHNOLOGY	15,359	-	15,359
0603280A	46	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		-	-
0603313A	47	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,107	-	25,107
0603322A	48	TRACTOR CAGE	3,083	-	3,083
0603606A	49	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,894	-	20,894
0603607A	50	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,469	-	4,469
0603654A	51	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	50,727	-	50,727
0603710A	52	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	33,341	-	33,341
0603728A	53	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,616	-	1,616
0603734A	54	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,207	-	5,207
0603772A	55	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE & SENSOR TECH	15,613	-	15,613
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,573	-	75,773
		Simulation Centers Upgrades		4,500	
		Family of Systems Simulators		3,000	
		Army Space Control		5,000	
		Missile Defense Flight Experiment		14,700	
		THEL		15,000	
		Accoustic Technology		4,000	
		Radar Power Technology		4,000	
		Scramjet Accoustic Combustion Enhance		2,000	
		Aero-Accoustic Instrumentation		4,000	
		Supercluster distributed Memory		2,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		SMDC Battlelab		5,000	
0603619A	57	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	22,803	-	22,803
0603639A	58	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,139	-	30,139
0603653A	59	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	118,139	-	118,139
0603713A	60	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	17	-	17
0603747A	61	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	13,574	-	13,574
0603774A	62	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,968	-	10,968
0603779A	63	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEM/VAL	4,897	-	4,897
0603790A	64	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,920	-	1,920
0603801A	65	AVIATION - ADV DEV	5,848	-	5,848
0603802A	66	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	28,679	-	28,679
0603804A	67	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	6,317	-	6,317
0603805A	68	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYS EVAL & ANALYSIS	13,753	-	13,753
0603807A	69	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	15,259	-	17,259
		Anti-malarial Research		2,000	
0603851A	70	TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	979	-	979
0603854A	71	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	355,309	-	355,309
0603856A	72	SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	20,277	-	20,277
0603889A	73	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS		-	-
0604201A	74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	42,280	-	42,280
0604220A	75	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	532	-	532
0604223A	76	COMANCHE	614,041	-	614,041
0604270A	77	EW DEVELOPMENT	61,056	-	99,556
		SIRFC/ATIRCM		38,500	
0604280A	78	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	62,218	-	62,218
0604321A	79	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	44,084	-	44,084

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604328A	80	TRACTOR CAGE	2,916	-	2,916
0604329A	81	MODERNIZED HELLFIRE	4,969	-	4,969
0604601A	82	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	2	-	2
0604604A	83	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,959	-	1,959
0604609A	84	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	3,461	-	3,461
0604611A	85	JAVELIN	490	-	490
0604619A	86	LANDMINE WARFARE	15,902	-	15,902
0604622A	87	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES		-	-
0604633A	88	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	2,026	-	2,026
0604641A	89	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)		-	-
0604642A	90	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	9,893	-	9,893
0604645A	91	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.	2,200	-	2,200
0604649A	92	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0604710A	93	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	32,574	-	32,574
0604713A	94	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	86,321	-	86,321
0604715A	95	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	73,295	-	73,295
0604716A	96	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	6,082	-	6,082
0604726A	97	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,771	-	1,771
0604739A	98	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	6,060	-	6,060
0604741A	99	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	16,462	-	16,462
0604746A	100	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	12,956	-	12,956
0604760A	101	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENG DEV	20,689	-	20,689
0604766A	102	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	57,419	-	57,419
0604768A	103	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	96,102	-	96,102
0604770A	104	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	17,898	-	17,898
0604778A	105	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	2,420	-	2,420

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604780A	106	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	18,498	-	18,498
0604801A	107	AVIATION - ENG DEV	7,104	-	7,104
0604802A	108	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	22,505	-	22,505
0604804A	109	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,457	-	20,457
0604805A	110	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	49,316	-	49,316
0604807A	111	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF EQUIP - ENG DEV	6,318	-	6,318
0604808A	112	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	69,584	-	69,584
0604814A	113	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	52,848	-	52,848
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	5,362	-	5,362
0604818A	115	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	33,420	-	33,420
0604819A	116	LOSAT	26,800	-	26,800
0604820A	117	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	8,429	-	8,429
0604823A	118	FIREFINDER	37,363	-	37,363
0604824A	119	DUAP COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS		-	-
0604854A	120	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	20,105	-	20,105
0605013A	121	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	94,170	-	94,170
0604256A	122	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,901	-	18,501
		Threat Virtual Mine Simulator		2,500	
		Threat Information Operations Attack Simulator		2,100	
0604258A	123	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,346	-	13,346
0604759A	124	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	44,019	-	44,019
0605103A	125	RAND ARROYO CENTER	19,872	-	19,872
0605301A	126	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	153,326	-	153,326
0605326A	127	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	15,410	-	15,410
0605502A	128	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605601A	129	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	119,657	-	119,657

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605602A	130	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	33,156	-	33,156
0605604A	131	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	27,248	-	27,248
0605605A	132	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,521	-	14,521
0605606A	133	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,200	-	3,200
0605702A	134	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,927	-	6,927
0605706A	135	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	8,737	-	8,737
0605709A	136	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,582	-	3,582
0605712A	137	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	71,079	-	71,079
0605716A	138	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	26,337	-	26,337
0605801A	139	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,811	-	73,811
0605803A	140	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	26,749	-	26,749
0605805A	141	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	11,276	-	11,276
0605853A	142	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION		-	-
0605854A	143	POLLUTION PREVENTION		-	-
0605856A	144	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE		-	-
0605857A	145	ARMY ACQUISITION POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	5,418	-	5,418
0605876A	146	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E		-	-
0605878A	147	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E		-	-
0605879A	148	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E		-	-
0605896A	149	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E		-	-
0605898A	150	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	5,371	-	5,371
0909999A	151	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
0603778A	152	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,523	-	75,523
		Cost Reduction Effort MLRS/HIMARS		16,000	
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,996	-	26,996
		Design and Manufacturing Program		2,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0203610A	154	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION		-	-
0203726A	155	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	36,816	-	36,816
0203735A	156	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	99,423	-	99,423
0203740A	157	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	48,910	-	48,910
0203744A	158	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	95,829	-	95,829
0203752A	159	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,929	-	2,929
0203758A	160	DIGITIZATION	29,671	-	29,671
0203759A	161	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	63,601	-	63,601
0203761A	162	FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROG	6,021	-	6,021
0203801A	163	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12,365	-	12,365
0203802A	164	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	64,418	-	64,418
0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	3,837	-	3,837
0208010A	166	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	38,926	-	38,926
0208053A	167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	6,267	-	6,267
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	5,215	-	5,215
0303028A	169	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		-	-
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,140	-	13,140
		Center for Comunications and Networking		5,000	
0303141A	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	71,955	-	71,955
0303142A	172	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	43,229	-	43,229
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,234	-	14,234
0305114A	174	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	783	-	783
0305204A	175	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	29,427	-	29,427
0305206A	176	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,898	-	4,898
0305208A	177	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	7,894	-	7,894
0708045A	178	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	57,906	-	57,906

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1001018A	179	NATO JOINT STARS		-	-
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(19,000)	(19,000)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946

Counter-terrorism basic research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61102A for the Army's counter-terrorism research program. Last year, the committee provided the funding to initiate a basic research program in order to explore technologies that deter, resolve, and mitigate terrorist acts, including physical structure and physical effects research. It is of the utmost concern that we conduct research and development not only for near-term solutions, but also for investigating revolutionary approaches in science and techologies that will provide next generation solutions for force protection and terrorist threats. The committee urges the Army to include funding for this important project in the future.

Composite materials

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62105A for composite materials for the next generation armored vehicle for the Army's objective force. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Advanced missile composite components

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the missile technology applied research program (PE 62303A) to develop the enabling technology for the next generation of tactical missiles. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Smart truck initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62601A, the Army's combat vehicle and automotive technology account for the National Automotive Center, to conduct demonstrations for the smart truck initiative. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Portable hybrid electric power system

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62705A for research in a portable, hybrid electric power system that would combine battery, fuel cell, super-capacitor, and other subsystems. The additional funds would be used to model and assess the tradeoffs as they relate to military missions. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Thermoelectric power generation

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62784A for a feasibility study on thermoelectric power generation for military applications.

Operational support

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in the Army's military engineering program (PE 62784A) for university partnering for operational support. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Equipment readiness

Long lead times and the high costs of procuring and inventory of replacement parts has resulted in soaring operation and support costs with a reduction of equipment readiness rates. The committee understands the Department of Defense has initiated a program to address these problems through the development of a self-contained, mobile manufacturing center that can produce spare parts at the point of need. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63005A for the continuation of this important effort. The committee directs cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Fuel cell auxiliary power units

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63005A for research in fuel cell auxiliary power units for use in the Army's objective force. The Army's transformation strategy includes reducing the size of the deployed logistics footprint and prioritizing the development of vehicles that are smaller, lighter, more lethal, yet more reliable, fuel efficient and survivable. A key component of increased survivability is reducing the signature of future Army platforms. Addressing these logistics and survivability challenges should entail a full evaluation of alternative energy sources.

Big Crow program office

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63006A for the Big Crow program, a national test asset supporting a wide variety of electronic warfare test and training exercises. The Big Crow program has historically been operated under the Department of Defense Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB), primarily in a test asset role. Recently, however, the operational forces have recognized the asset's potential. The Big Crow program has been deployed operationally to support NATO and U.S. force deployments in southeast Europe as well as Commander in Chief for Space (CINCSpace) activities. The committee understands that the Department is making progress in developing a new strategy to ensure long-term funding for this program that will provide stability to support test and evaluation as well as operational missions. Oversight of the program has been assigned to the Army Space and Missile Defense Command and funding for this program is provided in the Future Years' Defense Program beginning in fiscal year 2002. The additional $7.0 million would provide bridge funding to maintain continuity in operations until the program completes this transition.

Army Space and Missile Defense Command Simulations

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63308A for Family of Systems Simulators and an increase of $4.5 million in PE 63308A for Simulations Center Upgrade.

Aero-acoustics instrumentation

The budget request included no funds for aero-acoustics instrumentation. The committee has supported research and development activities conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command in the area of aero-acoustics. Aero-acoustics instrumentation will enable the Army to understand acoustic coupling of missile airframes to the internal components for vehicles flying as fast as Mach 10. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important research and development.

Acoustic technology research

The committee continues to support research sponsored by the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command in acoustic applications for detection, identification, and tracking of cruise missiles and mobile missile launchers. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued effort in this area.

Missile defense flight experiment

The committee has supported the Army's program to demonstrate critical missile defense kill vehicle technologies through flight testing. To continue this effort, the committee recommends an increase of $14.7 million in PE 63308A.

Radar power technology

The committee continues to support advanced radar power technology development at the Army Missile Defense and Space Technology Center. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important research and development.

Scramjet acoustic combustion enhancement

The committee is aware of research and development activities being conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command in the area of scramjet acoustic mixing. A scramjet engine that can utilize acoustics to more efficiently burn propellant could significantly increase the performance and efficiency of air defense interceptors. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63308A to support continuation of this important research and development.

Space and missile defense battle lab

The committee continues to support the Army's Space and Missile Defense Battle Lab. To support this important modeling and simulation capability, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63308A.

Supercluster distributed memory technology

The budget request included no funds for supercluster distributed memory technology. The committee is aware that supercluster distributed memory technology may provide a cost-effective approach to running complex computer simulations to predict the control forces exerted on a missile over its flight trajectory. To support evaluation of this technology, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million PE 63308A.

Tactical High Energy Laser

The budget request included no funding for completion of testing of the Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL) program. The committee supports expeditious completion of THEL development and testing. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued THEL testing and deployment preparation activities.

Anti-malarial research

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63807A to accelerate the development and fielding of the anti-malarial compound taphenoquine. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Electronic warfare development

The budget request included $61.1 million for Army electronic warfare development activities. The committee notes and appreciates ongoing efforts by the Army to completely identify and understand issues associated with the deployment of Task Force Hawk last year during operations in Kosovo. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement to install a suite of radio frequency countermeasures (SIRFC) and advanced threat infrared countermeasures (ATIRCM) equipment on Apache helicopters necessary to improve the ability of aircraft crews to survive in future conflicts. The committee recommends an increase of $38.5 million in PE 64270A for electronic warfare development, a total authorization of $99.6 million. Of this amount, $18.0 million would be used to support the development of a SIRFC production line and $20.5 million to complete development of SIRFC and ATIRCM "A" kits for the Apache Longbow helicopter.

Threat simulator development

The budget request included $13.9 million for threat simulator development activities. The committee recognizes the important roles that threat simulators play in preparing our forces to fight and win future battles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.6 million in PE 64256A, a total authorization of $18.5 million. Of the $4.6 million increase, $2.1 million would be used for threat information operations attack simulator development and $2.5 million would be used for threat virtual mine simulator development.

Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program

The budget request included $59.5 million for multiple launch rocket system product improvements. The committee understands

that the Army continues to pursue a cost reduction initiative associated with the multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) improved launcher and the high mobility artillery and rocket system (HIMARS). The committee understands this initiative could result in cost savings of greater than $500.0 million over the life of these programs. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $16.0 million in PE 63728A to support the ongoing MLRS and HIMARS cost reduction initiatives.

Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor

The budget request included $25.0 million for the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) system. The committee is concerned about possible vulnerabilities of an aerostat to climatic conditions and understands that the Army has established an Aerostat Design and Manufacturing (ADAM) program to facilitate the design and manufacture of affordable aerostats with improved performance and availability. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 12419A in support of the ADAM program to provide the type of material and tether technology to make the JLENS system viable.

Communications and networking technologies

The budget request included $8.1 million for Army information systems security research, development, test and evaluation. The committee supports efforts managed by the Army's Communications and Electronics Command (CECOM) in the area of applied communications and networking technology. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140A.

Navy

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
0601152N	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,343	-	16,343
0601153N	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	381,139	-	381,139
0602111N	3	AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,966	-	42,966
		Free Electron Laser		5,000	
0602121N	4	SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	44,563	-	48,813
		Biodegradable Polymers		1,250	
		Bioenvironmental Hazards Research		3,000	
0602122N	5	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	21,057	-	21,057
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	9,793	-	11,793
		Nontraditional Warfare Initiatives		2,000	
0602228N	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)		-	-
0602232N	8	COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELL, SURVEIL.	79,905	-	82,905
		Hyperspectral Research		3,000	
0602233N	9	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,939	-	33,939
		Cognitive Research		3,000	
0602234N	10	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	68,076	-	73,076
		Nanoscale Sensor Research		3,000	
		Ceramic and Carbon Based Composites		2,000	
0602270N	11	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,043	-	26,043
0602314N	12	UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	52,488	-	52,488
0602315N	13	MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	50,864	-	50,864
0602435N	14	OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,320	-	63,320
		Littoral Area Acoustic Demo		3,000	
0602633N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	35,028	-	37,028
		Computational Engineering Design		2,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0602805N	16	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,067	-	10,067
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,667	-	39,667
0603238N	18	PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	68,555	-	68,555
0603270N	19	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,583	-	17,583
0603508N	20	SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,432	-	57,232
		Supply Chain Best Practices		2,000	
		Virtual Testbed for Reconfigurable Ship		2,000	
		Modular Composite Hull		4,000	
		Composite Helo Hangar Door		5,000	
		Advanced Waterjet-21		4,000	
		Laser Welding and Cutting		2,800	
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	54,749	-	54,749
0603706N	22	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	10,110	-	10,110
0603707N	23	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	26,988	-	26,988
0603712N	24	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADV TECHNOLOGY	24,002	-	24,002
0603727N	25	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	49,506	-	55,506
		Joint Experimentation		6,000	
0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	58,296	-	58,296
0603782N	27	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,618	-	48,618
		Ocean Modeling for Mine and Expeditionary Warfare		3,000	
0603792N	28	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	76,333	-	91,333
		USMC ATT Initiative		15,000	
0603794N	29	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,673	-	29,673
0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,337	-	30,337
0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	7,536	-	7,536
0603254N	32	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,680	-	19,680

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603261N	33	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,956	-	1,956
0603382N	34	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	6,943	-	6,943
0603502N	35	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	97,929	-	102,929
		Minesweeper Integrated Combat Weapons System		5,000	
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE		-	-
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	148,952	-	148,952
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	244,437	-	244,437
0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	107,598	-	107,598
0603526N	41	ADVANCED SOFTWARE AND COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603527N	42	RETRACT LARCH	11,895	-	11,895
0603536N	43	RETRACT JUNIPER		-	-
0603542N	44	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	572	-	572
0603553N	45	SURFACE ASW	6,752	-	6,752
0603559N	46	SSGN CONVERSION	34,762	-	43,762
		SSBN to SSGN Conversion Design Options		9,000	
0603561N	47	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	113,269	-	117,769
		Electric Motor Brush Technology		2,000	
		Advanced Composite Sail Technology		2,500	
0603562N	48	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,356	-	4,356
0603563N	49	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	162	-	162
0603564N	50	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	46,896	-	50,496
		Shipboard Simulation for Marine Corps Operations		20,000	
		JCC(X) Analysis of Alternatives		(16,400)	
0603570N	51	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	168,483	-	168,483
0603573N	52	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,635	-	5,635

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603576N	53	CHALK EAGLE	64,770	-	64,770
0603582N	54	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,966	-	42,966
		Common Command and Decision Functions		10,000	
0603609N	55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	28,619	-	28,619
0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	137,981	-	165,481
		Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle		27,500	
0603612M	57	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV		-	-
0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	23,216	-	40,516
		High Mobility Artillery Rocket System		17,300	
0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	13,131	-	13,131
0603658N	60	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	119,257	-	119,257
0603713N	61	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,371	-	15,371
0603721N	62	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	62,194	-	62,194
0603724N	63	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,942	-	4,942
0603725N	64	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,824	-	1,824
0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	52,886	-	52,886
0603739N	66	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY		-	-
0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	125,222	-	125,222
0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	42,372	-	42,372
0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	13,541	-	13,541
0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	6,610	-	6,610
0603764N	71	LINK EVERGREEN	9,712	-	9,712
0603787N	72	SPECIAL PROCESSES	62,510	-	62,510
0603790N	73	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,992	-	8,992
0603795N	74	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	143,044	-	153,044
		Extended Range Guided Munition		10,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603800N	75	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	131,566	-	343,666
		Extend DEM/VAL		212,100	
0603851M	76	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,580	-	31,580
		Nonlethal Research and Technology Development		8,000	
0603857N	77	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)	13,110	-	13,110
0603889N	78	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS		-	-
0604327N	79	HARD & DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYS (HDBTDS) PROG		-	-
0604707N	80	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENG SUP	34,100	-	38,100
		NAVCIITI		4,000	
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT		-	-
0604212N	82	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	24,393	-	34,393
		Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar		10,000	
0604214N	83	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	38,061	-	38,061
0604215N	84	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	95,814	-	95,814
0604216N	85	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	69,946	-	77,946
		Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures		8,000	
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	455	-	455
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,051	-	6,051
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,906	-	2,906
0604231N	89	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	57,817	-	57,817
0604245N	90	H-1 UPGRADES	139,680	-	139,680
0604261N	91	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	20,766	-	20,766
0604262N	92	V-22A	148,168	-	148,168
0604264N	93	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,466	-	17,466
0604270N	94	EW DEVELOPMENT	97,281	-	97,281
0604300N	95	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	305,274	-	318,274

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Power Node Control Center		3,000	
		Advanced Food Service Technology		2,000	
		SPY-3 and Volume Search Radar		8,000	
0604307N	96	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	179,684	-	179,684
0604311N	97	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	273	-	273
0604312N	98	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,024	-	2,024
0604366N	99	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,194	-	1,194
0604373N	100	AIRBORNE MCM	47,312	-	47,312
0604503N	101	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	34,801	-	54,801
		Multi-Purpose Processor		15,000	
		Antenna Technology Improvements		5,000	
0604504N	102	AIR CONTROL	13,538	-	13,538
0604507N	103	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	875	-	875
0604512N	104	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,833	-	9,833
0604518N	105	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	3,720	-	3,720
0604524N	106	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	3,642	-	3,642
0604528N	107	SWATH (SM WATERPLANE AREA TWIN HULL) OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIP		-	-
0604558N	108	NEW DESIGN SSN	207,091	-	212,091
		Submarine Common Architecture		5,000	
0604561N	109	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	6,617	-	6,617
0604562N	110	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	20,492	-	24,492
		Advanced Tactical Software Integration		4,000	
0604567N	111	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,204	-	72,204
		CVN-77, CVN(X), and Nimitz Class Smart Product Model		10,000	
0604574N	112	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,291	-	3,291
0604601N	113	MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,968	-	1,968

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604603N	114	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	2,581	-	2,581
0604610N	115	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	9,347	-	9,347
0604612M	116	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV		-	-
0604618N	117	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	26,151	-	26,151
0604654N	118	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,102	-	7,102
0604703N	119	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,271	-	1,271
0604710N	120	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,531	-	5,531
0604721N	121	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	2,232	-	2,232
0604727N	122	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	20,823	-	20,823
0604755N	123	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	85,049	-	87,149
		NULKA Dual Band Spatially Distributed Infrared Signature		2,100	
0604771N	124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	5,273	-	5,273
0604777N	125	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	18,487	-	18,487
0604784N	126	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,710	-	20,710
0604800N	127	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	295,962	-	-
		Extend DEM/VAL		(295,962)	
0604805N	128	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE		-	-
0604910N	129	SMART CARD DEV/MOD	1,240	-	1,240
0605013M	130	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,833	-	6,833
0605013N	131	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,259	-	18,259
		Single Integrated Human Resources Strategy		3,000	
0508713N	132	NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	5,917	-	5,917
0604256N	133	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,293	-	24,293
0604258N	134	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	41,138	-	41,138
0604759N	135	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,707	-	40,707
0605152N	136	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,056	-	8,056

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605154N	137	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,889	-	43,889
0605155N	138	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,886	-	2,886
0605502N	139	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605804N	140	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	949	-	949
0605853N	141	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	17,644	-	17,644
0605856N	142	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,403	-	2,403
0605861N	143	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	53,380	-	53,380
0605862N	144	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	12,045	-	12,045
0605863N	145	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	76,128	-	76,128
0605864N	146	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,327	-	270,327
0605865N	147	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	8,957	-	8,957
0605866N	148	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,262	-	3,262
0605867N	149	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,694	-	12,694
0605873M	150	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,091	-	11,091
		Marine Corps Research University		3,000	
0305885N	151	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	4,666	-	4,666
0909999N	152	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
0603660N	153	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	207,000	-	207,000
0603661N	154	RETRACT VIOLET	30,161	-	30,161
0604227N	155	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS		-	-
0604805N	156	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	12,485	-	12,485
0101221N	157	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	42,687	-	44,687
		Reentry System Application Program		2,000	
0101224N	158	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,173	-	31,173
0101226N	159	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	879	-	879
0204136N	160	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	248,093	-	248,093

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0204152N	161	E-2 SQUADRONS	18,698	-	18,698
0204163N	162	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	12,012	-	12,012
0204229N	163	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	91,436	-	91,436
0204311N	164	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	16,928	-	16,928
0204413N	165	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	7,911	-	7,911
0204571N	166	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,059	-	32,059
		Joint Tactical Combat Training System		5,000	
0204575N	167	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,924	-	9,924
0205601N	168	HARM IMPROVEMENT	21,355	-	21,355
0205604N	169	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	26,245	-	26,245
0205620N	170	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	29,585	-	29,585
0205632N	171	MK-48 ADCAP	15,853	-	15,853
0205633N	172	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	51,018	-	51,018
0205667N	173	F-14 UPGRADE	1,228	-	10,228
		SAR Reconnaissance System Demonstrator		9,000	
0205675N	174	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,435	-	53,435
0206313M	175	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	96,153	-	96,153
0206623M	176	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	22,124	-	22,124
0206624M	177	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	2,854	-	2,854
0207161N	178	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,705	-	21,705
0207163N	179	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	12,140	-	12,140
0303109N	182	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	37,778	-	37,778
0303140N	183	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	21,530	-	21,530
0303150N	184	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		-	-
0305160N	186	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	19,730	-	19,730
0305188N	187	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	7,795	-	9,795

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Interoperability Process Software Tools		2,000	
0305192N	188	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	7,000	-	7,000
0305204M	189	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES		-	-
0305204N	190	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	113,052	-	113,052
0305206N	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,759	-	4,759
0305207N	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	27,479	-	27,479
0305208N	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,482	-	4,482
0305927N	194	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	2,038	-	2,038
0305972N	195	SPACE ACTIVITIES		-	2,000
		SPAWAR SATCOM Systems Integration Initiative		2,000	
0308601N	196	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,106	-	14,106
		Distributed Engineering Plant		5,000	
0702207N	197	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	34,166	-	34,166
0708011N	198	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,626	-	59,626
0708730N	199	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	9,366	-	9,366
XXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	531,940	-	531,940
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865

Free electron laser

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62111N to complete the development of the infrared free electron laser demonstration project to the 10 kilowatt level. This investment would enable the Department of the Navy to determine capabilities of such a tool for infrared counter-measures and further the technology base in high energy lasers.

Biodegradable polymers

The budget request included no funds for biodegradable polymers. The committee recommends an increase of $1.25 million in PE 62121N to aid in the development of polymer membrane methods for treating graywater (kitchen, shower, and cleaning solution), blackwater (sewage), and bilge water (oily contaminants) to acceptable levels prior to shipboard release.

Bioenvironmental hazards research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62121N for bioenvironmental hazards research. The committee is concerned that there is insufficient knowledge of the full impact and hazards to humans, animals, and plants from the potential use of biological warfare agents. Besides the obvious lethal effects on living organisms, biological warfare agents could have other very serious long-term consequences that would require a dedicated mitigation response or prophylaxis. The additional funds should be applied to research and development of the technologies and methods for better measuring and understanding the full range of impacts of biological warfare hazards to people and other living organisms, and thus improve our ability to develop suitable preparations or responses to such hazards. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Nontraditional warfare initiatives

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62131M for the Marine Corps to conduct applied research directed at their role as first responders. The additional funds should be used to explore innovative concepts for addressing non-traditional tactics and operational challenges arising in the 21st Century. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62232N to accelerate the introduction of fused hyperspectral, synthetic aperture radar and electronic intelligence. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Cognitive research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62233N for applied cognitive technologies to improve learning. In a hearing before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, Dr. Delores Etter, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology, explained the importance and the growing need for cognitive research, ". . . an area that we think is one of increasing importance is cognitive readiness. This is really the area of human optimization. The challenges in this area include sustained operations, environmental ambiguity, distributed learning, and the overall information overload that we are presenting to our soldiers." The committee understands that the Chief of Naval and Education and Training has initiated a program to deal with cognitive development for Navy personnel. The additional funds would extend this program's focus to include technological research in cognitive readiness and human optimization.

Ceramic and carbon based composites

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62234N for the continued development, evaluation and testing of ceramic and carbon based composites for use in strategic missiles and hypersonic vehicles. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Nanoscale sensor research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in nanoscale sensor technologies. The additional funding would be expected to support the area designated by the Office of Naval Research as a Grand Challenge to develop highly multi-functional nanoscale architecture devices to their ultimate limits (high speed (100x), small size (0.01x), and low power (0.001x)), that interactively combine sensing, image processing, computation, signal processing, and communication functions, to achieve real-time adoptive response, on-site for Navy missions. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Littoral area acoustic demonstrations

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62435N for acoustic data collection, all source data fusion, and advanced acoustic modeling and signal processing techniques in support of Navy research and development efforts. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Computational engineering design

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62633N for computational engineering research and design for marine and aerospace vehicles. This research provides a focus on the simulation and design of surface ship and submarine applications. It is particularly relevant in the view of the Navy's decision to

transfer ship design from the Navy laboratories to the shipyards. There is also some extension of the technology to aerospace based on requirements of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA). The committee expects the Office of Naval Research to fully explore such applications in the execution of the research. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Advanced water-jet technology

The budget request included no funds for advanced water-jet technology. Advanced water-jet technology represents the type of technological improvement in ship propulsion that could reduce both acquisition and total ownership costs. Water-jet technology has the potential to reduce ship signatures critical to maintaining war fighting superiority through battle space awareness. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63508N for advanced water-jet technology.

Composite helicopter hangar door

The budget request included no funds for developing a composite helicopter hangar door. The initiative to design and fabricate a composite helo hangar door for surface combatants has the potential to reduce combatant ship life-cycle costs by improving reliability and reducing maintenance requirements. The program will leverage enabling technologies that can lead to reduced radar signatures and cost and weight savings.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63508N for the design and fabrication of a DDG–51 helicopter hangar door structure using composite materials.

Composite modules for ship hull construction

The budget request included no funding in PE 63508N for development of composite hull modules which may be required for future ship construction. While composites have some war fighting advantages over standard ship construction using steel and aluminum components, the technical expertise for constructing composite modules is limited. It is anticipated that future ship construction may include expanded use of composites.

The committee encourages development of key technologies that will provide the foundation should the Navy decide to pursue the war fighting advantages of composites. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63508N for the development and construction of prototype composite modules for ship construction.

Laser welding and cutting

The budget request included no funding in PE 63508N for development of laser welding and cutting techniques. Navy ships are built using structural shapes and plate steel. Most shapes are currently stripped or split from I-beam stock material. Laser cutting and welding shapes from plate steel could enhance the quality and reduce the cost of producing shapes used in ship construction.

Laser cutting and welding also has the potential to enable more creative designs for shapes.

The committee encourages development of key technologies that have the potential to provide higher quality and lower costs for building Navy ships. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 63508N for the development and application to naval ship construction of laser welding and cutting techniques.

Supply chain best practices

The budget request included $37.4 million in PE 63508N for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and engineering systems in support of present and future ships and submarines.

The supply system for ships and submarines requires interface and interaction of a number of different communications and software systems. This incompatibility requires reentry of data which is manpower intensive. Because the supply chain best practices initiative has the potential to improve affordability, quality, and productivity by providing connectivity for an alliance among the Navy, industry, universities, and government agencies, the committee recommends an increase to the initiative.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63508N for supply chain best practices.

Virtual test bed for reconfigurable ship

The budget request included no funds for a virtual test bed for a reconfigurable ship. The Navy is developing a virtual machinery design, test, and evaluation capability for future ship systems. This will enable the combination of real time, interactive, software simulation with the hardware in-the-loop technologies.

The committee fully supports this simulation and testing prior to committing to system configuration. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63508N for a virtual test bed for a reconfigurable ship.

Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare

The budget request included $45.6 million for mine and expeditionary warfare advanced technology. Within that amount, the request included funds for algorithm development and modeling and simulation to provide battle space products to the Office of the Naval Oceanographer for promulgation to the war fighting commanders in chiefs (CINCs).

Research and development of products critical to monitoring, modeling, and disseminating environmental data are key factors in battle space awareness. Specifically, the databases and information regarding environments and predictions in littoral regions require emphasis on the mine warfare mission area. Investigation, data analysis, and prediction tools are required for current and eddy flow, bottom contour and content, and thermal layer behavior, cold water phenomena and man-made clutter.

Effective mine and submarine warfare are dependent on correct and timely environmental data. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 603782N for ocean modeling.

Marine Corps advanced technology transition

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63792N for a Marine Corps advanced technology transition initiative focused on the development of expeditionary warfighting technologies identified and developed through experimentation at the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory (CWL). The committee expects the Marine Corps program to be implemented in the same fashion as the current Navy initiative in PE 63792N. The program should demonstrate high risk/high payoff technologies and provide the Marine Corps with the opportunity to identify and move emerging technologies quickly and efficiently from laboratory to field. These projects should be selected by matching technological potential with requirements derived from operational issues of concern to the Marine Corps.

Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships

The budget request included $14.4 million in PE 63502N for an integrated combat weapons system (ICWS) for mine countermeasures ships. The global positioning system, autonomous minehunting neutralization, and mine sweeping capabilities contribute to a complex mine warfare information battlefield in ICWS. The mine countermeasures ships have the responsibility of maintaining mine warfare tactical and operational situations. At present, information from multiple sources is gathered and plotted by slow and manpower-intensive methods.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63502N for continuation of ICWS for mine countermeasures ships.

Trident SSGN design

The budget request included $34.8 million for the design of the Trident-class nuclear ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) conversion to a nuclear guided missile submarine (SSGN). In addition, the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) includes $1.1 billion in fiscal years 2002 through 2005 for maintaining additional attack submarine (SSN) force structure by either (1) refueling SSN 688-class submarines which were previously scheduled for decommissioning or (2) refueling and converting, to SSGN configuration, Trident SSBNs which were also previously scheduled for decommissioning. The decision to refuel up to four Ohio-class SSBNs, which would be converted for the SSGN mission, or use the funding to refuel Los Angeles-class SSNs, will be proposed by the administration as part of the fiscal year 2002 budget submission.

The committee recognizes that the design work on the SSGN capability which began in fiscal year 2000 must be sufficient to maintain viable options for converting SSBNs to the SSGN until the fiscal year 2002 decision is made. To meet the requirements for planning coincidental with the refueling of the first available SSBN, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63559N to continue design activity for converting SSBNs to an SSGN configuration.

The study of attack submarine force structure requirements conducted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) evaluated requirements of the commanders in chief (CINCs). That study concluded that a

submarine force structure below 55 SSNs in 2015 would be insufficient to meet warfighting requirements and that 68 SSNs would be necessary by 2015 to meet all the CINCs' and national intelligence community's highest operational and collection requirements. The study focused on intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) requirements of the CINCs.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's decision to refuel Los Angeles-class SSNs or convert Ohio-class SSBNs could be based more narrowly on the ISR deficiencies identified in the JCS study, without giving adequate consideration to the other warfighting capabilities offered by the SSGN, such as those outlined in the March 1999 Navy study of the Trident SSGN conversion option. Therefore, the committee directs the Navy to report to Congress on the attributes used to analyze the options of whether to refuel SSNs or to refuel and convert SSBNs and the distinctions among these attributes in the near-term and long-term. The committee directs that the Navy submit this report with the fiscal year 2002 budget.

Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology

The budget request included $2.2 million in PE 63561N for enhanced performance electric motor brush technology. Electric motors use monolithic carbon brushes to transfer electricity from a stationary stator to a rotating rotor. Carbon brushes wear relatively quickly and must be frequently inspected and replaced. A Navy-funded small business innovative research (SBIR) project demonstrated that fiber metal brushes provide significant wear and survivability improvements compared to carbon brushes. Fiber metal electric motor brushes have the potential to significantly reduce total ownership costs of ships and increase the survivability and operational reliability of electric motors.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63561N for shock and vibration qualification and completion of design and testing of enhanced performance electric motor brush technology.

Submarine composite sail

The budget request included no funding for development of a submarine sail made from composite materials. Preliminary studies indicate that a submarine sail with areas fabricated from composite materials may provide enhanced war fighting capabilities. In addition, the composite sail may provide lower weight and life-cycle costs for submarines. A composite sail is consistent with the technology insertion approach of the Virginia-class submarine program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63561N for development of an advanced submarine composite sail.

Joint command and control ship

The budget request included $30.8 million in PE 63564N to continue feasibility studies for the joint command and control ship (JCC(X)). The request is an increase of $14.1 million over the amount projected for the effort when the Administration submitted the fiscal year 2000 budget request. Congress authorized and appropriated $11.9 million for this program in fiscal year 2000.

The analysis of alternatives for the joint command and control ship mission is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 2001 and will be followed by the development of an operational requirements document. When the fiscal year 2001 request for JCC(X) is added to the amount included for the same effort in fiscal year 2000, the total is $42.7 million. However, the Navy required less than $26.3 million for analysis of alternatives and to commence the competition for the ADC(X)-class ship. These efforts for the ADC(X) should be similar in complexity to the JCC(X) effort.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $16.4 million in PE 63564N to bring the research and development for JCC(X) in line with the planning for a ship of similar complexity in the study phase of analysis.

Shipboard simulators for Marine Corps operations

The budget request included no funding for analysis of shipboard Marine Corps operational simulator technology. The committee is aware of advances made in training simulation technology and the potential that training and rehearsal planning simulators have in supporting Marines deployed at sea. It is clear that technology exists to provide shipboard simulators for many of the expeditionary missions embarked Marines will have to execute. As these simulators will allow Marines an opportunity to train to the fullest extent possible while in transit, the committee believes it is time to explore the availability and applicability of both existing and new training simulators to meet Marine Corps requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63564N to initiate a program to provide enhanced shipboard operational training simulators on amphibious ships for embarked Marines. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report, no later than March 1, 2001, that provides the following:

(1) an assessment of Marine Corps training requirements, plans to enhance future training opportunities, candidate systems that could provide both individual and collective training simulators to enhance the warfighting ability of deployed Marines, and an assessment of existing training simulators available for Marines afloat;

(2) a program to develop and field additional simulation capabilities beyond those currently available; and

(3) plans for obligating the funding provided, and future program adjustments necessary to support the fielding of new training simulation systems.

Navy common command and decision system

The budget request did not include funding for a common command and decision system. The common command and decision system development is a pre-planned product improvement (P3I) to the AEGIS Weapon System and the Mk 2 Ship Self-Defense System (SSDS). The improvement would replace the command and decision capability presently in these systems with a common computer architecture.

This effort will reduce future life-cycle costs by:

(1) reducing the number of computer programs that must be maintained;

(2) enabling the Navy to field new or modified warfighting capability much more quickly and at a lower cost; and

(3) improving warfighting capability by eliminating the redundant and conflicting processing now inherent in these systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63582N for continuation and completion of small business innovative research (SBIR) project for the common command and decision system.

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request included $138.0 million for research and development efforts associated with Marine Corps assault vehicles. The committee has noted with great interest progress made to date in the ongoing evaluation of the advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV). Early testing has yielded positive results and the committee looks forward to the results of future testing as these new combat vehicles continue in development. The committee notes an unfunded requirement for an additional AAAV which would be used to mature the vehicle's software and accelerate reliability testing. The committee recommends an increase of $27.5 million to support efforts to accelerate the development and testing of AAAV hardware and software, a total authorization of $165.5 million.

Marine corps ground combat/support system

The budget request included $23.2 million to support research and development activities associated with Marine Corps ground combat and combat support systems. The committee continues to be concerned about inadequate levels of fire support available to support Marine Corps operations ashore. The committee was interested to note a new effort by the Marine Corps to explore the utility of the Army's high mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS) to meet some of their outstanding fire support requirements. The committee believes this effort could result in a potential near-term solution for longer range general support artillery requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $17.3 million to support the acquisition of two HIMARS systems and to support testing and evaluation of the equipment and rocket systems, a total authorization of $40.5 million.

Extended range guided munition

The budget request included $39.1 million in PE 63795N for development of the extended range guided munition (ERGM). ERGM will provide precision fire support for forces ashore from Naval gunfire support ships. The budget request includes a two year delay (fiscal year 2002 to fiscal 2004) in the initial operating capability for ERGM. However, ERGM has demonstrated success in a number of technical issues and is scheduled for flight tests in calendar year 2000. The program appears to have regained momentum lost after moving the contractor's program office to a new geographic area. This move resulted in having to fill key staff positions with new personnel.

Because the development of ERGM technologies are key to providing extended range fire support to the Marine Corps, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63795N to reduce the risk in developing the advanced technologies required for ERGM.

Nonlethal research and technology development

The budget request included $23.6 million for the joint nonlethal weapons program. The committee recommends an total increase of $8.0 million in PE 63851M.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63851M for research in nonlethal environmental effects and remediation. Both at home and abroad, Americans, our allies, and innocent populations face an escalating danger of environmental threats and hazards: purposely from rogue elements and inadvertently from the results of adjacent or contiguous conflict. The committee finds current understanding of the environmental effects of emerging military responses to asymmetric and conventional threats and availability of protections from environmental agents woefully inadequate. Protections for civilian populations and their environs do not exist at all.

These additional funds should be applied to develop a program for assessing, determining and optimizing the environmental effects and remediative capabilities of emerging nonlethal weapons, as well as for removing, destroying, neutralizing, or containing environmental hazards once those hazards are deployed by adversaries. Only by assessment, evaluation, and development of methodologies to limit the spread of environmental damage from the fielding of emerging environmental threats and capabilities can new environmental consequences be avoided or countered. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

The committee authorizes the remaining $6.0 million in additional funds be allocated as follows: $2.0 million to continue the nonlethal technology research innovation initiative; an increase of $1.0 million for the neutralization of weapons of mass destruction sites; and $3.0 million for the nonlethal smart mortar casing demonstration. The committee notes that all four of these items were included on the Commandant's unfunded priority list.

Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative

The committee continues to support the Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative (NAVCIITI) to continue development in reliable secure communications and advanced information technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64707N for this purpose.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request included no funds for the parametric airborne dipping sonar (PADS). The PADS program is the continuation of a small business innovative research project that is de-

signed to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate the three dimensional, stabilized steerable acoustic beams for mine avoidance and submarine detection in shallow water. It is the only system that has the potential to provide airborne active dipping sonars with antisubmarine and anti-mine capabilities for shallow water littoral operations.

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

The dual mine and submarine warfare potential of PADS makes it a flexible and cost effective war fighting enhancement for two deficient missions: mine location and diesel submarine detection. The Navy is encouraged to continue the present testing and development of PADS. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64212N for the continued development of PADS.

Multi-mission helicopter upgrade development

The budget request included $69.9 million for the continued development of the multi-mission helicopter upgrade. Although the Navy had planned to integrate the advance threat infrared countermeasure (ATIRCM) on the SH–60R, a fiscal year 1999 program and schedule restructure has resulted in a funding shortfall to complete this integration on time. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64216N to continue to develop the integrated self-defense suite for the SH–60R, a total authorization of $77.9 million.

Power node control centers

The budget request did not include funding for power node control centers (PNCCs). PNCCs have the potential to integrate all of the shipboard power functions, such as switching, conversion, distribution and system operation and protection. This technology would support present and future surface ship and submarine platforms as a building block for increased use of electrical equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to PE 64300N for PNCCs.

Ship manpower reduction initiative

The budget request included no funding for research and development of technologies that could lead to manpower reductions resulting from altering food service operations on ships. Committee visits to fleet units verified that food service operations at sea are manpower intensive in preparing and serving food, cleaning of food service areas, and maintaining food service equipment.

Civilian cruise ships have developed technologies and methods for food service operations at sea that may be applicable to Navy ships. The Navy is investigating methods of reducing manpower required for food service operations at sea, while maintaining the quality and freshness of meals. These methods could lead to reduced manpower requirements in fleet units. Therefore, the com-

mittee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64300N for advanced food service technology testing.

SPY–3 and volume search radars

The budget request included $69.6 million for development of the SPY–3 multi-function radar and $57.5 million for development of a new volume search radar (VSR) in PE 64300N. Both radars are being developed for future surface ships including CVN–77 and DD–21.

The goal of the SPY–3 is to provide an affordable, high performance radar for ship defense. It will provide search, detect, track, and weapon control functions that are now provided by two to three different radars.

The VSR will be required to complement the SPY–3 by providing long range above the horizon surveillance and timely cuing to the SPY–3. Development of these radars are keys to reducing life-cycle costs in the combat systems of future surface ships. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million to PE 64300N for the development of the SPY–3 and VSR radars.

Acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf insertion of multi-purpose processor

The budget request included $28.2 million for submarine sonar improvement. The multi-purpose processor (MPP) is the result of a small business innovative research (SBIR) initiative. The MPP provides a capability to transport new, advanced software to existing hardware installations more easily. It lies at the heart of the Navy's acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) insertion (ARCI) program. This program is designed to permit anti-submarine forces to regain acoustic superiority over diesel and nuclear submarines of other navies.

The committee believes that the proven success of MPP and ARCI in attack submarines should be applied to other platforms such as surface ships, integrated undersea surveillance systems (IUSS), and maritime patrol aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 64503N for continuation of the SBIR follow-on for advanced development of MPP transportable software technology, technology insertion, advanced processor software builds, and for providing MPP units and training throughout the fleet and the Navy research and development community.

Submarine antenna technology improvement

The budget request included $0.9 million in PE 64503N for submarine communications antenna systems improvement. Submarine communications are vital to the evolving submarine littoral operational concepts. The submarine's ability to remain undetected while communicating depends on continuous development of submarine antenna technology. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64503N for submarine antenna technology improvements.

Submarine common architecture

The budget request included no funding in PE 64558N for migrating the Virginia-class submarine architecture to the Los Angeles-class submarines. Systems engineering and integration to define and manage common network interfaces enables low cost and low risk capability improvements for the Los Angeles, Ohio, and Seawolf-classes' submarine non-propulsion electronics and tactical integrated electronics systems. Therfore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64558N for development of a submarine common architecture.

Advanced tactical software for submarines

The budget request included $20.5 million in PE 64562N for software upgrades to integrate improved submarine weapons capabilities. Integration and installation planning for implementation of the Navy's family of processors and displays, the AN/UYQ–70, will enable maximum results from submarine combat systems software upgrades.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64562N for the system engineering necessary to integrate advanced tactical software into existing combat control systems for submarines.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $1.1 million for continued development and testing of the NULKA active countermeasures decoy. Development of a dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload is required for defense against advanced heat-seeking anti-ship missiles (ASMs).

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

The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 64755N for the development and operational testing of the dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload upgrade.

Navy single integrated human resources strategy

The budget request included $15.3 million PE 65013N for information technology development. The Navy has been designated the lead agency for development of software which will be used by all services to consolidate pay and personnel reporting systems. However, there are a number of service-specific systems which will provide information to the joint system that is under development. The Navy's single integrated human resources strategy (SIHRS) will update legacy systems which will provide input data to the joint personnel and pay system. SIHRS has the potential to provide enhanced system performance, workload reduction, and reduced cost.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65013N for the business process re-engineering of Navy legacy systems through the single integrated human resources strategy (SIHRS).

Marine Corps research university

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65873M for the Marine Corps Research University. The Marine Corps Research University, initiated by the Corps and competitively awarded to Pennsylvania State University in May of 1999, was established to assist the Marine Corps to enter the 21st Century. The rush of the information age and increased operational requirements has taxed the capabilities of the Corps to remain on the cutting edge of a broad range of issues routinely dealt with on a university campus. These and other factors led the Marine Corps to seek a relationship with a major multi-disciplinary research university. Additional funds should be used to provide support initiatives and critical research in areas, such as the new Marine Corps Integrated Logistics Concept (ILC), the Human Effects Advisory Panel (HEAP) which supports non-lethal weapons development, the V–22 alternative metals study, the Probable Cause Detection System (PCDS) for Chem-Bio detection, continuing and distance education courses, and supply-chain courses in support of logistics education.

Reentry system applications program

The committee continues to support the reentry system applications program (RSAP) as a sustaining technology program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 11221N to support the RSAP program. Also, the committee directs that the Navy establish a separate project category for the RSAP program within PE 11221N to ensure program continuity and execution.

Joint tactical combat training system

The budget request included $27.1 million for consolidated training systems development. Of this amount, $7.8 million was for the joint tactical combat training system (JTCTS). JTCTS is a joint Navy and Air Force program to provide realistic combat training for joint air and sea forces through a combination of simulated and real targets, instrumented aircraft, and ship participants. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 24571N to accelerate hardware and software integration of JTCTS, a total authorization of $32.1 million.

F–14 tactical reconnaissance

The budget request included $1.2 million for operational systems development of the F–14 aircraft. The F–14 remains the only near-term tactical reconnaissance aircraft organic to the carrier battle group. Weather and battlefield conditions with smoke and dust continue to hamper tactical reconnaissance platforms for both pre-strike reconnaissance and battle damage assessment. Synthetic aperture radar (SAR) systems offer a technical solution to all-weather, day and night reconnaissance that is missing on our tactical reconnaissance platforms. The committee understands that there are potentially two non-developmental SAR systems that could be demonstrated for suitability on strike fighter aircraft, neither of which is being procured for U.S. tactical aircraft at this time. Recent experience in Operation Allied Force in marginal weather again emphasized the need for all weather reconnaissance and battle dam-

age assessment capabilities to match the all weather weapons now available. Because of the high military utility provided to operational commanders, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 25667N to demonstrate the military utility of non-developmental SAR reconnaissance systems, a total authorization of $10.2 million.

Software interoperability process tools

The budget request included $0.9 million for joint command control communications computer intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) operational architectures. The operational architectures will provide the baseline to identify war fighter requirements, design and structure assessments, and generate functional metrics.

Software interoperability process tools prevent interoperability problems by anticipating needs and shortfalls and implementing solutions. The process tools have the potential to reduce software development time lines by providing essential analysis that complements the joint communications infrastructure synchronization initiative. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35118N for software interoperability process tools.

Satellite communications systems integration initiative

The budget request included no funding for the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) satellite communications (SATCOM) systems integration (SSI) initiative. The SSI initiative is intended to facilitate improved identification and evaluation of new and emerging communication and network technologies in the area of SATCOM that can distribute a wider diversity of information products. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35972N for the SSI initiative.

Distributed engineering plant

The budget request included $9.1 million in PE 38601N for modeling and simulation activities including development and analysis. It is the Navy's intention to continue a new focus for battle group pre-deployment hardware and software testing by leveraging shore based facility capabilities. The linking of the shore based facilities with battle group assets is referred to as a distributed engineering plant (DEP). The DEP will be used to feedback information into the acquisition cycle as well as to test software and hardware compatibility in both actual and virtual environments.

The East Coast Command Control Communications and Computers Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Engineering Center is a critical node in the DEP. Three of the C4ISR focus areas that will improve the connectivity and responsiveness of the DEP are:

(1) fusing geographically distributed simulators using the high level architecture to conduct end-to-end system interoperability testing;

(2) adapting visualization and computer-aided design tools to shipboard C4ISR configuration management; and

(3) integrating systems for distributed simulation/stimulation in end-to-end Navy and joint testing.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 38601N for the three C4ISR battle center focus areas described in the above paragraph.

Air Force

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206,149	-	206,149
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	72,815	-	80,315
		Resin Systems for Engine Applications		2,000	
		Laser Processing Tools		4,000	
		Thermal Protection Systems		1,500	
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	48,775	-	54,775
		Aeronautical Research		6,000	
0602202F	4	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	62,619	-	62,619
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	116,262	-	124,262
		Variable Displacement Vane Pump		3,000	
		PBO Membrane Fuel Cell		5,000	
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE SENSORS	65,644	-	65,644
0602269F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		-	-
0602601F	8	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	57,687	-	68,287
		Tech-Sat 21Transfer		(5,000)	
		Aluminum Aerostructures		3,000	
		Space Survivability		5,600	
		HAARP		7,000	
0602602F	9	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	45,223	-	45,223
0602605F	10	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	32,337	-	32,337
0602702F	11	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	78,749	-	78,749
0602805F	12	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,144	-	10,144
0603106F	13	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	13,895	-	13,895
0603112F	14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,678	-	21,678
0603202F	15	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	34,440	-	34,440

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603203F	16	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	28,311	-	34,311
		Integrated Demonstration & Applications Laboratory (IDAL)		6,000	
0603205F	17	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	2,445	-	4,445
		Fiber Optic Control Technologies		2,000	
0603211F	18	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	12,961	-	12,961
0603216F	19	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	41,964	-	41,964
0603227F	20	PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	6,491	-	6,491
0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	12,479	-	12,479
0603245F	22	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	13,184	-	13,184
0603253F	23	ADVANCED SENSOR INTEGRATION	5,350	-	5,350
0603270F	24	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	25,882	-	25,882
0603302F	25	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	24,283	-	24,283
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603401F	27	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	97,327	-	146,327
		Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS)		5,000	
		Upper Stage Flight Experiment		5,000	
		Scorpius		5,000	
		Space Maneuver Vehicle		15,000	
		Solar Orbital Transfer Vehicle (SOTV)		5,000	
		Micro-Satellite Technology (XSS-10)		12,000	
		Composite Payload Fairings and Shrouds		2,000	
0603410F	28	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,412	-	3,412
0603444F	29	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	4,625	-	4,625
0603601F	30	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	22,731	-	22,731
0603605F	31	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	33,371	-	33,371
0603707F	32	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY		-	-

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603723F	33	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603726F	34	AEROSPACE INFO TECH SYS INTEGRATION	7,429	-	7,429
0603728F	35	BATTLESPACE C2 TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603789F	36	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,468	-	19,468
0603876F	37	SPACE-BASED LASER	63,216	-	93,216
		SBL Integrated Flight Experiment (IFX)		30,000	
0603260F	38	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,401	-	4,401
0603319F	39	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	148,637	-	241,037
		Program Restoration		92,400	
0603430F	40	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	246,396	-	246,396
0603432F	41	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	26,068	-	26,068
0603434F	42	NAT POLAR-ORBITING OP ENVIRON SATELLITE SYS (SPACE)	76,654	-	76,654
0603438F	43	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,728	-	9,728
0603441F	44	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603617F	45	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	7,828	-	7,828
0603690F	46	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY	991	-	991
0603742F	47	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,933	-	10,933
0603790F	48	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H)	5,509	-	5,509
0603800F	49	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	129,538	-	341,638
		Extend DEM/VAL		212,100	
0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,488	-	24,488
0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	39,246	-	58,446
		RSLP GPS Range Safety		19,200	
0603854F	52	WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	134,029	-	116,029
		Wideband Gapfiller Satellite Design		(18,000)	
0603856F	53	AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)	3,370	-	3,370

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603859F	54	POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL)	2,543	-	2,543
0603860F	55	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	18,092	-	18,092
0603876F	56	SPACE-BASED LASER		-	-
0604237F	57	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT		-	-
0604327F	58	HARD & DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROG		-	-
0604012F	59	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,312	-	1,312
0604201F	60	INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	712	-	712
0604222F	61	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	10,133	-	10,133
0604226F	62	B-1B	168,122	-	168,122
0604227F	63	DISTRIBUTED MISSION TRAINING (DMT)	3,782	-	3,782
0604233F	64	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	23,853	-	23,853
0604239F	65	F-22 EMD	1,411,786	-	1,411,786
0604240F	66	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	48,313	-	53,313
		SATCOM Connectivity		5,000	
0604270F	67	EW DEVELOPMENT	58,198	-	58,198
0604441F	68	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	569,188	-	569,188
0604442F	69	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD	241,021	-	241,021
0604479F	70	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	236,841	-	232,841
		Excess Satellite Engineering Effort		(4,000)	
0604480F	71	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)		-	-
0604600F	72	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0604602F	73	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,876	-	8,876
0604604F	74	SUBMUNITIONS	4,775	-	4,775
0604617F	75	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	668	-	668
0604618F	76	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,157	-	1,157
0604703F	77	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	5,929	-	5,929

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604706F	78	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	14,758	-	14,758
0604708F	79	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,746	-	2,746
0604727F	80	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	1,498	-	1,498
0604735F	81	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	12,559	-	12,559
0604740F	82	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	214	-	214
0604750F	83	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,298	-	1,298
0604754F	84	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,745	-	8,745
0604762F	85	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	11,621	-	11,621
0604779F	86	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL C2 SYS (JINTACCS)	5,825	-	5,825
0604800F	87	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	299,540	-	-
		Extend DEM/VAL		(299,540)	
0604805F	88	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	19,851	-	19,851
0604851F	89	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	18,325	-	18,325
0604853F	90	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) - EMD	332,952	-	332,952
0605011F	91	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	14,204	-	14,204
0207249F	92	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS	3,965	-	3,965
0305176F	93	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	10,842	-	10,842
0604256F	94	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,785	-	34,785
0604258F	95	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	191	-	191
0604759F	96	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	54,057	-	54,057
0605101F	97	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	24,080	-	24,080
0605306F	98	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,356	-	4,356
0605502F	99	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH		-	-
0605712F	100	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	28,238	-	28,238
0605807F	101	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	386,205	-	386,205
0605808F	102	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING		-	-

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605854F	103	POLLUTION PREVENTION		-	-
0605860F	104	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,906	-	7,906
0605864F	105	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	46,476	-	46,476
0909900F	106	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
1001004F	107	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,773	-	3,773
0101113F	108	B-52 SQUADRONS	50,787	-	50,787
0101120F	109	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	4,182	-	4,182
0101122F	110	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	6,457	-	6,457
0102325F	111	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		-	-
0102326F	112	REG/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MOD PROG	992	-	992
0102411F	113	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM		-	-
0102445F	114	COUNTERDRUG AEROSTATS		-	-
0207027F	115	AIR AND SPACE COMMAND AND CONTROL AGENCY (ASC2A)	24,769	-	24,769
0207131F	116	A-10 SQUADRONS	8,615	-	8,615
0207133F	117	F-16 SQUADRONS	124,903	-	124,903
0207134F	118	F-15E SQUADRONS	61,260	-	68,860
		BOL Integration		7,600	
0207136F	119	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,670	-	14,670
0207141F	120	F-117A SQUADRONS	3,912	-	3,912
0207161F	121	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,706	-	21,706
0207163F	122	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	53,707	-	53,707
0207247F	123	AF TENCAP	9,826	-	11,826
		Hyperspectral Technology		2,000	
0207248F	124	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	75,443	-	75,443
0207253F	125	COMPASS CALL	5,834	-	5,834
0207268F	126	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	166,926	-	166,926

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0207320F	127	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS		-	-
0207323F	127A	EXTENDED RANGE CRUISE MISSILE		86,100	86,100
0207325F	128	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	120,281	-	120,281
0207412F	129	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	19,873	-	19,873
0207414F	130	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM		-	-
0207417F	131	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	35,653	-	35,653
0207423F	132	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,867	-	2,867
0207424F	133	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	81,027	-	81,027
0207433F	134	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	90,713	-	90,713
0207438F	135	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	41,068	-	41,068
0207581F	136	JOINT SURVEILLANCE & TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYS (JOINT STARS)	144,118	-	151,318
		Global Air Traffice Management (GATM)		7,200	
0207590F	137	SEEK EAGLE	19,472	-	19,472
0207591F	138	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	266,458	-	266,458
0207601F	139	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	17,624	-	17,624
0207605F	140	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	3,874	-	3,874
0208006F	141	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	20,755	-	20,755
0208021F	142	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	1	-	1
0208031F	143	WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,475	-	1,475
0208060F	144	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	19,824	-	19,824
0208160F	145	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	98,263	-	98,263
0208161F	146	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	74,240	-	74,240
0301357F	151	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		-	-
0302015F	153	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	34,410	-	34,410
0303110F	154	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	7,328	-	7,328
0303112F	155	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)	11,478	-	11,478

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0303131F	156	MIN ESSENTIAL EMERG COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	15,302	-	15,302
0303140F	157	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,212	-	12,212
		Lighthouse Cyber-Security		5,000	
0303141F	158	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	46,369	-	46,369
0303150F	159	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,743	-	3,743
0303401F	160	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	4,857	-	4,857
0303601F	161	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	17,797	-	20,797
		B-2 Connectivity		3,000	
0304311F	163	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		-	-
0305099F	164	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	8,508	-	8,508
0305110F	165	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	58,643	-	58,643
0305111F	166	WEATHER SERVICE	19,942	-	19,942
0305114F	167	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, & LANDING SYS (ATCALS)	18,093	-	18,093
0305119F	168	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)		-	-
0305128F	169	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	467	-	467
0305137F	170	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	200	-	200
0305138F	171	INERTIAL UPPER STAGE (IUS)		-	-
0305144F	173	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	25,815	-	25,815
0305158F	174	TACTICAL TERMINAL	238	-	238
0305159F	175	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	45,149	-	45,149
0305160F	176	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	25,372	-	25,372
0305164F	177	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	66,975	-	66,975
0305165F	178	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (SPACE & CONTROL SEGMENTS)	250,197	-	260,897
		Transfer from Missile Procurement		10,700	
0305182F	180	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	53,654	-	53,654
0305202F	181	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	27,546	-	33,546

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		U-2 SYERS		6,000	
0305205F	182	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	109,215	-	127,215
		Improved Radar for Global Hawk		6,000	
		Global Hawk Air Surveillance Demonstration		12,000	
0305206F	183	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	136,913	-	136,913
0305207F	184	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS		-	-
0305208F	185	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	21,330	-	21,330
0305906F	186	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	19,309	-	19,309
0305910F	187	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	2,553	-	2,553
0305911F	188	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	9,462	-	9,462
0305913F	189	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	17,088	-	17,088
0305917F	190	SPACE ARCHITECT		-	-
0305953F	191	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE (EELV) (SPACE)		-	-
0308601F	192	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,177	-	1,177
0308699F	193	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	4,219	-	4,219
0401115F	194	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	60,496	-	60,496
0401119F	195	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	92,530	-	92,530
0401130F	196	C-17 AIRCRAFT	176,439	-	176,439
0401214F	197	AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)		-	-
0401218F	198	KC-135S	487	-	487
0401219F	199	KC-10S	19,526	-	19,526
0404011F	200	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	1,109	-	1,109
0702207F	201	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,515	-	1,515
0708011F	202	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	53,082	-	53,082
0708026F	203	PROD, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	15,227	-	15,227
0708071F	204	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,238	-	11,238

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0708611F	205	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	32,258	-	32,258
0708612F	206	COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMP PROGRAM (CRSIP)	2,356	-	2,356
0901218F	207	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,209	-	7,209
1001018F	208	NATO JOINT STARS	3,270	-	3,270
XXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	4,123,225	12,500	4,135,725
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(42,100)	(42,100)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836

Laser processing tools

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62102F for the development and application of a high power, tunable, ultraviolet laser processing tool for the fabrication of micro-engineered components and subsystems pertinent to aerospace applications. A high-average power free electron laser with ultraviolet capability would allow processing materials and micro make micro- and nano-devices for space systems applications. This research would also assist in enabling the Air Force's ability to manufacture low-cost pico and nano-satellites, and microsystems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Resin systems for Air Force applications

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62102F for the development and demonstration of high temperature resin systems for Air Force engine applications. The committee understands that this technology could reduce the cost of high temperature components in turbine engines for fighter aircraft. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Thermal protection systems

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62102F for the development of thermal protection systems for hypervelocity vehicles and atmospheric flight trajectories. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Aeronautical research

The committee remains gravely concerned with the failure of the Air Force to properly fund critical aeronautical research. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62201F for advanced concepts research and technology development for long term aeronautical systems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Polyphenylene benzobisoxozole membrane fuel cell

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62203F for research in polyphenylene benzobisoxozole (PBO) films for fuel cell membranes. The committee notes that fuel cells can provide a lower cost, lighter weight, higher performance and more energy efficient fuel cell. The microporous PBO substrate may provide a component solution that will increase the strength and high temperature capabilities currently inhibiting fuel cell technologies. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Variable displacement vane pump

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62203F to complete the development and demonstration of the variable displacement vane pump (VDVP) as an alternate engine fuel pump. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

High frequency active auroral research

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to continue experimentation in the high frequency active auroral research program as follows: an increase of $7.0 million in PE 62601F and an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63714D.

Space survivability

The committee recommends an increase of $5.6 million in PE 62601F to continue critical research in clutter mitigation, space weather effects on spacecraft, ionospheric effects on global positioning systems (GPS), communication and geolocation, and space environment distributed anomoly resolution sensor research.

Aluminum aerostructures

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 603112F for the development and demonstration of methodology for producing advanced aluminum aerostructures. This effort is critical for improved afford ability, maintainability, and enhanced performance of current and future Air Force systems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Hyperspectral research

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63203F to complete the development of a multi-spectral synthetic battlespace simulation capability to address the critical needs of the Air Force's advanced air and space sensor technologies. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Fiber optical control technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63205F for the development and demonstration of all optical control interface with an electro-mechanical flight actuator. The committee understands this technology has the potential to improve performance and survivability while lowering operating costs for future Air Force flight vehicles. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Low cost launch technology

The committee continues to support the development of a range of low-cost launch technologies, including the Scorpius concept. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million

in PE 63401F for low cost launch technology development, including Scorpius.

Micro-satellite technology

The committee continues to support the Micro-Satellite Technology program. The committee was disappointed that the Air Force Research Laboratory was unable to complete preparations for the launch of the XSS–10 micro-satellite with funds available in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $5.0 million requested for the Tech-Sat 21 program in PE 62601F to PE 63401F for an overall increase of $12.0 million in PE 63401F to complete work on and launch the XSS–10.

Miniature satellite threat reporting system

The budget request included no funding for the Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS). The committee continues to support MSTRS to develop the capability to protect satellites from uplink jamming, interference, or intrusion. The committee also supports efforts to develop sensors capable of detecting laser threats. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F for the MSTRS program.

Next generation composite launch vehicle payload fairings and shrouds

The committee supports the development of composite manufacturing and processing technologies for the next generation of payload fairings and shrouds to improve the performance of U.S. space systems while reducing overall production cost. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63401F to support this effort.

Solar orbital transfer vehicle

The committee has supported development of the solar orbital transfer vehicle (SOTV) technology program. The SOTV program combines thermionic technology for electricity production and thermal propulsion. To continue this effort, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F.

Space maneuver vehicle

The committee continues to support the Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) partnership to develop a reusable upper stage vehicle. The committee supports the Air Force effort to acquire a "second tail number" of NASA's X–37 as a Space Maneuver Vehicle operational technology demonstrator (X–40B). Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63401F to support acquisition of the "second tail number" X–40B SMV demonstrator.

Upper stage flight experiment

The Air Force has developed a program to demonstrate advanced upper stage technologies to lower the cost of space launch. To support the launch of this experimental rocket motor in the near future, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F.

Space Based Laser program

The budget request included $137.7 million for the Space Based Laser (SBL) program, including $63.2 million in the Air Force budget and $74.5 million in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization budget. Although the Air Force and BMDO have structured a viable program to launch an SBL integrated flight experiment (IFX) in the fiscal year 2012–2014 timeframe, this program remains funding-constrained. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 63876F to support acceleration of the IFX and its integrated test facility.

Airborne laser program

The budget request included $148.6 million for the Airborne laser (ABL) program. Although the committee has raised concerns regarding the maturity of the ABL technology in the past, the committee is concerned by the Air Force's decision to significantly reduce funding for the ABL program in fiscal year 2001, and throughout the years of the Future Years Defense Program. The committee notes that the Air Force has implemented a range of risk reduction measures that the committee had previously directed, including efforts in the area of atmospheric compensation being conducted at the North Oscura Peak test facility in New Mexico. As required by the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2000, the Air Force reviewed progress in five specific risk reduction areas. Pursuant to this requirement, the Secretary of the Air Force reported to Congress on December 6, 1999, that "[e]xcellent progress has been made in all five areas," and that "[t]he ABL Program continues to meet or exceed every technical and programmatic milestone and remains on-cost and on-schedule."

In light of this positive report, the committee does not understand or support the Air Force's decision to significantly reduce the ABL program funding. This cut jeopardizes the ability to complete the initial ABL test aircraft in a timely manner. The first test aircraft is critical to determining whether all necessary ABL technologies are ready for production. The committee supports rapid demonstration of these key technologies and thus strongly opposes the delay in the completion of the Program Definition and Risk Reduction (PDRR) aircraft. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $92.4 million in PE 63319F, the amount needed in fiscal year 2001 to keep the PDRR aircraft on schedule to conduct the first lethal demonstration during fiscal year 2003. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to spend these additional fiscal year 2001 funds consistent with the fiscal year 2000 program plan. Absent the development of technical problems, the ABL program should remain on schedule for a lethal demonstration in fiscal year 2003 and initial operational capability in fiscal year 2007.

Rocket systems launch program

The committee continues to support the Rocket Systems Launch Program (RSLP), which utilizes excess strategic missile rocket motors to launch small payloads. The committee recommends an increase of $19.2 million in PE 63851F to demonstrate quick reaction launch capabilities, Global Positioning System range safety, and common strategic missile technology.

Wideband gapfiller military satellite communications

The budget request included $92.3 million in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), Air Force, for the Wideband Gapfiller satellite communications system (WGS). The committee notes that, as a result of the Department of Defense policy to fully fund satellites with procurement funding, the fiscal year 2001 RDT&E budget request for WGS was increased by $34.1 million over fiscal year 2000 projections. The committee recommends a decrease of $18.0 million in PE 63854F for WGS satellite design.

B–2 advanced technology bomber

The budget request included $48.3 million for continued development of the B–2 advanced technology bomber. The Air Force unfunded requirements list included a request for additional risk reduction for connectivity. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE64240F for the connectivity risk reduction for the B–2 advanced technology bomber.

The budget request also included $17.8 million for the operational system development of military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) terminals. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE33601F for risk reduction efforts in MILSATCOM terminals specific to integration with the B–2 advanced technology bomber.

Milstar satellite communications

The budget request included $236.8 million for Milstar satellite communications research, development, test and evaluation, including an increase of $11.0 million over fiscal year 2000 budget projections for satellite engineering requirements. The committee believes that this growth is not fully justified. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in PE 64479F.

F–15E squadrons

The budget request included $61.3 million for continued operational systems development of the F–15 aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the integration of the BOL countermeasure system on the F–15 series of aircraft, although it was included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. Integration of this system will dramatically increase the chaff and flare capacity of the F–15, giving it preemptive expendable capability. The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million in PE 27134F for BOL countermeasure system integration on the F–15, a total authorization of $68.9 million.

Hyperspectral system development

The committee supports research and development of hyperspectral technology for use in high altitude and space applications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 27247F to support these efforts.

Extended range cruise missile

The budget request included no funding for the extended range cruise missile (ERCM). Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the

Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on replacement options for the conventional air-launched cruise missile (CALCM). The CALCM has become the Air Force weapon of choice in recent conflicts, and as such, its inventory has been seriously depleted. This report defined near-term, mid-term, and long-term solutions to address this required capability. The near-term solution, which is ongoing and funded, is to convert the remaining, available air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs) to CALCMs. The mid-term solution, which is not funded in the fiscal year 2001 budget request, is to begin a two to three-year ERCM development to upgrade an existing cruise missile design. This development will be followed by a four-year production run to build up the cruise missile stockpile. Funding for the initiation of this development is very high on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $86.1 million in PE 27323F to commence ERCM development.

Joint surveillance and target attack radar system

The budget request included $144.1 million for operational system development of the E–8 joint surveillance and target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft and weapons system. The global access, navigation, and safety strategic management plan, published in fiscal year 1999, included a requirement for installation of global air traffic management (GATM) equipment in the E–8 JSTARS aircraft. This modification will be required to maintain current access to oceanic and continental routes in Europe, ensuring that missions can be safely and effectively flown. The Air Force has included development of GATM modifications for the E–8 on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.2 million in PE 27581F for development and integration of GATM on the JSTARS aircraft, a total authorization of $151.3 million.

Lighthouse cyber security

The budget request included $7.2 million for Air Force information system security research, development, test and evaluation. The committee supports the Lighthouse Cyber Security Program managed by the Air Force, which focuses on computer system vulnerabilities and threats, and provides guidance and corrective courses of action through the use of modeling and prototype tools. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140F to support the Lighthouse Cyber Security Program.

Dragon U–2

The budget request included $27.5 million in PE 35202F for operational systems development of the U–2 aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the continued development of the Senior Year electro-optic reconnaissance system (SYERS). The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 35202F for further SYERS development, a total authorization of $33.5 million.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE-WIDE			
0601101D	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,007	-	2,007
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	90,415	-	90,415
		Advanced Photonics Research		[3,000]	
0601103D	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	253,627	-	259,127
		Personnel Research Institute		4,000	
		Infrasound Detection Basic Research		1,500	
0601105D	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	16,978	-	16,978
0601111D	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RES	6,715	-	6,715
0601114D	6	DEF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RES	9,859	-	24,859
		Program Increase		15,000	
0601384BP	7	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	33,197	-	38,197
		Chemical Agent Detection-Optical Computing		2,000	
		Thin Film Technology		3,000	
0602110E	8	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	15,000	-	15,000
0602173C	9	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	37,747	-	49,747
		Wide Band Gap		2,000	
		NTW Follow-On Kill Vehicle Technology		10,000	
0602227D	10	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	15,029	-	15,029
0602228D	11	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	14,236	-	14,236
0602234D	12	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	18,602	-	20,702
		Bio-Defense Research		2,100	
0602301E	13	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	376,592	-	376,592
0602302E	14	EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	69,282	-	69,282
0602383E	15	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	162,064	-	162,064
0602384BP	16	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,600	-	81,600

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Hybrid Sensor Suite		8,000	
0602702E	17	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	121,051	-	321,051
		Remotely Controlled Combat Systems Initiative		200,000	
0602708E	18	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,761	-	38,761
		High Definition Systems		7,000	
0602712E	19	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	249,812	-	252,812
		3-D Structure Research		3,000	
0602715BR	20	NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIES	230,928	-	230,928
0602787D	21	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,680	-	8,680
0305108K	22	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH		-	-
0603002D	23	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,043	-	2,043
0603104D	24	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,964	-	8,964
0603121D	25	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,622	-	8,622
0603122D	26	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	41,307	-	51,307
		Chem-Bio Detectors		5,000	
		Blast Mitigation Testing		3,000	
		Facial Recognition Acess Control Technology		2,000	
0603160BR	27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADV DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES	77,391	-	77,391
0603173C	28	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADV TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	93,249	-	130,249
		Magdalena Ridge Observatory		9,000	
		Wide Band Gap		10,000	
		Excalibur		3,000	
		Atmospheric Inteceptor Technology		15,000	
0603174C	29	SPACE BASED LASERS (SBL)	74,537	-	74,537
0603225D	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,670	-	16,670
0603232D	31	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,534	-	7,534

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603285E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	26,821	-	26,821
0603384BP	33	CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROG - ADVANCED DEV	46,594	-	67,694
		Chem-bio Individual Sampler		2,700	
		Consequence Management Information System		6,400	
		Chem-bio Advanced Materials research		3,500	
		Small Unit Bio Detector		8,500	
0603704D	34	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,777	-	15,777
		Complex System Design		5,000	
0603711BR	35	ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	52,930	-	52,930
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,082	-	31,082
		Competitive Sustainment Initiative		8,000	
0603716D	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,357	-	51,357
0603727D	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,607	-	7,607
0603738D	39	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH		-	-
0603739E	40	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	191,800	-	191,800
0603747E	41	ELECTRIC VEHICLES		-	-
0603750D	42	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,425	-	116,425
0603755D	43	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	164,027	-	164,027
0603760E	44	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	128,863	-	128,863
0603761E	45	COMMUNICATION AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603762E	46	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	182,225	-	182,225
0603763E	47	MARINE TECHNOLOGY	30,304	-	30,304
0603764E	48	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	134,249	-	134,249
0603765E	49	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	101,387	-	101,387
0603805S	50	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS		-	-
0603832D	51	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	56,971	-	61,971

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		WMD Simulation Capability		5,000	
0605160D	52	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,483	-	1,483
0603228D	56	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	35,108	-	35,108
0603708D	57	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS		-	-
0603709D	58	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	10,294	-	10,294
0603714D	59	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,534	-	20,534
		HAARP		5,000	
0603736D	60	CALS INITIATIVE	1,585	-	3,585
		Integrated Data Environment (IDE)		2,000	
0603790T	61	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0603851D	62	ENVIRON SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROG	24,906	-	34,906
		Remediation of Uexploded Ordnances		10,000	
0603857J	63	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)		-	-
0603861C	64	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603868C	65	NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	382,671	-	442,671
		Accelerate NTW SM-3 Incerceptor		60,000	
0603869C	66	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	63,175	-	63,175
0603870C	67	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEF ACQ - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603871C	68	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	1,740,238	-	1,869,238
		Risk Reduction		129,000	
0603872C	69	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL		-	5,000
		BMD Liquid Fueled SurrogateTarget		5,000	
0603873C	70	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	231,248	-	231,248
0603874C	71	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	270,718	-	280,218
		Advanced Optical Data and Sensor Fusion		3,000	
		Advanced Research Center		6,500	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603875C	72	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	116,992	-	104,992
		RAMOS		(20,000)	
		Arrow System Improvement Plan		8,000	
0603876C	73	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	22,621	-	22,621
0603884BP	74	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	83,800	-	83,800
0603892D	75	ASAT		-	20,000
		KE-ASAT		20,000	
0603920D	76	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	12,728	-	12,728
0603923D	77	COALITION WARFARE	11,839	-	11,839
0604722D	78	JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0605104T	79	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS		-	-
0605110T	80	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MGT SYS (PIMS)	1,932	-	1,932
0901585C	81	PENTAGON RESERVATION	4,772	-	4,772
0604384BP	82	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	100,815	-	102,915
		Next Generation Anthrax Vaccine		2,100	
0604709D	83	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	11,553	-	13,153
		WMD Response System		1,600	
0604764K	84	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	14,685	-	14,685
0604771D	85	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,250	-	16,250
0604805D	86	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE		-	-
0604861C	87	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	549,945	-	549,945
0604865C	88	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	81,016	-	81,016
0604867C	89	NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	274,234	-	274,234
0605013D	90	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,000	-	12,000
0605013S	91	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,671	-	1,671
0605014S	92	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (FIELD ACTIVITY)	26,797	-	26,797

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605015S	93	INFORMATION TECH DEV (STANDARD PROCUREMENT SYSTEM)	15,772	-	15,772
0303129K	94	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	11,340	-	11,340
0303140K	95	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	18,210	-	18,210
0303141K	96	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	22,287	-	22,287
0305840K	97	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	28,094	-	28,094
0603858D	98	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,204	-	1,204
0604942D	99	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS		-	-
0604943D	100	THERMAL VICAR	4,882	-	4,882
0605104D	101	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,597	-	30,597
0605110BR	102	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	3,927	-	3,927
0605114E	103	BLACK LIGHT	5,000	-	5,000
0605116D	104	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	3,769	-	3,769
0605117D	105	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	32,173	48,100	80,273
0605123D	106	AFCC ENGINEERING AND INSTALLATION	6,000	-	6,000
0605124D	107	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	9,122	-	9,122
0605126J	108	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	21,200	-	21,200
0605128BR	109	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		-	-
0605128D	110	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)		-	-
0605130D	111	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,697	-	31,697
0605160BR	112	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT		-	-
0605384BP	113	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	23,907	-	23,907
0605502BP	114	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - CHEM BIO DEF		-	-
0605502D	115	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605502E	116	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605710D	117	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	641	-	641
0605790D	118	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMIN	1,728	-	1,728

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605798S	119	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,048	-	5,048
0605801K	120	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	45,350	-	45,350
0605803S	121	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING & EVALUATION	8,776	-	8,776
0605804D	122	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	43,915	-	43,915
0605898E	123	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT)	34,679	-	34,679
0604805D	124	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	9,629	-	9,629
0208045K	125	C3 INTEROPERABILITY	37,072	-	37,072
0208052J	126	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	11,941	-	11,941
0302016K	130	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	641	-	641
0302019K	131	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	5,704	-	5,704
0303126K	132	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,416	-	1,416
0303127K	133	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	5,019	-	5,019
0303131K	134	MIN ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	7,099	-	7,099
0303140G	135	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	290,771	-	317,571
		Information Operations Technology Center Alliance		5,000	
		Trust Rubix		1,800	
		Cyber Attack Sensing and Warning		20,000	
0303149J	136	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	5,486	-	5,486
0303149K	137	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	405	-	405
0303153K	138	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,735	-	8,735
0304210BB	139	SPECIAL RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES (SRC) PROGRAM	3,800	-	5,800
		Virtual Worlds Initiative		2,000	
0305102BQ	141	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	74,975	-	81,975
		Smart Maps		2,000	
		NIMA Viewer		5,000	
0305127V	142	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	444	-	444

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0305159I	143	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)		-	-
0305190D	144	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	25,182	-	35,182
		JCOATS-IO		5,000	
		Information Assurance Testbed		5,000	
0305202G	145	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	4,379	-	4,379
0305206G	146	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,514	-	13,514
0305207G	147	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,543	-	4,543
0305208L	150	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	994	-	994
0305885G	152	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	95,671	-	95,671
0305889G	153	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT		-	-
0708011S	154	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,090	-	7,090
0902298J	155	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	12,540	-	12,540
0902740J	156	JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	24,095	-	24,095
1001017D	157	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES		-	-
1160279BB	158	SM BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RES/SMALL BUS TECH TRANS PILOT PROG		-	-
1160401BB	159	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,360	-	7,360
1160402BB	160	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,778	-	7,778
1160404BB	161	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	133,520	-	133,520
1160405BB	162	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,022	-	3,022
1160407BB	163	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,065	-	2,065
1160408BB	164	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	87,071	-	92,671
		Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher		5,600	
XXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,323,435	140,000	1,463,435
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(1,500)	(1,500)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEF-WIDE	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)		-	-
0605130D	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING		-	-
0605804D	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION		-	-
		TOTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	121,401	-	141,401
		Program Increase		20,000	
0605118D	2	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	17,172	-	17,172
0605131D	3	LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,712	-	11,212
		Reality Fire-Fighting Training		1,500	
0605804D	4	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	53,275	-	53,275
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	201,560	21,500	223,060

Advanced photonic composites research

The budget request includes $90.1 million for defense research sciences (PE 61101E). The committee recommends that, of the funds, $3.0 million be used to extend the Advanced Photonic Composites Research Program in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Photonic composite materials are complex material systems whose key optical property is described by a periodic function. The optical property typically is an index of refraction or some non-linear optical behavior. Due to their complex three dimensional nature, photonic composite materials are very difficult to produce. However, these materials offer great promise for the development of photonic devices with greatly improved performance due to their inherent ability to substantially reduce the volume of material required to achieve certain optical effects.

Infrasound detection capability basic research

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61103D for basic research in the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty verification. The additional funds will be used to develop and evaluate infrasound sensors and conduct studies and analysis for use in developing more effective and efficient infrasound detection capability to support the detection of nuclear explosions on a global basis. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Personnel research initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 61103D for the defense personnel research initiative. The additional funds will support basic research efforts in manpower and personnel including operations research, economics, cognitive and experimental psychology with the objective of reducing attrition, increasing retention, and ensuring an efficient allocation of military forces.

Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research

The budget request includes $9.9 million for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR) to broaden the infrastructure for universities that support national defense research. The research conducted is peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 61114D to continue efforts in this merit-based program.

Chemical and biological defense basic research

The budget request included $33.2 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research. The goal of this program is to improve the operational performance of the military services by concentrated research in areas that can contribute to defense against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, to be distributed as follows: $2.0 million for optical com-

puting chemical agent detection; and $3.0 million for continued research in thin film technology development.

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization funding and programmatic guidance

The budget request included approximately $4.9 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), including Procurement, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) and military construction. The committee's recommended changes to the budget request for BMDO procurement and RDT&E are provided below. The committee's recommendations for BMDO military construction are provided elsewhere in this report.

Support Technology

The committee continues to support BMDO's efforts in the area of wide bandgap electronics materials and devices. To support this important technology effort, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62173C and an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63173C.

The committee continues to support the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT) program to develop advanced interceptor kill vehicle technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63173C to support the AIT program.

The committee believes that BMDO should immediately begin to define and develop the necessary technology for the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) block II kill vehicle. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62173C to support the development of advanced NTW kill vehicle concepts employing light-weight non-toxic pumped-propulsion and active/passive sensor technology.

The committee has supported BMDO's efforts to evaluate innovative and low-cost launch technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63173C to support low cost launch technology, including the Excalibur concept.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63173C to support the Magdalena Ridge Observatory.

National Missile Defense

The budget request included approximately $1.8 billion for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, including Procurement and RDT&E. The committee notes that the Director of BMDO has identified an additional $300.0 million that could be utilized to further enhance risk reduction and testing activities. Of this amount, the Director identified $129.0 million as critical risk reduction unfunded requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $129.0 million in PE 63871C for NMD risk reduction.

The committee understands that BMDO is considering entering into a competition for the NMD X-band ground-based radars (GBR) that would be deployed following the initial deployment of the Alaska GBR site. The committee directs the Director of BMDO to conduct an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of a competitive approach to follow-on GBR development and deployment, and

provide a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001.

Navy Theater Wide

The committee continues to support the NTW program and urges the Secretary of Defense to accelerate this important program to the extent permitted by the pace of technological development. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million in PE 63868C to accelerate the NTW SM–3 interceptor.

BMD Technical Operations

The committee continues to support the Army Space and Missile Defense Command's Advanced Research Center (ARC). The ARC provides a valuable tool in support of both theater and national missile defense programs. The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 63874C in support of the ARC.

The committee supports BMDO's efforts to improve missile defense technologies and capabilities against advanced theater ballistic missile threats. One promising area of research is in optical data and sensor fusion for detection and discrimination of advanced threats, missile plumes, and penetration aids using advanced image processing and optical discrimination algorithms. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63874C for BMDO to continue this work.

International Cooperative Programs

The budget request included $117.0 million for BMDO International Cooperative Programs, including $81.2 million for Israeli Cooperative Projects and $35.8 million for the Russian-American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program.

The committee is pleased that the budget request includes funding to support continued acquisition of the Arrow Third Battery. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63875C to initiate the Arrow System Improvement Plan.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has revised the Russian-American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program from its fiscal year 2000 approach to a restructured two-satellite program. The committee understands that this revised program is intended to improve the prospects for technical success with a greater focus on defense objectives, while also protecting sensitive U.S. technology. Under the revised proposal, Russia would build, launch and operate two essentially identical satellites that carry U.S.-built infrared sensors. The U.S. is attempting to devise a plan to place these sensors in tamper-resistant containers and have monitors to ensure proper handling to preclude unauthorized technology transfer.

Although this revised two-satellite program is a significant improvement over the previous two-satellite RAMOS concept, the committee continues to have serious concerns. The committee is concerned that, one year after the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) determined that RAMOS was of marginal benefit to BMDO, the Department now proposes to spend approximately $350.0 million on the development and production of two satellites over the

Future Years Defense Program (FYDP), and that this entire amount is to be paid for by DOD. In contrast, BMDO's core technology program is widely recognized to be under-funded throughout the years of the FYDP. The committee also is not convinced that the United States can provide infrared sensors for integration into Russian-built and launched satellites without compromising this technology or otherwise providing significant technical assistance to Russia to accommodate the integration and proper functioning of the U.S.-built sensors. In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to restore the RAMOS program to the approach presented to Congress in the fiscal year 2000 budget request, which was approved by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Consistent with this approach, the committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in PE 63875C for the RAMOS program.

BMD Targets

The committee continues to support BMDO's effort to develop a theater missile defense surrogate target based on a liquid fuel engine. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63872C to continue this effort.

Bio-defense research

The budget request included $18.6 million for PE 62234D, the Lincoln Laboratory research program. This reflects a 10 percent decrease that has not been explained or substantiated by the Department of Defense. The reduction included in the budget request will have a significant impact on the advanced bio-defense development activities, a project that the Department has extolled as "best in its class". Performance was rated "beyond expectation". The effort is to develop an integrated bio agent detection, identification, and warning sensor system that is smaller, lighter and quicker; the actual target is an integrated system the size of a mailbox.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 62234D to continue the development and demonstration of this bio-defense technology in the vital national security interest.

Hybrid sensor suite

The budget request included no funding in PE 62384BP for a lightweight, man-portable hybrid sensor suite using thin film technology. The committee notes the requirement for a low-power, inexpensive chemical agent detector. Therefore, The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62384BP for a hybrid sensor suite using thin-film technology.

High definition systems

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 62708E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's high definition system program. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that no projects be pursued without an industry cost share.

Three dimensional structures research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62712E for the development, optimization and demonstration of fabrication processes for highly integrated three dimensional microcircuits. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Biological agent sensor technologies

The budget request included $300,000 for combating terrorism technology support to continue to develop aerogel and fiber optic based technologies for chemical and biological collector and detector prototypes that meet the requirements of multiple federal agencies. The committee notes that since calendar year 1997, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has provided an estimated $2.9 million for technology base development of aerogel-based chemical and biological sample collector and sensor systems. The research efforts of DARPA indicate that aerogel properties can be tailored to meet or exceed the requirements of existing and future collector and sensor platforms. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63122D to transition the continued development of aerogel and coupled fiber optic-based biological sensor technologies from the DARPA Biological Defense Program to the Technical Support Working Group support program.

Blast mitigation testing

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63122D, Combating Terrorism Technology Support, to accelerate the testing and certification of blast mitigation effects technology. These funds would allow the Department of Defense to accelerate the testing and analysis of building components and improve building design standards and guidelines for use in new construction applications.

Facial recognition access control technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63122D, Combating Terrorism Technology Support, for facial recognition access control technology. These funds will be used to further the Department of Defense's efforts to develop, test and evaluate this surveillance, identification, and access control technology, and allow prototype development and testing.

Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force detector technologies

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for the Chemical and Biological Individual Sampler (CBIS) or the Small Unit Biological Detector (SUBD) programs. The committee notes the continuing requirement of the Marine Corps for chemical and biological detectors and analyzers in conjunction with the Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force capability requirements. The committee continues to support CBIS and SUBD research and development initiatives and recommends an increase in PE

63384BP of $11.2 million, to be distributed as follows: $2.7 million for the CBIS program to carry forward multiple, mature technologies and allow for operational assessments by the Joint Forces Command; and $8.5 million for the SUBD program to evaluate component detection sensitivity, and to fabricate prototypes.

Consequence Management Information System

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for a Consequence Management Information System. The committee notes the requirement for a program to enable civilian and military incident responders, such as Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams, to access and share selected information for operational planning and execution. The committee supports this initiative and recommends an increase of $6.4 million in PE 63384BP for a Consequence Management Information System.

Reactive materials

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for the evaluation of advanced materials that contain reactive technologies. These technologies have demonstrated the potential to increase protection to the warfighter when incorporated into clothing, tentage, and shelters for defense against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63384BP for the evaluation of advanced materials that contain reactive technologies.

Complex systems design

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63704D to continue the development of the multi-view data standards for integrated digital environment for complex systems design. The Department of Defense currently employs a number of computer-based synthesis and analysis tolls that advance all phases of the life cycle of complex defense systems. From concept design, through development and production, and throughout life cycle ownership of a complex system, these tools have dramatically improved the efficiency and reduced the costs of each discrete phase. However, since each tool employs its own unique data representation and data storage mechanism, there exists, with few exceptions, no substantial interoperability between tools at the semantic level for interchange of similar data structures. This inability to collaborate results in a development process that remains largely manual, with no means for even semi-automated configuration management of the total project design. Congress has expressed strong support of this effort. The committee requires the Department to conduct a review of the project and report back to congressional defense committees on the Department's plan to implement this technology once it is completed.

Competitive sustainment initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62712S for the competitive sustainment initiative. This initiative provides the foundation for forging new, more cooperative links between the Department of Defense and the supply base to eliminate waste and improve the velocity of logistics. The committee directs

that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability at U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM)

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63832D, Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office, for the development and installation of a Weapon of Mass Destruction Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability for the Joint Task Force-Civil Support that was recently established as part of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM). This program will allow USJFCOM, along with government agencies, state, and local authorities, to model chemical, biological or radiological incidents from the initial detection of the attack and initial effects through the medical response to the incident in an integrated, interoperable manner.

Integrated data environment technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63736D for the continuous acquisition life-cycle support initiative's integrated data environment program. This technology addresses the critical issues of life-cycle costs and logistic support for the warfighter. The committee directs that cost sharing for this project be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Demonstration/validation of technology for the remediation of unexploded ordnance at active, inactive, closing, transferred, and transferring ranges

The budget request included $9.0 million for research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) related to the environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance (UXO), $5.0 million for development of UXO technology through the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)(PE 63716D) and $4.0 million for demonstration/validation through the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP)(PE 63851D). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in ESTCP (PE 63851D) for demonstration/validation of UXO remediation technology.

The committee has previously expressed concern (S. Rept. 106–50) about the lack of focus or support in the Department of Defense (DOD) RDT&E base for UXO remediation. Based on information provided to the committee, it is evident that increased emphasis in this area is absolutely essential, particularly for demonstration/validation of technology that has been developed through SERDP and other DOD programs. It is the committee's expectation that the increased funding will be used for the demonstration/validation of viable, cost effective solutions that will help the military departments meet the extraordinary challenge of UXO remediation at active, inactive, closed, transferred, and transferring ranges. Moreover, the committee intends that ESTCP shall establish performance measures for UXO remediation technologies in order to determine the resulting level of implementation within the DOD.

Next generation anthrax vaccine

The budget request included $400,000 in PE 64384BP for a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare agent anthrax. The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 64384BP for continued research and development of a recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

The U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) developed a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare agent anthrax in 1995. The committee notes that the vaccine currently utilized by the Department of Defense in the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP) was licensed in 1970 and has been certified as safe and effective by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The committee is concerned that there is inadequate support for continued research and development of a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological agent anthrax and provides additional funding for this effort.

Remote Ordnance Neutralization System

The budget request included $11.6 million for the Joint Robotics Program, PE 64709D. The committee recommends an increase of $1.6 million in PE 64709D to develop and test improvements to the Remote Ordnance Neutralization System (RONS). These funds would allow the Department of Defense to upgrade RONS to a digital system and improve operator interface capabilities.

Cyber attack sensing and warning

The committee is aware of efforts being undertaken by the Department of Defense to develop technologies to detect and respond to cyber attacks on the defense information infrastructure. To support the development and deployment of such sensors, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 33140G.

Information Operations Technology Center

The committee strongly supports the efforts by the Information Operations Technology Center (IOTC) to develop information operations/information warfare tools. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140G to support these important efforts by the IOTC.

Trusted RUBIX

The budget request included no funding to complete evaluation of the Trusted RUBIX multilevel security database guard. The committee recommends an increase of $1.8 million in PE 33140G for evaluation and certification of the Trusted RUBIX information system security technology for interface with multilevel security software.

Virtual worlds initiative

The U.S. Special Operations Command has developed a program for integrating various sources of imagery and other information into three-dimensional products to support special operations forces. In order to support development of a scene generation data-

base and other elements of the Virtual Worlds Initiative, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 34210BB.

Intelligent spatial technologies for smart mapping systems

The committee recognizes the importance and technological challenges involved in developing intelligent spatial technologies for military applications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in the advanced research and development component of PE 35102BQ for intelligent spatial technology development in spatio-temporal database research for smart maps.

Joint Mapping Tool Kit

The committee continues to support the development of the Joint Mapping Tool Kit (JMTK) by the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA). The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35102BQ for continued development of the JMTK and the NIMA viewer.

Information assurance testbed

The budget request included no funding to support the Information Assurance Testbed. Section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) established an Information Assurance Testbed within the Department of Defense (DOD) to facilitate simulations, wargames, exercises and experiments in the area of information assurance and information warfare. The Testbed was also intended to provide an organizational structure with which DOD could interact with other departments and agencies and with the private sector on matters related to cyber security and cyber threats. The committee continues to support this important effort. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35190D to support the Testbed.

Joint course of action analysis and targeting support for information operations

The committee supports the Secretary of Defense's efforts to coordinate and de-conflict activities in the Department of Defense in the area of information operations (IO). The joint course of action analysis and targeting support for IO (JCOATS–IO) program is intended to establish a centralized process for IO-based capabilities. To support this important initiative, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35190D.

Advanced lightweight grenade launcher

The budget request included $87.1 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Operational Enhancements. The committee recommends an increase of $5.6 million in SOF Operational Force Enhancements (PE 1160408BB) to fund the continued research and development of the advanced lightweight grenade launcher.

Management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers

Congress has addressed the issue of management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers twice in the last two years.

Section 907 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) required the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive review of the management of the test and evaluation centers. Section 907 specifically required the Secretary to develop a plan, including a schedule for establishing a cost-based management information system for the test and evaluation centers. The statement of managers on the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–301) added the requirement that the Department report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of financing test and evaluation facilities through a working capital fund.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not yet submitted the plan and schedule required by section 907 or the report required by the statement of managers. The committee directs the Department to ensure that these requirements are fully implemented in a timely manner. In particular, the committee understands that the Department has developed a cost-based information system for use by the major range test facilities base (MRTFB). In accordance with the requirements of section 907, the Department should develop a schedule to implement this system for all test and evaluation centers and to ensure that the data collected by this system is actively used to make management and investment decisions.

The committee is also aware of certain cases in which developmental testing has been conducted outside the Department's test and evaluation base to reduce program costs. The committee directs the Department to review these decisions and ensure that the quality and integrity of the testing program has not been compromised by these cost-cutting decisions.

Furthermore, the committee has serious concerns with the budget request for the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program (CTEIP). CTEIP provides critical test and evaluation capabilities for joint and multi-service system test requirements. In this role, CTEIP provides a corporate means to leverage test investments for the services and defense agencies. This year funding decreased even though the Annual Report of the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation for 1999 stated the clear and pressing need for new investments in the test and evaluation infrastructure, ". . . with its emphasis on such efforts as improving and test efficiencies, promoting increased use of modeling and simulation, creating common instrumentation, and developing capabilities for test information systems, the CTEIP is clearly focused on developing the test capabilities we will require to meet the test challenges of the next century."

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64940D to be applied to critical upgrades at the defense test and evaluation facilities as determined by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). The committee directs that the ad-

ditional funds be awarded in accordance with the standards provided in the assessment of the centers from the MRTFB criteria. The DOT&E should report back to committee on the allocation of such funds and the criteria used to determine the recipients.

Augmented reality fire-fighting training

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 65131D for augmented reality fire-fighting training. Augmented reality is the use of live and virtual (computer generated) objects. The current project has demonstrated the basic technology in a multi-room office environment. This follow-on would focus on a shipboard system that would allow the actual crew to train in the actual environment during a deployment. The Live Fire Test and Evaluation Office is chartered with ensuring timely and accurate assessments of system survivability, vulnerability, and munitions effectiveness of weapons systems. One of the leading causes of casualties, in wartime or peace, is fire or fire effects. Evaluation of the training of ship crews under realistic combat emergency conditions is of critical importance to total ship survivability assessments.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Aircraft carrier modernization

The Navy is acquiring the next nuclear powered aircraft carrier in the Nimitz-class, the CVN–77. In order to reduce the total operational cost and improve system capability, the Navy intends to rely on the contractor team to provide total systems integration effort for the combat system, a function that has previously been managed by the Department of the Navy. The Navy believes that this approach will take advantage of commercial-based design to improve overall capability.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is conducting a review of the process by which we acquire electronic warfare programs. This review has been generated because of the Department's repeated experience of cost, schedule and technical problems associated with such acquisitions.

The committee believes that the Department of the Navy should apply appropriate lessons derived from this on-going study to the aircraft carrier program. In particular, the committee believes that the Navy should give due consideration to risk, cost, and benefit of newer electronic warfare systems compared to other alternatives.

Advanced ship hull demonstrators

The budget request included no funding in PE 63792N for advanced ship hull demonstrators. However, within PE 64300N and PE 64558N, both destroyer and submarine hull designs are being tested.

Tactics and operational concepts for littoral operations from the sea continue to evolve. The introduction of new capabilities requires the review of both strategic and tactical doctrine. Although it is not feasible to build a full scale prototype test vehicle for the many advanced hull designs proposed to the Navy, the Navy should leverage investments in advanced hull designs made by other entities including those of allied/foreign navies.

Rapid evaluation of advanced hull design tactical and strategic advantages should provide the Navy with valuable information for the development of operational concepts and tactics.

The committee is encouraged by Navy War College innovative concepts for applying available and future ship capabilities to influence both strategic and tactical operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends the Navy demonstrate capabilities inherent in advanced hulls where those capabilities have the potential to provide valuable insights for use in modeling, simulation, war gaming, operational concept development, and ship construction. In addition, the committee encourages the Navy to take advantage of authority previously provided to them, by including the use of advanced hull designs in joint and combined exercises, as well as fleet battle experiments.

Crusader

The committee noted with interest decisions made by the Secretary of the Army to restructure the Crusader artillery system development program. The committee has supported efforts to develop and field this next generation system to fully modernize a heavy corps, and is concerned that adjustments made to the program appear to make this outcome unlikely. The committee understands the Chief of Staff has directed the program manager to determine the feasibility of producing a 40-ton system that will be easier to deploy but just as operationally capable as the existing concept. While the notion of lightening this system is admirable, this action will further delay any potential fielding of a system that has been in development for more than a decade. Most troubling is the revised schedule that now calls for a production decision to be delayed until the first quarter of fiscal year 2009. The committee does not understand how this delayed program fits with efforts to field an objective force, with common platforms, in the fiscal year 2012 time frame. The committee directs the Army to provide a report, by March 1, 2001, that describes how the current development and acquisition strategy for Crusader will fit with efforts designed to field the objective force described in the Army transformation initiative.

Future ship technology research and development

The budget request includes significant investments in future ship research and development. These investments are key to ensuring future ships have the technology required to maintain a war fighting advantage. In addition, some technologies may lower operating and construction costs. The Navy is encouraged to review the following technologies which have the potential to provide a technological edge and/or reduce life-cycle costs for future ships:

(1) applying multi-purpose processor technology to advanced integrated electronic warfare systems;

(2) developing a battle force tactical trainer with an upgraded personal computer system;

(3) modernizing aircraft carrier design software;

(4) pursuing advanced hull, mechanical, and engineering development of integrated topside structures and reduced ship signatures;

(5) emphasizing total ship engineering for enhanced damage control and survivability;

(6) modifying surface ship sonars for advanced mine detection;

(7) developing a damage control action management system;

(8) reviewing life-cycle cost benefits of an inter-cooled recuperated gas turbine engine;

(9) commercial off the shelf desktop computers which are capable of processing both secure information and unclassified data;

(10) wireless, low power level onboard and off-board personnel tracking and monitoring device with applications for shore material tracking;

(11) developing interfaces between Navy legacy human resources systems and the Global Combat Support System; and

(12) developing business process re-engineering of legacy Navy and Naval Reserve personnel systems.

Joint training and experimentation

The committee has noted with great interest the ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) to establish the organizational and procedural mechanisms to promulgate doctrine, concepts, and requirements for joint military operations. The establishment of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) on October 1, 1999 was a major milestone on this path.

The steps taken by USJFCOM to date are promising. The joint experimentation program is underway. The Joint Warfighting Center continues to make progress in standardizing joint training and procedures across the entire force. The federation of the various service and defense agency battle labs to eliminate unnecessary duplication and provide a unifying vision for future efforts was especially notable.

In its December 1997 report on the Quadrennial Defense Review, the National Defense Panel recommended the establishment of a joint national training center. Other official and independent studies have made similar recommendations to make use of the capabilities of the existing training centers, e.g., Joint Readiness Training Center, National Training Center, Nellis Air Force Base, 29 Palms, and the San Diego Navy training facilities, for joint training and concept development. During his testimony before the committee on March 1, 2000, General James Jones, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, stated that the Marine Corps and Army were discussing the possibility of physically joining the 29 Palms Training Center and the Army National Training Center at Fort Irwin, CA.

Such proposals appear to have great merit and potential for further enhancing joint training and experimentation. While each service clearly has specific core competencies it must train to at its own centers, the benefits that would accrue from having a joint organization that monitors and leverages these training activities for future joint concept development and periodically coordinated joint training and experimentation activities seem compelling.

The committee directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2001, containing an assessment of the advisability and feasibility of establishing a joint national training center. The report shall include a summary of actions taken, planned or under consideration regarding the establishment of such a center.

Joint operational test bed system

The Commander, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) intends to establish a joint operational test bed system (JOTBS) to conduct joint interoperability testing and experimentation. The committee understands that, under the current plan, JFCOM intends to demonstrate interoperability of Predator unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the tactical control system (TCS). The committee encourages JFCOM to continue this JOTBS activity and other efforts to continue fulfilling its mandate for ensuring interoperability among various services' systems. The committee also encourages the services to provide appropriate assistance to JFCOM to continue these efforts.

Maritime patrol aircraft

The committee is concerned about the overall state of maritime patrol and reconnaissance forces. The recent cancellation of the P–3 sustained readiness program is cause for concern about the age and condition of these aircraft, and whether there will be sufficient assets to meet unified and fleet commander in chief requirements. Insufficient funding of capability upgrade programs for the P–3, such as anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) and the block modification upgrade, further exacerbates the problem by causing over-utilization of the limited numbers of aircraft with these modifications. The capability of AIP-equipped P–3s was demonstrated in Operation Allied Force with the destruction of multiple targets with standoff land attack missiles.

The committee is aware of the recent acquisition decision by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, which approved entry into concept exploration of the multi-mission maritime aircraft (MMA) and directed an analysis of alternatives for such a program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, which outlines the current status of the MMA concept exploration, to include the impact of funding requested in the fiscal year 2002 budget request to prevent near-term shortfalls in this critical mission area.

Patriot theater missile defense

The committee notes that Patriot is the first system that the United States has deployed specifically to counter theater ballistic missile threats, and is evolving toward significantly improved capabilities with the PAC–3 system. The Army currently has almost 3,000 Patriot PAC–2 missiles deployed and has recently commenced low-rate production of the Patriot PAC–3 missile. The Army is planning to upgrade approximately 1,500 PAC–2 missiles into the Guidance Enhanced Missile Plus (GEM+) configuration by fiscal year 2005. The Army has also invested significant resources

in the development of the Patriot Anti-Cruise Missile (PACM) upgrade to PAC–2. At the same time, the Army and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) are seeking to reduce the per-unit cost of the PAC–3 missile. To be successful, BMDO will have to increase the production rate for the PAC–3 missile. Further complicating the dilemma regarding the Patriot force composition and funding priorities is the fact that the Army has recently discovered a number of technical problems associated with the fielded Patriot inventory. Therefore, the Army and BMDO need to balance the needs of the existing PAC–2 force with those of the future PAC–3 force. The committee strongly supports both the GEM+ and PAC–3 programs and directs the Secretary of the Army and the Director of BMDO to develop an investment strategy that properly balances the need to upgrade the PAC–2 system and accelerate deployment of PAC–3.

Prophylactic pharmaceuticals

Many life-threatening diseases today are treated by multiple drug efforts that can include vaccines. The committee notes the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to procure a vaccine and develop a second generation vaccine to protect service personnel against the biological agent anthrax. Relying on a single medical approach strategy rather than multiple drug therapies may expose protection efforts to undue risk should a vaccine procurement or development effort fail. Relying on a single medical approach may also deny service personnel the full range of modern pharmaceutical treatment that may be available from the medical research community.

The committee is aware of medical research involving synthetic compounds which inhibit the anthrax enzyme NAD Sythetase. Application of this synthetic compound could possibly be developed into a man-made prophylactic pharmaceutical to protect against exposure to anthrax and cure post-infection exposure.

The committee supports efforts to explore a multi-tiered medical approach to defending military service members against biological agents. The committee directs the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) to report to the congressional defense committees the results of a cost-benefit analysis of a prophylactic pharmaceutical development program that is based on current medical research to develop synthetic compounds that inhibit the anthrax enzyme NAD Sythetase. USAMRIID will also report on the funding requirement to fully develop this research into a prophylactic pharmaceutical. The development program will have the following goals: (1) to develop synthetic pharmaceutical compounds that can be taken prophylactically immediately before exposure to anthrax spores and offer additional post-exposure protection against the germinating spore for non-vaccinated personnel; and (2) to develop a novel mechanism of action-based drugs that would kill the infectious anthrax bacteria whether it was a natural strain or a genetically engineered strain.

Radiation hardened electronics investment strategy

The committee strongly supports the Secretary of Defense's establishment of a Radiation Hardened Oversight Council and other

initiatives to ensure the availability of radiation hardened microelectronic components to meet the Department of Defense's unique requirements for future national security systems. The investment strategy directed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, would ensure adequate funding to meet science and technology, engineering, and production needs from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2005. The committee supports this strategy and urges the military departments and defense agencies to support the investment strategy goals.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of the Radiation Hardened Electronics Investment Strategy, including the degree to which the relevant military departments and defense agencies are fulfilling their directed investment goals.

Small arms fire control system

The committee notes with great interest progress made to date in developing the small arms fire control system (SAFCS). This lightweight, automated, optical sight system greatly enhances the accuracy of fire for both the Mark 19 grenade launcher and the M2 .50 caliber machine gun. The committee was pleased to note that the Army has recognized the critical role this system can play in ground combat operations and has requested the funding necessary to continue the development of this system. The committee encourages the Army to complete the development of SAFCS as soon as is practical and begin a robust procurement program to enhance the ability of our ground forces to fight and win decisively.

Transition of successful research projects into the acquisition system

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has a long history of successfully providing innovative technologies and revolutionary warfighting systems concepts to the services. In recent years, DARPA has worked closely with the services to identify areas of opportunity and technological needs where DARPA can play an effective role. Unfortunately, the percentage of DARPA initiatives transitioned to the services continues to be relatively low. In some cases, this transition problem appears to be attributable to the rapid pace of technological developments and the comparatively slow pace of the acquisition system. As a result, a research program may be successfully completed before the money is available, leaving a budget gap that adversely affects the program.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review this problem and report to the congressional defense committees not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act on alternative approaches to ensuring that successful research initiatives are fielded in a timely manner. The review should consider possible changes to the acquisition and budgeting systems, including, but not limited to, the development of a transition opportunity fund that would provide the Department greater flexibility to take advantage of rapidly developing technology.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE III			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS			
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,123,731	(95,200)	19,028,531
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,300,154	(46,000)	23,254,154
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,705,658	40,900	2,746,558
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,346,977	42,100	22,389,077
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,920,069	53,500	11,973,569
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,521,418	5,000	1,526,418
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	960,946	5,000	965,946
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	133,959	5,000	138,959
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,182,335	40,000	3,222,335
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,446,375	4,500	3,450,875
Office of the Inspector General	144,245	0	144,245
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	0	8,574
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	0	389,932
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	0	294,038
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	0	376,300
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	23,412	0	23,412
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	186,499	0	186,499
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	836,300	9,000	845,300
Defense Health Program	11,310,423	91,300	11,401,723

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	458,400	0	458,400
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	64,900	(9,500)	55,400
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	25,000	0	25,000
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	4,100,577	0	4,100,577
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	108,746,081	150,600	108,896,681
REVOLVING FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Fund	916,276	0	916,276
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	0	388,158
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)	0	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)	0	0	0
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	1,154,434	0	1,154,434
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	109,900,515	150,600.0	110,051,115

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**3,330,899**	**60,000**	**3,390,899**
010 DIVISIONS	1,174,856	-	1,194,856
Corrosion Control		10,000	
Battlefield Mobility Enhancement System		10,000	
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	321,297	-	321,297
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	350,844	-	390,844
Aviations Spares		40,000	
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	503,390	-	503,390
050 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	980,512	-	980,512
LAND FORCES READINESS	**2,370,841**	**-**	**2,370,841**
060 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,144,565	-	1,144,565
070 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	531,614	-	531,614
080 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	694,662	-	694,662
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**3,879,341**	**95,000**	**3,974,341**
090 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (OPERATING FORCES)	2,698,913	-	2,698,913
100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OPERATING FORCES)	916,378	95,000	1,011,378
110 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	131,042	-	131,042

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	82,388	-	82,388
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	50,620	-	50,620
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**9,581,081**	**155,000**	**9,736,081**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS		**526,913**	**5,000**	**531,913**
140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	309,219	-	309,219
150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	130,471	-	130,471
160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	66,557	-	66,557
170	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (MOBILITY OPERATIONS)	20,666	5,000	25,666
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**526,913**	**5,000**	**531,913**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**364,026**	**5,000**	**369,026**
180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	73,963	-	73,963
190	RECRUIT TRAINING	15,728	-	15,728
200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	14,618	-	14,618
210	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	134,581	-	134,581
220	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (ACCESSION TRAINING)	75,468	-	75,468
230	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACCESSION TRAINING)	49,668	5,000	54,668

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING		**2,193,890**	**60,000**	**2,253,890**
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	242,799	-	242,799
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	323,414	-	323,414
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	100,260	-	100,260
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	417,639	-	467,639
	Range Upgrade		50,000	
280	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	845,136	-	845,136
290	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	264,642	10,000	274,642
RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING		**895,653**	**3,000**	**898,653**
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	385,251	-	385,251
310	EXAMINING	77,700	-	77,700
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,629	-	87,629
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,207	-	79,207
340	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	77,491	3,000	80,491
350	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (RECRUIT/OTHER TRAINING)	188,375	-	188,375
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**3,453,569**	**68,000**	**3,521,569**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**472,588**	**-**	**472,588**
360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	472,588	-	472,588

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS		**1,551,090**	**-**	**1,551,090**
370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	488,831	-	488,831
380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	365,993	-	365,993
390	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	356,748	-	356,748
400	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	339,518	-	339,518
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**3,289,407**	**6,500**	**3,295,907**
410	ADMINISTRATION	327,113	-	327,113
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	466,906	-	466,906
430	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	164,992	-	164,992
440	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	154,893	-	154,893
450	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	739,315	-	739,315
460	ARMY CLAIMS	112,851	-	112,851
470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	69,439	-	69,439
480	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	1,076,077	-	1,077,577
	Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness		1,500	
490	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	177,821	5,000	182,821
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS		**249,083**	**-**	**249,083**
500	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	194,381	-	194,381
510	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	54,702	-	54,702
520	EXPANSION OF NATO	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,562,168**	**6,500**	**5,568,668**
UNDISTRIBUTED:			
Civilian Under-execution		(4,600)	
Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(40,500)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(292,100)	
WMD-CST		7,500	
TOTAL		**(329,700)**	**(329,700)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**19,123,731**	**(95,200)**	**19,028,531**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS	**4,267,564**	**157,000**	**4,424,564**
010 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,636,230	-	2,793,230
Aviation Spares		75,000	
TACAMO Spares		82,000	
020 FLEET AIR TRAINING	798,956	-	798,956
030 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	59,407	-	59,407

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	102,182	-	102,182
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	648,745	-	648,745
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,044	-	22,044
SHIP OPERATIONS		**6,334,227**	**312,300**	**6,646,527**
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,237,075	-	2,312,075
	Spares		75,000	
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	539,919	-	539,919
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	393,478	-	393,478
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,113,052	143,300	2,350,352
	AOE Maintenance		40,000	
	LHA Midlife		32,000	
	BMB Maintenance		22,000	
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,703	-	1,050,703
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT		**1,667,580**	**7,000**	**1,674,580**
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	371,080	-	371,080
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	16,452	-	16,452
140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	167,779	-	167,779
150	WARFARE TACTICS	141,835	-	141,835
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	257,981	7,000	264,981
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	548,600	-	548,600

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	163,062	-	163,062
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	791	-	791
WEAPONS SUPPORT		**1,386,942**	**-**	**1,386,942**
200	CRUISE MISSILE	139,779	-	139,779
210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	816,722	-	816,722
220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	48,635	-	48,635
230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	381,806	-	381,806
WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT		**19,100**	**-**	**19,100**
240	NWCF SUPPORT	19,100	-	19,100
BASE SUPPORT		**3,017,265**	**150,000**	**3,167,265**
250	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	866,050	150,000	1,016,050
260	BASE SUPPORT	2,151,215	-	2,151,215
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**16,692,678**	**626,300**	**17,318,978**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES		**428,418**	**-**	**428,418**
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	428,418	-	428,418
ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS		**196,403**	**-**	**196,403**
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,939	-	2,939
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	193,464	-	193,464

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS		**44,113**	**-**	**44,113**
300	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,707	-	23,707
310	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,112	-	1,112
320	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	19,294	-	19,294
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**668,934**	**-**	**668,934**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**174,633**	**-**	**174,633**
330	OFFICER ACQUISITION	90,121	-	90,121
340	RECRUIT TRAINING	6,594	-	6,594
350	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,918	-	77,918
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		**913,264**	**29,300**	**942,564**
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	276,861	-	281,161
	NULKA Training		4,300	
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	342,553	-	342,553
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	107,625	-	107,625
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	186,225	-	211,225
	Range Upgrades		25,000	
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION		**354,956**	**3,000**	**357,956**
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	180,737	-	180,737

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	86,613	-	86,613
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	56,234	-	56,234
430	JUNIOR ROTC	31,372	3,000	34,372
BASE SUPPORT		**522,786**	**15,000**	**537,786**
440	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	198,071	15,000	213,071
450	BASE SUPPORT	324,715	-	324,715
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**1,965,639**	**47,300**	**2,012,939**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**1,346,099**	**-**	**1,346,099**
460	ADMINISTRATION	618,145	-	618,145
470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	19,987	-	19,987
480	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	114,660	-	114,660
490	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	97,812	-	97,812
500	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	187,270	-	187,270
510	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	308,225	-	308,225
520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0	-	0
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT		**1,728,826**	**-**	**1,728,826**
530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,105	-	186,105
540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
550	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	355,482	-	355,482
560	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	721,560	-	721,560
570	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	303,087	-	303,087
580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	61,092	-	61,092
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	47,240	-	47,240
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	54,260	-	54,260
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**622,854**	**-**	**622,854**
610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	622,854	-	622,854
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS		**8,508**	**-**	**8,508**
620	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,508	-	8,508
BASE SUPPORT		**266,616**	**15,000**	**281,616**
630	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	109,485	15,000	124,485
640	BASE SUPPORT	157,131	-	157,131
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS		**0**	**-**	**0**
650	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	0	-	0
PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS		**0**	**-**	**0**
660	PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**3,972,903**	**15,000**	**3,987,903**

UNDISTRIBUTED:

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
Civilian Under-execution		(53,800)	
Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(585,700)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(105,100)	
MTAPP		2,000	
Call Center		3,000	
Information Technology Center		5,000	
TOTAL		**(734,600)**	**(734,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**23,300,154**	**(46,000)**	**23,254,154**
OPERATIONAS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	**1,908,545**	**63,700**	**1,972,245**
010 OPERATIONAL FORCES	420,702	-	443,802
Initial Issue		23,100	
020 FIELD LOGISTICS	235,561	-	235,561
030 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,194	33,100	137,794
Corrosion Control		7,500	
040 BASE SUPPORT	760,299	-	760,299

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
050	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	394,789	-	394,789
USMC PREPOSITIONING		**86,281**	**-**	**86,281**
060	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	82,390	-	82,390
070	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,891	-	3,891
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**1,994,826**	**63,700**	**2,058,526**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**86,386**	**-**	**86,386**
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,655	-	10,655
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	300	-	300
100	BASE SUPPORT	55,649	-	55,649
110	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	19,782	-	19,782
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		**205,972**	**-**	**205,972**
120	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	32,975	-	32,975
130	FLIGHT TRAINING	166	-	166
140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,704	-	8,704
150	TRAINING SUPPORT	84,417	-	84,417
160	BASE SUPPORT	50,948	-	50,948
170	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	28,762	-	28,762
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION		**140,518**	**3,000**	**143,518**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	100,001	-	100,001
190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	17,961	-	17,961
200	JUNIOR ROTC	11,917	3,000	14,917
210	BASE SUPPORT	8,006	-	8,006
220	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,633	-	2,633
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**432,876**	**3,000**	**435,876**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**277,956**	**-**	**277,956**
230	SPECIAL SUPPORT	204,293	-	204,293
240	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	31,414	-	31,414
250	ADMINISTRATION	25,811	-	25,811
260	BASE SUPPORT	14,157	-	14,157
270	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,281	-	2,281
CANCELLED ACCOUNT		**0**	**-**	**0**
280	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**277,956**	**-**	**277,956**
	UNDISTRIBUTED:			
	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		**(25,800)**	

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL		(25,800)	(25,800)
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,705,658**	**40,900**	**2,746,558**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR FORCE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS	**8,673,688**	**100,000**	**8,773,688**
010 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,363,665	-	2,363,665
020 PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	306,379	-	306,379
030 COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	205,101	-	205,101
040 AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	774,341	-	774,341
050 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,341,224	-	1,341,224
060 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,093,924	-	1,093,924
070 BASE SUPPORT	1,849,247	100,000	1,949,247
080 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	739,807	-	739,807
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	**1,536,955**	**-**	**1,536,955**
090 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	680,464	-	680,464
100 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	154,153	-	154,153
110 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	280,971	-	280,971

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
120	JCS EXERCISES	37,052	-	37,052
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	124,998	-	124,998
140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	259,317	-	259,317
SPACE OPERATIONS		**1,279,808**	**-**	**1,279,808**
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	234,395	-	234,395
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	116,766	-	116,766
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	248,564	-	248,564
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	53,473	-	53,473
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	114,729	-	114,729
200	BASE SUPPORT	377,605	-	377,605
210	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	134,276	-	134,276
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**11,490,451**	**100,000**	**11,590,451**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS		**3,159,544**	**44,700**	**3,204,244**
220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,653,084	-	1,653,084
230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	37,961	-	37,961
240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	146,133	-	146,133
250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	305,244	-	305,244
260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	429,775	-	429,775

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
270	BASE SUPPORT	466,832	44,700	511,532
280	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	120,515	-	120,515
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**3,159,544**	**44,700**	**3,204,244**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**266,841**	**-**	**266,841**
290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	68,142	-	68,142
300	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,302	-	4,302
310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	61,522	-	61,522
320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	68,220	-	68,220
330	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACADEMIES ONLY)	64,655	-	64,655
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		**1,669,169**	**-**	**1,669,169**
340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	256,003	-	256,003
350	FLIGHT TRAINING	618,293	-	618,293
360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	109,263	-	109,263
370	TRAINING SUPPORT	75,599	-	75,599
380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,626	-	11,626
390	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	471,268	-	471,268
400	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OTHER TRAINING)	127,117	-	127,117
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION		**305,491**	**3,000**	**308,491**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	113,524	-	113,524
420	EXAMINING	3,483	-	3,483
430	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,032	-	87,032
440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	69,633	-	69,633
450	JUNIOR ROTC	31,819	3,000	34,819
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**2,241,501**	**3,000**	**2,244,501**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS		**3,131,611**	**75,000**	**3,206,611**
460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	985,411	-	1,060,411
	Readiness Spares Packages		75,000	
470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	396,144	-	396,144
480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	222,395	-	222,395
490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	55,398	-	55,398
500	BASE SUPPORT	1,131,172	-	1,131,172
510	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	341,091	-	341,091
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**1,624,374**	**-**	**1,624,374**
520	ADMINISTRATION	153,206	-	153,206
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	322,654	-	322,654
540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	146,783	-	146,783

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	59,073	-	59,073
560	ARMS CONTROL	41,094	-	41,094
570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	590,249	-	590,249
580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	35,109	-	35,109
590	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,917	-	13,917
600	BASE SUPPORT	237,050	-	237,050
610	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	25,239	-	25,239
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**685,834**	**-**	**685,834**
620	SECURITY PROGRAMS	685,834	-	685,834
SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS		**13,662**	**-**	**13,662**
630	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	13,662	-	13,662
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**5,455,481**	**75,000**	**5,530,481**
	UNDISTRIBUTED:			
	Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(52,200)	
	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(157,600)	
	NBC Sustainment		29,200	
	TOTAL		**(180,600)**	**(180,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR FORCE		**22,346,977**	**42,100**	**22,389,077**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
010 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	396,489	-	446,489
Mobility Enhancements		50,000	
020 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,263,572	-	1,263,572
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,660,061**	**50,000**	**1,710,061**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
030 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	45,677	-	45,677
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**45,677**	**-**	**45,677**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
040 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	10,999	-	10,999
050 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,331	2,000	102,331
060 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	15,354	-	15,354
070 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	78,299	-	78,299
080 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,445	-	7,445
090 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,089	-	1,089

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
100	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	49,158	-	49,158
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**262,675**	**2,000**	**264,675**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
110	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	94,525	-	94,525
120	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	88,431	-	88,431
130	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,207,597	-	4,207,597
140	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (FY 98/99)	0	-	0
150	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (NO YEAR)	0	-	0
160	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	348,658	-	348,658
170	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,416	-	1,416
180	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	184,856	-	184,856
190	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	755,197	-	755,197
200	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	12,596	-	12,596
210	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,143,496	-	1,144,696
	MOCAS Enhancements		1,200	
220	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,827	-	14,827
230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	67,598	-	64,498
	Partnership for Peace		(3,100)	
240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	126,929	-	126,929

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
250	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	215,624	-	215,624
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,434,204	-	1,434,204
270	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	157,883	-	157,883
280	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	22,495	-	22,495
290	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	417,126	-	437,126
	Joint Spectrum Center Data Base Upgrade		25,000	
	Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management		(5,000)	
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	0	-	0
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	43,864	-	43,864
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	299,334	-	299,334
330	NATURAL DISASTERS	0	-	0
340	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	315,000	-	315,000
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**9,951,656**	**18,100**	**9,969,756**

UNDISTRIBUTED:		
Civilian Under-execution	(27,500)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation	(27,200)	
Legacy	6,100	
Defense Travel System	(20,000)	
Information Security Scholarship Program	20,000	

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
Command Information Superiority Architecture		2,000	
Information Protection Research Institute		10,000	
IMPACT AID		20,000	
TOTAL		**(16,600)**	**(16,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**11,920,069**	**53,500**	**11,973,569**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**680,318**	**-**	**680,318**
010 DIVISION FORCES	9,921	-	9,921
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	22,544	-	22,544
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	218,697	-	218,697
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	103,347	-	103,347
050 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	325,809	-	325,809
LAND FORCES READINESS	**211,288**	**5,000**	**216,288**
060 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	129,020	-	129,020
070 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	35,501	-	35,501
080 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	46,767	5,000	51,767

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**461,815**	**-**	**461,815**
090 BASE SUPPORT	345,771	-	345,771
100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	114,704	-	114,704
110 UNIFIED COMMANDS	0	-	0
120 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,340	-	1,340
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,353,421**	**5,000**	**1,358,421**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130 ADMINISTRATION	34,708	-	34,708
140 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	22,482	-	22,482
150 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	41,594	-	41,594
160 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	69,213	-	69,213
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**167,997**	**-**	**167,997**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**1,521,418**	**5,000**	**1,526,418**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS		**478,297**	**-**	**478,297**
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	355,803	-	355,803
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	0	-	0
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,381	-	17,381
040	AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,384	-	3,384
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	101,391	-	101,391
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	338	-	338
RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS		**130,106**	**5,000**	**135,106**
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	48,182	-	48,182
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	621	-	621
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	11,207	-	11,207
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	68,721	5,000	73,721
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,375	-	1,375
RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT		**34,850**	**-**	**34,850**
120	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	34,850	-	34,850
RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT		**5,436**	**-**	**5,436**
130	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,436	-	5,436
BASE SUPPORT		**206,409**	**-**	**206,409**
140	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	63,728	-	63,728
150	BASE SUPPORT	142,681	-	142,681

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**855,098**	**5,000**	**860,098**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**105,848**	**-**	**105,848**
160 ADMINISTRATION	7,004	-	7,004
170 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,847	-	1,847
180 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	27,713	-	27,713
190 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	63,070	-	63,070
200 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,566	-	5,566
210 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	648	-	648
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	**0**	**-**	**0**
220 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	0	-	0
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	**0**	**-**	**0**
230 CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**105,848**	**-**	**105,848**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**960,946**	**5,000**	**965,946**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
MISSION FORCES			
010 TRAINING	17,938	-	17,938
020 OPERATING FORCES	46,561	-	46,561
030 BASE SUPPORT	17,024	-	17,024
040 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	8,330	-	8,330
050 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	9,014	5,000	14,014
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**98,867**	**5,000**	**103,867**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,907	-	7,907
070 SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,317	-	11,317
080 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	484	-	484
090 ADMINISTRATION	7,628	-	7,628
100 BASE SUPPORT	7,756	-	7,756
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**35,092**	**-**	**35,092**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**133,959**	**5,000**	**138,959**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
010 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,199,990	-	1,199,990
020 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	49,309	-	49,309
030 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	281,177	5,000	286,177
040 BASE SUPPORT	224,138	-	224,138
050 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	45,661	-	45,661
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,800,275**	**5,000**	**1,805,275**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060 ADMINISTRATION	47,817	-	47,817
070 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,094	-	20,094
080 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,562	-	10,562
090 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,457	-	6,457
100 AUDIOVISUAL	654	-	654
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**85,584**	**-**	**85,584**

Title III
Operation Maintenance
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**1,885,859**	**5,000**	**1,890,859**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**1,639,496**	**20,000**	**1,659,496**
010 DIVISIONS	420,846	-	440,846
Initial Issue		20,000	
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	743,303	-	743,303
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	192,504	-	192,504
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	184,399	-	184,399
050 LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	98,444	-	98,444
LAND FORCES READINESS	**262,419**	**-**	**262,419**
060 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	72,247	-	72,247
070 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	190,172	-	190,172
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**1,085,439**	**20,000**	**1,105,439**
080 BASE OPERATIONS	460,632	-	460,632
090 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	202,431	20,000	222,431
100 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	422,376	-	422,376
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,987,354**	**40,000**	**3,027,354**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
110 STAFF MANAGEMENT	73,993	-	73,993
120 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	20,115	-	20,115
130 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	33,627	-	33,627
140 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	67,246	-	67,246
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**194,981**	**-**	**194,981**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**3,182,335**	**40,000**	**3,222,335**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
010 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,216,504	-	2,216,504
020 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	368,761	-	373,261
Distribution Mission Training		4,500	
030 BASE SUPPORT	291,414	-	291,414
040 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	104,385	-	104,385

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	452,932	-	452,932
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**3,433,996**	**4,500**	**3,438,496**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	2,668	-	2,668
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,711	-	9,711
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**12,379**	**-**	**12,379**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		**3,446,375**	**4,500**	**3,450,875**
TRANSFER ACCOUNTS				
10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	389,932	-	389,932
20	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	294,038	-	294,038
30	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	376,300	-	376,300
40	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,412	-	23,412
50	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	186,499	-	186,499
60	DRUG INTERDICTION	836,300	9,000	845,300
70	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	4,100,577	-	4,100,577
80	PENTAGON RENOVATION	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS		**6,207,058**	**9,000**	**6,216,058**
MISCELLANEOUS				
90	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	11,310,423	98,000	11,401,723
	Foreign Currency Fluction		(6,700)	
100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE	0	-	0
110	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	458,400	-	458,400
120	INSPECTOR GENERAL	144,245	-	144,245
130	OPPLAN 34A-35 P.O.W.		-	
140	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	64,900	(9,500)	55,400
150	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	25,000	-	25,000
160	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS	0	-	0
170	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	8,574	-	8,574
TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS		**12,011,542**	**81,800**	**12,093,342**
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:		**108,746,081**	**150,600**	**108,896,681**

Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $69.832 million to be appropriated from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for fiscal year 2001.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Impact aid for children with disabilities (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would add $20.0 million to Operation and Maintenance funding for defense-wide activities for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, title 20 United States Code, 7703(d).

Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment Teams (sec. 312)

The budget request included $157.9 million for the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), but did not include funding to strengthen the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC). The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) requested an additional $12.0 million to obtain the additional analytical expertise required to strengthen the Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment (JWCA) teams that support the JROC process, thus enabling the JROC to focus on more strategic, future-oriented, overarching issues. The committee is concerned that an investment of $12.0 million for this effort is premature. The committee favors a more modest, focused investment that would allow the CJCS to measure the progress and effectiveness of these reforms before reporting back to the Congress and requesting additional resources.

Therefore, the committee directs that, of the $157.9 million authorized to be appropriated for the JCS under Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, Budget Activity 04, $4.0 million will be available only for the purpose of additional investment in the JWCA teams to re-focus and strengthen their analytical efforts in support of the JROC process. Upon receipt of the CJCS report on the progress to strengthen and re-focus the JROC process, required by a separate provision in this bill, the committee would consider requests for a re-programming, additional authorizations, and/or legislative provisions to support the CJCS in this important, timely effort to improve the joint warfighting capabilities of U.S. armed forces.

SUBTITLE C—HUMANITARIAN AND CIVIC ASSISTANCE

Increased authority to provide health care services as humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow any underserved community, in addition to rural underserved areas, to receive medical, dental, and veterinary services through the humanitarian and civic assistance program.

Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allowances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize pay and allowances from within funds for the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Assistance Account, for reserve members of the U.S. Special Operations Command when these reservists perform humanitarian demining activities. This will enable these individuals to benefit from the same valuable training opportunities currently experienced by their active duty counter-parts, and will help mitigate the high operations tempo of the active component resulting from the numerous requirements placed on them for low intensity engagement operations.

SUBTITLE D—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

The committee is concerned with the long-term efficiency of the industrial facilities of the armed forces including depots, arsenals, and ammunition manufacturing plants. Over the past several years the military services have continued to downsize their force structure, which has reduced the requirement for the products and services of these facilities. However, as a result of the national security requirement to retain an industrial infrastructure capable of surging to meet the military's needs during a conflict, the Department of Defense must maintain industrial facilities that are not required on a day-to-day basis.

In 1992, the Congress enacted the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative which provided the mechanisms necessary to allow the Army's ammunition plants to attract private sector firms to locate at these plants, utilizing the unused surge capacity, and paying rents which were used to offset the Army's cost of maintaining and operating these plants. The private sector jobs also provided for the retention of critical skills at the ammunition plants that would then be available whenever necessary. This initiative has had great success, saving the Army $37.0 million each year and preserving hundreds of skilled workers.

Section 361 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 authorized the Secretary of Defense to designate of each depot level activity of the Department of Defense as a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence in the recognized core competencies of the depot activity, to adopt best-business practices at these facilities in connection with their core competency, and encourage the creation of public-private partnerships at these Centers for the performance of depot-level maintenance and repair in order to maximize the utilization of the capacity at these Centers. It also authorized the lease of excess depot-level equipment and facilities to private sector entities. Unfortunately, because of conflicting legal interpretations and other institutional barriers, the Department of Defense has made only limited use of these authorities.

The committee believes it is important to improve the efficiency of all Department of Defense industrial facilities that are required to maintain a core capability necessary for the repair and manufac-

turing of military ordnance and weapon systems. Therefore, the committee includes a number of provisions to clarify and enhance current legal authorities to provide the mechanisms necessary to more fully utilize these facilities by government and commercial organizations.

Codification and improvement of armament retooling and manufacturing support programs (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would make certain changes and codify in permanent law the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative. The provision would expand the objectives of the program to include a reduction of the cost of ownership and/or disposal of ammunition plants, to enhance best business practices, and foster cooperation with the private sector at these facilities. The provision would also make it easier for non-federal entities to use excess capacity at these facilities, and offset the costs to the Federal Government of ownership by allowing revenues generated through private sector use to be applied to overhead and production costs.

Centers of industrial and technical excellence (sec. 332)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, by devolving the authority to designate the depot-level activities to the respective secretaries of the military departments, including the arsenals of the United States Army. The provision would also expand the activities authorized to be conducted at these centers by employees of the center, the private sector, or other entities outside the Department of Defense, to include the performance of work under contract, or subcontract, in any of the core competencies of the center; the performance of depot-level maintenance and repair at the center; other work consistent with the needs of the Department of Defense that requires the use of any facility or equipment of the center that are not fully utilized by a military department for its own production and maintenance requirements. The full costs of work performed by the employees of the Center under contract from the private sector must be charged to the contract. Any revenues generated, by rents or through other mechanisms, by private sector use of facilities and equipment at these centers would be available to offset the costs of facility operations, maintenance, and environmental restoration at the center where the leased property is located.

The committee believes that the head of the center should use these authorities to maximize the utilization of the capacity at the center, reduce or eliminate the cost of Department of Defense ownership of the center, reduce the cost of products of the Department of Defense produced or maintained at the center, foster cooperation between the armed forces and private industry, and leverage private sector investment in the recapitalization of plant and equipment at the center.

Effects of outsourcing on overhead costs of centers of industrial and technical excellence and ammunition plants (sec. 333)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress thirty days prior to entering into a contract that would result in moving workload, performed by 50 or more employees, from a center or ammunition plant. The report should describe the impact of any reduction in workload at a center or ammunition plant as a result of a contract and describe the overhead costs of that facility

The committee is concerned that the process for determining the costs associated with entering into a contract with a private sector source for the performance of a workload currently performed at a center of industrial and technical excellence, or an ammunition plant, does not include a review of the impact that such a contract will have on the overhead costs of the center or plant.

Revision of authority to waive limitation on performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 334)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2466 of title 10, to allow the President of the United States rather than the secretary of the respective military service to waive the 50 percent requirement for reasons of national security. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not taken the actions necessary to ensure the Air Force is able to comply with the requirement contained in section 2466 of title 10, that 50 percent of all depot maintenance funds of a military service be spent on depot maintenance services provided by employees of the Federal Government. The committee believes that this requirement is essential to maintain the core maintenance capability necessary to preserve a ready and controlled source of repair and maintenance.

Manufacturing technical assistance pilot program

The committee recognizes the valuable contribution that the manufacturing technical assistance pilot program has made to the development and retention of a skilled private sector workforce capable of supporting the manufacturing requirements of the United States Air Force. The committee believes that this program could also provide great value to the manufacturing and maintenance needs of the other military services, such as the ship building industry that supports the United States Navy.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to support an Atlantic Fleet pilot program for the development and retention of the manufacturing skills necessary to support the Navy's shipbuilding requirements of the 21st Century. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining the results of this pilot program.

SUBTITLE E—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Environmental restoration accounts (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2703(a) of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new paragraph that would designate an account for formerly used defense sites within the Environmental Restoration Account. The provision would also ensure that all site closeout activities would be funded out of an appropriate Environmental Restoration Account.

Payments of fines and penalties for environmental compliance violations (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to seek congressional authorization prior to paying any fine or penalty for an environmental compliance violation if the fine or penalty amount agreed to is $1.5 million or more or is based on the application of economic benefit or size of business criteria. Supplemental environmental projects carried out as part of fine or penalty for amounts $1.5 million or more and agreed to after the enactment of this Act would also require specific authorization by law.

The committee recommends this provision as a result of concerns that stem from a significant fine imposed at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, (FWA), a related policy established by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and an apparent need for further congressional oversight in this area. On March 5, 1999, EPA Region 10 sent FWA a notice of violation (NOV) and on August 25, 1999, EPA sent a settlement offer of $16.07 million: (1) $155,000 for the seriousness of the offenses; (2) $10.56 million for recapture of economic benefit for noncompliance; and (3) an additional $5.35 million because of the "size of business" at FWA.

According to EPA, the $16.07 million fine was imposed to correct excessive emissions of particulate matter from an aging coal-fired central heat and power plant (CHPP) at FWA, and to impose a penalty for years of violations under the Clean Air Act (CAA). The EPA policy or rule that directs the application of economic benefit or "size of business" penalty assessment criteria to federal facilities is based on memoranda dated October 9, 1998, and September 30, 1999, issued by the EPA headquarters Federal Facilities Enforcement Office (FFEO). Notice and comment procedures were not used to promulgate these memoranda.

The compliance and enforcement history of the CHPP provides some insight into this committee's concerns regarding the EPA NOV. In the mid–1980s, EPA delegated its CAA program authority to the State of Alaska. In order to comply with opacity requirements, FWA purchased opacity monitors in 1988 and installed them in 1989, however, the monitors had a high failure and maintenance rate. In March 1994, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) issued an NOV for opacity violations at the FWA CHPP that identified a need for PM emission reductions. In response, FWA negotiated a compliance schedule with ADEC for the construction of a full-steam baghouse for each of the boilers in the CHPP.

FWA continued to work with ADEC from March 1994 to 1999 to: accomplish about $15.3 million worth of numerous CHPP upgrades for controlling air emissions; resolve Department of Defense (DOD) privatization issues; conduct a baghouse feasibility study; and seek military construction authorization for a $15.9 million baghouse project. In the interim, FWA received a CAA Title V Permit completeness determination from the state on February 19, 1998. As a result, FWA continues to operate the CHPP under a CAA Title V permit application, which contains schedules for compliance that were the result of careful coordination with ADEC.

The $15.9 million baghouse was programmed for fiscal year 2000 and was authorized and appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 2000. As planned, the baghouse design complies with all applicable CAA requirements, including compliance assurance monitoring. When the EPA NOV was issued, FWA was in compliance with the Title V schedules for implementing air emission control technologies agreed to with ADEC.

First, the committee questions EPA's regulatory judgement in assessing fines and penalties despite the fact that the installation was operating in good faith under a Title V permit application that is overseen by a state with delegated authority. Second, it is the committee's view that the application of economic benefit or "size of business" penalty assessment criteria to the DOD is inconsistent with the statutory language and the legislative history under section 7413 of title 42, United States Code.

The terms economic benefit and "size of business" suggest market-based activities, not government functions subject to congressional appropriations. In addition, the statement of managers accompanying the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–549; 104 Stat. 2399 (October 27, 1990)) provides that with respect to the economic benefit criterion: "Violators should not be able to obtain an economic benefit vis-a-vis their competitors as a result of their noncompliance with environmental laws." The committee is not aware that the DOD has competitors.

As a practical matter, the functions of DOD facilities are not analogous to private business. The DOD, unlike private sector, must fund all of its operations, to include environmental compliance, through congressional appropriations. "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." (U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7; Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) 31 U.S.C. 1501). Moreover, the expenditure of federal funds must be consistent with authorization and appropriation acts—Congress and the Office of Management and Budget oversee apportionment of funds to agencies during the fiscal year to avoid overspending—DOD allocates funds to the military departments, which in turn issue allotments to command and staff organizations. (31 U.S.C. 1341(a)(1); Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, Administrative Control of Appropriations (1984)).

The committee has concluded that DOD payment of fines or penalties based on economic benefit or size of business criteria would interfere with the management power of the Federal Executive Branch and upset the balance of power between the Federal Execu-

tive and Legislative Branches, exceeding the immediate objective of compliance. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments from paying such fines and penalties without specific authorization by law.

Annual reports under Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the current reporting requirement for the Science Advisory Board to allow for its inclusion in the annual report for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. This provision allows for more streamlined reporting by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority for indemnification of transferees of closing defense property (sec. 344)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2315) to clarify the application of the existing indemnification authority. The exercise of the current authority under section 330 is predicated upon cumbersome conditions for claimant eligibility, which has resulted in confusion and a complete absence of claims for indemnification. The provision would eliminate ambiguous conditions, streamline claimant access, and facilitate early transfer of base closure properties to assist communities in recovering from the initial effects of base closure.

Consistent with existing authority, the recommended provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to indemnify any state, political subdivision, or any person who acquires ownership or control over transferred surplus base closure property for the costs of legally required remediation. Presently, the capital markets are reluctant to finance certain projects at base closure properties due to the potential for contamination, and liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and analogous state laws. That concern is magnified in those instances in which a military department transfers surplus base closure property for which there is a deferral of covenants under section 120(h)(3)(C) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.)

Payment of fines or penalties imposed for environmental compliance violations at certain Department of Defense facilities (sec. 345)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense (DOD) to pay fines and penalties, or to carry out supplemental environmental projects in accordance with section 8149 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The Secretary of the Army would be specifically authorized to pay following supplemental environmental projects carried out in satisfaction of an assessed fine or penalty: (1) $993,000 for Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.; (2) $377,250 for Fort Campbell, Kentucky; (3) $20,701 for Fort Gor-

don, Georgia; (4) $78,500 for Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado; (5) $20,000 for Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah. The Secretary of the Navy would be specifically authorized to pay the following fines and penalties: (1) $108,000 for Allegany Ballistics Laboratory, West Virginia; and (2) $5,000 for Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas.

Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with the former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia (sec. 346)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay not more than $98,210 from the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites Account to reimburse the Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site Special Account of the Hazardous Substance Superfund, established by section 9507 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9507). The reimbursement is for oversight costs incurred by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on a time critical removal action at the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot performed by the Department of Defense under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (10 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

Environmental restoration activities (sec. 347)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to use funds available in the environmental restoration accounts, pursuant to section 2703 of title 10, United States Code, to permanently relocate facilities. That authorization is contingent upon a secretary's written determination that such permanent relocation is part of a response action that: (1) has the support of the affected community; (2) has the approval of relevant regulatory agencies; and (3) is the most cost effective response action available. The authority would terminate after September 30, 2003, and be subject to a five percent funding cap within each fiscal year for the funds available under section 2703. The secretary concerned would also be required to provide an annual report to the congressional defense committees on each response action for which there has been a written determination made under this provision.

The committee expects the Department of Defense (DOD) to use this authority judiciously, and ensure that funds are used only for legitimate environmental restoration priorities. It is expected that this provision will provide the necessary flexibility to facilitate environmental restoration at certain formerly used defense sites (FUDS), where progress has been slow.

The committee is concerned about the progress of environmental remediation planning and activities, and the appearance of an overall lack of support for the FUDS Program within the Army and the DOD. (Formerly Used Defense Sites: Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Audit Agency Report, AA 99–186, April 19, 1999). It is expected that both the Secretaries of Defense and Army shall address with consistency the environmental remediation issues at these sites. Moreover, the Secretaries of Defense and Army shall

ensure that there is adequate funding in the fiscal year 2002 budget request and the Future Years Defense Program to meet environmental remediation requirements and other related activities throughout the FUDS program.

Ship disposal project (sec. 348)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to continue to carry out a ship disposal project in fiscal year 2001 and to use competitive contracting procedures to award task orders within the ship disposal project. The provision would also direct the Secretary to submit, not later than December 31, 2000, a report to the congressional defense committees on the ship disposal project.

Report on the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program (sec. 349)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, a report to the congressional defense committees. The report shall contain specific recommendations regarding the future mission of the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program and address issues of concern within the Department of Defense.

Report on Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (sec. 350)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit, not later than October 1, 2000, a report to the congressional defense committees that includes the Army's analysis and recommendations regarding future applications for both phases of the Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (PEPS) technology. The committee notes that PEPS has demonstrated merit as a research and development project (PE 62720A) that could provide the Army and other military departments with the capability to reduce costs associated with treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic waste streams. The project has been executed in two phases: (1) a fixed-transportable unit demonstration; and (2) a mobile unit demonstration. It is expected that the data produced during both phases of the technology demonstrations should provide the Army with the information necessary to determine PEPS applications within the military user community.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Effects of worldwide contingency operations on readiness of certain military aircraft and equipment (sec. 361)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the effects of worldwide contingency operations on the aircraft of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and the ground equipment of the Army and Marine Corps. The report shall include the Secretary's assessment of the effects of those operations on the ability of the Department of Defense to maintain a high level of readiness.

The committee is concerned that the continued high OPTEMPO of military forces is wearing out already aging weapon systems.

This is particularly true for aviation assets that have been used to provide extensive support in the no-fly zone over Iraq, to execute the air war over Kosovo, and support the numerous other contingency operations around the world, including East Timor. This is also true for the ground equipment that is used in these operations.

Realistic budgeting for readiness requirements of the Army (sec. 362)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to develop a new methodology to be used in preparing a budget request that more accurately reflects the Army's requirements. This methodology should be based on the level of training that is required to be conducted to maintain essential readiness, the cost of conducting that required training, and the cost of all other Army operations, including the cost of funding its infrastructure requirements. This methodology should be used in the preparation of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. Army, despite repeated assurances, continues to migrate training funds to its infrastructure support and other accounts as a result of insufficient funding for these programs in the budget request. Over the past several years the Army has included funding for 800 miles of training in its budget, but has only executed between 600 and 650 training miles during the fiscal year. Those funds that were not utilized for training were reprogrammed to pay for such things as real property maintenance and base operations, which have been dramatically underfunded over the past few years.

The committee is concerned that this practice indicates there are significant problems with the methodology used to identify resources necessary to fund its operations. The first problem stems from the fact that the current methodology does not accurately reflect the required training that must be conducted to maintain a division's necessary level of readiness. If it did, the Army would not report that its divisions are ready to perform the National Military Strategy when they only execute 75 percent of the funds programmed for this purpose. The second problem stems from the unrealistic budget request for must pay accounts, such as base operations, and other essential accounts, such as real property maintenance. Insufficient funding in these areas will continue to force operational commanders to reprogram funds from their training accounts to their infrastructure accounts in order to ensure the delivery of essential services such as utilities and building maintenance.

Additions to plan for ensuring visibility over all in-transit end items and secondary items (sec. 363)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 349 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 by including specific requirements for monitoring and measuring implementation of the plan to ensure visibility over in-transit inventory items. The requirements would include the assignment of oversight responsibility for each action required to address weaknesses in the controls over in-transit items, a description of the resources required for oversight, and an estimate of the annual cost of oversight.

Performance of emergency response functions at chemical weapons storage installations (sec. 364)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from converting to contractor performance the emergency response functions of any chemical weapons storage installation currently performed by U.S. government employees until the Secretary certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the plan for conversion of the emergency response functions:

(1) is consistent with the recommendation contained in the General Accounting Office report, Department of Defense Competitive Outsourcing, dated March 2000; and

(2) provides for a transition to contractor performance of emergency response functions that ensure an adequate transfer of the relevant knowledge and expertise regarding chemical weapon emergency response to the contractor personnel.

The Secretary's certification is necessary to ensure that there will be no lapse of capability to perform the chemical weapon emergency response mission at a chemical weapons storage installation during any transition to contractor performance of those emergency response functions.

Congressional notification of use of radio frequency spectrum by a system entering engineering and manufacturing development (sec. 365)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees before a new weapon system is acquired that would outline the frequency that the system will use. The report would also include a statement of whether the Department is designated as the primary user of that frequency and, if not, the unique technical characteristics that make it necessary to use that particular frequency, and a description of the protections that the Department of Defense has been given to ensure that it will not incur costs as a result of current or future interference from other users of that particular frequency. The committee further recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the upgrade of the Joint Spectrum Center data base.

The committee is concerned that in the past the Department of Defense has pursued the development of weapons systems utilizing portions of the radio frequency spectrum that are not designated for military use. This can lead to unintended interference between that system and a commercial system licensed to use the same frequency. This interference could then result in operational constraints, or expensive redesign of the weapon system. The committee is further concerned that there is insufficient funding in the budget request to maintain an effective data base to assist program managers in determining the characteristics of various systems currently operating on particular frequencies, and in testing these systems to ensure non-interference.

Monitoring of value of performance of Department of Defense functions by workforces selected from between public and private workforces (sec. 366)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system for monitoring the performance of functions of the Department of Defense that are performed by 50 or more employees of the Department and have been subjected to a review to determine whether the function should be performed by federal employees or a private sector workforce. The provision would also establish three performance measures; the costs incurred, the savings derived, and the value of the performance by the selected workforce measured against the costs of the performance of the workload by the workforce at the beginning of the review. Finally, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Congress with an annual report outlining the results of the performance reviews conducted over the previous years.

Suspension of reorganization of naval audit service (sec. 367)

The committee is concerned that the Naval Audit Service has launched a program for total consolidation of audit personnel into the National Capitol Region without benefit of a convincing, detailed cost-benefit analysis, an assessment of the impact of the reorganization on the service's auditing mission, including an assessment of the impact of such a consolidation on this highly skilled and critical workforce. The committee is concerned that consolidation will undermine the efficiency and effectiveness of auditing functions throughout the Navy and particularly in the three highest concentrations of naval facilities and activities: San Diego, Norfolk, and Honolulu. The Congress, and the military departments, depend upon the quality of investigation and reporting done by audit agencies as an independent and credible source of information necessary to fulfill oversight responsibilities. The committee is concerned that consolidation could undermine the institutional and individual auditor independence so essential to an effective audit service and the quality of information provided to Navy leadership and the Congress. Therefore, the committee includes a provision that would delay the implementation of further consolidations until such time as the Secretary provides his analysis of the savings that the reorganization will achieve.

Investment of commissary trust revolving fund (sec. 368)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to invest a portion of the Commissary Trust Revolving Fund in public debt securities. Any income resulting from these investments would be credited to and become part of the fund.

Economic procurement of distilled spirits (sec. 369)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the military exchanges to use private distributors to distribute distilled spirits in those cases in which such an option is determined to be the most cost-effective means of distribution.

Resale of armor piercing ammunition disposed of by the Army (sec. 370)

The committee is concerned that excess Department of Defense armor-piercing ammunition could be made available to the public. The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to ensure that excess armor-piercing ammunition that is not transferred to law enforcement or other governmental agencies or made available for foreign military sales is destroyed. This requirement would not apply to the non- armor-piercing components of that ammunition, but such components could not be used to produce armor-piercing ammunition for sale to civilian purchasers.

Damage to aviation facilities caused by alkali silica reactivity (sec. 371)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to test the use of lithium salts to preserve runway integrity and provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining its success in mitigating the impact of Alkali Silica Reactivity (ASR).

The committee is concerned with reports of significant damage to aircraft engines as a result of the ingestion of pieces of cement from runways and parking aprons that have deteriorated because of alkali silica reactivity (ASR). The Corps of Engineers' Research and Development Center recently recommended the application of lithium salts to selected pavements at Fort Campbell to test the ability of this product to reduce or eliminate ASR damage to cement surfaces.

Reauthorization of pilot program for acceptance and use of landing fees charged for use of domestic military airfields by civil aircraft (sec. 372)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize a military service to accept payments for the use of domestic military and shared use airfields by civil aircraft and to use those payments for the operation and maintenance of the airfield. The pilot program would be authorized through fiscal year 2010.

Reimbursement by civil air carriers for support provided at Johnston Atoll (sec. 373)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to require payment from a civil air carrier for support provided by the United States to that carrier at Johnston Atoll that is either requested by the carrier, or determined to be necessary to accommodate the carrier's use of Johnston Atoll. The payment shall be equal to the actual costs incurred by the United States, and shall be credited to either Air Force operation and maintenance accounts or to the Army chemical demilitarization accounts.

Review of costs of maintaining historical properties (sec. 374)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of

the annual costs incurred by the Department of Defense in complying with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)(16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). The committee is concerned that NHPA places a significant burden on the already underfunded real property maintenance budgets of the military services. As those buildings which were constructed during World War I and the Korean War reach fifty years of age, the cost of meeting these requirements has increased and will continue to increase.

The provision would require the Comptroller General to provide the congressional defense committees with a report of the results of the review including the projected costs of maintaining these properties over the next 10 years, an analysis of maintaining only those properties which originally qualified as historic properties when the NHPA was first enacted, the accounts used for paying the costs to comply with the NHPA, and the identity of all properties that must be maintained in order to comply with the NHPA.

Extension of authority to sell certain aircraft for use in wildfire suppression (sec. 375)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the current authority for the Secretary of Defense to sell excess aircraft and spare parts to persons or entities that contract with the Federal Government for the delivery of fire retardant by air in order to suppress wildfires. The provision would extend the authority which currently expires at the end of fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2005.

Overseas airlift service on Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft (sec. 376)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 41106(a) of title 49, United States Code, to bring it in line with current Department of Defense (DOD) policy regarding the procurement of air transportation services. This provision would require that the DOD procure transportation from air carriers with aircraft in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) for travel from a place in the United States to a place outside the United States, and to the extent practicable, between two locations outside the United States.

The committee understands the need to maintain a viable CRAF to transport military personnel and equipment to a theater of operations during conflict. Following Operation Desert Storm, the General Accounting Office testified before Congress that the CRAF program had saved the DOD between $50.0 billion and $90.0 billion over the 40 year life of the program. United States air carriers commit their aircraft to the CRAF program largely in exchange for DOD international airlift business. DOD has little to offer these carriers in return for their commitment except U.S. Government business.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Army

Real property maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing growth in the backlog of real property maintenance (RPM) throughout the Department of Defense. The current backlog of real property maintenance exceeds several billion dollars. This is a particular problem for our aging Army facilities. The insufficient funding dedicated to maintaining our military infrastructure is having a direct and negative impact on military readiness as necessary repairs on roads, airstrips, rifle ranges, and other training and operational facilities are continually deferred. Furthermore, the underfunding is undermining the quality of life of our military personnel and their families as repairs on the buildings in which they work and live, such as barracks, are also deferred. If this necessary maintenance continues to go unfunded, the Department will be faced with even larger costs to repair damages caused by inclement weather and other environmental conditions. In many cases, this deferral of property maintenance will lead to higher costs in a few short years when the military is already facing a "bow wave" of procurement to replace its aging weapon systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $320.0 million to the operations and maintenance accounts of the military services for the maintenance of real property, as outlined below:

	Millions
Army	120.0
Navy	180.0
National Guard	20.0
Total	320.0

Excess carryover-defense working capital fund activities

Current Department of Defense policy states that three months of carryover is the maximum amount allowable for the Defense Working Capital Fund Business Activities for organic work. Carryover workload is the gross unfilled orders at the end of the prior fiscal year, plus new orders for the current fiscal year, minus work in process for the current fiscal year. This does not include carryover for non-supply intra and inter working capital fund orders, foreign military sales orders, base closure orders, non-Department of Defense orders and contract obligations. The committee is aware that several defense working capital fund activities currently exceed the allowable carryover under the Department of Defense policy. The budget request for fiscal year 2001 in these activities would provide $678.4 million in funding that could not be expended until sometime after December 31, 2001, more than three months after the beginning of fiscal year 2002 when additional resources would be made available.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $678.4 million in the military service operation and maintenance accounts to reflect the funds that cannot be expended during fiscal year 2001, and bring these accounts within the Department's policy. These reductions are distributed, as follows:

	Millions
Army	40.5
Navy	585.7
Air Force	52.2

Foreign currency fluctuation

The committee notes the continuing strength of the American dollar in relation to other currencies. This makes the purchase of services and goods overseas less expensive than was originally believed when the Department of Defense put together the fiscal year 2001 President's budget request. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the foreign currency fluctuation (FCF) account currently contains approximately $639.4 million, or $319.4 million more than the historical level of foreign currency fluctuation reserves. The committee further understands that current exchange rates mean the Department will accumulate an additional $290.4 million in these reserves through the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts during fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for a total of $929.8 million.

The committee believes that this is more than enough to compensate for any unforseen weakening of the dollar in relation to foreign currencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $607.8 million in the military services O&M accounts to reflect the savings that will be realized in fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and to draw down the FCF account to an appropriate level. These reductions are distributed as follows:

	Millions
Army	292.1
Navy	105.1
USMC	25.8
Air Force	157.6
Defense Wide	27.2
Total	607.8

Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements

The committee notes that the Department of Defense civilian personnel drawdown continues at a more rapid pace than expected. During the past several years, civilian personnel levels in the Department of Defense have been reduced faster than anticipated when the budgets for each succeeding fiscal year were drafted. This drawdown resulted in lower-than-budgeted civilian personnel levels, yielding savings of several million dollars during the past few fiscal years. Analysis performed by the General Accounting Office of the President's budget request indicates that this under-execution will continue during fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction to the military services operation and maintenance accounts to reflect the funds that were requested for civilian personnel budgets but will not be necessary as a result of the lower civilian personnel levels:

	Millions
Army	4.6
Navy	53.8
Defense Wide	27.5
Total	81.9

Army equipment maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment is having on the Army's ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments have led to increased work hours as young soldiers have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the shortfall in equipment maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of this equipment. The committee is also aware of the unfunded requirement for corrosion control treatments on this equipment to slow its rate of degradation. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for Army corrosion control, and $5.0 million for depot level maintenance of Army Reserve equipment.

Battlefield mobility enhancement system

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the purchase of the battlefield mobility enhancement system, a six wheeled vehicle used for logistical support in training and on the battlefield by light infantry divisions.

Army aviation spares

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, and during visits to the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. Furthermore, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the service chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for Army aviation spares.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $77.5 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Army Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Navy

Navy spares

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and in the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. These shortfalls exist for new systems, as well as older, established systems. Furthermore, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $232.0 million for Navy spares including; $82.0 million for TACAMO spares; $75.0 million for spares for other fielded aviation systems; and $75.0 million for ship spares.

Ship depot maintenance

The budget request included $2.2 billion for ship depot maintenance. The committee is concerned with reports of insufficient funding for ship depot maintenance. Recent testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations indicates that there is more than $200.0 million worth of such maintenance that currently cannot be executed because of a lack of funding. The committee is also concerned with reports that many private shipyards, which are essential to maintaining a healthy domestic maintenance capability, are being forced to downsize their operations as a result of insufficient workloads.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $237.3 million for ship depot maintenance, including $40.0 million for the AOE class ships, $32.0 million for LHA maintenance, $22.0 million for berthing and messing barge maintenance, and $143.0 million for general ship depot maintenance. The committee recommends a further increase of $5.0 million for depot maintenance of Navy Reserve vessels.

Oceanography

The budget request included $257.9 million for operational meteorology and oceanography. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command for operations and collaborative oceanography programs.

Training range upgrades

As a result of insufficient funding over the past several years, much of the infrastructure at our military training ranges is obsolete and degrading. Training range modernization was identified in letters to the committee as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the United States military. Furthermore, the recent difficulties at the Navy's training range on the island of Vieques, together with the significant deployment of U.S. military personnel to combat environments, demonstrates the need to pursue the development of most up-to-date and non-intrusive training areas as soon as possible. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for Army training range upgrades and $25.0 million for Navy training range upgrades.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $31.3 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Navy information technology center

The budget request included no funding to support operation of the Navy information technology center (ITC). The Navy recently created the ITC organization to serve under the Navy's Program Executive Officer for Information Technology (PEO IT). The ITC will support the PEO IT organization and will provide officers' organization much like the naval systems commands operate today. The Navy needs funding to span the time between creating the organization and the time when the PEO IT and organizations that will use the services of the ITC can align their funding and budgets

to support the ITC. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $5.0 million to support ITC operations.

US Navy Call Center

The budget request included no funding for a contractor-supported national employee benefits call center. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance Navy to establish a contractor-supported national employee benefits call center in Cutler, Maine. This call center would provide a full range of benefit and entitlement information and assistance to civilian employees of the Department of the Navy. The call center would replace eight separate Human Resource Services Centers now in operation.

Marine Corps

USMC initial issue

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not adequately fund personal gear such as cold weather gear and body armor. Adequate funding for this gear is essential to the safety and comfort of our military personnel in the field. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $23.1 million in the operation and maintenance accounts for the Marine Corps to purchase items of individual combat clothing and equipment including ballistic plates, outer vests, and polar fleece pullovers. This will help provide Marines in the field with the clothing, gear, and other equipment they need to survive and sustain themselves during combat operations.

USMC equipment maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment is having on the Marine Corps ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments in corrosive environments have led to increased work hours as young Marines have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the significant shortfall in depot maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of this equipment. The committee is also aware of the unfunded requirement for corrosion control treatments on this equipment to slow its rate of degradation.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $33.1 million for general and depot level maintenance of aging Active Marine Corps equipment, and $5.0 million for equipment of the Marine Corps Reserves. The committee recommends a further increase of $7.5 million for the Marine Corps corrosion control program.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $11.9 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Air Force

Air Force base operations

The budget request included $4.6 billion for Air Force base operations. The committee is concerned with the continued underfunding of essential base operations. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force has informed the committee that the Air Force has $144.7 million in base operating requirements, including the installation of communications networks for C–17 support that were not funded within the President's budget request for fiscal year 2001. Insufficient funding for base operations forces unit commanders to migrate funding from training accounts in order to meet the day-to-day requirements of military installations, such as sewer, electricity, and communications. Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of $144.7 million for Air Force base operations.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $31.8 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Air Force readiness spares packages

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, and during visits to the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. Finally, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million for Air Force readiness spares packages.

Air Force nuclear, biological and chemical defense

The budget request included $12.4 million for Air Force nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) defense readiness programs. An important element of the Department of the Air Force Expeditionary Air Forces (EAF) program is to ensure sustained and effective EAF operations in an environment contaminated with nuclear, biological and/or chemical agents. The Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve require decontamination kits, chemical air processing systems, life support NBC equipment, handheld biological sampling kits, individual protective equipment and training to implement this capability. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $29.2 million for EAF NBC defense readiness programs.

It is imperative that the budget request for the Department of Defense (DOD) fully support requirements for the NBC defense capabilities of each military service. Any review by the DOD to ensure this requirement is fulfilled should be defense-wide and not limited to one military branch. In funding this requirement, the

committee intends to provide the Air Force with the same level of NBC defense capability as the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps.

Defense-Wide

Mobility enhancements

With the end of the Cold War and the reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel stationed abroad, the armed forces are far more dependent upon strategic lift and its supporting mobility infrastructure. Unfortunately, much of this infrastructure, including rail heads and port facilities, experienced significant degradation as a result of insufficient funding to maintain military bases. The committee is concerned that this degraded infrastructure will delay the deployment of military forces to a theater of operations, and thereby increase the risk associated with the successful execution of that operation, unless properly repaired. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million to repair and replace infrastructure associated with the deployment of forces.

Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS)

The budget request included $1.1 billion for the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million for improvements to the Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) System. The increase in funding is necessary for the development of a query tool and enhanced shared data warehouse that will allow contractors to view contract data that resides in the MOCAS data base.

Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative)

The budget request included $48.4 million within the Defense Security Cooperation Agency budget line for the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program. The committee recommends $45.3 million for this program for fiscal year 2001, the same amount allocated to the program by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000.

When this program was initiated in fiscal year 1996 as an assistance program jointly funded by the Departments of Defense and State, the money provided by the Department of Defense was intended to be used to strengthen military-to-military relationships through joint military exercises, professional military education, and interoperability programs with the Partnership for Peace nations. The committee is concerned that the money provided for this program is being used increasingly for purposes and projects that are not focused on the military-to-military goals for which this program was intended. For example, the committee notes that $1.0 million of the amount requested for this program is intended to be used to pay for packing, crating, handling and transportation charges associated with the delivery of Excess Defense Articles (EDA) to PfP nations. The committee believes that this is an inappropriate use of defense funds to pay for what is essentially security assistance. Such charges, to the extent they are paid by the PfP program, should be funded by the State Department's portion of this program. The committee believes that the Defense Department should conduct a review of the PfP program to ensure that it is properly focused on improving the military-to-military rela-

tionship between the United States and the PfP nations, and on enhancing military interoperability between NATO and the PfP nations.

Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program

The budget request included $14.0 million for Defense Environmental Security Information Management (DESCIM) Program. Based on concerns related to program management and performance, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in the DESCIM program. The $5.0 million from DESCIM shall be used in the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (PE 63851D) to demonstrate/validate technology for environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance.

Domestic preparedness center

The budget request included no funding for a domestic preparedness center. The Congress established the Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness to contribute to providing civilians from federal, state, and local agencies with training and expert advice regarding emergency response to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The center, operated by the American Red Cross, is developing the curriculum and capability to begin training in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for WMD response training. The committee notes that on October 1, 2000, the Department of Justice will be designated the lead federal agency for oversight, management, funding, and execution of the domestic preparedness program, including operations at the Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness.

Cultural and historic activities

The budget request included $300,000 for the Legacy Resource Management Program. The committee recommends an increase of $6.1 million for the recovery and preservation of three Civil War vessels: the H.L. Hunley, a Civil War submarine; the U.S.S. Monitor, a Civil War ironclad warship; and the C.S.S. Alabama, a Civil War commerce raider.

The committee strongly supports continued efforts to recover and preserve these three sunken U.S. vessels, which have gained cultural and historical significance based on their unique design and the circumstances under which they were lost. All three vessels qualify for listing on the National Register under the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). The importance of these vessels also stems from their identification as potential war graves. As a matter of policy, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Navy, on behalf of the United States, have asserted sole ownership and survey responsibility for submerged vessels that serve as war graves. In addition, the activities associated with the survey, recovery, and preservation of these vessels have provided Navy salvage divers with essential deepwater diving experience.

The committee notes that the DOD and the Navy have a responsibility to protect and preserve these historic vessels. As a result, these vessels are eligible for funding under the Legacy Resource

Management Program. Moreover, it is the committee's expectation that the Navy would continue to use these historic preservation activities as an opportunity to secure valuable deepwater training for its salvage divers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy in fiscal year 2001 to use the additional Legacy funds to accomplish the following: (1) to raise the H.L. Hunley, recover other remaining artifacts, and conduct related preservation activities; (2) to make preparations for the turret recovery of the U.S.S. Monitor and recover other remaining artifacts, including two cannons; and (3) to survey and recover the artifacts of the C.S.S. Alabama, including the aft pivot gun and the lifting screw.

The committee further directs that, not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that completely describes all prior and current use of Legacy funds and relevant state funds, and the status of recovery and preservation activities related to the H.L. Hunley, the U.S.S. Monitor, and the C.S.S. Alabama. The report should also describe the projected funding and date for completion of all recovery and preservation activities.

Defense Travel System

The committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million for the Defense Travel System (DTS) Program delays.

The committee is becoming increasingly concerned over the delays in the fielding of this new travel system. The modernization of the massive military travel system will yield significant savings to the Department of Defense as well as the government traveler. The Department spends an estimated $3.0 billion a year on travel, and almost a third of this cost is the processing of the paperwork. After fielding of the DTS, the savings are expected to be more than $300.0 million a year and make trip planning less complex for the traveler.

During fiscal year 2000, the Department used below threshold reprogrammings to reduce the funding for the DTS by more than 22 percent. While the committee is again receiving assurances that the program is on schedule and properly funded, the committee is concerned that the funding for this program will be further reduced from the budget request. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary to treat this program as a congressional interest item under the procedures for prior approval reprogramming.

Command information superiority architecture program

The committee has supported the Command Information Superiority Architecture (CISA) program. This program has focused on command, communications and intelligence architectures and is now oriented toward command-specific communications and computer information architectures (CCIAs). The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, to support CISA's efforts in the area of CCIAs.

Guard and Reserve Components

Air Force Reserve equipment maintenance

The budget request included $281.0 million for Air Force Reserve depot maintenance. The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment and extensive deployments are having on the Air Force Reserve's ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments have led to increased work hours as young airmen have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the significant shortfall in depot maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of Air Force Reserve equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for depot level maintenance of aging Active Marine Corps equipment, and $5.0 million for equipment of Air Force Reserve aircraft.

National Guard initial issue

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not adequately fund personal gear such as cold weather gear. Adequate funding for this gear is essential to the safety and comfort of our military personnel in the field. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System for the Army National Guard to provide protection in combat conditions during cold and wet weather.

Distributed mission trainer

The committee is aware of the $4.5 million unfunded requirement for a 12 year fee-for-service contract and logistics support for F–15 linked simulators to support increased production of F–15 pilots. This will enable linked training among advanced flight training bases. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million for this purpose.

Miscellaneous

Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic affairs

The committee supports the humanitarian demining and emergency humanitarian response activities of the Department of Defense (DOD). These activities have enabled military personnel of the DOD to forge constructive relationships with the armed forces and civilian population of other nations, while carrying out valuable training which enhances the military skills of our troops. However, the committee is concerned that the Department continues to request funding for humanitarian assistance activities in this account that do not enhance military training, do not require military unique capabilities, and should therefore be funded by the Department of State. These activities include paying commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients and procuring food solely for humanitarian relief operations. The committee is also concerned with increased reliance upon the DOD to construct facilities in foreign countries that would more appropriately be funded through the foreign aid account and constructed by local private sector firms.

Therefore, the committee recommends $26.5 million for the humanitarian demining program, an increase of $1.0 million above the President's budget request. The committee further recommends $28.9 million for the humanitarian assistance program that is used by the regional commanders-in-chief for emergency response activities. This represents a level of funding for this program that is equal to last year's level in real terms. However, it does not include the $1.0 million that was requested to pay commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients. The committee directs the DOD to restrict its use of commercial carriers in this area to instances where such use enhances a military activity. The committee is also concerned with the continued reliance upon the DOD for the procurement of humanitarian daily rations that the committee indicated in the Senate report accompanying S. 1059 should be funded through the Department of State.

The committee expects the Department of State in the future to fund those activities and programs that do not require military unique capabilities, and do not enhance the military mission. If the Department continues to request funding for activities that are clearly foreign assistance, rather than activities related to a military mission, the committee will recommend legislation providing strict guidelines on what activities can be funded through this program in the future.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Charlestown, Rhode Island

The Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field (CNALF), Rhode Island, is a formerly used defense site (FUDS) that was used for pilot and aviation crew training during World War II. In 1970, CNALF was closed and reported as excess to the General Services Administration for disposal in 1974. By deed, dated May 22, 1981, 172.4 acres were conveyed to the Town of Charlestown and in June 1982 an additional 55 acres was conveyed.

The site was determined eligible for the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) for FUDS. In 1992, the Town of Charlestown, Rhode Island, requested the consideration of a military warehouse and two boiler houses for demolition because of hazards that existed prior to disposal of the site. The town previously had not wanted these buildings to be considered for demolition. In June 1993, the Army recommended a building demolition project for these buildings, which was included in the fiscal year 1994 DERP–FUDS workplan, but has been continually delayed as a result of funding constraints. The Army has now tentatively rescheduled the CNALF building demolition activities for fiscal year 2001.

The committee is generally concerned about the lack of adequate funding for DERP–FUDS. Delayed action at sites like CNALF is further reason for questions regarding the management of the FUDS Program. It is the committee's expectation that the Secretary of the Army would ensure better management of the FUDS program, and specifically the CNALF site. If the site demolition workplan cannot be executed in fiscal year 2001, then the Sec-

retary of the Army shall, not later than January 1, 2002, provide a report to the congressional defense committees that explains the Army's inaction.

Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund

The Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of State (DOS) have numerous programs and authorities to provide education and training to military and civilian personnel associated with foreign militaries. Combatant commanders, who are charged with peacetime engagement with foreign militaries in their respective geographic regions, unanimously attest to the value of foreign military education and training. During hearings this year before the committee, three combatant commanders and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, praised foreign military education and training as a very low-cost investment that produces great results. These results are significant numbers of foreign military officials, many of whom rise to senior leadership positions, military and civilian, within their respective nations who were positively exposed to American democratic values, military professionalism, and the role of the military within a democracy. All of these witnesses stressed that modest increases in foreign military education and training programs would produce significant dividends in the form of friendly, professional, military partners for the United States.

A review of existing DOD authorities and use of available funds in this area revealed that combatant commanders are authorized to use up to $2.0 million of the Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund (CIF) for foreign military education and training. However, the committee is concerned that virtually none of this authority has been used in the past several years, despite the testimony of our senior military and civilian leadership on the importance of such education and training.

Therefore, the committee directs that $2.0 million of the $25.0 million authorized to be appropriated for the CIF (Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, BA 01, Joint Chiefs of Staff) shall be used only for foreign military education and training.

Inventory of financial management and feeder systems

Section 1007 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Department of Defense to include an inventory of financial management and feeder systems in its biennial Financial Management Improvement Plan. Section 1007 requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a detailed plan for ensuring that systems have appropriate interfaces and internal controls.

In addition to the material required to be included in this inventory pursuant to section 1007, the committee directs the Secretary to identify each system listed in the inventory as critical or noncritical and major or non-major, and provide the criteria used in making these designations.

It is the expectation of the committee that the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief Information Officer of the Department will certify the accuracy and completeness of the inventory required by section 1007. The committee directs the Comptroller General to review the Financial Management Improvement Plan and report any

findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees.

Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistics support (JCALS) program

The committee is pleased with the progress that the Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistic support (JCALS) program has made during fiscal year 2000. JCALS is a demonstrated effective tool in the automated technical manual area that has helped the Department of Defense achieve its goals for cost-reduction and moving to paperless operations. Beyond its traditional technical manual capability JCALS has also proven to be an effective tool in addressing the paper-intensive acquisition and procurement processes used by the military services. The committee applauds these efforts by the Department to leverage its significant investment in JCALS to support other initiatives in acquisition and logistics, and would encourage even greater use of the program in the future. The Department's ability to capitalize on existing assets such as JCALS by making them multi-functional rather than single purpose will pay dividends by minimizing investment in duplicative systems development and support for the Department's acquisition and logistics community. The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, on the progress made to restructure the program to expand the functionality and use of the JCALS program beyond the technical manual capability.

Mechanization of Contract Administration Service

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense will not maintain adequate funding for Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) pending full replacement by the Defense Procurement Payment System (DPPS). The DPPS has experienced system problems that have delayed the implementation of this system. It is critical that the Department maintain the MOCAS system until the conversion is complete. Failure to adequately fund MOCAS will lead to unacceptable delays in the payment of service, commercial, and payment vouchers, and force the committee to seek further action.

National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence

In the statement of managers to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the conferees directed the Secretary of the Army to transfer the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE) to a new program element under the control and oversight of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment). The conferees directed the Secretary to take such action based on concerns related to management and focus.

The committee notes that, through a memorandum dated March 14, 2000, the Secretary successfully accomplished the transfer and provided specific direction regarding the environmental technology focus of NDCEE. The committee agrees with the Secretary's direction that the NDCEE address technologies for all environmental

quality issues, to include pollution prevention, conservation, compliance, and restoration.

It is the committees view that the NDCEE has significant potential to serve as a national asset that will promote demonstration/validation of innovative technologies. It is anticipated that the NDCEE efforts will serve to reduce the total ownership costs of the Department of Defense (DOD) weapon systems. The committee is particularly interested in an emphasis on demonstration/validation of viable technologies that address the complexities associated with environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance (UXO).

Pesticide contamination at the former Fort Devens, Devens, Massachusetts, and other closed and active military installations

In order to transfer portions of Fort Devens in 1996, the Army made a finding of suitability to transfer (FOST) pursuant to section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.). That finding of suitability certified that a comprehensive assessment had been conducted to identify sources of hazardous contaminants and to specify that all remedial actions had been taken. The FOST was based on the environmental baseline survey (EBS) that identified limited quantities of pesticides in buildings used for storage of such chemicals at Fort Devens. Contrary to the Army's FOST, environmental testing conducted on behalf of Massachusetts Development Finance Agency (MassDevelopment) revealed a widespread and pervasive presence of pesticides in the soils. These undisclosed environmental conditions have jeopardized the MassDevelopment's implementation of its reuse plan at Fort Devens.

In early 1997, MassDevelopment notified the Army of the extraordinarily high levels of pesticide contamination that existed at locations which the Army had not disclosed prior to the 1996 property transfer, and demanded Army remedial action pursuant to section 120(h)(3) of CERCLA. While the Army has participated in discussions with MassDevelopment about the undisclosed environmental conditions, the Army has not formally responded to the MassDevelopment notice or demand. In these discussions the Army suggested that the Army may have no liability for the remediation of the pesticides.

The committee is very concerned about the Army's lack of responsiveness and apparent inclination to deny remedial action liabilities under section 120(h)(3) of CERCLA at Fort Devens. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to conduct cleanup of the pesticide contamination, consistent with section 120(h)(3) and the relevant congressional intent under CERCLA. The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments will comply with all environmental legal requirements, to include ". . . any remedial action found to be necessary after the date of such transfer. . . ." (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

Revised requirements for report on Defense use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier

The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report not later than December 1, 2000 on the cost and feasibility of existing hard disk storage technology or other technologies that could be used as a Public-Private Key Infrastructure (PKI) authentication device. The Secretary should include in this report a comparison of these technologies on the basis of cost and performance to the Smart Card discussed in the report required by section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. This review should not delay the Department's ongoing deployment of the Smart Card.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000
Navy	372,037	372,000	372,000
Marine Corps	172,518	172,600	172,600
Air Force	360,877	357,000	357,000

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	350,000	350,000	350,088
The Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000
The Naval Reserve	90,288	88,900	88,900
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,624	39,500	39,558
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,678	108,000	108,022
The Air Force Reserve	73,708	74,300	74,300
The Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,500

The increase of 88 in the Army National Guard and 22 in the Air National Guard is necessary to support five additional Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams.

The increase of 58 above the request in the Marine Corps Reserve end strength is necessary to accommodate an additional four officers and 54 enlisted Active Reserve personnel on active duty in support of the reserves to enhance the readiness of the Marine Corps Reserve.

The increase in the Coast Guard Reserve end strength is the continuation of the committee's efforts to restore the Coast Guard Reserve to a robust augmentation force. An Office of Management and Budget study has validated the requirement that the Coast Guard Reserve strength be 12,293. The Coast Guard Reserve is to be commended for recovering from the severe shortfall of the past several years. The committee recommends that the appropriation for the Coast Guard Reserve be increased from $73.6 million to $80.0 million.

End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the full time support end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	22,430	22,448	22,536
The Army Reserve	12,804	12,806	12,806
The Naval Reserve	15,010	14,649	14,649
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,272	2,203	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	11,157	11,148	11,170
The Air Force Reserve	1,134	1,278	1,278

The increase of 88 in the Army National Guard and 22 in the Air National Guard is necessary to support five additional Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams.

The recommended increase of 58 above the request in the Marine Corps Reserve end strength will permit the Marine Corps Reserve to retain four officers and 54 enlisted Active Reserve personnel on active duty in support of the reserves to enhance the readiness of the Marine Corps Reserve.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the minimum level of dual status technician end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	23,125	22,357	22,357
The Army Reserve	6,474	5,249	5,249
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,247	22,221	22,221
The Air Force Reserve	9,785	9,733	9,733

Fiscal year 2001 limitation on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,180	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	1,295	1,195	1,195
The Air National Guard of the United States	342	326	326
The Air Force Reserve	0	0	0

Increase in number of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the control grades for Active Guard Reserve personnel. The recommended control grade increases support changes in the roles and missions of the reserve components.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

Suspension of strength limitations during war or national emergency (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to suspend the grade limitations for senior enlisted personnel and senior reservists on active duty in support of the reserve during time of war or national emergency.

Exclusion of certain reserve component members on active duty for more than 180 days from active component end strengths (sec. 422)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt a number, limited to not more than two tenths of one percent of the active duty end strength, of reserve component members on active duty performing special work in support of the armed forces and the combatant commands from counting against the active component end strengths.

Exclusion of Army and Air Force medical and dental officers from limitations on strengths of reserve commissioned officers in grades below brigadier general (sec. 423)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt reserve component medical and dental officers of the Army and Air Force from the grade ceiling limits on the same basis as active component and Naval Reserve medical and dental officers.

Authority for temporary increases in number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades (sec. 424)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to increase, by not more than two percent, the number of reserve component personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty only when the Secretary has authorized an increase in end strength for a fiscal year.

Temporary exemption of Director of the National Security Agency from limitations on number of Air Force officers above major general (sec. 425)

The committee recommends a provision that would temporarily exempt the Air Force officer serving as the Director of the National

Security Agency from the limitations on the number of Air Force officers authorized to serve on active duty in grades above major general. The exemption of the recommended provision would expire on September 30, 2005.

SUBTITLE D—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 431)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $75,632,266,000 to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel.

The budget request of $75,801,666,000 was reduced by $172,600,000 due to adjustments in foreign currency fluctuation and military personnel under execution. $3,200,000 was added to accommodate the recommended increase in full-time reservists in the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Eligibility of Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for position vacancy promotions (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to use a single selection board to recommend Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for assignment to vacant positions and to recommend the colonels or brigadier generals for promotion to brigadier general or major general.

Promotion Zones for Coast Guard Reserve Officers (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation the same flexibility as secretaries of the military departments to establish promotion zones for the Coast Guard Reserve based on service need.

Time for release of officer promotion selection board reports (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make public the names of officers recommended for promotion by a selection board prior to approval of the board by the President. The recommended provision would permit reserve component promotion board results to be made public in a more timely manner and in a manner consistent with that used for active component promotion board results.

Clarification of authority for posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the existing statute concerning the authority for posthumous promotion to include an officer who had been selected for promotion but died before the service secretary approved the recommendation of the selection board.

Inapplicability of active-duty list promotion, separation, and involuntary retirement authorities to reserve general and flag officers serving in certain positions designated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude reserve component general and flag officers in certain joint duty assignments from the active duty list for promotion purposes. These reserve component general and flag officers would be considered for promotion on the active-status list of their reserve component.

Review of actions of selection boards (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary concerned to correct a person's military records in accordance with a recommendation made by a special board. The remedy may be restoration to active duty or status, if the person was separated, retired, or transferred to the retired or inactive reserve as the result of a recommendation made by a selection board; or the person may elect to receive back pay and allowances in lieu of restoration. If a special board does not recommend the correction, the action of the original selection board shall be considered as final. The secretaries concerned are to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision, which may include the circumstances under which consideration by a special board requires an application by the person, and applicable time limits. All such regulations are to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

A person challenging the action or recommendation of a selection board, or a secretary's action thereon, is not entitled to relief in any judicial proceeding unless the matter has first been considered by a special board or a secretary has denied such consideration. A court reviewing a special board's action or recommendation or the action of a secretary thereon may hold it unlawful only on the basis that it did not comply with applicable procedures, or was contrary to law. If the review is of a secretary's denial of special board consideration, the bases are the same, with the addition of the arbitrary and capricious standard. The remedies provided under this provision are exclusive. This provision does not limit the jurisdiction of any federal court to determine the validity of any relevant statute, regulation, or policy, but the remedies set out herein are to be the exclusive remedies for any person challenging the action of a selection board on the basis of any invalidity. These provisions also do not limit the secretaries' authority to correct military records through boards for correction of such records under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code. A special board may include a board for correction of military or naval records, if designated by the secretary concerned. For these purposes, a "selection board" includes boards for continuation on active duty, or selective early retirement, but does not include promotion selection boards. Similarly, the term "special board" does not include a promotion special selection board.

The provision would also amend section 628 of title 10, United States Code, the statute dealing with promotion special selection boards, to require exhaustion of a person's remedies before a special selection board (or the Secretary of Defense's rejection of the claim without consideration by such a board). No official or court of the United States may grant any relief on a promotion claim until the officer or former officer has been selected for promotion by a promotion special selection board and the board's report has been approved by the President. A court may review a secretary's determination not to convene a special selection board. If the determination is found to be arbitrary, capricious, not based on substantial evidence, or contrary to law, the secretary concerned shall convene such a board. Similarly, a court may review the recommendation of a special selection board and, if it finds that the recommendation was contrary to law or involved material error, the

secretary must provide for reconsideration of the officer or former officer by another special selection board. The provision has additional requirements on exclusivity and remedies similar to those provided for on continuation and special early retirement boards referred to above. As in the earlier provision, nothing herein would limit the authority of correction boards under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and would apply to all proceedings pending on or after that date, but would not apply with respect to any action commenced in a court of the United States before the date of enactment.

Extension to all Air Force biomedical sciences officers of authority to retain until specified age (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to retain, with the officer's consent, biomedical sciences officers. The recommended provision would provide the Secretary of the Air Force with the same authority to retain biomedical sciences officers as currently used by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy.

Termination of application requirement for consideration of officers for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would terminate the requirement that a reserve officer apply for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List. The recommended provision would permit the secretary of a military department to offer continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List to an officer who was recommended for continuation by a board without requiring the officer to apply for such consideration. The officer would retain the option to accept or decline such an offer.

Technical corrections relating to retired grade of reserve commissioned officers (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate conflicting provisions regarding the time-in-grade requirement to retire at the current grade held by a reserve component officer. The recommended provision would apply to reserve commissioned officers promoted as a result of a selection board recommendation after October 1, 1996, the effective date of the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act.

Grade of chiefs of reserve components and directors of National Guard components (sec. 510)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretaries of the military departments to, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, increase the grade of the Chief of Army Reserve, Chief of Naval Reserve, Chief of Air Force Reserve, Director of the Army National Guard, and the Director of the Air National Guard to lieutenant general or, in the case of the Navy, vice admiral. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of the Navy to increase the grade of the Chief of Marine Corps Reserve to lieutenant general.

SUBTITLE B—JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT

Joint officer management (sec. 521–528)

The committee recommends a series of provisions that would streamline the designation and management of joint speciality officers. The recommended provisions would simplify the requirements to be designated as a joint speciality officer, would require that Joint Professional Military Training be conducted in residence, would establish the promotion objectives for joint speciality officers as a group to be equal to or greater than the rate for officers of the same armed force in the same grade and competitive category serving on the headquarters staff of that armed force, would establish the minimum tour length to qualify for a joint tour, and would modify the required contents of the annual report to comply with the simplified management requirements.

SUBTITLE C—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Eligibility of children of reserves for Presidential appointment to service academies (sec. 541)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the children of members of reserve components and retired or retirement-eligible reservists eligible for presidential appointments to the service academies on the same basis as children of active duty or retired active duty personnel.

Selection of foreign students to receive instruction at service academies (sec. 542)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretaries of the military departments to give priority consideration to foreign students applying for admission to the service academies who have a national service obligation upon graduation from the academy.

Repeal of contingent funding increase for Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (sec. 543)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement that any amount in excess of $62,500,000 appropriated for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program be made available for the Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Revision of authority for Marine Corps platoon leader class tuition assistance program (sec. 544)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize members of the Marine Corps platoon leader class to continue to receive tuition assistance while in pursuit of an undergraduate degree. Currently, participants in the Marine Corps platoon leader class lose their eligibility to use the tuition assistance program once they are commissioned.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO RECRUITING

Army recruiting pilot programs (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to carry out three distinct pilot programs to assess the effectiveness for creating enhanced opportunities for recruiters and to improve the effectiveness of Army recruiting programs. The recommended provision would require the pilot programs to be carried out during a period beginning on October 1, 2000 and ending on December 31, 2005. The Secretary of the Army would be required to submit, not later than February 1, 2006, a separate report that would assess the value of each of the pilot programs and make recommendations for permanent authority to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Enhancement of the joint and service recruitment market research and advertising programs (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary actions to enhance joint and service recruiting and advertising programs through an aggressive market research program and would waive certain requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act to enhance the flexibility of the Secretary of Defense and the military services to react to changes in the recruiting market.

Access to secondary schools for military recruiting purposes (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would, effective July 1, 2002, require local educational agencies to provide military recruiters access to secondary schools on the same basis as colleges, universities, and private sector employers, unless the governing body of the local educational agency acts by majority vote to deny access to military recruiters. The recommended provision would also establish a process to ensure that secondary schools provide military recruiters access to the campus, directories, and student lists on the same basis as that afforded colleges, universities, and private sector employers. The recommended provision would require the relevant military service to send a senior official to meet with the local educational agency within 120 days of a military recruiter being denied access. If the secondary school continues to deny access to military recruiters the Secretary of Defense shall, within 60 days, communicate with the governor of the state requesting assistance in restoring access for military recruiters. A copy of this correspondence shall be provided to the Secretary of Education. If one year after the date of the transmittal of the letter from the Secretary of Defense the local educational agency continues to deny access to at least two of the armed forces, the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate who represent the district or districts in which the local educational agency operates.

Today, more than 600 high schools deny access to military recruiters from three or more services. Thousands of high schools

deny access to military recruiters of at least one service. The Department of Defense, the military services, and the Department of Education have not aggressively pursued restoration of access to these high schools despite the requests of the military recruiters. The recommended provision would establish a process through which the military services, the Department of Defense, the Department of Education, the governors, and the local educational agencies would work together to establish local procedures and practices that would permit military recruiters the same access to high school students as colleges and universities. The committee believes that every high school student deserves the opportunity to learn of the opportunities of military service just as they learn of the opportunities associate with college or private sector employment.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report, not later than March 1, 2001, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives outlining his plan to eliminate the backlog of high schools that currently deny access to military recruiters. The required report shall include specific milestones for each service.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Authority for award of Medal of Honor to certain specified persons (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits and authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman of Boise, Idaho for valor during the Vietnam Conflict; to James K. Okubo of Detroit, Michigan for valor during World War II; and to Andrew J. Smith of Massachusetts for valor during the Civil War.

Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits for award of military decorations to certain individuals who have been recommended by the service secretaries for these awards.

Ineligibility for involuntary separation pay upon declination of selection for continuation on active duty (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would make an officer, who has twice failed selection for promotion to the next higher grade, and who was offered the opportunity to continue on active duty, and who declines this offer, ineligible to receive involuntary separation pay.

Recognition by states of military testamentary instruments (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt a military testamentary instrument from any requirement of form, formality, or recording before probate under the laws of a state; and would provide that such an instrument has the same legal ef-

fect as a testamentary instrument prepared and executed in accordance with the laws of the state in which it is presented for probate. A "military testamentary instrument" is one prepared with testamentary intent in accordance with regulations prescribed under this provision by a person eligible for military legal assistance, which makes a disposition of that person's property, and takes effect upon his death. An instrument is a valid military testamentary instrument only if: it is executed by the testator (or in his presence, by his direction, and on his behalf); it is executed in the presence of a military legal assistance counsel, whether a judge advocate or a civilian attorney; it is executed in the presence of at least two disinterested witnesses; and it is executed in accordance with any additional requirements as may be provided by regulation. In addition, a military testamentary instrument may be regarded as self-proving with respect to the genuiness of the signature, the testator's status and title, and compliance with applicable regulations if certain prescribed additional formalities are complied with.

Sense of Congress on the court-martial conviction of Captain Charles Butler McVay, Commander of the USS Indianapolis, and the courageous service of its crew (sec. 565)

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of Congress that, on the basis of facts presented in a public hearing conducted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate on September 14, 1999, the American people should now recognize Captain McVay's lack of culpability for the loss of the USS Indianapolis and the lives of the men who died as a result of the sinking and that Captain McVay's military record now reflect that he is exonerated for the loss of the ship and its crew; and that Congress strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to award a Navy Unit Commendation to the USS Indianapolis and its final crew.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Automated in- and out-processing of military personnel

The committee is aware that Fort McPherson, Georgia, a U.S. Army installation, is conducting a pilot program using standard commercial-off-the-shelf software products to implement an electronic one-stop in/out-processing system. The committee believes that any effort that reduces the personnel time lost to in/out-processing and streamlines these processes while improving efficiency is a positive initiative that should be considered for expanded use. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to review the pilot program at Fort McPherson, Georgia, and consider conducting a similar pilot program at several bases. The committee believes that such an electronic one-stop in/out-processing concept would work very well at any installation, especially at an installation that is using smart cards in other base support activities. The committee also urges the secretaries of the military departments to consider expanding the concept of electronic one-stop in/out- processing to civilian employees.

Funeral honors for members of the uniformed services

Section 578 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, upon request, a funeral honors detail be provided for the funeral of any veteran. For the purposes of this provision, the term veteran was defined to include a decedent who served in the active military, naval, or air service. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Commerce, to convene a conference, not later than December 31, 2000, to assess the desirability and feasibility of expanding eligibility for a funeral honors detail to former members of the Commissioned Officer Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report the findings and recommendations resulting from the conference to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2001.

Information related to alternatives to the Survivor Benefit Plan

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has consistently and commendably administered, through the military departments, mandatory Transition Assistance Programs (TAP) for military members prior to separation. Among the mandatory briefing subjects during these pre-retirement programs is a session on the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP). The committee notes that, today, military members are retiring at younger ages and with an increased actuarial longevity in their retirement years. This fact should have a substantial positive impact on the financial condition of the funds supporting SBP. The committee also notes that, many times, during the required TAP seminars, alternatives to the SBP are excluded from presentation or exposure even though many in the retiring population might benefit from considering alternatives to SBP during pre-retirement processing. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide, not later than January 30, 2001, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a description of the TAP program and its content by service, including a description of the methods of exposure, if any, to information on to SBP; the number of retirees by pay grade for the last three years; and the number of individuals in the same categories with full participation in SBP (55 percent), those who elected a reduced SBP between 35 and 55 percent, those who elected a reduced SBP below 35 percent, and those who declined SBP.

Prevention of alcohol-related incidents

The committee is aware of the potential for reducing the incidence of alcohol-related automobile accidents and incidents of misconduct through the use of portable one-step, saliva-based test strips that provide an immediate estimate of blood alcohol concentration. The committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to examine how and if the use of personal, one-step, blood-alcohol concentration tests might enhance ongoing efforts to

reduce the incidence of drunk driving and alcohol-related misconduct on military bases and installations.

Study on the use of peyote by military personnel

The committee is aware that current Department of Defense policy permits, as an accommodation of a religious practice, service members who are Indian Tribe members to use peyote, a hallucinogenic drug, providing it is not used on a military installation and is used at least 24 hours prior to any scheduled duty. Although the committee supports reasonable accommodation of religious practices of military personnel, the committee is also concerned that the Department of Defense has not conducted a comprehensive study of the impact the use of peyote may have on the long-term health of military personnel and on military safety and readiness. To ensure that these concerns are addressed, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study, in coordination with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, on the real and potential hazards related to peyote use. The Secretary of Defense shall report the findings of the study and any recommendations to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to finalizing the Department of Defense directive regarding accommodation of religious practices within the Department.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Increase in basic pay for Fiscal Year 2001 (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services by 3.7 percent. This increase would be effective January 1, 2001.

Corrections for basic pay tables (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would make several technical corrections to the basic pay tables for the uniformed services. The recommended provision would change the pay table as it pertains to monthly basic pay for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commandant of the Coast Guard from $12,441.00 to $12,488.70. Since the pay of these officers is capped under other provisions of law, there will be no change in the pay these officers receive. The recommended provision would also change the monthly basic pay for members serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Office of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard from $4,701.00 to $4,719.00. The recommended changes would be effective July 1, 2000.

Pay in lieu of allowance for funeral honors duty (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a reserve component member who performs funeral honors duty using either the stipend authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 or one day of basic pay, as if the funeral honor duty was a unit training assembly.

Clarification of service excluded in computation of creditable service as a Marine Corps officer (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the limitation on creditable service computation as a result of accepting tuition assistance applies only to service as an enlisted member and not as a commissioned officer.

Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing (sec. 605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to prescribe the Basic Allowance for Housing based on the cost of adequate housing for civilians of comparable income levels in the area at rates that would reduce or eliminate the member's out-of-pocket expenses. The recommended provision would eliminate the current requirement that 15 percent of the es-

timated housing expenses for military personnel be paid by the service member.

Eligibility of members in grade E–4 to receive basic allowance for housing while on sea duty (sec. 606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of the basic allowance for housing to members serving in the grade of E–4, without dependents, who are assigned to sea duty in ships. The recommended provision would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit an E–4 assigned to a ship to live off-base and receive the basic allowance for housing while that ship is in port.

Personal money allowance for the senior enlisted members of the armed forces (sec. 607)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of a personal money allowance of $2,000 per year to the Sergeant Major of the Army, the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, and the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard. The personal money allowance is intended to defray expenses incurred in connection with official duties not reimbursable through the use of Official Representation Funds. The Personal Money Allowance is currently authorized for certain senior officers.

Increased uniform allowances for officers (sec. 608)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the initial uniform allowance for officers from $200 to $400 and the additional uniform allowance for officers from $100 to $200.

Cabinet-level authority to prescribe requirements and allowance for clothing of enlisted members (sec. 609)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, to prescribe the clothing to be furnished annually to enlisted members and to establish the amount of the cash allowance paid when the prescribed clothing is not provided.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL INCENTIVE PAYS

Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay the special pay for critically short wartime health care specialists in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonuses, the Selected Reserve enlistment bonuses, the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve affiliation bonus, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, and the prior service enlistment bonus.

Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay certain bonuses and a special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists.

Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonuses for critical skills, the Army enlistment bonus, the special pay for nuclear qualified officers who extend the period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

Consistency of authorities for special pay for reserve medical and dental officers (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the amount of special pays for reserve medical and dental officers consistent. Currently, reserve component medical officers and reserve component dental officers receive disparate pays for similar qualifications and periods of service.

Special pay for physician assistants of the Coast Guard (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of a special pay to Coast Guard physician assistants on the same basis as non-physician health care providers in the military services.

Authorization of special pay and accession bonus for pharmacy officers (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department or, in the case of the Public Health Service Corps, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to pay a special pay and an accession bonus for pharmacy officers. The recommended provision would provide the military departments and the Public Health Service additional incentives to recruit and retain trained pharmacy officers.

Corrections of references to Air Force veterinarians (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the special pay for board certified veterinarians in the armed forces and the Public Health Service includes Air Force biomedical sciences officers who hold a degree in veterinary medicine.

Entitlement of active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps to special pays and bonuses of health professional officers of the armed forces (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the special pays and bonuses for active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps equal to those of health professional officers of the armed forces. The recommended provision would eliminate inequities in the special pays and bonuses paid to health professionals of the uniformed services.

Career sea pay (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to establish the rates of career sea pay up to a limit of $750 per month and would increase the maximum career sea pay premium pay from $100 per month to $350 per month for consecutive or cumulative duty at sea.

Increased maximum rate of special duty pay assignment pay (sec. 620)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the limit on special duty assignment pay from $275 per month to $600 per month. The secretary of a military department would retain the flexibility to establish the rate of special duty assignment pay within the maximum limit to meet the needs of the service. For those assignments common to all services, such as recruiters, the Secretary of Defense would ensure that the rate of the special duty assignment pay is consistent among the services.

Expansion of applicability of authority for critical skills enlistment bonus to include all armed forces (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, to all the services, the authority, now available only to the Army, to offer a bonus for enlistment for a period of two years in a critical skill.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Advance payments for temporary lodging of members and dependents (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay the temporary lodging allowance in advance of the incurrence of the expenses. Currently, payment of the temporary lodging allowance must be paid after a service member pays the bills and files a claim. The recommended provision would also require the Secretary of a military department to consider all elements of the cost of living to service members and their families, including the cost of housing, subsistence and necessary incidental expenses, when determining the per diem allowance for a member on duty outside the Continental United States in a travel status.

Incentive for shipping and storing household goods in less than average weights (sec. 632)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a service member a share of the amount of savings resulting from the service member shipping or storing a lower household good or baggage weight than the average weight shipped or stored by members of the same grade and dependent status.

Expansion of funded student travel (sec. 633)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize unmarried military dependents, under the age of 23 and enrolled in an accredited, full-time graduate degree program or an accredited vocational technical educational program in the Continental United States, one funded round trip per year to the sponsor's overseas duty location. Currently, only dependents in secondary or undergraduate educational programs are entitled to this funded travel.

Benefits for members not transporting personal motor vehicles overseas (sec. 634)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a service member a share of the savings that accrue when an authorized member elects not to ship their personal vehicle overseas at government expense. The recommended provision would also limit the amount payable to store a personal vehicle in lieu of the authorized shipment of the vehicle to an amount equal to the cost that would have been incurred by shipping the vehicle overseas and back.

SUBTITLE D—RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Exception to high-36 month retired pay computation for members retired following a disciplinary reduction in grade (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the computation of retired pay for military personnel who retire following a reduction in grade be based on the basic pay of the grade held at the time of retirement rather than the average of the highest three years of basic pay. The recommended provision would correct a situation in which a service member who is reduced in grade as a result of a disciplinary action and subsequently retires would have his or her retired pay computed based on the average of the highest three years of basic pay, effectively circumventing the intention of the reduction-in-grade.

Automatic participation in Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan unless declined with spouses' consent (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would require reserve component personnel notified of eligibility for retired pay upon reaching 60 years of age to make an election regarding coverage under the Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan. The recommended provision would require spousal consent if the member makes an election to decline or to provide less than the full,

immediate annuity for the spouse. Currently, the reserve component member may decline coverage or elect less than full participation without the spouse's knowledge or consent. The recommended provision would treat spouses of reserve component members in the same manner as spouses of active component members.

Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 to establish the effective date for offering the Thrift Savings Plan to active and reserve military personnel, effective not later than 180 days from the enactment of this Act. The recommended provision would also eliminate the requirement for the President to identify mandatory spending offsets that are currently provided in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001.

Retirement from active reserve service after regular retirement (sec. 644)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit a retired active component service member who later serves, and is promoted in an active reserve position, to retire as a member of the retired reserve at the higher grade. The recommended provision would permit such individuals to retire as a member of the retired reserve. Promotion in the reserves is currently authorized by sections 1370, 1406(b)(2) and 12771 of title 10, United States Code.

Same treatment for federal judges as for other federal officials regarding payment of military retired pay (sec. 645)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical correction to ensure that Article III federal judges are treated the same as other federal officials with regard to reduction in military retired pay. Section 651 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 eliminated the reduction in military retired pay for retired uniformed services personnel who are civilian employees of the federal government. The recommended provision makes a technical correction eliminating this reduction of retired pay for retired uniformed services personnel who are employed in certain judicial positions.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Reimbursement of recruiting and ROTC personnel for parking expenses (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to reimburse military recruiters, Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps cadre members, and Military Entrance Processing Command members for parking expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Extension of deadline for filing claims associated with capture and internment of certain persons by North Vietnam (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to pay claims to a person, or the survivor of a person, who demonstrates that he or she served as a Vietnamese operative pursuant to OPLAN 34A or OPLAN 35, was captured, remained in captivity after 1973, has not received any payment for the period spent in captivity, and whose original claim was received after the deadline for submitting claims, if the Secretary considers it necessary to prevent an injustice. The committee is aware of four claims that would qualify under the recommended provision. Payment of the additional claims would be made from within the original appropriations for this program.

Settlement of claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay (sec. 653)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to settle claims for payments for unused accrued leave and to waive time limitations for filing claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay. The committee encourages liberal use of this authority to ensure that otherwise valid claims of service members and former service members are not denied solely because the claim was not filed within the time required.

Eligibility of certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (sec. 654)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize volunteers for assignment to a category in the Individual Ready Reserve that is subject to involuntary recall to active duty to participate in the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program.

Authority to pay gratuity to certain veterans of Bataan and Corregidor (sec. 655)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a $20,000 gratuity to a veteran or surviving spouse of a veteran who served at Bataan or Corregidor, was captured and held as a prisoner of war, and was required to perform slave labor by the Japanese.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Adjustments to the Basic Allowance for Housing

The Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) rates for uniformed services personnel are determined by the Secretary of Defense based on the monthly cost of adequate housing for civilians of comparable income levels in the area in which the service member is assigned. Section 403 of title 37, United States Code, includes a protection against reductions in the BAH as long as the member retains uninterrupted eligibility to receive BAH. The committee is aware of cases in which the BAH for service members who have made a no-cost permanent change of station move and who remain in the

same quarters they occupied during their previous assignment has been reduced. The committee believes that implementation of the statutory provisions, as interpreted in the Joint Federal Travel Regulations, is flawed. The committee did not intend that service members would be adversely affected by a no-cost permanent change of station move in which the original quarters continue to be occupied. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the statute and the Joint Federal Travel Regulations, and to make such changes as may be necessary to ensure that service members who make no-cost moves are not adversely impacted by a reduction in BAH. The committee believes these changes should be retroactive, effective as of the date of the BAH legislation.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

SUBTITLE A—SENIOR HEALTH CARE

Extension of TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program providing health care delivery to the over–64 Medicare eligible population. Congress authorized implementation of several demonstration programs (Medicare Subvention, the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, a Medicare insurance supplement or "medi-gap" type policy, and pharmacy pilot programs). One of these programs is due to expire this year, some have just started, and others are due to start later this year. The recommended provision would extend the TRICARE senior supplement program to allow for continuity of care through calendar year 2005, and to allow the Department of Defense and the Congress time to evaluate and determine the most appropriate long-term health care solutions for these beneficiaries.

TRICARE senior prime demonstration program (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize expansion of the TRICARE Senior Prime, or "Medicare Subvention" program to major medical centers of the Department of Defense and extend the program through calendar year 2005. While the Medicare subvention demonstration program has provided limited data upon which to base evaluation and expansion decisions, it appears clear that the most productive expansion sites are those with the more extensive capabilities of major medical centers. Teaching programs conducted at the medical centers require a more extensive case-load and beneficiary population to support medical educational programs and readiness training requirements.

Although data is still limited, the committee believes that the reimbursement methodology agreed to by the Department of Defense and the Health Care Financing Administration may need modification. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense to engage in consultation with the Health Care Financing Administration to determine what modifications need to be addressed, both in terms of data collection and reimbursement methods, to facilitate expansion of the program.

Extension and expansion of demonstration project for participation of uniformed services personnel in the Federal Employee Health Benefit program (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would remove the limitation on the number of sites covered by the demonstration program allowing participation of Medicare-eligible military beneficiaries and their family members in the Federal Employees

Health Benefits Program. The recommended provision would extend the program through calendar year 2005 to allow for continuity in the provision of care for beneficiaries while the Department of Defense and the Congress analyze approaches to meeting the health care needs of the Medicare-eligible military retiree population.

Implementation of redesigned pharmacy system (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Department of Defense to reduce the enrollment fee and consider using deductibles for the pharmacy pilot program authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. The Department of Defense has been slow to implement this pilot program and there is considerable concern among the beneficiary population over the high cost of participation. The committee believes that the use of deductibles, which apply only when a benefit is utilized, are a more prudent management tool.

SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM

Additional beneficiaries under TRICARE prime remote program in CONUS (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand TRICARE prime remote to the uniformed services and to family members of active duty personnel who qualify for TRICARE prime remote. The committee recognizes the importance of providing a uniform and equitable medical benefit to all military members and their families, without regard to where they happen to be stationed in the United States.

Elimination of copayments for immediate family (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate copayments for those immediate family members of active duty service members enrolled in TRICARE Prime who receive care from a source that currently requires copayment.

Improvement in business practices in the administration of the TRICARE program (sec. 713)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to complete implementation of improved health care business practices no later than October 1, 2001. Previous legislation directed the Secretary of Defense to make improvements in providing access to beneficiaries, scheduling appointments, simplifying and making more efficient claims processing and payment systems, and ensuring portability and national enrollment. These improvements have not been fully implemented in a timely manner. The committee directs the Secretary to ensure the systemic changes necessary to achieve improved business practices and increased beneficiary and provider satisfaction are implemented no later than October 1, 2001.

SUBTITLE C—JOINT INITIATIVES WITH DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Tracking patient safety in military and veterans health care systems (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct enhanced cooperation between the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs in the area of patient safety. The two Departments are currently collaborating on a number of joint initiatives, including common information systems and patient safety initiatives. This provision directs the two agencies to work to develop a common set of patient safety indicators and to provide for centralized tracking of those indicators.

Pharmaceutical identification technology (sec. 722)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly develop a plan to bar code pills and to explore a bar code capability for the mail order pharmacy program. Joint initiatives and the commonality they produce can provide opportunities to greatly enhance patient safety.

Medical informatics (sec. 723)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to include two additional sections in the medical informatics report required by section 723(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The recommended provision includes a requirement to report on the progress or growth in medical informatics and how the TRICARE program and the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system can use medical information technology to raise standards of treatment. The provision also directs that, from within the resources of the Defense Health Program, $64.0 million be expended on a computerized patient record system, and $9.0 million be expended on an integrated pharmacy system in fiscal year 2001.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Permanent authority for certain pharmaceutical benefits (sec. 731)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a specific pharmacy benefit for eligible beneficiaries of the military health care system, including those eligible for Medicare. The recommended provision would authorize a national mail order program and a retail pharmacy network. The recommended provision would not require an enrollment fee nor an annual deductible for the mail order program. Drugs obtained through the retail network would require beneficiary cost shares of 20 percent and government coverage of 80 percent. The recommended provision would phase out the current base realignment and closure pharmacy benefit now in effect, in recognition of implementation of the recommended program.

The committee believes that meeting the pharmaceutical needs of our older retirees is a major step in meeting the commitment to en-

sure access to health care for those who have made military service a career. This is the first time the age 65 and over military retiree population will have a legal entitlement to health care benefits. The recommended provision would provide a uniform benefit for all military beneficiaries and would meet the major unmet healthcare need of older retirees, access to a pharmacy benefit.

Provision of domiciliary and custodial care for CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 732)

The committee recommends a provision that would cap the Department of Defense domiciliary and custodial care program costs at $100.0 million per year. The committee understands that the current programmatic estimates are significantly less and expects the Secretary of Defense to move quickly to implement a case management program to address the needs of those with chronic conditions. The recommended provision would also grandfather those that participated in the Department of Defense's home health care demonstration and allow their continued participation in the case management program, without regard to age.

Medical and dental care for medal of honor recipients and their dependents (sec. 733)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend lifetime medical and dental care, to be provided by the Department of Defense, to medal of honor recipients and their dependents. The committee recognizes the significant contributions of these current and former service members and their families, and would extend complete legal entitlement for these beneficiaries.

School-required physical examinations for certain minor dependents (sec. 734)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide eligible dependents a physical examination when such an examination is required by a school in connection with the enrollment in that school. Eligible dependents are between the ages of 5 and 12 years of age. The proposed provision would recognize school requirements for such physicals and, consistent with other provisions in this bill, would require no copayment for TRICARE Prime enrollees. Enrollees in TRICARE options other than Prime would pay appropriate cost shares. The committee expects, to the extent possible, that primary care managers would utilize the results of school physicals to accommodate other requirements for health assessments for school age children, such as sports physical requirements.

Two-year extension of dental and medical benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members (sec. 735)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the medical and dental benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members from one year to three years. The committee recognizes the impact on dependents of loss of a family member and that transition to alternate sources of health care may take a period of time longer than previously permitted. The recommended

provision would recognize the sacrifices of these family members and assist in their difficult transition from the military system.

Extension of authority for contracts for medical services at locations outside medical treatment facilities (sec. 736)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend from December 31, 2000 to September 30, 2002, the authority to enter into personal services contracts with physicians for medical screening of enlistment applicants. The Secretary of Defense is currently conducting a test to evaluate whether the employment of fee-basis physicians in medical screening of enlistment applicants should be sustained, or whether an alternate approach is more appropriate. The recommended provision would allow the Secretary of Defense to complete the evaluation of alternative medical screening strategies, and to sustain the pace of medical screening for armed forces applicants by extending contracting authority for an additional period of time.

Transition of chiropractic health care demonstration program to permanent status (sec. 737)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the provision of chiropractic health care services to military health care system beneficiaries who enroll in TRICARE Prime. The recommended provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to make available chiropractic services using a primary care manager model, that requires referral by a primary care physician. The recommended provision would continue services at existing demonstration sites until 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, at which time TRICARE Prime enrollees at those sites would continue to have available chiropractic services. The recommended provision recognizes the importance of the primary care manager in a managed care program and the value of offering a variety of approaches to meeting the health care needs of the beneficiary population.

Use of information technology for enhancement of delivery of administrative services under the Defense Health Program (sec. 738)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement, in at least one TRICARE region, a managed care support contract using commercially available internet-based systems and products, to assist in simplifying administrative processes in the TRICARE program. The recommended program would comply with patient confidentiality and security requirements and incorporate data requirements that are currently used in the marketplace, to include those used by Medicare and/or commercial insurers. This effort would include such areas as marketing, enrollment, beneficiary and provider education, appointment setting, and claims processing. The committee expects the initiative to enhance efficiency and improve services, as well as match commercially recognized standards of performance.

Patient care reporting and management system (sec. 739)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement a patient care reporting and management system in the military health system. The recommended provision would create a patient care reporting and management system that would identify, track, and report on errors and safety problems in the military medical system. The recommended provision would direct development of a process to study occurrence of errors, identify system factors contributing to occurrences, and provide for corrective actions throughout the military health care system.

Health care management demonstration program (sec. 740)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a test of two models to improve health care delivery in the Defense Health Program. The recommended provision would provide for two tests of health care simulation models: one for studying alternative delivery policies, processes, organizations, and technologies; and the second for studying long term disease management. The recommended provision directs the Secretary of Defense to implement each of these concepts in at least one site in fiscal year 2001 and report, not later than January 31, 2002, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the desirability and feasibility of incorporating these programs throughout the military health care system.

Studies of accrual financing for health care for military retirees (sec. 741)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct two studies, one by the Department of Defense and one by an independent entity, to evaluate the potential of revising the financing of the military medical benefit through an accrual based system. While the committee recognizes the potential of such a proposal, there remain many unanswered questions about administration and budgeting. The required studies will provide the committee with the necessary data to determine if permanently implementing such a concept would be warranted.

Augmentation of Army Medical Department by reserve officers of the Public Health Service Corps (sec. 742)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an agreement to conduct a program under which officers of the Public Health Service Corps Inactive Reserve may be detailed to augment the Army Medical Department, subject to existing legislative authorities.

The recommended provision would require the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to review existing legislative authorities and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2001, on the findings of this review and any recommendations necessary to permit en-

hanced augmentation by the Public Health Service Inactive Reserve.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Consultation with schools of pharmacy and nursing

The committee directs the military services to implement a program in which military treatment facilities and clinics would partner with local pharmacy and nursing schools to incorporate the full range of health care professional resources in health care endeavors. The committee supports integrating all aspects of professional health care delivery. Specifically, students of pharmacy and nursing schools could become a significant resource to pharmacies through participation in patient education programs. Patients would benefit from increased personal interaction, pharmacies would benefit by access to increased professional resources, and students would expand their clinical experience.

Financial assistance for those beneficiaries requiring animal assistance

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the requirements for animal assistance for dependents of military personnel whose medical conditions may require such assistance. The report should include an assessment of the economic impact to families of obtaining animals for such purposes as "seeing-eye" assistance and other medical conditions. The report should include an analysis of the current benefit coverage by the Department of Defense, if any, and, if appropriate, a proposal for coverage of such assistance.

Health care benefits for retirees living overseas

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than March 12, 2001, on the desirability and feasibility of providing health care benefits to military retirees living outside the United States. The committee recognizes that some military retirees make a conscious choice to live overseas but other military members return to their home of origin upon retirement from military service. The study will include an assessment of the numbers of retirees permanently residing overseas, an assessment of how many have returned to their home of origin, and options for providing health care benefits to retirees overseas.

Implementation of Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Department sharing initiatives

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary for Veterans Affairs to develop a plan and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than January 31, 2001, on the formation of problem solution groups and regional liaisons to facilitate sharing opportunities. Issues to be addressed should include reimbursement and payment, joint contracting, data commonality, and any

other issues inhibiting full and beneficial sharing of resources. The committee continues to observe that additional sharing is of value and that administrative obstacles preclude full benefit of existing arrangements between the two departments.

Notification of persons affected by unanticipated adverse outcomes of medical care

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the process for identifying serious medical errors and notifying affected patients or their families of such error events. The review shall include the mandatory reporting system used in the 500 hospitals and clinics within the Department of Defense, as described in the Report of the Quality Interagency Coordination Task Force to the President, dated February 2000. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2001, on the current notification process and any additional requirements the Secretary deems necessary after such review.

Special pays for military health care professionals

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2001, on the adequacy of special pays and bonuses for medical corps officers and other health care professionals. The committee directs this review because of the level of competition within the economy for health care professionals and the potential devaluation of current special pays and bonuses, which could have a significant impact on recruiting and retention of health care professionals.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Improvements in procurements of services (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would address concerns about the manner in which the Department of Defense (DOD) contracts for services. The committee is concerned that the DOD has not adjusted its contracting and oversight practices to meet the increasing significance of service contracting. From 1992 through 1999, DOD procurement of services increased from $39.9 billion to $51.8 billion while procurement of goods during that same time period decreased from $59.8 billion to $53.5 billion.

The DOD Inspector General (IG) recently reviewed contracts for professional, administrative, and management support services, which is the largest sub-category of contracts for services valued at $10.3 billion. The IG reviewed 105 contracts and each contract had one or more significant problems. These problems included the non-use of prior history to define requirements (58 out of 84 or 69 percent), inadequate government cost estimates (81 out of 105 or 77 percent), cursory technical reviews (60 out of 105 or 57 percent), inadequate competition (63 out of 105 or 60 percent), failure to award multiple-award contracts (7 out of 38 or 18 percent), inadequate contract surveillance (56 out of 84 or 67 percent) and lack of cost control (21 out of 84 or 24 percent). The IG found that "* * * cost-type contracts that placed a higher risk on the government continued without question for the same services for inordinate lengths of time (39 years in one extreme case) and there were no performance measures in use to judge efficiency and effectiveness of the services rendered."

The committee is concerned about the lack of oversight and accountability in managing these contracts. As a result, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop specific training applicable to services contracting and for the Secretary of each military department to establish centers of excellence in contracting for services. The committee has added $2.0 million to the Defense Acquisition University account to be used at the Defense Systems Management College for this purpose. The committee expects that these centers of excellence will be staffed with trained and experienced personnel that can assist the acquisition community when procuring services, make all acquisition personnel aware of the problems identified by the DOD IG, develop a time-phased plan with goals and performance measures to track improvements in the acquisition of services, and serve as a clearinghouse for best practices in contracting for services in the public and private sectors.

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a contracting preference for performance based contracting in services in which performance work statements would set forth re-

quirements in clear, specific, and objective terms with measurable outcomes. As an incentive for DOD to adopt performance based contracting techniques, performance based contracts for services under $5.0 million may be treated as contracts for a commercial item. The committee expects these improvements to lead to improved oversight and a greater results based focus on service contracting.

Addition of threshold value requirement for applicability of a reporting requirement relating to multiyear contract (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the multiyear reporting requirements required by section 809 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Under this provision, the head of an agency may not enter into a multiyear contract if the value exceeds $500.0 million until the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the congressional defense committees a report on the total obligational authority associated with existing and requested multiyear contracts contained in the Future Years Defense Program.

Planning for the acquisition of information systems (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chief Information Officers of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services to maintain a consolidated inventory of DOD mission critical and mission essential information systems, to identify interfaces between these and other information systems, and to maintain contingency plans for responding to a disruption in the operation of any of these information systems. The DOD in its report to the committee on Year 2000 Lessons Learned stressed the importance of maintaining the information that was developed to meet the Year 2000 problem and stated that "* * * centralized visibility of assets is fundamental to information technology management (e.g. acquisition, configuration management, and information assurance)."

The provision would also require that Department of Defense Directive 5000.1 be revised to establish minimum planning requirements for the acquisition of information technology systems, require registration and oversight by the Chief Information Office before award of a contract for mission critical or essential information technology systems, and prohibit Milestone I, II, or III approval until the Chief Information Officer has determined that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, including capital planning and investment control and performance, results based management techniques, and incremental acquisition.

Tracking of information technology purchases (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries for each military department to administer an automated system to track and manage purchases of information technology products and services in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold.

As a result of recent procurement reforms, there are many new procurement vehicles from which agencies can buy information technology. The Department of Defense (DOD) and the services can choose to buy information technology goods and services from the General Services Administration (GSA) multiple award schedules, government-wide acquisition contracts (GWACs), blanket purchase agreements, indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts, multiple award task order contracts, by credit card directly from vendors, or through a standard competitive contract.

The committee is concerned that there is insufficient data available to effectively support management decisions in determining whether the government is choosing the most appropriate vehicle to obtain the best price or best value for information technology (IT) purchases. For example, DOD and the services are negotiating enterprise software agreements designed to give DOD customers commercial off-the-shelf software products at prices significantly lower than those available on the GSA's Federal Supply Schedules. There is no data, however, to show to what degree buyers are using other agreements to buy the same products at potentially higher prices. In another example, the services, when asked by the committee how much IT was bought through GWACs, could not provide the answer. One military service tried to get this information and was told by the non-DOD agency who administered a GWAC that they would not share sales data with the service. This provision would prohibit any purchase by DOD off GWACs unless sales data is included in the data base required by this provision.

With DOD planning to spend $20.3 billion on information technology it is imperative that the Department have visibility over how these funds are being spent and whether there are more appropriate contracting strategies for achieving the Department's information technology needs. The committee expects DOD to use the data contained in this data base to more efficiently manage IT purchases to obtain best value products and services, while maximizing cost savings, competition, and efficient use of resources.

Repeal of requirement for contractor assurances regarding the completeness, accuracy, and contractual sufficiency of technical data provided by contractor (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement for contractors providing technical data to the government to furnish written assurances that the technical data is complete, accurate, and satisfies the requirements of the contract. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

The committee understands that the elimination of this requirement will not in any way diminish either the contractor's obligation to provide technical data that meets contract requirements or the government's ability to enforce this requirement. The committee expects that the Defense Contract Management Agency will continue to monitor contractor technical data programs in order to protect government data rights and to ensure the government receives timely and accurate information regarding contractor processes, practice, and controls for developing technical data.

Extension of authority for Department of Defense acquisition pilot programs (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of section 5064 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) and authorize the Department of Defense to continue to conduct five Defense Acquisition Pilot Programs through October 1, 2007. The committee notes that it would be inefficient and inappropriate to change contracting approaches in the middle of these programs, and understands that the extension provided in this provision should be sufficient to permit the completion of the programs under the pilot authority.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, on the lessons learned from the section 5064 pilot programs, how these lessons are being incorporated in major weapons systems acquisition, and what specific statutory constraints preclude new weapons systems programs from adopting the practices tested in the pilot programs.

Clarification and extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 807)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for three years the other transaction prototype authority under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 and identify appropriate uses of this authority to include cost sharing arrangements and the participation of nontraditional defense contractors. The committee also recommends a pilot program for the transition to follow-on production contracts for prototypes developed under the section 845 authority. Under the pilot program, an item or process developed by nontraditional defense contractors may be treated as a commercial item under a contract or subcontract for less than $20.0 million and purchased under the streamlined procedures established under the Federal Acquisition Regulations (48 C.F.R. Part 12). The committee intends that this provision will test and identify alternative methods to transition successful section 845 prototypes to production.

This provision would support using section 845 authority to attract companies that typically do not do business with the Department of Defense and encourage cost sharing and experimentation in potentially more efficient ways of doing business with traditional defense contractors. Other transaction authority is an important acquisition tool that can facilitate the incorporation of commercial technology into military weapon systems. In an environment where, in many areas, commercial technology is now more advanced than defense technology, it is imperative that the Department continue to have the flexibility to use innovative contractual instruments that provide access to this technology. There are, however, improvements that can be made in managing and overseeing these contractual arrangements.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reviewed the Department's use of section 845 authority for the committee and recommended that the Secretary of Defense provide updated guidance that sets out the conditions for using section 845 agreements and provides a framework to tailor the terms and conditions appropriate for each agreement. In addition, the GAO recommended that

the Secretary of Defense establish and require the use of a set of performance metrics directly related to the use of the agreements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to implement these recommendations by March 1, 2001, and further directs the GAO to report to the committee on the Department's compliance with these recommendations.

Clarification of authority of Comptroller General to review records of participants in certain prototype projects (sec. 808)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the audit access of the General Accounting Office (GAO) over other transaction prototype authority agreements for those contractors who have only done business with the government under other transaction authority or through cooperative agreements.

Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Department of Defense to ensure that the General Accounting Office has audit access to other transaction prototype authority agreements that provide for payments in excess of $5.0 million, unless a public interest waiver is obtained, or if a party or entity, or a subordinate element of a party or entity, has not entered into any other agreement that provides for audit access in the year prior to the agreement. This provision would clarify audit access by the GAO in those cases where a firm may have had a cooperative agreement or other transaction with the government prior to one year and has had no other government contracts.

Eligibility of small business concerns owned and controlled by women for assistance under the mentor-protege program (sec. 809)

The committee recommends a provision that would add small business concerns owned and controlled by women to the list of entities that are eligible to participate in the pilot mentor-protege program established by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

The pilot mentor-protege program provides incentives to major defense contractors to assist qualified small business to enhance their capabilities as contractors on Department of Defense (DOD) contracts. The mentor-protege program does not guarantee contracts to qualified small businesses. Instead, it is designed to equip these businesses with the knowledge and expertise that they need to win such contracts on their own, in the competitive market place.

The DOD has yet to meet the five percent government-wide annual goal for women-owned business participation in federal contracting required by section 7106 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. The committee encourages the Department to use the authority granted in this section, as well as existing programs, outreach, training and technical assistance to further the participation of women-owned businesses in DOD contracting.

Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec. 810)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to Congress on the

amount to be expended on the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) contract, the accounts from which the contract will be funded, a plan for incremental development, the management information specified in section 803(e), and any impact on the existing civilian workforce before beginning performance of the NMCI contract. The provision would require that the Marine Corps, the naval shipyards, and the naval aviation depots be excluded from the performance of the contract in the first year, and that the program be implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 and applicable regulations and directives.

The NMCI is a long-term "seat management" arrangement under which the Navy would transfer to a contractor the responsibility for providing and managing the Navy's desktop computer, server, infrastructure, and communication assets and services. Up to $2.0 billion a year could be expended on the contract over the next five years.

The committee recognizes that each of the military services faces aging information technology infrastructure, which is plagued with severe interoperability and information assurance problems. The committee supports the Navy's efforts to address these problems, and encourages the other military services to address them in an equally comprehensive manner. However, many questions have been raised by the General Accounting Office and others about the effectiveness of the Navy's NMCI contracting approach. To move forward before these questions have been addressed could risk wasting valuable defense resources and put in jeopardy the future use of this innovative contracting concept by the Federal Government.

The committee believes that for the Navy to successfully implement the NMCI, it will have to outline the business case for its information technology investments, demonstrate superior information technology project management expertise, and develop performance metrics based on sound baselines. The NMCI should be managed according to best private and public sector practices, including incremental development, as mandated in the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. The committee also believes that oversight by the DOD Chief Information Office is critical to the success of the program and that effective implementation of the memorandum of agreement between the Navy and DOD officials is a first step in ensuring effective management of the program.

The committee further recommends that the Navy ensure that the contractor for the NMCI program evaluates the use of commercial off the shelf desktop computers capable of securely processing, storing, and networking classified, sensitive, and unclassified data via the NMCI.

Qualifications required for employment and assignment in contracting positions (sec. 811)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a baccalaureate degree and 24 semester credit hours in business disciplines for new entrants into the GS–1102 occupational series and for contracting officers above the simplified acquisition threshold. The 24 semester credit hours may be included within the requirements for the baccalaureate degree or may be in addition to the

basic undergraduate degree requirement. The credit hours may be either undergraduate or graduate credit hours or a combination of both. These requirements will not apply to those who are already serving in these capacities as of September 30, 2000. This provision also does not effect the waiver authority in section 1724(d) of title 10, United States Code, which allows employees who do not meet these requirements to serve in these capacities if it is determined by the acquisition career program board of a military department that they possess significant potential for advancement based on demonstrated job performance and qualifying experience.

Defense contracting has changed significantly since the passage of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act of 1990. This provision will ensure that new entrants into the contracting field have the educational tools they need to effectively perform as contracting professionals in the changing federal marketplace.

Defense acquisition workforce (sec. 812)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a moratorium on further cuts in the acquisition workforce for three years. The Secretary of Defense may waive this prohibition upon certification to Congress that any reductions to the workforce will not negatively impact on the ability of the workforce to efficiently and effectively carry out its legally required functions.

The provision would also require a report on the sufficiency of the acquisition and support workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD). This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to perform a comprehensive reassessment of programmed reductions in the acquisition workforce, assess the impact of impending retirements, develop a plan to address future acquisition workforce challenges and problems arising from past reductions in the acquisition workforce, and identify steps that are being taken or could be taken by the DOD to enhance the tenure and reduce the turnover of program executive officers, program managers, and contracting officers.

The DOD Inspector General (IG) recently reported that DOD has reduced its acquisition workforce from 460,516 to 230,556 personnel, about 50 percent, from the end of fiscal year 1990 to the end of fiscal year 1999, while the workload has remained essentially constant, and even increased by some measures. The committee recognizes that the implementation of acquisition reform has improved efficiency in DOD contracting. However, according to the IG: ". . . staffing reductions have clearly outpaced productivity increases and the acquisition workforce's capacity to handle its still formidable workload."

The IG reported that reductions in the acquisition workforce have resulted in: (1) an increased backlog in closing out completed contracts; (2) increased program costs resulting from contracting for technical support versus using in-house technical support; (3) insufficient personnel to fill-in for employees on deployment; (4) insufficient staff to manage requirements; (5) reduced scrutiny and timeliness in reviewing acquisition actions; (6) personnel retention difficulty; (7) an increase in procurement action lead time; (8) some skill imbalances; and (9) lost opportunities to develop cost savings initiatives. The 14 DOD acquisition organizations reviewed by the

IG anticipate additional adverse effects on performance if further downsizing occurs.

In addition to concerns about the impacts of past acquisition workforce reductions, the committee is concerned about the changing demographics of the acquisition workforce as DOD loses a projected 55,000 of its most experienced personnel through attrition by fiscal year 2005.

In a hearing before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Administration witnesses testified about the need for innovative personnel changes to address impending demographic changes in the workforce, as well as addressing qualitative shortfalls. As a means to test personnel changes, the committee recommends a provision that would extend for three years the acquisition workforce demonstration project conducted under section 4308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. In addition, the committee recommends, as part of the report required by this provision, that the Secretary report on the lessons learned from this demonstration project and provide any recommendations to improve personnel management laws, policies, or procedures with respect to the DOD acquisition workforce.

Financial analysis of use of dual rate for quantifying overhead costs at army industrial facilities (sec. 813)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a financial analysis of the benefits and costs of permitting the use of dual overhead rates at Department of Army Government-Owned facilities as a means of encouraging commercial use of these facilities. The provision would also require the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on the results of this study by February 15, 2001.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Application of Cost Accounting Standards to universities

Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 contained provisions that modified and streamlined the applicability of the Cost Accounting Standards. Section 802(h) provided that these changes should not be construed to modify, supersede, impair, or restrict the applicability of the Cost Accounting Standards to educational institutions. Section 802(h) has been interpreted by some to preclude the Cost Accounting Standards Board (CAS Board) from altering the Cost Accounting Standards in any way, as they apply to universities and other educational institutions. That was not the committee's intent.

The committee understands that the applicability of both the Cost Accounting Standards and the cost accounting provisions in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–21 to universities and other educational institutions has led to confusion and misunderstanding. The committee believes that OMB and the CAS Board should work together to develop a more complete and seamless incorporation of the relevant Cost Accounting Standards into OMB Circular A–21. It is the committee's hope that OMB and the CAS Board will utilize terminology applicable to basic and applied research, and give examples relevant to university operations

to provide clear and consistent guidance on the steps that educational institutions must take to maintain compliance with applicable standards.

Appropriate use of the government purchase card

Last year, the committee directed that each of the military services conduct a review of purchase card transactions and report to Congress on their findings no later than March 1, 2000. The committee was disappointed that none of the services sampled the records of actual purchases to identify the items purchased and determine if the prices paid were reasonable. In the absence of such a review, the findings of the three services were inconclusive. For this reason, the committee directs each of the three military services to develop a plan for sampling purchase card transactions in selected commands to determine whether the prices paid were fair and reasonable, and to ensure that the purchase card is being used in an appropriate manner. The committee directs the military services to report their findings to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2001.

While the services provided some data on procurement savings through the use of the purchase card, the committee is concerned that processing costs at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service may have increased due to increased usage of the purchase card. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on this problem by February 1, 2001. The Secretary's report should: (1) provide an estimate of financial processing costs incurred due to the use of the purchase card and compare those costs to estimated contracting savings; and (2) discuss the feasibility of reducing those processing costs by electronically integrating purchases made through the government purchase card with the payment systems of the Department of Defense (for example, through the use of the Standard Procurement System).

Availability of contractor past performance information

The committee is aware that award fee determination information from previous contracts may be used in the assessment of a contractor's past performance for source selection purposes. Past performance information is generally considered to be source selection sensitive and, therefore, exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Once an award fee determination has been made under the previous contract, however, the information underlying the basis for that determination, because it is no longer pre-decisional, may be disclosed under FOIA unless some other express exemption applies. As a result, information may be treated as exempt from disclosure for the purpose of one contract, when it is subject to disclosure as it relates to another contract.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the issue to make a determination whether a clarification in regulation would be in the public interest. The committee directs the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and to the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representa-

tives on any determinations and actions with respect to this issue, no later than March 1, 2001.

Contracts for ancillary commercial services

Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 clarified that services ancillary to a commercial item, such as installation, maintenance, repair, training, and other support services would be considered commercial services, regardless of whether the services are provided by the same vendor or at the same time as the item, if the services are provided contemporaneously to the general public under similar terms and conditions.

It has come to the committee's attention that commercial practice may be to contract for such services on a basis other than firm-fixed prices under certain circumstances. For example, an elevator repair company may contract for the maintenance and repair of building elevators on a time and materials basis. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should utilize the flexibility provided in Section 8002(d) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act—which requires the use of firm, fixed price contracts "to the maximum extent practicable"—by authorizing the use of other than firm-fixed price contracts for the acquisition of ancillary commercial services when this is the common practice in sales to the general public.

At the same time, the committee has requested that the General Accounting Office undertake a broad review of best practices in the private sector for the acquisition of commercial products and services. In addition, this bill contains a number of provisions directed at improving the Department's management of contracts for commercial products and services. The committee does not believe that the Department should revise the current regulation prohibiting the use of other than firm-fixed price contracts under section 8002(d) for the acquisition of categories of commercial products and services other than ancillary services until the GAO review has been completed, the required management changes have been implemented, and the committee has had an opportunity to review the results.

Online auctioning

The Department of Defense has advised the committee that online auctioning may be well suited for competitive, high volume, commodity type purchases, and has the potential to save the Department significant resources in time, funding, and labor for such purchases. The committee urges the Department to identify specific markets for which the use of online auctioning may be appropriate and develop a pilot program to test the use of this innovate purchasing approach. The Department is directed to provide a progress report on this effort to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate no later than March 1, 2001.

Performance goals and measures for quality of equipment and other products

The committee is concerned that reductions in the acquisition workforce have increased the risk that quality control oversight measures may be inadequate. Recent reports of quality control

problems related to satellite launch failures, the continued stocking in the inventory of defective chemical protective suits, and concerns raised about the quality of aircraft carrier catapult parts raise questions about whether defense quality control problems may be systemic.

The Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) recently reported that the number of defense quality assurance personnel decreased from 12,117 in 1990 to 5,191 in 1999, a 57 percent decrease. The Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), the organization primarily responsible for in-plant quality assurance, stated to the DOD IG that increased quality control risk exists because of continued workforce reductions. DCMA also reported this risk from reduced oversight of contractors in its annual statement of assurance. DCMA commented that some contractors stated that when DCMA stopped performing inspections of all products, so did the contractors.

The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) stated that while customer complaints about the quality of material received have increased, DLA has placed less emphasis on responding to the customer complaints because of acquisition workforce reductions. Another military command stated that reduced staffing caused it to pay little attention to backlogs in Quality Deficiency Reports and Equipment Improvement Reports.

The committee is concerned that while staffing for quality assurance has been reduced, there are no overall DOD performance measures for the quality of products received from contractors. To address this issue, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to require the heads of acquisition activities in the DOD to establish and submit to the Secretary, for the Department's annual performance plan under the Government Performance and Results Act, performance goals and measures for the quality of military equipment and other products received from private sector sources. The Secretary of Defense shall also submit, by February 1, 2001, a report to Congress on how the Department plans to improve its quality assurance program.

Polyacrylonitrile carbon fibers

Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fibers are used in a variety of defense and space applications such as aircraft, missiles, launch vehicles, and helicopters. In 1985, the Department of Defense (DOD) determined that DOD was overly dependent on foreign industry for PAN carbon fibers and directed that one-third of PAN carbon fiber used in defense production should be supplied by domestic sources by the end of calendar year 1988. Congress included in the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1988 (Public Law 100–202) a requirement that by calendar year 1992, 50 percent of the DOD PAN carbon fiber requirements be purchased from domestic sources. To accomplish this objective, the statute also required that all new major systems use U.S. or Canadian manufacturers for all PAN carbon fiber requirements. DOD institutionalized these requirements in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations (DFAR). The statutory restrictions were not renewed after 1991. In 1996, DOD decided to continue the restrictions, but recommended that the issue be revisited in three years. The Department is currently

studying whether to maintain the PAN carbon fiber DFAR restriction.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2001, on the domestic and international industrial structure that produces PAN carbon fibers, current and anticipated market trends for this product, and on any decision made to maintain or discontinue the PAN carbon fiber DFAR restriction.

Procurements from the small arms production industrial base

The committee understands that there have been problems with the Department of the Army's process for forwarding waiver requests to the Secretary of Defense to authorize expanded competition on particular small arms critical repair parts contracts, as provided for in section 2473(a) of title 10, United States Code. The committee reiterates that waivers on small arms critical repair parts contracts should be forwarded to and granted by the Secretary of Defense when it is determined, with regard to a particular procurement, that restricting the procurement is not necessary to preserve the small arms production industrial base, as defined by section 2473(c) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee also reiterates its concern that quality and reliability be paramount in the execution of all small arms procurement. The Army must ensure that all solicitations for small arms, parts, and modifications—regardless of the method of procurement—will result in our troops receiving the safest and most reliable systems possible from reliable suppliers, and that each procurement will be based on detailed analyses of alternatives.

Risk management in the acquisition of major systems

The committee has reviewed a report entitled Report of the Price-based Acquisition Study Group, dated November 15, 1999, prepared for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics. Many of the recommendations of this report could be implemented without any change to existing law, and show significant promise for the reduction of risk in the acquisition of major systems. In this regard, the report is consistent with the recommendations of the General Accounting Office in work conducted for this committee.

For example, the report recommends that the Department: (1) establish a Defense-wide policy for risk mitigation through the use of evolutionary and incremental acquisition strategies, consistent with the requirements established for the acquisition of major systems of information technology in section 5202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996; (2) establish a Defense-wide policy for using price to help prioritize operational requirements; (3) facilitate the development of competitive pricing through the use of dissimilar competition in major systems acquisitions where it is not practicable to maintain multiple sources; (4) establish a center of excellence in market research to coordinate the use of best practices in market research across the department; and (5) conduct a Defense Science Board study on the impact of contract modifications and changes on contract cost, schedule, and quality. The committee urges the Depart-

ment of Defense to take strong action to implement these recommendations.

While the committee encourages the Department to implement the recommendations of the Study Group report relating to risk mitigation, the committee is concerned that several other recommendations of the report appear to be inconsistent with the requirements of existing law. In particular, the committee notes that the so-called "Cost or Pricing Analysis Decision Assistance Tool (COPADAT)" developed by the study group would direct results that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Truth in Negotiations Act—encouraging contracting officers to avoid obtaining certified cost or pricing data in circumstances where it is required by law. The committee directs the Department to stop all use of the COPADAT or any similar tool that would dictate a result that is inconsistent with statutory requirements to obtain certified cost or pricing data in sole source procurements of non-commercial items, absent "exceptional circumstances."

Similarly, the report recommends that the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation be revised to express a clear, unambiguous preference for price-based acquisition and that price-based acquisition be addressed in every acquisition plan or equivalent document, even in cases where the statute requires contracting officers to obtain certified cost or pricing data. The committee supports the use of price-based acquisition techniques to supplement the use of certified cost or pricing data in the determination of fair and reasonable prices in sole-source contracts for non-commercial items. However, the use of such techniques is not a substitute for statutory requirements or a basis for waiving the statutory requirements to obtain certified cost or pricing data in such acquisitions.

Finally, the committee notes that section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, established a new "exceptional circumstances" waiver to the Cost Accounting Standards. This waiver authority parallels waiver authority already available to the Department under the Truth in Negotiations Act.

The committee reminds the Department that the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, section 802 expressly limits the use of "exceptional circumstances" waivers to circumstances ". . . when the agency determines that it would not be able to obtain needed products or services from the vendor in the absence of a waiver." For this reason, the committee directs the Department to clarify that "exceptional circumstances" waivers to the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Cost Accounting Standards may not ordinarily be used to enter a contract with a major defense contractor or any other contractor that routinely does business with the Federal Government in contracts that are covered by the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Cost Accounting Standards.

Technical data rights for items developed exclusively at private expense

Section 2320 of Title 10, United States Code, establishes the statutory basis for regulations governing rights in technical data under Department of Defense contracts. This provision establishes the basic rule that the government has unlimited rights to technical

data developed exclusively with federal funds; the government does not generally have rights in technical data established exclusively at private expense; and rights to data developed in part with federal funds and in part at private expense are negotiable. When the government purchases an item developed exclusively at private expense, however, Section 2320 reserves the government's limited right to technical data that ". . . is necessary for operation, maintenance, installation, or training (other than detailed manufacturing or process data)."

Department of Defense officials have noted that it is increasingly common that commercially-developed systems or components are either returned to the manufacturer for repair or discarded. In such cases, these officials state, the government does not need technical data, and our insistence that contractors provide such data could discourage commercial companies from doing business with the government.

The committee believes that this concern is based upon a misreading of the statute. Section 2320 requires contractors to provide only technical data that "is necessary" for operation, maintenance, installation, or training. This requirement provides executive branch officials with the flexibility to determine what data, if any, is necessary for these limited purposes. If, in view of the manner in which the system or component will be used, no data is necessary for these purposes, the government should not require the seller to provide any such data. The committee directs the Department to review the regulations implementing Section 2320 and adopt any changes that may be necessary to clarify this point.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement to reduce the number of personnel assigned to major Department of Defense headquarters activities. The committee believes the reductions mandated by the previous legislation would adversely impact the ability of the service staffs, the Joint Staff, and the combatant commands to accomplish their missions.

Overall supervision of Department of Defense activities for combating terrorism (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD–SOLIC) as the principal civilian adviser to the Secretary of Defense on, and the principal official within the senior management of the Department of Defense (DOD) (after the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense) responsible for, combating terrorism. The ASD–SOLIC would provide overall direction and supervision for policy, program planning and execution, and allocation and use of resources for the activities of the Department of Defense for combating terrorism, including antiterrorism activities, counterterrorism activities, terrorism consequence management activities, and terrorism-related intelligence support activities. The committee is concerned that there is currently no single individual responsible for policy oversight at the Department to ensure a focused, comprehensive, cohesive, and well-funded DOD combating terrorism policy. The committee believes that there must be one official responsible for policy and budgetary oversight of this important mission. The intent of this provision is also to ensure that the Department's combating terrorism program is fully included in all stages of the Programs, Planning and Budgeting System (PPBS) as a single entity, rather than as separate activities.

As included in the Department of Defense's report, DOD Combating Terrorism Activities, provided to Congress pursuant to section 932 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, the Department's combating terrorism activities are divided into four components: antiterrorism/force protection, counterterrorism, terrorism consequence management, and intelligence support to combating terrorism. Currently, numerous DOD officials are responsible for these various combating terrorism activities. In many cases, responsibilities for these important activities overlap and it is unclear who has oversight for specific activities or ultimate responsibility for program direction. Through this

provision, it is the committee's intent to consolidate the oversight and management of this vital program.

Finally, the committee commends the Department for the fiscal year 2001 congressional justification book (CJB) for Combating Terrorism. This was a good first step in consolidating the numerous programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program. The committee looks forward to working with the Department to make certain modifications that will improve this product. In particular, the committee would like to see the Department separate military personnel costs from the other combating terrorism costs.

National Defense Panel 2001 (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that authorizes the establishment of a National Defense Panel (NDP) in fiscal year 2001 to accompany the fiscal Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) for fiscal year 2001. The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 (Public Law 105–85) established the QDR and the NDP, but the provision was a one year provision, and did not establish a recurring requirement. The Congress established the QDR as a permanent recurring requirement (10 U.S. Code, 118) in the National Defense Authorization Act of FY 2000, but did not include a requirement for the NDP.

This provision responds to widespread belief that the combination of the QDR and NDP serve to heighten awareness of the administration, the Pentagon, the Congress, and the broader national security establishment on national defense strategies and policies for the future. This provision authorizes establishment of an NDP, consisting of nine recognized national security experts and appropriate support staff, to proceed concurrently with the QDR. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of each Committee on Armed Services, will designate one of the nine members as the Chairman of the NDP.

The intent of this provision is to establish an NDP in fiscal year 2001 that will independently and objectively assess the current and projected strategic environment, assess the most dangerous threats to the national security interests of the United States over the next 10 to 20 years, and identify the strategic and operational challenges for the armed forces in countering these threats. The NDP will provide an interim report to the Secretary of Defense not later than July 1, 2001, that will be of assistance to him as he evaluates the overall QDR process. The NDP will provide a final report to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress not later than December 1, 2001. The Secretary of Defense will provide the defense committees of Congress his comments on the final NDP report not later than December 15, 2001.

Quadrennial National Defense Panel (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision that amends title 10, United States Code, to require that a National Defense Panel (NDP) be established on a recurring basis, every four years in the year preceding the inauguration of a new President. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 105–85) established the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the NDP, but the provision was a one year provision, and did not establish a recurring requirement. The Congress established the QDR as a permanent recurring requirement (10 U.S.C. 118), but did not include a requirement for the NDP.

This provision responds to widespread belief that the combination of the QDR and NDP serve to heighten awareness of the administration, the Pentagon, the Congress, and the broader national security establishment on national defense strategies and policies for the future. This provision authorizes the establishment an NDP, consisting of nine recognized national security experts and appropriate support staff, to precede the QDR. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of each Committee on Armed Services, will designate one of the nine members as the Chairman of the NDP.

The intent of this provision is to establish a recurring NDP that will independently and objectively assess the current and projected strategic environment, assess the most dangerous threats to the national security interests of the United States over the next 10 to 20 years, and identify the strategic and operational challenges for the armed forces in countering these threats. The NDP will serve to provide an incoming Secretary of Defense of a new administration with a range of strategic directions and policy options which may assist him in formulating the strategic framework and guidance to be used by the QDR required to be conducted during the first year of a new administration. Additionally, this provision provides the opportunity for Congress, in accordance with its oversight role, to have insight and an avenue for input into the QDR process.

Inspector General investigations of prohibited personnel actions (sec. 905)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, to broaden the definition of "Inspector General" in that section to include any officer of the armed forces or employee of the Department of Defense, not otherwise referred to in that definition, who is assigned or detailed to serve as an inspector general at any level in the Department. This expanded definition would authorize defense agency and joint service inspectors general, and civilian employees serving in such positions elsewhere in the Department, to handle alleged violations of the whistleblower protections afforded members of the armed forces in this statute. The provision also clarifies that the procedures necessary to ensure the expeditious processing and investigation of

such alleged violations shall be set out in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The committee understands that these regulations require that any investigation undertaken pursuant to section 1034 must be conducted by an inspector general who is independent of any individuals who may be subjects of the investigation.

Network centric warfare (sec. 906)

The committee has noted, with great interest, the efforts by Department of Defense (DOD) agencies, the military services, the joint staff, and combatant commanders to establish mechanisms to integrate information systems, sensors, weapons systems and decision-makers. The common terminology for this is network centric warfare (NCW). In conversations with various agencies and organizations, it has become increasingly apparent that many of these efforts are innovative but are unnecessarily redundant and not designed to work in conjunction with each other. More importantly, it appears that there is not an effective overarching concept at the DOD level to fully integrate these various concepts of operation and maximize their potential contribution to information superiority—a cornerstone of Joint Vision 2010.

Although ideas relating to the concepts of NCW have been analyzed within DOD, no clear consensus has emerged as to what priority it should have within broader efforts to transform the military. Additionally, there is no agreement on what fundamental organizational and doctrinal changes need to be pursued in order to most effectively implement these concepts or how the military services should work jointly in this effort. As a result, although the military services and several defense agencies are exploring new organizational concepts, operating procedures, training programs, and technologies to ensure information superiority in their operations, these efforts are often underfunded, low priority, and have not included joint war fighting and interoperability considerations.

Specifically, the committee has noted the following: (1) NCW is a set of concepts being developed to exploit the power of information and U.S. superiority in information technologies to maintain dominance on the battlefield while protecting the infrastructure and information that is critical to the United States; (2) NCW involves the integration of information from combat, combat support, logistics elements and headquarters staffs into a seamless system that provides a common picture of the battlespace that can be simultaneously shared and used by sensors, weapons systems, combat personnel, decision makers, support elements, and other elements of the military services, unified commands, and allied forces operating in that battlespace; (3) a robust joint command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) capability involving a networking of all these entities facilitates the timely flow of relevant, processed information that is necessary for achieving the sharing of an accurate common picture of the battlespace; (4) NCW is about networking capabilities, rather than creating separate networks or technologies, and is a means to generate greater combat power, dominance, and synergy through a linking of critical information sources that are geographically or hierarchically dispersed; (5) NCW is inherently joint,

in that new air, sea, and land platforms under development must be able to integrate themselves into a seamless, overarching information architecture to be able to see the battlespace, contribute to the information base, and quickly receive orders to employ required capabilities; (6) being joint in nature, the NCW concepts must be approved at the highest levels of DOD and executed aggressively by a coordinated, iterative effort of all the military services, defense agencies, combatant commands and the joint staff; (7) successful implementation of the concepts will produce numerous benefits, including: (a) significant reduction in fratricide; (b) more adaptive and agile forces capable of engaging effectively across the spectrum of conflict with higher probability of success and reduced risk; (c) enhancement of interoperability among the military services and allied forces; (d) reduced manning requirements and life cycle costs for weapons systems; and (e) efficient combat support operations; (8) the well-intentioned, but separate efforts of the military services and defense agencies have resulted in recurring difficulties and deficiencies, including a number of interoperability failures of critical systems and inefficiencies in recent operations, including Kosovo.

As a result of these findings and concerns, the committee directs that DOD provide three reports to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2001, that summarize their efforts to coordinate NCW activities within the entire Department. The first report will be a comprehensive summary on the development and implementation of NCW concepts in DOD. The report will include: (1) a clear definition of NCW; (2) identification and description of Office of the Secretary of Defense, joint staff and U.S. Joint Forces Command activities to coordinate NCW related activities; (3) recommended metrics for evaluating the progress towards implementing NCW concepts and attainment of fully integrated C4ISR capabilities; (4) recommendations for joint concept development and joint experimentation; (5) progress made, as determined by quantitative standards: (a) toward establishing an overarching conceptual foundation in programs and initiatives currently underway; (b) in fielding force-wide friendly combat identification; and (c) in effective fire control and airspace management; (6) discussion of additional authorities, authorizations and other resources required to effectively implement NCW; (7) joint requirements and acquisition policy changes being made or considered to implement NCW; (8) a discussion of how private sector lessons learned in networking are being incorporated; and (9) a discussion of how DOD NCW systems will integrate with other agencies of the federal government when DOD civil support is required.

Additionally, the committee directs the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command, on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, to conduct a study and submit a report on how to best use service and joint experimentation programs to develop NCW concepts and identify barriers to their implementation.

Finally, the committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit a report describing the coordination in several specified areas of the science and technology investments of the military departments and defense agencies in the development of future NCW capabilities.

Additional duties for the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 907)

Subtitle C of title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 established a Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization. The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1622 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2000 to include additional duties for the commission.

Special authority for administration of Navy Fisher Houses (sec. 908)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the degree to which Navy Fisher Houses may be provided common support equivalent to category B community support activities and would permit the current general schedule employees to continue to serve until they leave those positions.

Organization and management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 909)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify the agreement recently reached between the Secretary of the Air Force and the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol. However, the provision would not allow contract employees of the Air Force to commit federal resources.

The committee commends the Secretary of the Air Force and the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol for their efforts to establish a more cooperative relationship. The committee supports the proposal to develop an appropriate oversight mechanism to ensure the responsible expenditure of federal resources.

Responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program (sec. 910)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program from the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to the Secretary of Defense, and would amend the limitation on federal funding for the National Guard Challenge program to limit only Department of Defense funding. The fiscal year 2001 budget request for the National Guard Challenge is $62,500,000, which is also the maximum permitted by the existing statute. The recommended provision recognizes the concept of civilian control of the military and would clarify that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs is not required to communicate with state National Guard Challenge programs through the National Guard Bureau. The committee expects the National Guard Bureau to continue to be an important element in the National Guard Challenge Program.

Supervisory control of Armed Forces Retirement Home Board by Secretary of Defense (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish that the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board is subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense in the performance of its responsibilities, would give the Secretary of Defense

authority over appointment and terms of board members, and would make the Chairman of the Retirement Home Board responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

Consolidation of certain Navy gift funds (sec. 912)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer all amounts in the Naval Historical Center Fund to the Department of the Navy General Gift Fund and to close the Naval Historical Center Fund. The recommended provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer all amounts in the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund to the gift fund maintained for the benefit and use of the United States Naval Academy, and to close the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund.

Temporary authority to dispose of a gift previously accepted for the Naval Academy (sec. 913)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Naval Academy to, during fiscal year 2001 and at the request of the donor, transfer a gift previously given to the Naval Academy Gift fund to another entity.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000 (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the emergency supplemental appropriations enacted in the 2000 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act (Public Law 106–XXX). The supplemental provided funding for fiscal year 2000 expenses related to military operations in Kosovo, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, and natural disasters.

United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1003)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(c)(ii)) that requires a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of NATO for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, that U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision to authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2001, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

Annual OMB/CBO joint report on scoring budget outlays (sec. 1004)

The committee recommends a provision that makes minor administrative changes to the joint annual Office of Management and Budget/Congressional Budget Office (OMB/CBO) report on the scoring of budget outlays.

Prompt payment of contractor vouchers (sec. 1005)

The committee recommends a provision that will require the Secretary of Defense to reduce the backlog of vouchers to be paid by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) to five percent or less of the total Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) vouchers received. Normal commercial practice, as well as the government's own policy, calls for payment within 30 days for work satisfactorily accomplished. The committee is concerned that this standard is not being accomplished and creates undue hardships for private sector enterprises doing business with the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Committee recognizes the efforts by DFAS to reduce the backlog of vouchers and the electronic initiatives to expedite the processing of these vouchers, and applauds this effort. The DOD is urged to move more aggressively in the areas of electronic commerce to develop a common family of invoices, reduce excessive de-

tail and supporting data, and streamline the payment process. Electronic invoicing and payment has demonstrated its value and the Department is urged to be more aggressive in these areas.

The repeal of certain requirements relating to timing of contract payments (sec. 1006)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal two provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–79) concerning the prompt payment act and the shifting of pay days for federal employees.

Plan for prompt posting of contractual obligations (sec. 1007)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan concerning the timely obligation of funds. The committee notes that the ability to obligate funds is not standardized or even centralized within the Department of Defense. This obligation authority resides in the services in some cases and Defense Finance and Accounting Service in others. This lack of uniformity calls into question the Department's ability to reduce the backlog of vouchers and problem disbursements, and to improve the accounting systems.

Plan for the electronic submission of documentation supporting claims for contract payments (sec. 1008)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2001, for the electronic submission of contract supporting transactions (e.g. invoices, receiving reports, and certifications).

Administrative offsets for overpayment of transportation costs (sec. 1009)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide a streamlined offset procedure for amounts overpaid for transportation services, that are below the simplified acquisition threshold of $100,000. The amounts offset would be credited to the appropriation or accounts that funded the transportation service. This provision does not effect the budgetary requirements for these services.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The budget request for drug interdiction and other counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) totals $1.1 billion: $836.0 million in central transfer account; $166.5 million in the operating budgets of the military services for authorized counter-drug operations; and $76.8 million in the military construction account for infrastructure improvements at the forward operating locations. This request is in addition to the $137.0 million in the emergency fiscal year 2000 supplemental funding request for Plan Colombia.

The Committee recommends the following fiscal year 2001 budget for the Department's counter-narcotics activities.

Drug Interdiction & Counterdrug Activities, Operations and Maintenance

[In thousands of dollars]

[May not add due to rounding]

Fiscal Year 2001 Drug and Counterdrug Request	$1,070,064
Goal 1 (Dependent Demand Reduction)	22,736
Goal 2 (Support to DLEAs)	89,905
Goal 3 (DOD Personnel Demand Reduction)	74,067
Goal 4 (Drug Interdiction—TZ/SWB)	447,414
Goal 5 (Supply Reduction)	435,942
Increases:	
Airborne Reconnaissance Low	31,000
National Guard Support	25,000
Decreases:	
DINANDRO Riverine Support	3,000
DEA Transportation Support (PC–2307)	1,350
Carribean Law Enforcement Support	2,703
Supplemental Appropriation	
Forward Operating Location Construction	76,800
Plan Colombia	40,000
Total Fiscal Year 2001 Drug and Counterdrug Funding	1,119,011

Extension and increase of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1011)

The committee recognizes the importance of providing the democratically elected governments of the countries of the Andean Ridge, particularly Colombia, with the tools and training necessary to assert control over their sovereign national territory to prevent the illegal trafficking of narcotics and the regional in stability that narcotics trafficking creates. The committee supports the President's request for the supplemental funding that would be used to help train and equip the military and police forces of these countries. However, the resources requested for these activities would exceed the current authorities. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would extend until fiscal year 2006 the authority for the DOD to provide certain counter-drug assistance to the Government of Colombia. The provision would also increase the level of resources authorized to be expended through this authority to $40.0 million each year.

Recommendations on expansion of support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1012)

The committee understands the valuable contribution that the Department of Defense has made in providing needed assistance to the counter-drug forces of Colombia and Peru. However, the committee is concerned about efforts to seek an expansion of current authority to other nations without a clear plan on how this assistance will be put to the most effective use.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that would outline the Secretary's views regarding what, if any, additional countries should be included; what, if any, additional support should be provided; and a detailed plan for providing support, including the counter-drug activities proposed to be supported.

Review of riverine counter-drug program (sec. 1013)

The committee is concerned with reports of problems in the management and operation of certain portions of the riverine counter-drug program. While this program has made great strides improving the counter-drug capability of some forces, other forces have had far less success.

Therefore, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to review the riverine counter-drug program and provide a report to Congress on the results of that review. The report should include an assessment of the effectiveness of the program for each country receiving support, and a recommendation regarding which of the armed forces, units of the armed forces, or other organizations within the DOD should be responsible for managing the program.

The committee further recommends a reduction of $3.0 million in the support provided to the riverine operations of the Government of Peru.

Airborne Reconnaissance Low

The committee recognizes the critical need for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets to be deployed to the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) in order to more effectively combat the illegal trafficking of narcotics. In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Wilhelm, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, identified a need for more ISR assets. Unfortunately, as a result of requirements in other theaters, and the tragic accident in Colombia last year, there are insufficient quantities of ISR assets to always meet SOUTHCOM's requirements. In recent letters to the committee, General Shinseki, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, and General Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, identified a requirement for an additional Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft that was not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of $31.0 million for the procurement of an Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft to be used in the Department's counter-drug mission.

National Guard counter-drug activities

The committee understands the valuable contribution of the National Guard in the war on drugs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the counter-drug activities of the National Guard including the regional counter- drug operations such as the Gulf States Counter-Drug Initiative, the Regional Counter-Drug Training Academy, and the Northeast Counter-Drug Training Center.

Plan Colombia & Forward Operating Location construction

The committee recommends a decrease of $40.0 million to the fiscal year 2001 budget request for Plan Colombia to reflect the fact that these funds were provided through the counter-drug budget supplemental in fiscal year 2000. The adjustment for the supplemental appropriation for the Forward Operating Location construction is reflected in Division B of this report.

Drug Enforcement Agency transportation support

The committee is concerned with the Drug Enforcement Agency's (DEA) reliance on the DOD to transport DEA personnel around the Caribbean. Transportation of DEA personnel does not enhance military capabilities or require unique military assets, is the responsibility of the DEA, and should be funded through the DEA budget. The DOD budget request includes $3.4 million for such transportation services. The committee recommends a decrease of $1.4 million to the budget request for this activity. The committee expects the DEA to assume all costs for this activity after fiscal year 2001.

Caribbean law enforcement support

The committee is concerned with the increased reliance upon the DOD to provide assistance to foreign law enforcement agencies where the Department has limited, or no mission responsibility. The budget request includes $6.7 million for assistance to law enforcement agencies of Caribbean nations. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.7 million to the request for this activity. The committee expects the State Department to provide the support for this activity in the future.

SUBTITLE C—STRATEGIC FORCES

Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1015)

Six years have passed since the nuclear posture review of fiscal year 1994. The committee believes that a new nuclear posture review is overdue and should be completed in the near future. Although Presidential Decision Directive 60, signed in November 1997, reaffirmed and updated U.S. nuclear weapons employment policy guidance, there has not been an end-to-end review of U.S. nuclear weapons strategy, requirements, and posture since fiscal year 1994.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a comprehensive nuclear posture review that looks out five to ten years. The review would include: (1) the role of nuclear forces in United States military strategy, planning, and programming; (2) the policy requirements and objectives for the United States to maintain a safe, reliable and credible nuclear deterrence posture; (3) the relationship between U.S. nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives; (4) the levels and composition of nuclear delivery systems that will be required to implement the U.S. national and military strategy, including any plans to replace or modify existing systems; (5) the nuclear weapons complex that will be required to implement U.S. national and military strategy, including any plans to modernize or modify the complex; and (6) the active and inactive nuclear weapons stockpile that will be required to implement U.S. national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying warheads. The provision would also require that, concurrently with the Quadrennial Defense Review due in December 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report, in unclassified and classified forms as necessary, on the nuclear posture review. Finally, the

provision expresses the sense of Congress that a revised nuclear posture review should be used as the basis for establishing future arms control objectives and negotiating positions.

Plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1016)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to prepare a plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of U.S. strategic forces. The committee expects that the plan would look beyond current efforts to modernize existing systems and lay out a comprehensive vision for the maintenance of deterrent forces.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy may not be adequately planning for United States strategic nuclear forces in the long term. The committee supports current efforts to provide for continued sustainment of existing strategic delivery systems and warheads, but is concerned that there appears to be no long-range vision of how the United States should preserve strategic deterrent forces. The committee believes that the United States will require such forces beyond the date when existing systems become obsolete.

Correction of scope of waiver authority for limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles (sec. 1017)

Section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 revised the limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998 by permitting the Navy to retire (or otherwise eliminate from strategic nuclear operational status) four of its eighteen Trident ballistic missile submarines. The provision also includes a waiver authority that the President can exercise if the START II treaty enters into force. As drafted, however, the waiver only applies to the retirement of submarines. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would revise the scope of the section 1501 waiver so that it applies to all of the strategic nuclear delivery vehicles covered by section 1501.

Study and report on hardened and deeply buried targets (sec. 1018)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to assess requirements and options for defeating hardened and deeply buried targets. The provision would expressly authorize the Department of Energy (DOE) to conduct any limited research and development that may be necessary to complete such assessments.

The committee notes that a recent legal interpretation of existing law raised questions regarding whether DOE could participate in or otherwise support certain Department of Defense (DOD) studies and options assessments for defeating hardened and deeply buried targets. This provision removes any uncertainty and expressly allows DOE to assist the DOD with a review of these targets and the options for defeating such targets. The committee believes that DOE should provide information and all other assistance required

to help DOD make informed decisions on whether: (1) to proceed with a new method of defeating hardened and deeply buried targets and; (2) to seek any necessary modifications to existing law.

The committee is concerned that the ability to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets will continue to be a significant challenge for the foreseeable future.

SUBTITLE D—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Annual report of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff on combatant command requirements (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 153(d)(1) to require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to include within his report to Congress on the readiness requirements of the combatant commanders, information on the extent to which those requirements are addressed in the future years defense program.

Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 1022)

The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) was formed by the Department of Defense (DOD) after enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. At the request of DOD, title 10, U.S. Code was amended by the National Defense Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 105–85) to establish a legal requirement for the JROC (title 10, U.S. Code, 181). The JROC was formed to assist the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), in carrying out his title 10 responsibilities to provide the best possible advice to the Secretary on the degree to which defense budget proposals conform to requirements expressed by the combatant commanders, and to ensure that joint war fighting capabilities and joint interoperability issues were highlighted to the Secretary as he prepared his defense budget guidance. Accordingly, the JROC became a mechanism for forging consensus among the services on programming and budgeting issues.

While the JROC has made progress in promoting joint interoperability, much remains to be done. In recent years, the JROC has been increasingly involved in solving short-term unified commander requirements. At an April 4, 2000 Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on joint requirements, capabilities, and experimentation, General Richard B. Myers, USAF, the Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that the JROC must evolve further, shifting its focus to more strategic, future advanced war fighting requirements. To implement required changes in the JROC, the CJCS, with the support of the service chiefs and the combatant commanders has proposed an initiative, which includes: (1) shifting the primary focus of the JROC to more strategic issues; (2) integrating joint experimentation activities fully into the requirements, capabilities, and acquisition processes; and (3) shifting the focus of the Joint War Fighting Capability Assessment Teams from short-term, narrow issues to directly supporting the JROC in analyzing broader, future joint war fighting requirements.

The committee is encouraged by this initiative and will follow it closely. However, the committee is troubled to hear concerns from

combatant commanders about continuing deficiencies in joint military capabilities. A JROC process that recommends solutions to the most critical joint war fighting challenges at the strategic and operational levels could play a critical role in solving many of these problems.

In order to monitor developments in this area, the committee directs the CJCS to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by February 28, 2001, and semi-annually thereafter, detailing the progress made in reforming and re-focusing the Joint Requirements Oversight Council process. The report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: (1) a listing and justification for each of the distinct capability areas selected by the CJCS as the principal domain of the JROC; (2) a listing of joint requirements developed, considered, and/or approved within each of those capability areas; (3) a listing and explanation of decisions made by the JROC during the reporting period, with special note of actions made that were in disagreement with the position presented by the Commander-in- Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command, as the chief proponent of joint and combatant commander requirements; (4) an assessment of the progress made in elevating the JROC to a more strategic focus on future war fighting requirements, integration of requirements, and the development of overarching common architectures; (5) a summation and assessment of the role and impact of joint experimentation on the joint requirements, service requirements, defense acquisition and service acquisition processes and decisions; (6) recommendations as to additional legislation and/or resources required to further refocus and reform the JROC process; and (7) procedural actions taken to improve the JROC.

Preparedness of military installation first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1023)

The committee is supportive of the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to ensure first responder preparedness on military installations. However, the committee is concerned with the timetable for the program and also with the degree of coordination between the services and the local community first responders, particularly with regards to standardized equipment. The committee has included a provision directing, not less than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of Defense to submit to the committee a report on the Department's program to ensure the preparedness of DOD first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction on military installations. The provision directs the Secretary to include within the report the following: a detailed description of the program; the schedule and costs associated with the implementation of the program; how the program is being coordinated with first responders in the local communities in the localities of the installations; and the plan for promoting the interoperability of the equipment used by the installation first responders with the equipment used by the first responders in the localities.

Date of submittal of reports on shortfalls in equipment procurement and military construction for reserve components in future years defense programs (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10543(c) of title 10, United States Code, to specify that the report required by the section be submitted not later than 15 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for a fiscal year.

The committee is aware that the current level of funding for the reserve components will not reduce the significant backlog in military construction requirements. The impact will be increased costs for repair and maintenance, declining readiness and quality of life. The backlog problem is further aggravated by the lack of a uniform standard in characterizing the funding requirements. For the past several years, the Air Force has characterized some reserve component military construction projects as being in the "unfunded" future years defense program (FYDP), while the other components have resorted to other means to identify their requirements above those in the FYDP. However, the reporting requirement in section 10543 requires the Department of Defense to identify the highest priority unfunded requirements for the reserve components. It does not equate those unfunded requirements to an "unfunded FYDP". The committee expects the military departments to adhere to the traditional practices of classifying projects as either in the FYDP or not in the FYDP and of inclusion of the highest priority projects in the FYDP. To ensure consistency and that the highest priority construction projects, both unfunded and those in the FYDP, receive appropriate congressional consideration for additional funds, when available, the report required by section 10543(c)(1) shall reflect the highest priority projects whether or not they are included in the FYDP.

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs to increase funding and improve facilities for the reserve components through innovative approaches, such as joint use facilities. However, the ultimate solution is additional funding. The committee urges the military departments to more robustly fund reserve component construction in future budget requests and the future year defense program.

To ensure the funding resources available are devoted to the highest priority needs, the committee stringently follows the criteria established by the sense of the Senate provision on authorization of funds for military construction projects not requested in the President's Annual Budget Request (section 2856 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995). The committee urges the military departments to cooperate in this effort by adhering to this clear standard when identifying military construction projects for authorization that are not in the military construction budget request.

Management review of defense logistics agency (sec. 1025)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of all the functions of the Defense Logistics Agency to assess their efficiency, their effectiveness in meeting customer needs, their ability

to adopt best business practices, and to identify alternative approaches for improving the agency's operations.

An effective, efficient, and responsive logistics system is essential for ensuring a ready and reliable military force capable of successfully executing the national military strategy with a minimum of risk. The committee believes that the Defense Logistics Agency must be capable of meeting its customer requirements in the most efficient manner, exploiting best business practices where practical, and exploring alternative approaches when they make sense.

Management review of defense information systems agency (sec. 1026)

The Committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of the operations of the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) and make such recommendations that the Comptroller General determines would improve the support that this agency provides to the military services.

The increased role that information technology and services play in the national security environment requires that the military services receive the most efficient and effective support from those who provide these services. DISA, as the principal supplier of information services in the Department of Defense, must ensure that it is structured to take advantage of best business practices and to adopt alternative approaches where it makes sense.

SUBTITLE E—INFORMATION SECURITY

Institute for defense computer security and information protection (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an institute for defense computer security and information assurance to address the critical information assurance requirement of the Department of Defense (DOD). The institute would also facilitate the exchange of information regarding cyber threats, technology, tools, and other relevant issues, between government and non-government organizations and entities. The provision would require the Secretary to enter into a contract with a not-for-profit entity or consortium to organize and operate the institute. Finally, the provision would require the use of competitive procedures for the selection of the organization responsible for the operation of the institute, to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for establishment and initial operation of the institute.

The committee strongly supports the information assurance efforts of the DOD. A critical element of this effort is research and development in the area of information and network security. Although the DOD currently undertakes such research in various ways, including through private contractors, federally funded research and development centers and universities, the DOD does not have a central mechanism for coordinating these efforts. Currently a significant amount of research relevant to DOD is not being undertaken in the private sector or within government.

Moreover, some research being done in the private sector is not available to the DOD.

Information security scholarship program (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish an Information Security Scholarship Program within the Department of Defense (DOD) that would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide educational assistance to individuals seeking a baccalaureate or an advanced degree in disciplines related to computer security, network security, and information assurance in exchange for a service agreement. This program would allow active duty military personnel, DOD civilian personnel, and individuals not employed by the DOD to acquire such education in exchange for accepting or continuing employment in the DOD in the area of computer security and information assurance. The committee has received extensive testimony and other reports regarding the importance of education and training to the defense information assurance program and all other facets of cyber security.

The committee notes that Presidential Decision Directive/NSC–63, of May 22, 1998, regarding critical infrastructure protection, states that: ". . . there shall be Vulnerability Awareness and Education Programs within both the government and the private sector to sensitize people regarding the importance of security and to train them in security standards, particularly regarding cyber systems." The National Plan for Information Systems Protection of January 12, 2000, states that: ". . . within the Federal Government, the lack of skilled information systems security personnel amounts to a crisis. This shortfall of workers reflects a scarcity of university graduate and undergraduate information security programs." The National Plan calls for the creation of ". . . a Scholarship for Service Program to recruit and educate the next generation of Federal information technology workers and security managers." According to the National Plan: ". . . an important part of this program is the need to identify universities for participation in the program and assist in the development of information security faculty and laboratories at these universities."

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should work with selected universities to develop cyber security curricula that respond to the needs of the DOD. The committee believes that, initially, the Secretary should focus on establishing cyber security programs at two or three institutions of higher education. Such universities should become important sources of recruitment for satisfying the Department's information assurance personnel requirements. Although the committee believes that all qualified universities should be evaluated, it also believes that the universities already identified by the National Security Agency as information assurance centers of excellence should be leading candidates for involvement in the Information Security Scholarship Program. In order for universities to develop the requisite curricula and faculty, the DOD should also involve such universities in research relevant to the Department's information assurance needs. Once the Information Security Scholarship Program has been established at two or three institutions of higher education, the committee urges the

Secretary to expand and adequately fund the program to satisfy the personnel needs of the DOD.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for establishment and initial operation of the Information Security Scholarship Program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2001, describing the Secretary's plans for implementing this program.

The committee is also concerned that existing military and civilian education and training programs of the DOD and the military departments are not sufficiently focused on the problem of computer security and information assurance. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the education and training programs of the defense agencies and the military departments to determine the requirements for personnel qualified in the area of information technology security and what education and training programs are available in the area of information technology security. In addition to the review of programs for enlisted and officer personnel, this examination should include a review of the Reserve Officers Training Corps scholarship program in each service to determine whether scholarships leading to degrees in the information technology security area are sufficient to meet the projected officer needs of the military departments and the Department of Defense. The review shall include education and training programs, including internships, for civilian employees as well. Finally, the review shall evaluate the adequacy of cyber security programs at the military service academies. The Secretary of Defense shall report the results of his review to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001, in conjunction with the Secretary's report on the Information Security Scholarship Program.

Process for prioritizing background investigations for security clearances for Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1043)

The committee is concerned by delays in the background investigation process for granting security clearances to Department of Defense (DOD) personnel and contractors. The Defense Security Service (DSS) has experienced significant delays in processing requests for security investigations, which has resulted in a large backlog of overdue reinvestigations. This situation has imposed significant costs on DOD and its contractors and has delayed important programs. The committee supports the recommendations of the DOD Inspector General, outlined in the April 5, 2000, audit report (Report Number D–2000–111), which recommends that DOD implement a process for prioritizing security clearance investigations as a way of expediting the most important clearances. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process for expediting the completion of background investigations. This process shall include: (1) quantification of the requirements for background investigations; (2) categorization of personnel on the basis of the degree of sensitivity of their duties and the extent to which those duties are crit-

ical to the national security; and (3) prioritization of the processing of investigations on the basis of the categories of personnel.

Authority to withhold certain sensitive information from public disclosure (sec. 1044)

The committee recommends a provision that would protect from unauthorized disclosure two categories of sensitive unclassified information. Many allied and other friendly nations, and some international organizations, have a category of unclassified information that is subject to certain special controls and protected from release outside the government or organization. In addition, many governments have a category of classified information, "restricted", that is not used by the United States. "Restricted" information is normally provided at a level of protection less than that protection afforded to "confidential" in the U.S. classification system.

Information falling into one of these categories is frequently provided to the United States by foreign governments or international organizations under the condition that it be protected from unauthorized release. Under the present U.S. system, the only way that the United States can do so is to classify the information in the interests of national security under Executive Order 12958. This requires that the security requirements for classified information apply, including security clearances, safes, and precautions in transmission. This situation frequently imposes unnecessary costs and has caused problems for cooperative defense programs.

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard when not operating in the Navy), and the Secretary of Energy (with respect to that Department's national security programs) to withhold from public disclosure otherwise authorized by law sensitive information provided by a foreign government or an international organization which is itself protecting the information from disclosure. The information must be the subject of a written request from the government or organization that it be withheld, or have been provided on the condition that it be withheld, or fall within a category specified in regulations as being information the release of which would have an adverse effect on the ability of the United States to obtain similar information in the future. If the secretary of the department having the information transfers it to another agency, that agency shall withhold it from disclosure unless specifically authorized by the secretary of the department transferring it. The prohibition on disclosure will normally extend for the period specified by the country or organization providing the information, or for ten years if no period is so stated. The ten-year rule may be extended at the written request of the entity providing the information, as may the 25–year period applicable to certain information obtained by the United States prior to the enactment of this provision.

This provision does not authorize the withholding of information from Congress, or (except in the case of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities) the Comptroller General. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Energy are to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision.

Protection of operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to withhold from public disclosure the operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency. These files would be protected from disclosure, under the Freedom of Information Act or otherwise, to the same extent as provided for under section 701 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C 431). The provision also makes applicable to these files the decennial review provisions of section 702 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 432), with the Secretary of Defense exercising the authority granted to the Director of Central Intelligence in that section.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which was enacted May 5, 1950, and call upon the Department of Defense, the armed forces, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to commemorate the occasion in a suitable manner.

Eligibility of dependents of American Red Cross employees for enrollment in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools in Puerto Rico (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit dependents of American Red Cross employees performing Armed Forces Emergency Services duties in Puerto Rico to enroll in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools. The recommended provision would require that the Department of Defense be reimbursed for the education services.

Grants to American Red Cross for Armed Services Emergency Services (sec. 1054)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a grant to the American Red Cross up to $9,400,000 in each of fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003 in support of the American Red Cross. The recommended provision would provide that a grant may not be made until the American Red Cross certifies that it will expend, for the Armed Forces Emergency Services, an amount from non-federal sources that equals or exceeds the amount of the grant.

Transit pass program for certain Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1055)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide Department of Defense personnel with a transit pass benefit if they are assigned in areas that do not meet the revised national ambient air quality standards under section 109 of the Clean Air Act and they use means other than a single-occupancy vehicle to commute to or from work.

Fees for providing historical information to the public (sec. 1056)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to charge the public fees for providing historical information from the services' historical centers or agencies. These fees could be retained by the military departments to defray the costs of responding to requests for information. The fees charged for providing information pursuant to this section may not exceed the costs of providing the information. These fees would not apply to requests from members of the armed forces or federal employees which are made in the course of their official duties, or to requests made under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

Access to criminal history record information for national security purposes (sec. 1057)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, to provide expanded access to criminal history information by the Department of Defense and certain other executive departments and agencies to better evaluate employees and contractors with regard to fitness for assignment or employment. Current law provides access to such information only for security clearances or assignment to sensitive national security duties. This provision would expand that authority to cover also acceptance or retention in the armed forces, and appointment, retention, or assignment to a position of public trust or a critical or sensitive position either while employed by the Federal Government or as a federal contractor employee. This provision would also authorize the Federal Government to obtain such information through the use of common identifiers, such as names or Social Security numbers, rather than the cumbersome submission of paper fingerprint cards, as required under existing law. It would further prohibit states and localities from conditioning the provision of such information on indemnification agreements, thereby clearing up a problem that has existed since 1989, when the Defense Department's authority to enter into such agreements expired. Finally, it would allow access to such information by the most efficient, technologically-advanced means, from any point within or without a particular state or other jurisdiction, and provide for the payment of reasonable fees therefor.

Sense of Congress on the naming of the CVN–77 aircraft carrier. (sec. 1058)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that it is appropriate to recommend to the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, that an appropriate name for the final Nimitz-class aircraft carrier, CVN–77, is the U.S.S. Lexington.

The provision also expresses the sense of Congress that CVN–77 should be named U.S.S. Lexington in order to honor the 16 million veterans of the armed forces that served during World War II, and the incalculable number of U.S. citizens on the home front during that war, who mobilized in the name of freedom, and who are today respectfully referred to as the greatest generation.

Donation of civil war cannon (sec. 1059)

The committee recommends a provision that would convey all right, title and interest of the United States to a Civil War era cannon to the Edward Dorr Tracey, Jr. Camp 18 of the Sons of the Confederate Veterans. This cannon was manufactured by the Confederate States Arsenal at Macon, Georgia. The cannon, on loan from the Army, is currently on public display in Macon, Georgia.

Maximum size of parcel posts transported overseas for Armed Forces Post Offices (sec. 1060)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the authorized size of packages permitted to be mailed to eligible patrons of military post offices overseas to conform with those of the United States Postal Services.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Department of Defense export control procedures

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's focus on improving the performance of its export control responsibilities and supports efforts to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the defense export licensing system. National security concerns must always remain paramount over commercial concerns in this area. At the same time, where appropriate, the United States should not place unnecessary restraints on the ability of the private sector to compete in the global marketplace.

The Defense Department has undertaken an internal review of its practices for processing and scrutinizing export licence applications with an aim toward reducing the time it takes to review licences. The committee supports this effort and encourages the Department to work with the State Department to achieve a system that protects national security, and at the same time does not unnecessarily penalize U.S. industry.

The committee also supports the Department's efforts to modernize computer systems for licensing agencies. This computer modernization is important to ensure that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the State Department's Office of Defense Trade Controls can move, over time, to an all-electronic system. This effort will provide more efficient and comprehensive review of the national security impact of proposed export transactions while providing exporters with a more transparent and timely process.

Firefighting equipment

An important element of the chemical weapons demilitarization program is ensuring that the local cities and towns within the vicinity of destruction facilities receive the necessary education, training, and equipment to ensure community safety in the unlikely event of an accident during the destruction process. The Department of the Army has equipped the Umatilla Army Chemical Depot with firefighting vehicles, including an Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper, for this purpose. To ensure the Umatilla community has continued and unhindered access to the Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper, the Department of the Army is working with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Res-

ervation to convey the firefighting vehicle to the community. The committee supports this initiative and urges the Department of the Army to transfer the vehicle to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Tribes as soon as possible.

Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile

Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, as amended by section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, prohibits the use of funds for retiring or dismantling, or preparing to retire or dismantle specified strategic nuclear delivery systems, including the Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile, until the START II Treaty enters into force. Although the START II Treaty has been approved by the Russian Duma, it has not yet entered into force. Nevertheless, the committee recognizes that the Air Force must take certain steps to be in a position to be able to retire the Peacekeeper system if the START II Treaty, and associated protocols, enter into force. Specifically, the committee understands that the Air Force would need to acquire warhead containers and missile stage storage end rings in the near future if the Air Force is to retain the ability to deactivate the Peacekeeper weapon system by December 31, 2003, and eliminate the associated silos by December 31, 2007. Since the committee has long supported entry into force of the START II Treaty, the committee believes that the acquisition of such equipment is consistent with the current prohibition on preparing to retire or dismantle the Peacekeeper weapon system. Therefore, funds available to the Air Force from within existing appropriations are authorized to be utilized for the acquisition of Peacekeeper warhead containers and missile stage storage end rings.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

Computer/electronic accommodations program (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to expand the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program to provide assistive technology, assistive technology devices, and assistive technology services to any department or agency of the Federal Government. The recommended provision limits the cost of the assistance provided to not more than $2.0 million in any fiscal year.

Additional special pay for foreign language proficiency beneficial for United States national security interests (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide additional pay for civilian employees who maintain a foreign language proficiency determined to be beneficial for national security interests.

Increased number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase, by 25, the number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service. The committee is concerned by recent reports that the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) and the National Security Agency (NSA) are experiencing significant problems in the area of acquisition and acquisition oversight. Both agencies are seeking to strengthen their acquisition management and need to be able to attract skilled people. The committee expects that the recommended provision would help NIMA and NSA attract such individuals. The committee directs that the additional 25 positions established by the provision would be used by NIMA and NSA only to address acquisition-related deficiencies.

Extension of authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the termination date of the authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2010.

Work safety demonstration program (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a work safety demonstration program in which private sector work safety models would be used to determine whether the work safety record of Department of De-

fense civilian employees can be improved. The demonstration program would begin within 180 days of enactment of the Act and end on September 30, 2002. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit an interim report not later than December 1, 2001 and a final report not later than December 1, 2002, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Employment and compensation of employees for temporary organizations established by law or executive order (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the heads of federal agencies the flexibility to hire and pay individuals under a streamlined process to work in temporary organizations, commissions, boards, etc. that have been established for a period not to exceed three years. The recommended provision would permit federal agencies to hire temporary employees in a timely manner so they can meet the deadlines imposed by the President or Congress. The recommended provision would permit the temporary employees to receive life and health insurance benefits for the duration of their employment. Employees transferred to a temporary position from a career civil service position would have return rights to their former positions at the end of their employment with the temporary organization.

Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1107)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2005, the temporary authority that would permit civilian employees to volunteer for reductions-in-force.

Electronic maintenance of performance appraisal systems (sec. 1108)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of an executive branch agency to administer and maintain the performance appraisal system electronically.

Approval authority for cash awards in excess of $10,000 (sec. 1109)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to grant a cash award up to the maximum of $25,000 without seeking approval from the Office of Personnel Management.

Leave for crews of certain vessels (sec. 1110)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Military Sealift Command to pay civil service mariners, in an extended leave status, a lump-sum equal to the difference between their pay at a temporary promotion rate and their lower permanent grade rates.

Life insurance for emergency essential Department of Defense employees (sec. 1111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize civilian employees designated by the Secretary of Defense as emergency essential and subject to being deployed to combat areas to elect to participate in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance program.

Civilian personnel services public-private competition pilot program (sec. 1112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a public-private competition pilot program to assess the extent to which the effectiveness and efficiency of providing civilian personnel services could be increased by conducting competitions for the performance of such services between the public and private sectors. The recommended provision would require that the pilot program be conducted during the period beginning on October 1, 2000 and ending on December 31, 2004. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit, not later than February 1, 2005, a report that would assess the value of the pilot program and make recommendations for permanent authority to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Extension, expansion, and revision of authority for experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1113)

The committee recommends a provision to extend, expand, and revise the authority for the experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel established pursuant to section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). Section 1101 authorized the Secretary of Defense to appoint up to 20 eminent experts in science and engineering to temporary employment positions within the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) without regard to existing civil service laws concerning appointment and compensation.

The committee recognizes that DARPA expects to fill all 20 authorized positions in the near future and would benefit greatly from the expansion of the program. The committee is also aware that the defense laboratories would benefit from similar access to capable scientists and engineers from outside the civil service. For these reasons, the provision recommended by the committee would increase the number of positions authorized for DARPA from 20 to 40 and expand the program to the defense laboratories, authorizing an additional 40 positions for each of the military services and a total of ten additional positions for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) and National Security Agency (NSA). The provision would extend the program for an additional two years and clarify that the maximum pay authorized under the provision is intended to include locality pay adjustments.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Transfers of naval vessels to foreign countries (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer to various countries: on a combined lease-sale basis, four Kidd-class destroyers; on a grant basis, two Thomaston-class dock landing ships; on a grant basis, four Garcia-class frigates; on a combined lease-sale basis, two Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates; on a grant basis, one Dixie-class destroyer tender; on a grant basis, two Knox-class frigates; and, on a combined lease-sale basis, two Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates. The Chief of Naval Operations has certified, pursuant to statutory requirement, that such naval vessels are not essential to the defense of the United States. Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with these transfers would be charged to the recipient. The provision would also:

(1) direct that, to the maximum extent possible, the Secretary of the Navy shall require, as a condition of transfer, that repair and refurbishment associated with the transfer be accomplished in a shipyard located in the United States; and

(2) stipulate that the authority to transfer these vessels will expire at the end of a two-year period that begins on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that extends, for one year, the Department of Defense's authority to support United Nations (UN)-sponsored inspection and monitoring efforts to ensure full Iraqi compliance with its international obligations to destroy its weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems. The committee is troubled by Iraq's long-standing suspension of UN inspection and monitoring missions, and continued defiance of UN Security Council efforts to resume weapons inspections. Despite the December 17, 1999 adoption by the UN Security Council of Resolution 1284, which established the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) as the successor to the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), Iraq refuses to comply with this resolution and allow inspectors to resume operations in Iraq. The committee continues to believe that it is imperative that inspections of Iraq weapons sites resume as soon as possible to ensure Iraqi compliance with the disarmament obligations it accepted in 1991 at the end of the Persian Gulf conflict.

Repeal of restriction preventing cooperative airlift support through acquisition and cross servicing agreements (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision to eliminate the restriction in section 2350c of title 10, United States Code, that allows the Secretary of Defense to enter into military airlift agreements with allied countries only under the authority of section 2350c. This provision would clear up any ambiguity regarding the Secretary's authority to include airlift in cross servicing agreements for ". . . logistics support, supplies, and services . . ." under the authority of section 2342, title 10, United States Code.

Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training (sec. 1204)

The U.S. Army School of the Americas has been subjected to a great deal of controversy, mainly for the actions of a relatively small number of individuals who were graduated from the school many years ago. The committee is aware that the school's curricula has undergone significant positive changes in recent years. The committee believes that there continues to be a need for an institution that would provide professional education and training for the military, law enforcement and civilian (governmental and non-governmental) personnel of the Western Hemisphere.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the statute authorizing the Army to operate the U.S. Army School of the Americas and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to operate a Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training. The institute would be operated for the purpose of providing professional education and training to military, law enforcement and civilian personnel of the Western Hemisphere in areas such as leadership development, counterdrug operations, peace support operations, and disaster relief. The curricula of the institution would include, at a minimum, eight hours of instruction relating to human rights, the rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society. There would be a board of visitors, including four members of Congress and six members from academia, the religious community, and the human rights community, to review the institute's curricula and instruction. The board would submit an annual report to the Secretary of Defense. The selection of foreign personnel to attend the institute would be subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of Defense would submit an annual report to Congress detailing the activities of the institute during the previous calendar year.

Biannual report on Kosovo peacekeeping (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a biannual report from the President on the contributions of European nations and organizations to the peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. Specifically, each report shall include detailed information on the commitments and pledges made by the European Commission, the member nations of the European Union (EU) and the European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for reconstruction assistance in Kosovo, humanitarian as-

sistance in Kosovo, the Kosovo Consolidated Budget, police (including special police) for the United Nations (UN) international police force for Kosovo, and military personnel for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo; the amount of assistance that has been provided in each category, and the number of police and military personnel deployed to Kosovo by each such nation or organization. In addition, each report shall include a description of the full range of commitments and responsibilities undertaken for Kosovo by the UN, the EU and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the progress made by each in fulfilling those commitments and responsibilities, an assessment of the remaining tasks and an anticipated timetable for completing those tasks. The first report is to be provided to the relevant congressional committees on December 1, 2000.

The committee is concerned with the slow pace of the civil implementation effort in Kosovo and, in particular, with the unsatisfactory progress on the part of European nations and organizations to provide, in a timely manner, the assistance and personnel they have pledged to Kosovo. The committee notes that the United States bore the major share of the military burden for the air war on behalf of Kosovo; in return, European nations agreed to pay the major share of the burdens to secure the peace. Although European nations and organizations have pledged billions of dollars and thousands of personnel for this goal, only a fraction of the assistance has been provided to Kosovo. As a result, U.S. troops, and troops of other nations, serving in Kosovo are performing non-military missions—such as basic police functions—to make up for the shortfalls on the civilian side. These are missions for which military personnel were not specifically trained and which increase their personal risk. The committee believes that more must be done by the international organizations that have accepted the responsibilities for the civil implementation efforts in Kosovo, and by the European nations that have committed to provide a major portion of the assistance, to ensure that the economic and security infrastructure is put in place in Kosovo to avoid an open-ended U.S. military commitment in Kosovo.

The report required by this provision will provide the Congress with the data necessary to evaluate the performance of the organizations and nations covered by this provision in fulfilling their commitments regarding Kosovo.

Mutual assistance for monitoring test explosions of nuclear devices (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to remedy problems that may arise with respect to the installation of nuclear test explosion monitoring equipment as part of the International Monitoring System (IMS) of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty or as part of the United States Atomic Energy Detection System. Without this provision, the Department of Defense would be prohibited from accepting funds directly from an international organization to establish, operate, or maintain IMS equipment, owned by the U.S. Government, and to maintain equipment that is not the property of the U.S. Government.

Consolidated annual report on Cooperative Threat Reduction assistance and activities (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the information found in several Cooperative Threat Reduction reports into one annual report, thereby reducing the number of reports the committee receives each year, but maintaining the information the committee values. This new, consolidated annual report would be due no later than the first Monday in February, with the first report due in February 2002.

Limitation on use of funds for construction of a Russian facility for the destruction of chemical weapons (sec. 1208)

The budget request included $35.0 million for construction activities for the Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia as part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. While the committee recommends the requested amount, the committee has concerns about the construction of this facility. The committee believes that there may be higher priority CTR efforts to reduce the threat posed by chemical weapons in Russia that will provide a greater security return on investment, such as security improvements and maintenance for the seven Russian chemical weapons storage sites, completion and maintenance of the CTR-funded mobile central analytical laboratory, and expansion of the chemical weapons production facility destruction efforts at Volgograd and Novocheboksark.

However, after reviewing the administration's concerns regarding the threats posed by the nerve agent stockpile at Shchuch'ye, the committee recommends a provision that would provide conditional authority for the administration to proceed with the construction of this facility. Specifically, the provision provides that prior to obligating or expending fiscal year 2000 funds, or any funds in subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary of Defense must provide in writing to both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees a certification that: (1) the government of the Russian Federation has annually agreed to provide at least $25.0 million for the construction support and operation of that facility to destroy chemical weapons and for the support and maintenance of the facility for that purpose for each year of the entire operating life-cycle of the facility; (2) the government of the Russian Federation has agreed to utilize the facility to destroy the remaining four stockpiles of nerve agents located at Kisner, Pochep, Leonidovka, and Maradykovsky; (3) the United States has obtained multiyear commitments from governments of other countries to donate funds for the support of essential social infrastructure projects in sufficient amounts to ensure that the projects are maintained during the entire operating life-cycle of the facility; and (4) Russia has agreed to destroy its chemical weapons production facilities at Volgograd and Novocheboksark.

Limitation on the use of funds for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program (sec. 1209)

The request included $32.1 million for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program as part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. While the committee supports the re-

quest, the committee is troubled by the Russian Federation's announcement in February 2000 that due to increasing costs, Russia wanted to change the approach selected for converting its remaining three plutonium producing nuclear reactors. Since that time, meetings between the United States and Russia have failed to determine the future direction of the this program. Because of these circumstances, the committee is concerned that the project will be unable to expend its budget request during the fiscal year.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision prohibiting the obligation of more than 50 percent of the funds provided for this program until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense reports to the committee on an agreement between the U.S. Government and the Government of the Russia Federation regarding any new option selected for shutting down or converting the three Russian plutonium producing reactors. Any such agreement should include the new date on which such reactors will stop producing weapons grade plutonium and the cost sharing arrangement between the United States and Russia in undertaking activities under such an agreement.

TITLE XIII—NAVY ACTIVITIES ON THE ISLAND OF VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO

Navy activities on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico (secs. 1301–1308)

The committee remains concerned with the lack of live fire access to the Naval training facility on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the resultant negative consequences this has for Navy and Marine Corps readiness. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated that Vieques provides integrated live-fire training "critical to our readiness." The Secretary of the Navy also testified that "* * * only by providing this preparation can we fairly ask our service members to put their lives at risk." The concern of these individuals was reinforced by operational commanders, including the Commander of the Sixth Fleet of the Navy, who stated that the loss of Vieques would "cost American lives."

The committee recognizes and appreciates the sacrifice that the people of Vieques and other communities throughout America located near military training installations have made over the years to ensure that our military personnel are adequately prepared before being sent into harm's way. The committee is concerned that as a result of the Navy's failure to take those actions necessary to develop sound relations with the people of Vieques, and the tragic accident which resulted in the death of a civilian employee of the Navy, the future of such training is in jeopardy.

Therefore, the committee includes a number of provisions that would support the agreement reached between the Department of Defense and the Government of Puerto Rico intended to restore relations between the people of Vieques and the Navy, and provide for the continuation of live fire training on the island.

Specifically, subtitle 13 would authorize the expenditure of $40.0 million for infrastructure and other economic projects on the island of Vieques, and require the President to conduct a referendum on Vieques to determine whether the people of Vieques approve or disapprove of the continuation of Naval training on the island. The conservation zones on the western side of the island, containing seven endangered and threatened species, would be transferred to the Secretary of Interior to be administered as wildlife refuges.

If the people of Vieques approve the continuation of live fire training, the subtitle would authorize an additional $50.0 million in economic aid for the island residents.

If the people of Vieques do not approve the continuation of live fire training, the subtitle would require the Navy and Marine Corps to cease all training operations on the island of Vieques by May 1, 2003; to terminate any operations at Roosevelt Roads that are related to the use of training ranges on Vieques; and the trans-

fer of all conservation zones on Navy property on the eastern side of the island of Vieques, together with the live impact area and other Navy property on the eastern side of the island, to the Secretary of the Interior until such time as the Congress enacts subsequent legislation regarding the disposition of that land.

If the Navy ceases operations on Vieques and reduces its presence on Roosevelt Roads, the subtitle would place a moratorium on military construction projects at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, until such time as it can be determined if the active military units at Fort Buchanan can be consolidated on Roosevelt Roads with the remaining Naval units. The Comptroller General of the United States will be required to conduct a review of the continuing requirement for Fort Buchanan and provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining his recommendations regarding the potential consolidation of active U.S. Army units in Puerto Rico with the Navy at Roosevelt Roads.

DIVISION B-MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
Military Construction, Army	897,938	(116,859)	781,079
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	63,949	817,371
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	232,522	763,491
Military Construction, Defense-wide	784,753	(98,420)	686,333
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	122,499	181,629
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	111,627	161,806
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	10,784	92,497
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	16,103	21,988	38,091
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	17,822	32,673
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369
NATO Infrastructure	190,000	0	190,000
Total Military Construction	4,553,427	365,912	4,919,339
FAMILY HOUSING			
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	56,200	218,306
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	(19,911)	958,364
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	362,822	24,052	386,874
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	882,638	(1,071)	881,567
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	23,664	247,147
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	(18,846)	807,425
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	44,886	0	44,886
Total Family Housing	3,480,481	64,088	3,544,569

* *Reflects projects previously authorized in PL 106-65 (Fiscal Year 2000, Defense Authorization Act)*

** *Reflects reduction of FOLs proposed in the FY 00 Congressional Emergency Supplemental*

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Space & Missile Def Command Building	23,400		23,400
2	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	OTS Academic Fac	3,825		3,825
3	Alabama	Army National Guard	Redstone Arsenal	Patriot UTES&DS Maintenance Shop		8,083	8,083
4	Alabama	Air National Guard	Dothan AGS	Combat Communications Squadron Fac		11,000	11,000
5	Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Central Vehicle Wash Fac	3,000		3,000
6	Alaska	Air Force	Cape Romanzof Radar Site	Generator Fuel Storage	3,900		3,900
7	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Hazardous Material Storage	1,450		1,450
8	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Dormitory (120 RM)	14,540		14,540
9	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Joint Mobility Complex		25,000	25,000
10	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Child Development Center		7,666	7,666
11	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	15,920		15,920
12	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	11,600		11,600
13	Alaska	Navy Reserve	Anchorage	Marine Corps Reserve Training Center	6,403		6,403
14	Alaska	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement (Phase 2)	44,000		44,000
15	Alaska	Air National Guard	Kulis ANGB	Corrosion Control Fac		12,000	12,000
16	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Field Operations Fac	1,250		1,250
17	Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Combat Aircraft Loading Apron	8,200		8,200
18	Arizona	Navy	NAVDET Camp Navajo	Magazine Modernization	2,940		2,940
19	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Physical Fitness Center	7,900		7,900
20	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Chemical Defense Qualification Fac****	15,500	(12,908)	2,592
21	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 5)	43,600		43,600
22	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squadron Ops/AMU	7,960		7,960
23	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Easement "Blackjack Drop Zone"		1,259	1,259
24	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Fitness Center	9,100		9,100
25	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Fort Smith MAP	Fire Training Fac	1,760		1,760
26	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Fort Smith MAP	Operations and Training Fac		7,200	7,200
27	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Barracks Complex - North	31,000		31,000
28	California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Urban Assault Course	2,100		2,100
29	California	Navy	MCAS Miramar	Ground Combat Training Range	7,350		7,350
30	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Infantry Squadron Battle Course	4,000		4,000
31	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Armor/Anti-Armor Tracking Range	4,100		4,100

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
32	California	Navy	NADEP North Island	Component Repair Clean Room Fac	4,340		4,340
33	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	8,260		8,260
34	California	Navy	NAS North Island	Berthing Wharf (Phase 2)	12,800		12,800
35	California	Navy	NAVSTA San Diego	Berthing Pier (Phase 1)	35,700		35,700
36	California	Navy	NAWCWD Point Mugu	ADAL Range Ops Ctr	11,400		11,400
37	California	Navy	NF San Clemente	Aircraft Operations Building	8,860		8,860
38	California	Navy	NSWSES Port Hueneme	Weapon Combat Systems Integration Lab	10,200		10,200
39	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Control Tower		6,299	6,299
40	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Water Treatment Plant & Distribution Line	3,800		3,800
41	California	Air Force	Los Angeles AFB	Fitness Center	6,580		6,580
42	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	4,650		4,650
43	California	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP North Island	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,900		5,900
44	California	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP TwentyNine Palms	Fuel Storage Fac	2,200		2,200
45	California	Special Ops Cmd	NAB Coronado	SOF Applied Instruction Fac	4,300		4,300
46	California	Special Ops Cmd	NAS North Island	SOF Small Craft Berthing Fac	1,350		1,350
47	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Edwards AFB	Med Clinic Replacement/Dental Clinic Alter	17,900		17,900
48	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Fleet Hospital Ops & Trg Cmd Support Fac	2,900		2,900
49	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Horno)	3,950		3,950
50	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Med/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Pulgas)	3,750		3,750
51	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Med/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Flores)	3,550		3,550
52	California	Army National Guard	Bakersfield	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	(1,380)	-
53	California	Army National Guard	Camp Parks	Organizational Maintenance Shop		6,062	6,062
54	California	Army National Guard	Colton	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
55	California	Army National Guard	Escondido	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	(1,380)	-
56	California	Army National Guard	Fresno (Shields Avenue)	Organizational Maintenance Shop		2,847	2,847
57	California	Army National Guard	Fresno	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	(1,869)	-
58	California	Army National Guard	Los Alamitos AFRC	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
59	California	Army National Guard	Richmond	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
60	California	Army National Guard	San Jose	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	(1,869)	-
61	California	Army National Guard	San Mateo	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461	(461)	-
62	California	Army National Guard	Santa Barbara	Organizational Maintenance Shop	483	(483)	-

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
63	California	Navy Reserve	NAS Alameda	Seawall	950		950
64	Colorado	Army	Pueblo Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 2)	10,700		10,700
65	Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Add to and Alter Athletic Facilities	18,960		18,960
66	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	SBIRS Power Connection	2,750		2,750
67	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Computer Network Defense Fac		6,826	6,826
68	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Operations Support Fac	2,260		2,260
69	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	11,000		11,000
70	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Add to Operational Support Fac	8,450		8,450
71	Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Replace Ammunition Maintenance Stor Fac		6,000	6,000
72	Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Drydock Support Fac	3,100		3,100
73	Connecticut	Air National Guard	Orange	Air Control Squadron Complex		12,000	12,000
74	Delaware	Army National Guard	Smyrna	Readiness Center		7,020	7,020
75	Dist of Columbia	Navy	MC Barracks	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	17,197		17,197
76	Dist of Columbia	Navy	NAVDIST Washington	Navy Museum Annex	2,450		2,450
77	Dist of Columbia	Navy	NRL Washington	Nano Science Research Lab	[12,390}		[12,390]
78	Dist of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Child Development Center	4,520		4,520
79	Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field Milton	JPATS T-6A GSE/Aircraft Paint Fac	3,900		3,900
80	Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field Milton	JPATS T-6A Operations Maintenance Fac	1,230		1,230
81	Florida	Navy	NSWC Ft Lauderdale	Seawall & Ship Berthing Fac	3,570		3,570
82	Florida	Navy	Panama City CSS	Amphibious Warfare Integration Fac		9,960	9,960
83	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Upgrade Dormitory (72 RM)	5,600		5,600
84	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Precision Guided Munit Maint Fac	3,340		3,340
85	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Upgrade Access Roads	5,600		5,600
86	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Defense Access Road	2,360		2,360
87	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	DEOMI Fac	12,970		12,970
88	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Operations Fac	6,800		6,800
89	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Maintenance Fac	18,500		18,500
90	Florida	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP MacDill AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	16,956		16,956
91	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Corrosion Control Fac	8,100		8,100
92	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Air Field Readiness Improvements	3,000		3,000
93	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Hot Cargo Pad	7,354		7,354

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
94	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Age Maintenance/Dispatch Complex	4,750		4,750
95	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Eglin AFB	Hospital ADAL/Life Safety Upgrade	37,600		37,600
96	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Patrick AFB	Medical Clinic	2,700		2,700
97	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Tyndall AFB	Medical Clinic Addition/Alteration	7,700		7,700
98	Florida	Army Reserve	Orlando	Add/Alter AFR Ctr/OMS/Storage	17,953		17,953
99	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Barracks Complex - Kelley Hill (Phase 3 B)****	24,000	(24,000)	-
100	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	15,800		15,800
101	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks - Hunter AAF(Phase 1C)****	26,000	(26,000)	-
102	Georgia	Navy	MCLB Albany	Renovate Vehicle Storage Fac	1,100		1,100
103	Georgia	Navy	TRIREFITFAC Kings Bay	Sand Blasting/Paint Fac	5,200		5,200
104	Georgia	Air Force	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Air Support Operations Squadron Fac	4,920		4,920
105	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Dormitory		8,818	8,818
106	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Water Treatment Plant	2,500		2,500
107	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Airmen Dining Hall		4,095	4,095
108	Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Munitions Maint and Training Complex	8,500		8,500
109	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (Phase 1)		5,970	5,970
110	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Fitness Center Expansion	2,650		2,650
111	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Training Building Addition	1,769		1,769
112	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFB	C-130 Assault Strip	6,032		6,032
113	Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Training Facility	Saddle Access Road (Phase 1)		12,000	12,000
114	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks - Wilson Street (Phase 1B)****	46,400	(24,000)	22,400
115	Hawaii	Army	Wheeler AAF	Barracks Complex	43,800		43,800
116	Hawaii	Navy	Camp Smith	CINCPAC Headquarters (Phase 2)	35,600		35,600
117	Hawaii	Navy	FISC Pearl Harbor	Wharf Upgrade	12,000		12,000
118	Hawaii	Navy	NAVUWEC Lualualei	Consolidated Fleet Test Support Fac	2,100		2,100
119	Hawaii	Navy	MCB Kaneohe	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,400		18,400
120	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Relocate Seal Delivery Vehicle Team	14,200		14,200
121	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,500		16,500
122	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Sewer Main (Ford Island)		6,900	6,900
123	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	4,620		4,620
124	Hawaii	Army National Guard	Maui	Readiness Center		11,592	11,592

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
125	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Enhanced Training Range, Idaho (Phase 3)	10,125		10,125
126	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	37,000		37,000
127	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	37,700		37,700
128	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Replace RTC Drill Hall	11,700		11,700
129	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Physical Training Fac	35,000		35,000
130	Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Munitions Storage/Land Acquisition	3,830		3,830
131	Illinois	Air National Guard	Scott AFB	KC-135 Simulator Fac	1,500		1,500
132	Illinois	Air Force Reserve	Scott AFB	Support Group Training Fac		6,912	6,912
133	Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 3)	54,400		54,400
134	Indiana	Army National Guard	Delphi	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,563		1,563
135	Indiana	Army National Guard	Elkhart	Organizational Maintenance Shop	2,322		2,322
136	Indiana	Army National Guard	Logansport	Organizational Maintenance Shop	739		739
137	Indiana	Army National Guard	Plymouth	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951		951
138	Indiana	Army National Guard	South Bend	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951		951
139	Indiana	Navy Reserve	MCRC Grissom AFB	Reserve Center		4,730	4,730
140	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Barracks - Infantry Drive (Phase 1C)****	15,000	(5,000)	10,000
141	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Advanced Waste Water Treatment Fac		22,000	22,000
142	Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Install Approach Lighting System		2,100	2,100
143	Kansas	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP McConnell AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	11,000		11,000
144	Kansas	Army National Guard	Kansas City	Organizational Maintenance Shop	641		641
145	Kansas	Air National Guard	McConnell AFB	B-1 Power Check Pad		1,550	1,550
146	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Spt (Phase 2)	8,500		8,500
147	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks - Market Garden Rd (Phase 2C)****	9,400	(9,400)	-
148	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Multi-Purpose Digital Tng Range (Phase 3)****	8,450	(7,850)	600
149	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Flight Simulator Fac	5,400		5,400
150	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Tactical Equipment Complex	6,400		6,400
151	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Equipment Maintenance Complex	4,500		4,500
152	Kentucky	Army National Guard	Fort Knox	MATES (Phase 1A)		3,929	3,929
153	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	B-52H Fuel Cell Maintenance Dock		14,074	14,074
154	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	6,390		6,390
155	Louisiana	Army Reserve	Fort Polk	ADAL USAR Ctr/OMS/Equip Conc Site	9,912		9,912

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
156	Louisiana	Army Reserve	New Orleans	USAR Center/OMS/Unheated Storage	10,375		10,375
157	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans	Warehouse Addition for Admin Support	800		800
158	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans	Air Passenger Terminal	590		590
159	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NSA New Orleans	Physical Fitness/Recreational Area		1,670	1,670
160	Maine	Navy	NAS Brunswick	Aircraft De-Ice/Rinse Fac	2,450		2,450
161	Maine	Navy	NSY Portsmouth	Standardize Waterfront Crane Rail System		4,960	4,960
162	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 3)	45,700		45,700
163	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Munitions Assessment/Processing Sys Fac	3,100		3,100
164	Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Replace Barracks		19,000	19,000
165	Maryland	Navy	Nav Ord Tech Ctr Indian Hd	EOD Equipment Support Fac	6,430		6,430
166	Maryland	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Patuxent River	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	8,300		8,300
167	Maryland	Nat Security Agency	Fort Meade	Route 32	3,459		3,459
168	Maryland	Nat Security Agency	Fort Meade	Critical Utility Control (Phase 2)	769		769
169	Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Renovate Acq Mgmt Fac (Phase 2)		17,851	17,851
170	Michigan	Army National Guard	Augusta	Organizational Maintenance Shop		3,600	3,600
171	Michigan	Army National Guard	Lansing	Combined Maintenance Shop (Phase 1)		22,743	22,743
172	Michigan	Army National Guard	Midland	Organizational Maintenance Shop	3,600	(3,600)	-
173	Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena County RAP	Replace Operations and Training Fac	4,500		4,500
174	Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANGB	Upgrade Runway		18,000	18,000
175	Minnesota	Army National Guard	Mankato	Readiness Center	4,681		4,681
176	Mississippi	Navy	NAS Meridian	T-45 Aircraft Support Fac	4,700		4,700
177	Mississippi	Navy	NAS Meridian	Control Tower and Beacon Tower		1,530	1,530
178	Mississippi	Navy	NOO Stennis Space Center	Warfighting Support Center		6,950	6,950
179	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Corrosion Control Fac		4,828	4,828
180	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Technical Training Fac	15,040		15,040
181	Mississippi	Air National Guard	Jackson IAP	C-17 Corrosion Control/Maintenance Hangar	10,500	2,300	12,800
182	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Basic Training Complex (Phase 1 A)	38,600		38,600
183	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Conventional Munitions Storage Igloos	4,150		4,150
184	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Munitions Assembly Area	7,900		7,900
185	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Minute Man III Missile Maintenance Fac	5,300		5,300
186	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Convert Commercial Gate		3,517	3,517

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
187	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Helicopter Operations Fac		2,362	2,362
188	Montana	Army National Guard	Havre	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461		461
189	Montana	Army National Guard	Kalispell	Organizational Maintenance Shop	493		493
190	Montana	Army National Guard	Libby	Organizational Maintenance Shop	463		463
191	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station		9,765	9,765
192	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Gering	Organizational Maintenance Shop	657		657
193	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Mead	Organizational Maintenance Shop	714		714
194	Nebraska	Army National Guard	North Platte	Organizational Maintenance Shop	508		508
195	Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	Corrosion Control Hanger		6,280	6,280
196	Nevada	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP NAS Fallon	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	5,000		5,000
197	Nevada	Army National Guard	Carson City	USP&FO Administrative Building		4,472	4,472
198	Nevada	Air National Guard	Reno	Fuel Storage Complex		5,000	5,000
199	New Hampshire	Air National Guard	Pease Int Trade Port	Replace Medical Training Fac		4,000	4,000
200	New Hampshire	Army Reserve	Rochester	Land Acquisition	980		980
201	New Jersey	Navy	NWS Earle	Recreation Center	2,420		2,420
202	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Fitness Center	9,772		9,772
203	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Fort Dix	OES Barracks Upgrade		9,975	9,975
204	New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Control Tower		4,934	4,934
205	New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	Repair Bonito Pipeline		18,380	18,380
206	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Replace Airfield Pavement (Phase 2)		7,352	7,352
207	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Consolidated Soldier Support Ctr (Phase 2)****	10,300	(10,300)	-
208	New York	Army	USMA West Point	Cadet Physical Dev Ctr (Phase 2A)****	13,600	(13,600)	-
209	New York	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Fort Drum	Veterinary Treatment Fac	1,400		1,400
210	New York	Army National Guard	Hancock Field (ANG)	Readiness Center	5,376		5,376
211	New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara ARS	Visiting Airmen Quarters (Phase 1)		6,881	6,881
212	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Butner Road (Phase 1)	26,000		26,000
213	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks - Tagaytay Street (Phase 2 B)****	38,600	(35,492)	3,108
214	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks - Longstreet Road (Phase 1)	45,600		45,600
215	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Ammunition Holding Area	12,600		12,600
216	North Carolina	Army	Sunny Point Army Term	Railroad Equipment Maintenance Fac	2,300		2,300
217	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Aircraft Hangar Improvements	8,480		8,480

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
218	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Control Tower	2,600		2,600
219	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Aircraft Rinse Fac	800		800
220	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	14,300		14,300
221	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Amphibious Ops/Maint Storage Complex	9,500		9,500
222	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Child Development Center	4,420		4,420
223	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Armories	[14,000]		[14,000]
223	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Armories	10,000		10,000
224	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Operations/Maintenance Storage Fac	3,650		3,650
225	North Carolina	Navy	NADEP Cherry Point	Aircraft Stripping Fac Addition	7,540		7,540
226	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Dangerous Cargo Pads	24,570		24,570
227	North Carolina	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Cherry Point	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,700		5,700
228	North Carolina	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Bragg	SOF Media Operations Complex	8,600		8,600
229	North Carolina	Def Education Activity	MCB Camp LeJeune	Russell Elementary School	5,914		5,914
230	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Fort Bragg	Military Educational Fac (Phase 1)	8,709		8,709
231	North Dakota	Army National Guard	Wahpeton	Armed Forces Readiness Center		10,960	10,960
232	Ohio	Army	Columbus	Military Entrance Processing Station	1,832		1,832
233	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace West Ramp (Phase 1)	22,600		22,600
234	Ohio	Navy Reserve	NMCRC Rickenbacker	Relocation and Consolidation of Facilities		7,080	7,080
235	Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Tactical Equipment Shop (Phase 2)		10,100	10,100
236	Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	C-17 Cargo Compartment Trainer		2,939	2,939
237	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Depot Corrosion Control Strip Fac	12,380		12,380
238	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	5,800		5,800
239	Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Maintenance Hanger		10,504	10,504
240	Oklahoma	Army National Guard	Sand Springs	Armed Forces Reserve Center		13,530	13,530
241	Oregon	Army	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 6)	9,400		9,400
242	Oregon	Army National Guard	Baker City	Readiness Center	3,122		3,122
243	Oregon	Navy Reserve	Portland IAP	Reserve Ctr Alter Vehicle Maintenance Fac	1,420		1,420
244	Pennsylvania	Army	Carlisle Barracks	Academic Research Fac	10,500		10,500
245	Pennsylvania	Army	New Cumberland AD	Military Entrance Processing Station	3,700		3,700
246	Pennsylvania	Def Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Replace Controlled Humidity Warehouse	13,000		13,000
247	Pennsylvania	Def Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Child Development Center	4,700		4,700

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
248	Pennsylvania	Air Force Reserve	Pittsburgh IAP	Combat Communications Fac		3,105	3,105
249	Pennsylvania	Air Force Reserve	Willow Grove ARS	Alter Hangar & Fire Suppression	2,400		2,400
250	Rhode Island	Navy	NUWC Division Newport	Shore Based Launch Fac	4,150		4,150
251	South Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Flightline Fire Safety Improvements	3,140		3,140
252	South Carolina	Navy	MCRD Parris Island	Field Training Complex	2,660		2,660
253	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Base Mobility Warehouse		9,449	9,449
254	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Add To Flight Simulator Fac	2,500		2,500
255	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Repair Runway, North Field		10,289	10,289
256	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	USCENTAF Ops Weather Squadron Fac	2,850		2,850
257	South Carolina	Def Education Activity	Laurel Bay	Laurel Bay Primary Classroom Addition	804		804
258	South Carolina	Army National Guard	Leesburg Training Center	Infrastructure Upgrades		5,682	5,682
259	South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Base Civil Engineer Complex (Phase 1)		10,290	10,290
260	Tennessee	Army National Guard	Henderson	Organizational Maint enance Shop (Phase 1)		1,976	1,976
261	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Railyard Infrastructure	26,000		26,000
262	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Railhead Fac (Phase 3)	9,800		9,800
263	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase 1)	16,000		16,000
264	Texas	Army	Red River Army Depot	Ammunition Container Complex	800		800
265	Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	Aircraft Parking Apron	[2,670]		[2670]
266	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Realistic Bomber Training Initiative	12,175		12,175
267	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Fitness Center		12,813	12,813
268	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	5,500		5,500
269	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Child Development Center		4,830	4,830
270	Texas	Air National Guard	Ellington Field	Base Supply Complex		10,000	10,000
271	Texas	Army Reserve	Camp Bullis	USAR Center/Unheated Storage	1,464		1,464
272	Texas	Army Reserve	Fort Sam Houston	USAR Center/OMS/Equip Concentration Site	13,678		13,678
273	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	C-130 Corrosion Control Fac (WCF)	16,500		16,500
274	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Dormitory		11,550	11,550
275	Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	10,300		10,300
276	Vermont	Air National Guard	Burlington IAP	Aircraft Maintenance Complex		9,300	9,300
277	Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Aircraft Maint Instructional Building		4,450	4,450
278	Virginia	Navy	AEGIS CSC Wallops Is	Spy 1-D T&E Fac Addition	3,300		3,300

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
279	Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	Physical Training Fac	8,590		8,590
280	Virginia	Navy	NAB Little Creek	Waterfront Ops Fac	2,830		2,830
281	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	13,300		13,300
282	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	11,800		11,800
283	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Taxiway Extension & Lights	6,350		6,350
284	Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	Airfield Improvements	5,250		5,250
285	Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Pier Enhancements	4,700		4,700
286	Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Innovative Technology & Infrastructure	11,300		11,300
287	Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Joint Warfare Analysis Center		19,400	19,400
288	Virginia	Navy	NSY Norflolk, Portsmouth	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,100		16,100
289	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	7,470		7,470
290	Virginia	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Oceana	Replace Fuel Storage Tank	2,000		2,000
291	Virginia	Def Logistics Agency	DSC Richmond	Emergency Services Fac	4,500		4,500
292	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	Classified	Unit Training Fac		2,303	2,303
293	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	FCTC Dam Neck	Operational Support Fac	5,500		5,500
294	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	NAB Little Creek	SOF Air Operations Fac	5,400		5,400
295	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	NAS Oceana	SOF Operations Support Fac	3,400		3,400
296	Virginia	Army National Guard	Richlands	Organizational Maint enance Shop		1,175	1,175
297	Virginia	Army Reserve	Fort A.P. Hill	USAR Ctr/OMS/Area Maint Support Activity	4,275		4,275
298	Washington	Navy	NAVSUBASE Bangor	Strategic Security Support Fac		4,600	4,600
299	Washington	Navy	NS Everett	Aquatic Combat Training Fac		5,500	5,500
300	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Oily Wastewater Collection	6,600		6,600
301	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Pier Replacement (Phase 1)	38,000		38,000
302	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Chemical Metallurgical Lab	9,400		9,400
303	Washington	Navy	Strat Wpns Fac Pac, Bremerton	Explosives Handling Wharf Modification	1,400		1,400
304	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Runway Centerline Lights		2,046	2,046
305	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Nose Docks	3,750		3,750
306	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/AMU	6,500		6,500
307	Washington	Army National Guard	Bremerton	Readiness Center	2,639	1,609	4,248
308	Washington	Army National Guard	Yakima Training Center	Readiness Center	5,104	1,418	6,522
309	Washington	Army Reserve	Tacoma	USAR Center/OMS/Area Maint Spt Act, Marine	14,759		14,759

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
310	West Virginia	Air National Guard	Yeager ANG	Upgrade Parking Apron and Taxiway		6,000	6,000
311	West Virginia	Navy Reserve	Eleanor	Reserve Center		2,500	2,500
312	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Minute Man III Missile Service Complex	15,520		15,520
313	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Command And Control Support Fac	10,200		10,200
314	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Upgrade Storm Water Drainage System		10,394	10,394
315	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Fac	1,810		1,810
316	CONUS Various	Navy	CONUS Various	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and Dining Fac	11,500		11,500
317	Bahrain	Navy	ASU	Operations Center	19,400		19,400
318	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Fac	8,800	(8,800)	-
319	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	860	(860)	-
320	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Sm Expeditionary Aircraft Maint Hangar/Apron	590	(590)	-
321	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	3,000	(3,000)	-
322	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Squadron Ops/AMU Unit/Storage	2,200	(2,200)	-
323	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Fac	29,500	(29,500)	-
324	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Aircraft Maint Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	9,200	(9,200)	-
325	Diego Garcia	Air Force	Diego Garcia	Munitions Storage Igloos	5,475		5,475
326	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Rescue Station	2,200	(2,200)	-
327	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Airmen Qts/Dining Fac	4,650	(4,650)	-
328	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	4,900	(4,900)	-
329	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Squadron Ops/AMU Unit/Storage	2,600	(2,600)	-
330	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Officer Quarters	1,600	(1,600)	-
331	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Aircraft Maint Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	6,723	(6,723)	-
332	Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Barracks Complex - Warner 7005	7,800		7,800
333	Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Barracks Complex - Warner 7041	3,850		3,850
334	Germany	Army	ASG Darmstadt	Barracks Complex - Kelley 4164	5,600		5,600
335	Germany	Army	ASG Darmstadt	Barracks Complex - Cambrai Fritsch 4002	5,700		5,700
336	Germany	Army	Kaiserslautern	Child Development Center	3,400		3,400
337	Germany	Army	Mannheim	Barracks Complex - Coleman 2	4,050		4,050
338	Germany	DFAS	Kleber Kaserne	Renovate Administrative Fac	7,500		7,500
339	Germany	Def Education Activity	Hanau	Argonner Elementary School Classroom Add	1,026		1,026
340	Germany	Def Education Activity	Hohenfels	Middle/High School	13,774		13,774

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
341	Germany	Def Education Activity	Schweinfurt	Elementary School Addition	1,444		1,444
342	Germany	Def Education Activity	Wurtzburg	Elementary School Classroom Addition	1,798		1,798
343	Germany	Def Threat Red Agency	Darmstadt	Renovate Admin Fac	2,450		2,450
344	Germany	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Kitzingen	Health/Dental Clinic Life Safety Upgrade	1,400		1,400
345	Germany	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Wiesbaden AB	Health/Dental Clinic Addition/Alteration	7,187		7,187
346	Guam	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Andersen AFB	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	16,000		16,000
347	Guam	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Andersen AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	20,000		20,000
348	Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Community Facilities	[32,969]		[32,969]
348	Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Community Facilities	32,029		32,029
349	Italy	Navy	NSA Naples	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	15,000		15,000
350	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Dormitory (102 RM)	8,000		8,000
351	Italy	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Sigonella	Replace Bulk Fuel Storage Fac	16,300		16,300
352	Italy	Def Education Activity	Sigonella	Sigonella Elementary School/High School Add	971		971
353	Italy	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	NSA Naples	Medical Dental Fac Replacement	43,850		43,850
354	Japan	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP MCAS Iwakuni	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	22,400		22,400
355	Japan	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Misawa Air Base	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	26,400		26,400
356	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Whole Barracks Renewal Complex	14,200		14,200
357	Korea	Army	Camp Page	Barracks Complex	19,500		19,500
358	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	6,400		6,400
359	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 RM)	11,348		11,348
360	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	10,600		10,600
361	Korea	Special Ops Cmd	Taegu	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Complex	1,450		1,450
362	Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein	Unaccompanied Personnel Hsg Renovation	18,000	(18,000)	-
363	Puerto Rico	Special Ops Cmd	Roosevelt Roads	SOF Boat Maintenance Fac	1,241		1,241
364	Spain	Air Force	NS Rota	Enhance Rota, Various Facilities	5,052		5,052
365	Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Fire Training Fac	1,000		1,000
366	United Kingdom	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP RAF Mildenhall	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	10,000		10,000
367	United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Feltwell	Feltwell Elementary School Classroom Add	1,287		1,287
368	United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Lakenheath	Lakenheath Elementary School Classroom Add	3,086		3,086
369	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	72,106	2,776	74,882
370	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000		15,000

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
371	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Classified Project	11,500		11,500
372	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation	22,600		22,600
373	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(635)	(635)
374	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,659		7,659
375	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	63,335	758	64,093
376	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(2,889)	(2,889)
377	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	54,237	17,292	71,529
378	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,850		9,850
379	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(15,000)	(15,000)
380	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,800		1,800
381	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,786		6,786
382	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (OSD)	2,900		2,900
383	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction (Defense Level)	3,000		3,000
384	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (Defense Level)	24,000		24,000
385	Worldwide	Special Ops Cmd	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	3,790		3,790
386	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,694		3,694
387	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	14,729		14,729
388	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	NMD Initial Deployment Facilities	85,095		85,095
389	Worldwide	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
390	Worldwide	Defense Agencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(7,115)	(7,115)
391	Worldwide	Defense -Wide	NATO Sec Inv Prog	NATO Security Investment Program	190,000		190,000
392	Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,295	25,000	27,295
393	Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,232	3,310	7,542
394	Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	9,119	7,277	16,396
395	Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000		4,000
396	Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,917		1,917
397	Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,400	809	7,209
398	Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,521	38	1,559
399	Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,304	924	3,228
400	Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,115		4,115
401	Worldwide	DFAS	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
402	Worldwide	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,196		6,196
403	Worldwide	Def Threat Red Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,600		2,600
404	Worldwide	Energy Cons Imp	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	33,570	(16,785)	16,785
405	Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	22,000		22,000
406	Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
407	Worldwide	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment & Closure IV	1,174,369		1,174,369
408	Worldwide	Navy	Various Worldwide	Host Nation Infrastructure Support	142		142
			[xxxxxx] Authorization only				
			****Authorized for Appropriation in FY00 Authorization Act				
				Total	**4,553,427**	**365,912**	**4,919,339**

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1	Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Family Housing Revitalization (75units)		24,000	24,000
2	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Family Housing Replacement Const (110 Units)	16,224		16,224
3	California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Replacement Construction (79 Units)	13,923		13,923
4	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Replace Family Housing (160 Units)	27,768		27,768
5	Dist of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Military Family Housing (136 Units)	17,137		17,137
6	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Family Housing Replacement Const (72 Units)	15,500		15,500
7	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Hale Moku (98 Units)	22,230		22,230
8	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Radford Ter (112 Units)	23,654		23,654
9	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Pearl City (62 Units)	14,237		14,237
10	Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Replace Capehart South (84 Units)	21,910		21,910
11	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Family Housing Replacement Const (119 Units)		22,694	22,694
12	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Family Housing Replacement Const (56 Units)	7,800		7,800
13	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Family Housing Replacement Const (128 Units)		20,000	20,000
14	Maine	Navy	NAS Brunswick	Replace/New Enlisted Homes (168 Units)	18,722		18,722
15	Maryland	Army	Fort Detrick	Family Housing Replacement Const (48 Units)	5,600		5,600
16	Mississippi	Navy	NS Pascagoula	Family Housing (140 Units) ,Phase 1		21,605	21,605
17	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Family Housing Replacement Const (112 Units)	14,600		14,600
18	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Revitalize Family Housing (149 Units)		7,838	7,838
19	North Dakota	Air Force	Cavalier AFS	Construct Military Family Housing (2 Units)	443		443
20	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Military Family Housing (134 Units)	19,097		19,097
21	South Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	Family Housing New Construction (1 Unit)	250		250
22	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Family Housing Replacement Const (64 Units)	10,200		10,200
23	Texas	Army	Fort Sam Houston	Replace Family Housing (80Units)		10,000	10,000
24	Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	Replace/New Family Housing (98 Units)	16,873		16,873
25	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Family Housing New Construction (60 Units)	21,800		21,800
26	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	6,542	2,200	8,742
27	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvement	63,590		63,590
28	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,374		44,374
29	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	198,101		198,101
30	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payment	1		1
31	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	397,792		397,792

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
32	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	202,011		202,011
33	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	855		855
34	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	90,286		90,286
35	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	44,855		44,855
36	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(19,911)	(19,911)
37	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	183,547		183,547
38	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	19,958		19,958
39	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(5,391)	(5,391)
40	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,239		1,239
41	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	71		71
42	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	165,057		165,057
43	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	30,884		30,884
44	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	142,690		142,690
45	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	393,830		393,830
46	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	84,914		84,914
47	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	63,953		63,953
48	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(1,071)	(1,071)
49	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	174,046		174,046
50	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	12,760	970	13,730
51	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	27,997		27,997
52	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,332		2,332
53	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	158,959		158,959
54	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	55,685		55,685
55	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	34		34
56	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	114,628		114,628
57	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	428,456		428,456
58	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	38,180		38,180
59	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(6,615)	(6,615)
60	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(12,231)	(12,231)
61	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,564		3,564
62	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	25,924		25,924

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
63	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	271		271
64	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	421		421
65	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	77		77
66	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	316		316
67	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	22		22
68	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	12,554		12,554
69	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	653		653
70	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	415		415
71	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	146		146
72	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	444		444
73	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	15		15
74	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	64		64
				Total	**3,480,481**	**64,088**	**3,544,569**
				Grand Total	**8,033,908**	**430,000**	**8,463,908**

FY 2001 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Air Force: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2001

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Defense Reutilization and Marketing Organization Complex	12,800
		Total Air Force-BRAC IV Construction	**12,800**

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The Army requested authorization of $897,938,000 for military construction and $1,140,381,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $781,079,000 for military construction and $1,176,670,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The budget request included 10 military construction projects which were authorized for appropriation by division B of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Since these projects required no additional authorization, the committee did not authorize $168.5 million based on the prior year authorization. The committee also did not authorize $18.0 million for the renovation of unaccompanied personnel barracks at Kwajalein Atoll based on the fact that the majority of the beneficiaries were not military personnel.

The amounts authorized for military construction reflects a reduction of $20.5 million based on savings in the foreign currency account. The reduction shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXI of this bill.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2001.

Improvement to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

This section would authorize improvements to existing family housing units for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 825) to reduce the funding authorization for Fort Stewart, Georgia, from $71.7 million to $25.7 million due to a technical correction. The provision would also strike the funding authorization for Fort Riley, Kansas, due to a technical correction. The provision would also increase the authorization of appropriations for unspecified minor construction from $9.5 million to $14.6 million and make certain conforming changes.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1999 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2182) to increase the funding authorization of a barracks project at Fort Riley, Kansas, from $41.0 million to $44.5 million and the Railhead Facility at Fort Hood, Texas, from $32.5 million to $45.3 million. The provision would also make certain technical corrections.

Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 1998 project (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (division B of Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2185) to increase the funding authorization of a barracks project at Hunter Army Airfield, Fort Stewart, Georgia, from $54.0 million to $57.5 million. The provision would also make certain technical corrections.

Authority to accept funds for realignment of certain military construction project, Fort Campbell, Kentucky (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept funds from the Federal Highway Administration or the State of Kentucky to fund the additional costs associated with the realignment of a rail connector military construction at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, authorized in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–210; 110 Stat. 2763). The provision would authorize the Secretary to use the funds received under this authority in addition to the funds authorized and appropriated for the rail connector project. The provision would also specify that the costs associated with realignment include, but are not limited to, redesign costs, additional construction costs, additional costs due to construction delays related to the realignment, and additional real estate costs.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Presidio Housing, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California

The committee notes that base closures in the San Francisco Bay Area have severely reduced the availability of government housing for military families and that the lack of housing in proximity to the duty stations of service personnel impacts on readiness and the quality of life of uniform personnel. The committee further notes that the Army and the Presidio Trust have reached an interim accord on the use of 22 designated housing units at the Presidio through September 2005. Although this agreement will mitigate the near-term housing crisis, it only postpones a problem that must have a long-term solution. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Presidio Trust to develop a long-term agreement on the use of the 22 units by military families. The agreement should provide that the reimbursement for the housing will be no more than the basic allowance for housing. The Secretary shall report on the status of the negotiations to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 15, 2001. The report shall include the issues relating to the 22 houses, including the rank and grade of senior occupant of each house, the position taken by the Presidio, the cost of alternative housing, and the replacement value of the 22 houses.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The Navy requested authorization of $753,422,000 for military construction and $1,245,460,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $817,371,000 for military construction and $1,268,441,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect reductions of $3.9 million based on saving in the foreign currency account, $5.3 million to be offset by prior year unobligated funds. The reductions shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXII of this bill.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2001.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Correction in authorized use of funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1997 military construction project at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. The provision would permit the use of previously authorized funds to carry out a military construction project involving infrastructure development at that installation.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The Air Force requested authorization of $530,969,000 for military construction and $1,049,754,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $763,491,000 for military construction and $1,054,572,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect reductions of $12.0 million based on savings in the foreign currency account and $15.0 million to be offset by prior year unobligated funds. The reductions shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXIII of this bill.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2001.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The Defense Agencies requested authorization of $784,753,000 for military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $689,333,000 for military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing or fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends a reduction of $76.8 million for the construction of forward operating locations in Ecuador and Curacao/Aruba. The committee takes this action without prejudice and is aware that the funds for these military construction projects will be funded in a supplemental appropriations bill. The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect a reduction of $7.1 million based on savings in the foreign currency account. The reduction shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXIV of this bill.

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

This section contains the list of authorized Defense Agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Defense Agencies budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Defense Agencies may spend on military construction projects.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Certification of requirement for military construction projects, Manta Air Base, Ecuador

The budget request included $22.7 million for construction projects at Manta Air Base, Ecuador. The number of projects and funding level is based on the requirement that the facilities would support two E–3s, two KC–135s, three P–3s, three ARL, and one Senior Scout (C–130) missions and accompanying personnel. The committee directs that funds available for construction of large aer-

ial surveillance aircraft related facilities at Manta Air Base, Ecuador, not be obligated until the Secretary of Defense submits a report directed elsewhere in this bill on the demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE UAV in airborne surveillance role in the counter-drug effort.

The committee further directs that the construction of the visiting officers quarters and visiting airmen quarters and dining facility not be executed until the Secretary of Defense certifies that sufficient aircraft are scheduled to operate out of the Manta Airfield on a routine basis to ensure the construction of these facilities is justified.

Planning and design, Defense Intelligence Agency

The budget request included $6,786,000 for the planning and design for Defense Intelligence Agency. The committee is aware of the urgent need to consolidate and relocate the Defense Intelligence Agency activities to a more secure location. The committee supports the Department of Defense plans for a new Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters and directs the Secretary of Defense to expedite the planning and design.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of $190,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends $190,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

This section would authorize appropriations of $190,000,000 for the contribution of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested a military construction authorization of $221,976,000 for fiscal year 2001 for National Guard and Reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2001 of $506,696,000 to be distributed, as follows:

Army National Guard	$181,629,000
Air National Guard	161,806,000
Army Reserve	92,497,000
Air Force Reserve	32,673,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	38,091,000
Total	506,696,000

Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the National Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2001. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Support for Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams

The committee included $25.0 million in the authorization of appropriation for the Army National Guard military construction account for the specific purpose of facilitating the activation of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams. Although these teams are to be assigned to locations that have the facilities to accommodate their needs, the committee understands that the Army National Guard has identified a requirement of approximately $31.0 million for renovation of the facilities to accommodate these teams. The committee is aware that the military construction program for the reserve components is underfunded and that this requirement would place an additional burden on an already constrained Army National Guard military construction program. The committee recommends this additional funding be provided on a one time basis and directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the expenditure of these funds not later than October 1, 2001.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2004, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1998 projects (sec. 2702)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1998 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2001, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2002, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2703)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1997 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2001, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2002, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2704)

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Joint use military construction projects (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, when preparing the fiscal year defense budget request, should identify military construction projects suitable for joint use, specify in the budget request joint use military construction projects, and give priority to joint use military construction projects. The provision would also direct the Secretary to include in the budget request a certification by each secretary concerned that the service screened each construction project in the budget request for the feasibility for joint use. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than September 30 of each year, a report that included the number of military construction projects evaluated for joint use construction, when the project could be executed, and a list of the military construction projects determined to be feasible for joint use. The provision would also make certain conforming changes.

Exclusion of certain costs from determination of applicability of limitation on use of funds for improvement of family housing (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2825 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretary concerned to exclude certain costs from the counting against the limitation for housing improvement. The specific costs that would be excluded are the installation, maintenance and repair of communications, security or anti-terrorism equipment required by the occupant in the performance of his duties. The provision would also exclude the cost of repairing or replacing the exterior of the unit or units if such repair or replacement is necessary to meet historic preservation standards.

The committee directs that whenever the secretary concerned exercises this authority, the secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees and wait 30 days prior to executing any project for which the exemptions apply. The report should include a description of the project, its purpose, and cost.

Replacement of limitations on space by pay grade of military family housing with requirement for local comparability of military family housing (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the limitation on space-by-grade requirement for family housing construction.

The provision would authorize the secretary concerned to construct family housing units that are consistent with similar housing units constructed in the local area. The provision would also direct the secretary concerned to include the net square area when requesting the authorization for construction of military family housing units.

The committee expects the secretary concerned to continue reporting as part of the military construction project data (DD1391) the net square area of each type family housing unit proposed for construction.

Modification of lease authority for high-cost military family housing (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828 (b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the $60,000 per year cap on the lease of an individual housing unit and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into leases for eight housing units in the Miami area for no more than five years. The provision would further amend section 2828 (b) to authorize the Secretary concerned to adjust the maximum cost authorized for family housing leases based on the percentage that the national average monthly cost of housing differ during the two preceding fiscal years. The provision would authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the maximum amount of the eight family housing unit leases in the Miami area by the percent the annual average cost of housing for the Miami Military Housing Area exceeds the annual average cost for the same region for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year.

Applicability of competitive policy to alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned use competitive procedures when exercising the alternative authorities for the acquisition and improvement of military housing. The Secretary concerned could waive competitive procedures if he determines competition would be inconsistent with public interest and notifies the Congress in writing of such determination not less than 30 days before entering the agreement.

Provisions of utilities and services under alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2806)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2872 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries to provide utilities and services to privatized housing units located on a military installation on a reimbursable basis. The payments received for such services would be credited to the appropriate account or working capital fund from which the cost of furnishing the utilities and services was paid.

Extension of alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2807)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2885 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to enter a contract for military housing privatization until February 10, 2004.

Inclusion of readiness center in definition of armory for purposes of construction of reserve components facilities (sec. 2808)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 18232(3) of title 10, United States Code, to equate the term Readiness Center to the term Armory. The provision would also make certain conforming changes.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Increase in threshold for reports to Congress on real property transactions (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the reporting threshold to congressional defense committees for real property transactions from $200,000 to $500,000.

Enhancements to military lease authority (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretary concerned to lease facilities that are under the control of that department and that are not excess to the needs of that department. The secretary concerned would be authorized to accept as compensation for the leases, either payment in-kind or cash. The provision would clarify that in-kind consideration may be applied at any military installation and that it may take the following forms: maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration of any property; construction of new facilities for the department; provision of facilities for use by the department; base operating support services; and other services related to the activity that will occur on the leased property, as the secretary considers appropriate. In the instances where the payment in-kind payment is the construction or provision of new facilities with a value in excess of $500,000, the secretary would not be authorized to enter the lease until 30 days after the date on which a report on the facts of the lease is submitted to the congressional defense committees. The provision would further authorize the secretary concerned to use cash proceeds from leases for maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvements or restoration of property or facilities, construction or acquisition of new facilities, lease facilities, and facilities support. At least 50 percent of the cash payment received would be available for use only at the military installation at which the property is located. The provision would authorize the secretary concerned to construct or acquire facilities in excess of $500,000 only after he submits a report on the facts of the construction or acquisition of such facilities to the congressional defense commit-

tees and waits 30 days. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than March 15 of each year, a report to the congressional defense committees providing an accounting of the rental receipts and a detailed explanation of all leases and amendments to existing leases. The provision would also authorize the secretary concerned to indemnify the leasee from any claim for personal injury or property damage, that results from the release of hazardous substance, pollutants or contaminants, petroleum, or unexploded ordnance as a result of Defense activities on the military installation at which the leased property is located.

Expansion of procedures for selection of conveyees under authority to convey utility systems (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2688(b) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the secretary concerned may use procedures other than competitive procedures only under the circumstances specified in section 2304 (c) through (f) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee believes that maximizing competition in the privatization of utility systems within the Department of Defense is essential to ensuring that the military receives the most efficient and effective service and to ensuring taxpayers derive the maximum value from the government's previous investment in these systems. However, the committee is concerned that the Department may be inadvertently creating barriers to competition. Specifically, the committee believes that the Department may not be giving potential offerors enough time to respond to its requests for proposals. This particularly affects the utilities required to obtain permission from their regulators in order to form teams or partnerships to respond to the Department's requirements. Providing insufficient time for regulated entities, therefore, has the effect of limiting competition. The Department should examine and adjust its existing timetables to ensure that potential competitors have adequate time to respond. Additionally, the committee believes that the Department's efforts to bundle systems or installations into a single solicitation for a large region may exclude entities that are only qualified to provide one type of service, or are limited to operating within a specific geographical area. The committee believes the Department should structure its solicitations in a way that allows interested entities to bid on parts of that which is being offered, as well as the entire package, thereby ensuring that all have a fair chance in the competition.

While the committee supports the Department's competitive privatization efforts, it believes that the Department must be mindful of the impacts of these efforts upon public safety and the public interest in assuming a safe and effective network of utility systems among multiple users. The Department should take steps, either through reliance upon existing public utility regulatory mechanisms or through careful contract provisions and service oversight of privatization contracts, to protect public interests both within and without base installation boundaries. Further, the Department should consider the cost of protecting these public interests in the decision to privatize. Finally, the committee applauds the Department's efforts to work with industry, in particular the two-day,

Utility Privatization Industry Forum. The committee directs the Department to build on that effort by taking action to eliminate barriers to full competition.

SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Scope of agreements to transfer property to redevelopment authorities without consideration under the base closure laws (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2905(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and section 204(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure Realignment Act (title II of Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) to clarify that the seven-year period to account for the proceeds from any sale or lease of property received by the redevelopment authority begins at the date of the initial transfer of property.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Part I—Army Conveyances

Land conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, as public benefit, if qualified, or at fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 752 acres, including improvements thereon, and known as the Charles Melvin Price Support Center to the Tri-City Regional Port District of Granite City, Illinois, for the development of a port facility and for other public purposes. The property authorized for conveyance may include 158 military family housing units, but only if the Port Authority agrees to accord priority use to members of the armed services for the lease of the housing. The Secretary may include personal property of the Army at the Charles Melvin Price Support Center that the Secretary of Transportation recommends is appropriate for the development or operation of the port facility, and that the Secretary of the Army agrees is excess to the needs of the Army. The provision would authorize the Secretary to provide for an interim lease of the property to the Port District until such time it is conveyed by deed. As compensation for the interim lease, the Secretary may accept payment in-kind at less than fair market value if the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest.

The provision would also authorize the Secretary to retain part of the parcel, not to exceed 50 acres, for the development of an Army Reserve Center. When the Secretary determines the acreage is no longer required, the Secretary shall transfer the acreage to the Port District. In determining the location of the Army Reserve Center, the Secretary shall consider its impact on the Port District's use of the remainder of the property.

The provision would further authorize the Secretary of the Army to require the Port District to lease to the Department of Defense

or any other Federal Agency facilities. Any lease under this authority shall be made under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary and the Port District. The agency leasing the facility shall provide for maintenance of the facility, as required by all Federal, State, and local laws and ordinances. At the end of the lease, the property would revert to the Port Authority. As a further condition of conveyance, the Port District would grant the Secretary of the Army an easement on the property conveyed to permit the Secretary to implement and maintain flood control projects. The Secretary shall be responsible for the maintenance of any flood control project built on the easement.

Land conveyance, Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, to the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a parcel of real property, including improvements, located at 950 Saw Mill Run Boulevard in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and containing the Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay Army Reserve Center. The exact acreage and legal description of the real property would be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey would be borne by the City.

Land conveyance, Colonel Harold E. Steele Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2833)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, to the Ellis School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a parcel of real property, including improvements, located at 6482 Aurelia Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and containing the Colonel Harold E. Steele Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop. The exact acreage and legal description of the real property would be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey would be borne by the Ellis School.

Land conveyance, Fort Lawton, Washington (sec. 2834)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Seattle, Washington, a parcel of real property at Fort Lawton, Washington, consisting of Area 500 and Government Way from 36th Avenue to Area 500. The purpose of the conveyance would be to include the property in Discovery Park, Seattle, Washington.

Land conveyance, Vancouver Barracks, Washington (sec. 2835)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Vancouver, Washington, a parcel of real property, including any improvements, at Vancouver Barracks, Washington. The conveyance includes 19 structures known as the west barracks. The purpose of the conveyance would be to include the property as part of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve.

Part II—Navy Conveyances

Modification of land conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California (sec. 2851)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2811 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990 and 1991 (division B of Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1650). The provision would change the authority to use the monetary consideration from construction of family housing at Marine Corps Air Station Tustin, California, for the repair of roads and development of facilities at Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California.

Modification of land conveyance, Defense Fuel Supply Point, Casco Bay, Maine (sec. 2852)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2839 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3065) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to replace electric utility service removed during environmental remediation. The provision would also authorize the Secretary, in consultation with the community, to improve the utility services and install telecommunications service, provided the community funds the cost of the improvements.

Modification of land conveyance authority, former Navy Training Center, Bainbridge, Cecil County, Maryland (sec. 2853)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1 of an Act to convey land in Cecil County, Maryland (Public Law 99–596; 100 Stat. 3349) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to reduce the amount of consideration received from the State of Maryland by an amount equal to the cost of restoring the historic buildings on the property. The total amount of the reduction would not exceed $500,000.

Land conveyance, Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine (sec. 2854)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 263 acres known as the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine, to the State of Maine, any political subdivision of the State of Maine, or any tax-supported agency in the State of Maine. The Secretary may require the recipient of the property to reimburse the Secretary for any environmental assessment or other studies required with respect to the conveyance of the property.

Part III—Defense Agencies Conveyance

Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Farmers Branch, Texas (sec. 2871)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to convey at fair market value a parcel of real

property, owned and purchased by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, a non-appropriated fund instrumentality, located in Farmers Branch, Texas. As a condition of the conveyance, the provision would require cash payment as consideration and would require that the payment be processed according to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 485 (c)). The provision would waive section 2693 of title 10, United States Code, the provisions of the Federal Property Administrative Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), and section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411). The provision would also direct the Secretary to submit a report on the conveyance to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the conveyance.

The committee does not intend the waivers of current law to become general policy, instead the waivers pertain to the unique aspect of the property authorized for conveyance. Specifically, the property is not located on a military base, the title of the property is held by a non-appropriated fund property, and no appropriated funds were used to acquire, construct, rehabilitate, or improve the property.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Naming of the Army missile testing range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll (sec. 2881)

The committee recommends a provision that would name the Army missile testing range at the Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Report on Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy is considering an increase above the recommended number of submarines in the Quadrennial Defense Review. Anticipating this future need, it is important to ensure that all the organizations providing support to the submarine force have sufficient resources to meet both current and potentially increased future requirements. As the only government facility capable of producing the highest quality silent propellers and related equipment for submarines, the Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is an essential facility for support of the submarine fleet. Because of its unique capability, it is critical that the Center has sufficient facilities, equipment, and trained staff to meet the Navy's current and future requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit, not later than March 1, 2001, a report to the congressional defense committees that analyzes the facility, equipment, and staffing requirements of the Naval Foundry and Propeller Center. This report should also include the funding levels needed in future budgets to provide the needed capabilities and capacity at the Center.

Report on requirement for Education Center at Fort Stewart, Georgia

The committee is aware that the opportunity for continuing education while in the military is a valuable tool for enhancing recruiting and retention of highly motivated individuals. To maximize the available resources, several military installations have or are prepared to enter joint cooperative agreements with State or local university systems. The committee is aware that Fort Stewart, Georgia, has identified an opportunity for a joint cooperative agreement with the University System of Georgia to address the educational needs of the military personnel and family members stationed at the installation. However, the lack of adequate facilities precludes the full achievement of such an agreement. The committee is supportive of such innovative approaches to meeting the educational needs of our military personnel and directs the Secretary of the Army to study the requirement for and feasibility of funding and constructing an education center at Fort Stewart, Georgia. The study should also address the desirability of joint use of such facility by the local community and the cost sharing arrangements that should accompany such joint use. The Secretary should provide the results of the study to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate by January 15, 2001.

Study on commercial leases

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has made progress in reducing the number of commercial leases. However, the committee believes that a more aggressive approach to relocating activities from leased facilities to government-owned space would yield additional savings for the Department.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2001, a report that analyzes the relocation of activities from leased facilities to available DOD owned space in metropolitan areas that currently have vacant or underutilized DOD property. The metropolitan areas studied should include, but not be limited to, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and San Antonio, Texas.

Study regarding the location of the National Museum of the United States Army

The Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, established the precedence that permits each service (to include the Marine Corps) to designate one museum at one location to be the official service museum. In response to this authority, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force have designated official museums. The Army and the Marine Corps have not yet specified a museum, although the committee understands that the Marine Corps is considering a location at the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Virginia.

The Chief of Staff of the Army initiated a National Military Museum of the United States Army site selection process in 1983. This process culminated in the selection of a site within the National Capitol Region. The proposed site was submitted for congressional approval in both the fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1995. For rea-

sons not related to the specific site, the Congress did not approve the procurement of the location. Since 1996, the Army has not made a concerted effort to identify or seek congressional approval for an Army museum in the National Capitol Region.

The committee is aware that communities have an interest in hosting the National Military Museum of the United States Army and have dedicated resources toward that effort. The committee supports the establishment of a museum dedicated to honor the 225-year history of the Army and believes that any further delay in selecting a site would not only be a disservice to the thousands of men and women who wear the Army uniform, but also to the communities eager to host the National Military Museum of the United States Army. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to immediately initiate a new site selection process and provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2001. The report shall include the selected site, if one is judged appropriate, the site selection process, schedule for developing the National Military Museum for the United States Army, and funding sources.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Atomic energy defense activities

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2001, 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 six categories: national nuclear security administration; defense environmental restoration and waste management; defense environmental management privatization; other defense activities; Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request for the atomic energy defense activities totaled $13.1 billion, an 8.3 percent increase over the adjusted fiscal year 2000 level. Of the total amount requested: $4.6 billion was for weapons activities; $1.6 billion was for other nuclear security activities; $4.6 billion was for defense environmental restoration and waste management activities; $1.0 billion was for defense facility closure projects; $540.1 million was for defense environmental management privatization; $555.1 million was for other defense activities; $112.0 million was for defense nuclear waste disposal; $17.0 million was for a Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative; and $140.0 million was for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program.

The committee recommends $12.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities, a decrease of $323.6 million to the budget request. The committee recommends $6.2 billion for the national nuclear security administration (NNSA), an increase of 37.2 million to the budget request. The amount authorized for the NNSA is as follows: $4.7 billion for weapons activities, an increase of $78.8 million to the budget request; $847.0 million for defense nuclear nonproiferation, a decrease of $59.0 million to the budget request; and $695.0 million for naval reactors, an increase of $17.4 million to the budget request. The committee further recommends $5.5 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, including defense facility closure projects, a decrease of $132.0 million to the budget request; $515.0 million for defense environmental management privatization, the amount of the budget request; $466.3 million for other defense activities, a decrease of

$88.8 million to the budget request; $17.0 million for a Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative, the amount of the budget request; and $112.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, the amount of the budget request. The committee recommends no funding for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program, representing a decrease of $140.0 million to the budget request.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the committee recommendations:

SUBTITLE A-NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE XXXI-XXXII			
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)			
National Nuclear Security Adminstration			
Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Secruity Actitivities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	515,000	0	515,000
Other Defense Actitivities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	0	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities			
Stewardship Operations & Maintenance			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile Research and Development	243,300	6,000	249,300
Stockpile Maintenance	257,994	0	257,994
Stockpile Evaluation	151,710	0	151,710
Dismatlement/Disposal	29,260	0	29,260
Production Support	149,939	0	149,939
Field Engineering, Training, and Manuals	4,400	0	4,400
Total, Directed stockpile work	836,603	6,000	842,603
Campaigns			
Primary Certification	41,400	0	41,400
Dynamic Materials Properties	64,408	0	64,408
Advanced Radiography	43,000	0	43,000
Secondary Certification and Nuclear Systems Margins	52,964	0	52,964
Intertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High Yield	120,800	0	120,800
Certiication in Hostile Environments	15,400	0	15,400
Defense Computing and Modeling	249,100	437,075	686,175
Weapons System Engineering Cerification	16,300	0	16,300
Enhanced Surety	40,600	0	40,600

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Enhanced Surveillance	89,651	0	89,651
Advanced Design and Production Technologies	75,735	0	75,735
Pit Manufacturing Readiness	108,038	10,000	118,038
Secondary Readiness	15,000	0	15,000
Materials Readiness	40,511	0	40,511
Tritium Readiness	77,000	0	77,000
Total, Campaigns	1,049,907	447,075	1,496,982
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of Facilities	1,313,432	71,300	1,384,732
Program readiness	75,800	0	75,800
Special Projects	48,297	0	48,297
Materials Recycle and Recovery	22,018	0	22,018
Containers	7,876	0	7,876
Storage	9,075	0	9,075
Advanced Simulation and Computing	477,075	(477,075)	0
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,953,573	(405,775)	1,547,798
Total, Stewardship Operations & Maintenance	3,840,083	47,300	3,887,383
Secure transportation asset			
Operation and maintenance	79,357	0	79,357
Program direction	36,316	0	36,316
Total, Secure transportation asset	115,673	0	115,673

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Program direction	224,071	(2,500)	221,571
Construction:			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	0	2,300
01-D-103 Preliminary Project Design and Engineering, various locations	14,500	0	14,500
01-D-124 HEU materials storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,800	0	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	0	3,000
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	0	5,000
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	0	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	0	6,700
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	0	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	0	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	5,200	0	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	0	2,000
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	0	13,000
99-D-127 Stockpile mgmt restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,765	0	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,998	0	4,998
99-D-132 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, nuclear materials safeguards & security upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	18,043	0	18,043
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium facility modernization and consolidation, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	30,767	0	30,767

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	75,000	0	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations	0	34,000	34,000
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	35,232	0	35,232
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,918	0	2,918
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	74,100	0	74,100
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) building upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	13,337	0	13,337
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	0	2,713
Total, Construction	414,173	34,000	448,173
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
Less proposed supplemental	0	0	0
Total, Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Security Activities			
Defense nuclear nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operation and maintenance	225,990	30,000	255,990
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL, Los Alamos, NM	7,000	0	7,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification R&D	232,990	30,000	262,990

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Arms control			
Arms control operations	272,870	0	272,870
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia	100,000	(100,000)	0
HEU transparency implementation	15,190	0	15,190
International nuclear safety	20,000	0	20,000
Total, Arms control	408,060	(100,000)	308,060
Program direction	41,550	(41,550)	0
Total, Arms Control and verification R&D	682,600	(111,550)	571,050
Fissile materials disposition			
Operation and maintenance	175,517	0	175,517
Construction			
00-D-142, Immobilization & associated processing facility, title I & II SRS, Aiken, SC	3,000	0	3,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, title I & II design, Aiken, SC	20,000	11,000	31,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, title I & II design, Aiken, SC	15,000	0	15,000
Total, Construction	38,000	11,000	49,000
Program direction	9,918	(9,918)	0
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	223,435	1,082	224,517
Russian plutonium disposition	0	0	0
Program direction	0	51,468	51,468

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	906,035	(59,000)	847,035
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	627,500	17,400	644,900
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400	0	11,400
Construction:			
01-D-200 Major office replacement building Schenectady, NY	1,300	0	1,300
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	0	16,000
Total, Construction	17,300	0	17,300
Total, Naval reactors development	656,200	17,400	673,600
Program direction	21,400	0	21,400
Total, Naval reactors	677,600	17,400	695,000
Subtotal, Other nuclear security activities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
Project overrun reserve	0	0	0
Offset for proposed supplemental (Russian Pu)	0	0	0
Addback of proposed rescission (Russian Pu)	0	0	0
Total, Adjustments	0	0	0
Total, Other Nuclear Security Activities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,177,635	37,200	6,214,835
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management			
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	0	1,082,297	1,082,297
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	901,475	(40,000)	861,475
Construction:			
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion, Idaho National Engineering Lab (INEEL) Idaho Falls, Idaho	500	0	500
01-D-407 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend-down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	0	27,932
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,714	0	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEEL, ID	4,300	0	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	0	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,949	0	3,949
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,512	0	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Aiken, SC	8,879	0	8,879

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
Total, Construction	69,476	0	69,476
Total, Site/project completion	970,951	(40,000)	930,951
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,588,725	(55,000)	2,533,725
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	(25,000)	395,000
Construction:			
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	1,300	0	1,300
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	0	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	46,023	0	46,023
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	0	17,385
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	0	27,212
Total, Construction	99,732	0	99,732
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,108,457	(80,000)	3,028,457
Science and technology	196,548	50,000	246,548
Program direction	359,888	(5,000)	354,888
Subtotal, Defense environmental restoration & waste management	4,635,844	1,007,297	5,643,141
Use of prior year balances	(34,317)	(57,000)	(91,317)

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Pension refund	(50,000)	0	(50,000)
Addback of proposed rescission	0	0	0
General reduction	0	0	0
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	540,092	0	540,092
Use of prior year balances	(25,092)	0	(25,092)
Total, Defense Environmental Management Privatization.	515,000	0	515,000
Other Defense Activities			
Intelligence			
Operation and maintenance	36,059	0	36,059
Construction:			
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information fac, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
Total, Intelligence	38,059	0	38,059
Counterintelligence	45,200	30,000	75,200

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Security and emergency operations			
Nuclear safeguards and security	124,409	0	124,409
Security investigations	33,000	0	33,000
Emergency management	93,600	(56,300)	37,300
Program direction	89,367	(2,500)	86,867
Total, Security and emergency operations	340,376	(58,800)	281,576
Independent oversight and performance assurance			
Independent oversight and performance assurance	0	0	0
Program direction	14,937	0	14,937
Total, Independent oversight and performance assurance	14,937	0	14,937
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	86,446	(10,000)	76,446
Program direction	22,604	0	22,604
Total, Environment, safety and health	109,050	(10,000)	99,050
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	21,500	0	21,500
Program direction	3,000	0	3,000
Total, Worker and community transition	24,500	0	24,500

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Russian uranium disposition	0	0	0
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	0	3,000
Subtotal, Other defense activities	575,122	(38,800)	536,322
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0	(50,000)	(50,000)
Project overrun reserve	0	0	0
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Less proposed supplemental (EH)	0	0	0
Less proposed supplemental (SO)	0	0	0
Total, Adjustments	(20,000)	(50,000)	(70,000)
Total, Other Defense Activities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	0	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative			
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund	12,800	0	12,800
Energy employees pilot project	2,000	0	2,000
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund	2,200	0	2,200
Total, Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES	12,925,581	(183,600)	12,741,981
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $6.2 billion for activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), an increase of $97.3 million to the budget request.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $4.6 billion for weapons activities, an increase of $78.8 million to the budget request. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $842.6 million for directed stockpile work, an increase of $6.0 million; $1.5 billion for campaigns, an increase of $447.1 million; $1.5 billion for readiness in technical base and facilities, a decrease of $405.8 million; $115.7 million for secure transportation assets, the amount of the budget request; $448.2 million for construction, an increase of $34.0 million; and $221.6 million for program direction, a decrease of $2.5 million.

Directed Stockpile Work

In the directed stockpile work account, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to the budget request for a cooperative research effort with the Department of Defense regarding defeating hard and deeply buried targets.

Campaigns

In the campaigns account, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for the pit manufacturing readiness campaign to begin conceptual design activities for a pit production facility adequate to meet future national security needs; an increase of $477.1 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to reflect the consolidation of all defense computing and modeling activities into a single program line item; a decrease of $20.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to reflect delays in acquisition of the 100-trillion-operations-per-second computer platform; a decrease of $5.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to slow the rate of growth in the Visual Interactive Environment Weapon Simulation (VIEWS) program; and a decrease of $15.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to slow the rate of growth in university partnership activities. The authorized amounts for both the VIEWS and university partnerships programs represents an increase over fiscal year 2000 funding levels.

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) requires that the Nuclear Emergency Search Team remain a program function within the Office of Military Applications under the Office of Defense Programs. The committee further notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 104–65) directed the Secretary of Energy to slow the rate of growth in the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative and Strategic Computing accounts. Finally, the committee is aware that the November 8, 1999, report of the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile stated that its "paramount concern"

with the DOE stockpile stewardship program ". . . is the need to begin work now on an adequate plutonium pit production manufacturing capability." The committee endorses this finding and directs the Secretary of Energy to begin conceptual design activities for a pit production facility with a capacity adequate to meet future national security needs immediately.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

In the budget request for the readiness in technical base and facilities account, the committee recommends: an increase of $56.3 million to reflect the movement of the nuclear emergency search team and accident response group from the other defense activities emergency management account to the weapons activities account; and an increase of $15.0 million for the Kansas City, Pantex, and Y–12 plants to continue advanced manufacturing, modernization, infrastructure improvement, and skills retention efforts.

Construction

In the construction account, the committee recommends an increase of $34.0 million to the budget request for continued preliminary design and engineering development activities in the accelerator production of tritium program.

Program Direction

In the program direction account, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommends moving the nuclear emergency response programs from the other defense account into the weapons activities account. The amount authorized for program direction reflects an increase of $2.5 million to account for the salaries of those federal employees who will likewise be transferred.

The committee directs that the proposed decrease to the program direction account be achieved through the reorganization and realignment of headquarters and field office roles and responsibilities. The committee believes that the performance of the Office of Defense Programs will be improved by eliminating duplicative efforts and by streamlining management control of DOE weapons activities.

The committee continues to believe that the Office of Defense Programs is overstaffed. The committee notes that several independent assessments of the organizational structure of the Office of Defense Programs, dating back as far as calendar year 1997, have also concluded that the Office of Defense Programs would benefit from a realignment of headquarters and field organization personnel. The committee expects the Department to utilize the authority to make voluntary separation incentive payments authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to fully implement the realignment recommendations described in the calendar year 1997 report by the Institute for Defense Analysis.

Budget Structure for Office of the Assistant Administrator for Defense Programs

The committee commends the Office of Defense Programs for establishing a more detailed and transparent budget structure. The committee continues to believe that this new budget structure will greatly enhance the effectiveness of these programs and instill a higher degree of budgetary discipline in the Office of Defense Programs. The committee further believes that the new budget structure will also assist Congress in assessing the degree of integration among varied experiments, simulation, research, and weapons assessments activities carried out at the Department's weapons laboratories and production plants. The committee directs that future budget requests for weapons activities clearly identify the funding required for each campaign and each program element under the directed stockpile work and readiness in technical base and facilities accounts.

Advanced Simulation and Computing

The committee continues to support the Advanced Simulation and Computing program, including the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) and Stockpile Computing program. However, the committee believes that the Department has not fully integrated these programs with the experimental facilities and capabilities that are envisioned for the stockpile stewardship and management program. The committee remains concerned that the rate of growth in this program is not fully justified. The committee notes that the acquisition schedule for the 100-trillion-operations-per-second, ASCI-Blue computer to be located at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory has slipped by as much as two years, yet the budget request reflects no related decrease in funding to account for the delayed delivery of this machine.

The committee is also concerned that the rate of growth in the Advanced Simulation and Computing program is taking resources away from other, equally important, programmatic requirements of the Office of Defense Programs. The committee notes that even at this reduced level of funding, the Advanced Simulation and Computing programs will experience significant growth in the level of funding over fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 funding levels.

The committee continues to support the utilization of the capabilities and facilities of the Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center to better meet the Department's supercomputing needs in lieu of planned acquisitions proposed within the Advanced Simulation and Computing program.

Technology Partnerships and Education

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for campaigns, the committee recommends $10.0 million for the American Textiles Partnership (AMTEX) project. The committee recommends these funds in order to complete work on this partnership in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes the AMTEX project was projected to conclude in fiscal year 2000, but that the Department of Energy failed to obligate the full amount of funds authorized for the project in that fiscal year.

Tritium Production

Of the funds available in the tritium readiness campaign account, the committee recommends $58.0 million for the Commercial Light Water Reactor program and $53.0 million for the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) program.

The committee recommended an increase in the tritium production account to allow DOE to comply with the requirements of section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). The committee notes that the request was insufficient to complete preliminary design and engineering development of critical components of the APT technology, as required by section 3134 and the Secretary of Energy's December 22, 1998, tritium decision.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Energy failed to request adequate funds to implement the December 1998, tritium decision and meet the requirements set forth in section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). The committee has reduced funding in the defense computing and simulation account to bring the Department into compliance with the Secretary's December 1998, tritium decision and the requirements set forth in section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Nuclear Weapons Emphasis and Effects

Of the funds available for directed stockpile work, the committee recommends $5.0 million for a cooperative program with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to re-establish a vigorous nuclear weapon effects test capability. The program shall emphasize the need to invest in all elements of nuclear weapon effects technologies, including basic phenomenology, analysis and modeling, radiation effects simulation, and hardening technologies.

Defense Medical Devices Prototyping Pilot

The committee recommends that, of the funds available for campaigns, up to $6.0 million be made available for the Defense medical devices prototyping pilot program. Such funds are available only for activities that support the national security missions of DOE and established missions of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). No weapons activities funds shall be available for any activity that is not carried out pursuant to a cooperative agreement between DOE and NIH. Any weapons activities funds utilized must be leveraged with at least equal funding from NIH.

Defense nuclear nonproliferation

The committee recommends $847.0 million for defense nuclear nonproliferation, a decrease of $59.0 million to the budget request of $906.0 million. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $262.9 million for nonproliferation verification research and development, an increase of $30.0 million; $308.1 million for arms control, a decrease of $100.0 million; $224.5 million for fissile materials control and disposition, an increase of $1.1 million; and $51.5 million for program direction, the amount of the budget request.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program was formerly known as the nonproliferation and national security account during fiscal year 2000. Because DOE did not request these funds under separate budget accounts, as required by section 3251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, (Public Law 106- 65), the committee has renamed and consolidated these accounts, including program direction, into a single account titled National Nuclear Security Administration to meet the statutory requirements.

Fissile Materials Control and Disposition

In the fissile materials control and disposition account, the committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million to the budget request to accelerate design activities for the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility and a decrease of $9.9 million to reflect consolidation of all Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program direction funds into a single account, consistent with the requirements of title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Naval reactors

The committee recommends $695.0 million for naval reactors, an increase of $17.5 million to the budget request for expedited decommissioning and decontamination activities at surplus facilities.

Safeguards and security activities

The committee directs that all funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section be managed exclusively by line programs within the NNSA.

Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.5 billion for environmental management activities of the Department of Energy (DOE), excluding defense environmental management privatization and including defense facilities closure projects, for a net reduction of $132.0 million. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $1.1 billion for closure projects, the amount of the request; $930.1 million for site and project completion, a reduction of $40.0 million; $3.0 billion for post 2006 completion, a decrease of $80.0 million; $246.0 million for technology development, an increase of $50.0 million; and $191.5 million for program direction, a decrease of $5.0 million. The committee also recommends a decrease of $57.0 million to account for available uncosted, unobligated prior year funds and funds to be deobligated from completed, prior year construction projects.

The committee directs that future year requests for defense environmental restoration and waste management include the request for defense facility closure projects.

Post 2006 Completion

In relation to the budget request for the Post 2006 completion account, the committee recommends: an increase of $10.0 million to

address planning, research, demonstration, and other requirements associated with modification of the Savannah River in-tank precipitation process; an increase of $10.0 million for the Columbia River Corridor Initiative at Hanford to continue reactor decontamination and decommissioning activities; a decrease of $25.0 million in the defense contribution to the uranium decommission and decontamination fund; a decrease of $57.0 million to account for increased contractor efficiencies to be gained through contract management reforms and construction project management improvements; and a decrease of $18.0 million to reflect the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account.

The committee recommends full funding for the F-canyon and H-canyon materials processing facilities.

Site and Project Completion

In relation to the budget request for the site and project completion account, the committee recommends a decrease of $37.0 million to account for increased contractor efficiencies to be gained through contract management reforms and construction project management improvements and a decrease of $3.0 million to reflect the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account.

Science and Technology Development

In relation to the budget request for the science and technology development account, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for applied research and development activities. The amount authorized reflects the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account from the Post 2006 and Site and Project Completion accounts.

The committee supports the integration of industrial programs and university based programs into the Environmental Management technology focus areas. The committee understands that this approach will better link such research efforts with site needs. The committee believes that the Office of Science and Technology cannot meet its objectives without the active participation of industry and academia. The committee encourages the Office of Science and Technology to continue its inclusion of industry and universities in technology development and deployment activities.

The committee notes that the Department's cleanup and waste management efforts will continue well into the 21st Century with costs anticipated to exceed $150.0 billion and much of the cleanup work scheduled to continue beyond fiscal year 2030. DOE must make meaningful investments in innovative science and technology in order to reduce costs, reduce safety and health risks, and develop solutions to problems for which there are currently no available or effective technologies.

Over the past several years DOE has started to focus the environmental management research and development efforts to the cleanup requirements of the various sites and facilities. This effort

has started to show significant progress in developing new technologies and making them available for cleanup and waste treatment and in substantially reducing the costs of those activities. In the past, DOE has utilized the research capabilities of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) with great success. The committee is supportive of these efforts and encourages the DOE to expand the research conducted at HBCUs and HSIs.

While in many instances there are no technologies or inadequate technologies to treat accumulated waste or to clean up DOE sites and facilities, in many instances DOE has successfully adapted or incorporated existing technologies into the Environmental Management Program. For example, DOE has been able to adapt several new technologies from the oil industry and has had considerable success with horizontal drilling techniques devised by the oil industry. The committee is aware of several other technologies available to the oil industry such as macro-encapsulation technology that could possibly be used by the DOE Office of Environmental Management. The committee encourages DOE to take advantage of these and other technologies developed by the oil industry that could be helpful to DOE, as well as any other technologies already developed and utilized by industry.

Program Direction

In relation to the program direction account, the committee recommends $354.9 million, a decrease of $5.0 million.

Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response

The committee recommends $5.9 million for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response training facility in Richland, Washington, to be offset by contributions from facility users.

Columbia River Corridor Initiative

The committee supports the Columbia River Corridor Initiative to accelerate cleanup along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) directed the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to establish a schedule by which the 100 square miles of the Hanford site that adjoin the Columbia River could be cleaned up on an accelerated schedule and proposed for delisting from the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List. The committee notes that this schedule has not been submitted to Congress. The committee expects that this report will be provided not later than November 1, 2000.

Use of Professional and Performance Insurance at DOE Cleanup Sites

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than February 1, 2001, regarding the use of private insurers by contractors to the Department of Energy to underwrite professional and performance liabil-

ity risks related to contracts administered by the Office of Environmental Management (EM). The report shall identify: (1) those contracts that include insurance requirements or accommodate insurance costs; (2) the costs and benefits for such insurance coverage, including the desirability of mandating such coverage in all EM cleanup contracts and an assessment of the prudence value of third party evaluation of contract objectives; (3) the costs to the U.S. Government of failure to require such coverage, including litigation and arbitration expenses and any delays meeting cleanup objectives; and (4) a comparison of the DOE contract requirements to those at commercial cleanup sites with similar coverage. The report shall further assess the desirability of utilizing private insurers or other entities to provide remediation guarantees for EM cleanup contracts, specifically for fixed price remediation projects.

Report on Pilot Program To Use Prior Year Unobligated Balances To Accelerate Cleanup of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

The committee encourages the Secretary to Energy to use the authority provided by section 3176 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 to accelerate closure of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS).

Safeguards and Security Activities

The committee directs that all funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section be managed exclusively by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee authorizes $466.3 billion for other defense activities, a decrease of $88.8 million to the budget request. The reduction reflects a decrease of $50.0 million to account for available uncosted, unobligated prior year funds and funds to be deobligated from completed, prior year construction projects.

Intelligence

The committee recommends $38.1 million for the Office of Intelligence, the amount of the budget request.

Counterintelligence

The committee recommends $75.2 million for the Office of Counterintelligence, an increase of $30.0 million to the budget request.

The committee directs that these funds be utilized to continue implementation of an enhanced computer security program at Department of Energy facilities, including cyber security measures such as intrusion detection, early warning, reporting, and analysis capabilities and a computer vulnerability assessment. The committee directs that priority be given to implementing such added computer security at the three nuclear weapons laboratories.

Security and emergency operations

Nuclear safeguards and security

The committee recommends $124.4 million for safeguards and security, the amount of the budget request.

Security Investigations

The committee recommends $33.0 million for security investigations, the amount of the budget request. The committee notes that of these funds, $20.0 million is authorized in line program accounts and is reflected as an offset to the Other Defense Activities account.

Emergency Management

The committee recommends $37.3 million for emergency management, a decrease of $56.3 million to the budget request. The reduction reflects movement of the nuclear emergency search team and accident response group programs to the weapons activities account authorized in section 3101(a)(1) of this Act. No emergency management funds are authorized for these activities.

Program Direction

The committee recommends $86.9 million for program direction, a decrease of $2.5 million to the budget request. This reduction reflects the movement of nuclear emergency response programs to the weapons activities account.

Independent oversight and performance assurance

The committee recommends $14.9 million for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

Environment, safety and health-defense

The committee recommends $99.1 million for environment, safety and health-defense, a decrease of $10.0 million to the budget request. The reduction would be taken from proposed increases in risk and health studies at Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities that do not directly support the national security missions of the Department and, therefore, are not appropriately funded in this account.

Worker and community transition

The committee recommends $24.5 million for worker and community transition, the amount of the budget request.

The committee endorses the Department of Energy's (DOE) decision to remove the requirement that management and operating contracts at DOE sites include provisions for conducting economic development activities in the communities surrounding such sites. The committee encourages DOE contractors to continue to be good corporate citizens by supporting community-based initiatives. The committee believes, however, that economic development activities

of DOE contractors should not be used as a measure of performance or as a selection criteria for the award of contracts.

Office of Hearings and Appeals

The committee recommends $3.0 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $515.0 million for defense environmental management privatization projects, the amount of the budget request. The amount authorized is for the following projects: $450.0 million for the Tank Waste Remediation System Project, phase I (Richland); $65.0 million for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment project (Idaho); and $25.1 million for spent nuclear fuel dry storage (Idaho). The amount authorized is reduced by $25.1 million to reflect the use of prior year, uncosted balances in the defense environmental management privatization account.

The committee is deeply concerned with the status of the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) project. The committee understands that cost estimates for the construction portion of this project have increased from $3.2 billion to $6.4 billion, translating into a total estimated project cost increase from $6.9 billion to over $13.0 billion. The committee further understands that these cost estimates are based on a project design that is only 13 to 15 percent complete and, therefore, subject to additional change.

The committee fully supports the TWRS project and believes that the technological approach proposed is viable and realistic. The committee also believes it is vitally important that this project proceed to full scale construction only when the Department of Energy has a high degree of confidence in the overall project cost and other facility requirements. The committee believes that the Secretary of Energy should not enter into a fixed price contract for this project until the contractor has, at a minimum, completed not less than 40 percent of the project design activities.

Energy employees compensation initiative (sec. 3105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $17.0 million for the establishment of an energy employees compensation fund to compensate Department of Energy (DOE) contractor employees that have proven health or other medical problems that are directly related to their employment at a DOE nuclear facility.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $112.0 million for the Department of Energy fiscal year 2001 defense contribution to the Defense Nuclear Waste Fund.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Reprogramming (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in excess of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of $1.0 million above the amount authorized for the program, until the Secretary of Energy submits a report to the congressional defense committees and a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the report is received.

Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out any construction project authorized under general plant projects if the total estimated cost does not exceed $5.0 million. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the reasons for the cost variation if the cost of the project is revised to exceed $5.0 million.

Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit any construction project to be initiated and continued only if the 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. The provision would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from exceeding such limits until 30 legislative days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed report setting forth the reasons for the increase. This provision would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under $5.0 million.

Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit funds authorized by this Act to be transferred to other agencies of the government for performance of work for which the funds were authorized and appropriated. The provision would permit the merger of such transferred funds with the authorizations of the agency to which they are transferred. The provision would also limit, to not more than five percent of the account, the amount of funds authorized by this Act that may be transferred between authorization accounts within the Department of Energy.

Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to request construction funding until the Secretary has completed a conceptual design. This limitation would apply to construction projects with a total estimated cost greater than $5.0 million. If the estimated cost to prepare the construction design exceeds $600,000, the provision would require the Secretary to obtain a specific authorization to obligate such funds. If the estimated cost to prepare the conceptual design exceeds $3.0 million, the provision would require the Secretary to re-

quest funds for the conceptual design before requesting funds for construction. The provision would also provide an exception to these requirements in the case of an emergency.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit to Congress a report on each conceptual design completed under this provision.

Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design with any funds available to the Department of Energy pursuant to this title, including those funds authorized for advance planning and construction design, whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously to protect the public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, subject to section 3121 of this Act, amounts to be appropriated for management and support activities and for general plant projects to be made available for use in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

Availability of funds (sec. 3128)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize amounts to be appropriated for operating expenses or for plant and capital equipment for the Department of Energy to remain available until expended. Program direction funds would remain available until the end of fiscal year 2003.

Transfer of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with limited authority to transfer up to $5.0 million in fiscal year 2001 defense environmental management funds from one program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project, once in a fiscal year.

SUBTITLE C—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Term of office of person first appointed as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (sec. 3031)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a fixed term of office for the first individual appointed as the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security at the Department of Energy. The individual shall be subject to removal by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Membership of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (DOE) to serve as the DOE representative on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council.

Scope of authority of Secretary of Energy to modify organization of National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3133)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to reorganize, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

Prohibition on pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3134)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy (DOE) by this or any other Act to pay the basic pay of an officer or employee of DOE who: (1) serves concurrently in a position in the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and a position outside the NNSA; or (2) performs concurrently the duties of a position in the NNSA and the duties of a position outside the NNSA.

The committee notes that this provision would not apply to detailees who are assigned to serve in position within the NNSA from other federal agencies, other DOE organizations, or private entities under a loaned executive program if such employees do not fulfill any of the duties of their permanent organization during the period of their detail.

The provision prohibits any detailees from serving in enumerated positions specifically defined in title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Organization plan for field offices of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3135)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy to develop an appropriate staffing and organization plan to carry out the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The plan would identify: (1) the roles and responsibilities to be assigned to each NNSA field organizational unit and the NNSA headquarters organization; (2) any modifications, downsizing, eliminations, or consolidations of field offices; (3) any modifications to headquarters and field office staffing levels that the Under Secretary determines are necessary to implement the plan; and (4) a schedule by which the plan could be implemented. The plan would be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2001.

Future-years nuclear security program (sec. 3136)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security to submit a future-years nuclear security program plan that would contain the estimated expenditures necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), including the anticipated workload requirements at each site under the jurisdiction of the NNSA, for fiscal year 2001 and the subsequent five-year period. The provision would require that the Administrator of the NNSA identify how funds authorized under each program element in the weapons activities account support the reliability and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The provision would further require that the first report be submitted to Congress not later than November 1, 2000.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy was required by section 3135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) and section 3253 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to provide a five-year budget plan, and that the Secretary failed to comply with such requirements. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense provides such future-year budget data to Congress with the President's budget request. The committee believes that such a plan will provide an important planning tool for the Secretary, the Administrator, and the Congress, and would serve as a baseline upon which the congressional defense committees can better evaluate succeeding budget submissions.

Cooperative research and development of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3137)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish cooperative research and development objectives for the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and require that such cooperative research and development be consistent with and support the missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The provision would establish a goal of obligating 0.5 percent of NNSA funds available during fiscal years 2001 and 2002 for cooperative research and development agreements, or similar cooperative, cost-shared research partnerships with non-federal organizations. The provision would further require the Administrator of the NNSA to submit a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth a recommendation as to the appropriate percentage goal levels. The provision would require that, beginning in March 2002, and no later than the end of March of each year thereafter, the Administrator report to Congress on whether the goals of this section have been met in the previous fiscal year. If the goals have not been met, the provision would require the Administrator to describe the actions he or she will take to achieve such goals and provide any legislative changes recommended to achieve them.

SUBTITLE D—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3151)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to maintain a high state of readiness at the F-canyon and H-canyon facilities at the Savannah River site. The provision would further prohibit use of funds to begin decommissioning activities at the F-canyon facility, including studies and planning, until the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and the Secretary of Energy submit a report certifying that all materials currently present in the facility are safely stabilized and the requirements for the facility to meet future fissile materials disposition needs can be fully met utilizing the H-canyon facility. The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan describing how all long-term chemical separations activities would be transferred from the F-canyon facility to the H-canyon facility beginning in fiscal year 2002. The report would be submitted not later than February 15, 2001.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (sec. 3152)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy by this or any other Act for travel by the Secretary of Energy or any employees of the Office of Secretary of Energy after March 1, 2001, unless or until the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department will not utilize Atomic Energy Defense funding to conduct treatment, storage, or disposal activities at sites designated as Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) prohibits any Atomic Energy Defense funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1999 from being obligated or expended to conduct treatment, storage, or disposal activities at sites designated as FUSRAP sites. The committee continues to support the cleanup of FUSRAP sites in an expeditious, cost-effective manner. The committee, however, does not support the use of scarce Atomic Energy Defense funds for this purpose.

Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program (sec. 3153)

The budget request included $682.6 million for the Arms Control and Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development programs of the DOE Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program under the National Nuclear Security Administration. While the committee considers the activities included in this account important to U.S. national security, the committee is concerned with the proposed increase of 25 percent in funding over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee believes this level of growth is unjustified. Therefore, the committee recommends $571.1 million

for this account in fiscal year 2001, a decrease of $111.6 million from the budget request, reflecting a net increase of $65.4 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level.

Arms Control Program

The budget request included $408.6 million for the programs contained within the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program's Arms Control Program account. The committee notes that this account was formerly included in the nonproliferation and national security account during fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends $308.0 million for fiscal year 2001, a reduction of $100.0 million.

The budget request included $272.8 million for the Arms Control Operations Program within the Arms Control Program account. While the committee supports this request, the committee is concerned that DOE has not been funding a number of programs within the Arms Control Operations Program at levels intended by the Congress due to budgetary constraints in some of the other programs within the Arms Control Program. Therefore, the committee directs that the following programs within the Arms Control Operations Program receive no more than the following amount of funding: $144.8 million for the Material Protection, Control, and Accounting Program; $5 million for the International Emergency Cooperation Program; $14.0 million for the Export Control Operations Program; $16.0 million for the Spent Fuel Activities in Kazakhstan Program; $17.5 million for the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI); $22.5 million for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program (IPP); $15.2 million for the Transparent and Irreversible Nuclear Reductions Program; and $37.6 million for other arms control program activities.

Material Protection, Control, and Accounting Program

The budget request included $144.8 million for the Material Protection, Control, and Accounting (MPC&A) Program. The committee supports this request, however, the committee is concerned with the findings of a recent General Accounting Office report on this program.

Approximately half of the threat reduction funds spent to date by DOE have been expended by the MPC&A Program. In March 2000, the GAO issued a report entitled "Limited Progress in Improving Nuclear Material Security in Russia and the Newly Independent States." The report found that the MPC&A Program had spent $481.2 million dollars in Russia and the newly independent states since the program's inception in 1994. These funds were spent for a variety of MPC&A activities, including security training, improvements to weapons-usable nuclear materials transport vehicles, and have improved the security of approximately 70 percent of the total weapons-usable material at risk. Just seven percent of the weapons-usable material at risk for theft or diversion, however, has been protected by fully installed security systems.

The committee is concerned that for almost half a billion dollars invested in this threat reduction work, the MPC&A Program has not made significant progress toward reducing the threat posed by

unsecured weapons-usable nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision requiring DOE to provide an annual report to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees on the MPC&A Program that describes the status of securing weapons-usable nuclear material identified by DOE as being at risk for theft and diversion that has received complete and integrated material protection, control, and accounting systems in Russia. The report should specifically describe: (1) the number of buildings and site locations with completed and integrated material protection, control, and accounting upgraded systems; (2) the total amount of highly-enriched uranium and plutonium secured to date in Russia under the auspices of the program; (3) the amount of weapons-usable nuclear material remaining that still requires complete and integrated material protection, control, and accounting systems; (4) the out year budget costs and planning estimated to secure the remaining material; and (5) the total cost to date and by fiscal year of the completed material protection, control, and accounting systems. This report for the previous fiscal year is due no later than January 1, each year during the lifetime of the program. The first report, covering fiscal year 2000 is due January 1, 2001.

According to the March 2000 GAO report, little progress has been made in installing nuclear security systems in Russia's nuclear weapons complex, where over 90 percent of all the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union is located. This is primarily due to the reluctance of Russian officials to grant DOE access to buildings in the nuclear weapons complex. It is the committee's understanding that DOE is negotiating with Russia to gain better access in the nuclear weapons complex, but to date no agreement has been achieved.

The committee believes obtaining an appropriate access policy is necessary to ensure that U.S. funding for this program achieves its intended purpose. Because the MPC&A Program has enjoyed good access at the Russian Navy sites utilizing a model that is acceptable to both parties, the committee recommends that this model be examined as an option for gaining access to the nuclear weapons complex. The committee believes that until such an access policy is agreed to, the MPC&A Program will be unable to adequately address the threat of unsecured weapons-usable nuclear materials in Russia. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision prohibiting the obligation of funds for any MPC&A Program projects in the Russian weapons complex after October 1, 2000, until an access policy is agreed to with the Russians and implemented by the Secretary of Energy. The committee requires the Secretary of Energy to notify the committee in writing that an access policy has been established and implemented prior to obligating funds for an MPC&A Program project in the Russian nuclear weapons complex.

Nuclear cities initiative

The budget request included $17.5 million for the NCI, an increase of $10.0 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee supports this request. As part of its efforts to address the threat posed by diversion of former Soviet Union scientific expertise, DOE created the NCI in 1998 to work exclusively

in Russia's closed cities to create jobs for displaced Russian workers in the nuclear complex, and to assist the Russian Federation in reducing the size of its nuclear weapons complex.

Last year the committee included a provision prohibiting funds for the NCI from being obligated or expended until the Secretary of Energy certified to Congress that Russia had agreed to close some of its facilities engaged in work on weapons of mass destruction. The committee was disappointed by the certification provided by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to this provision. The evidence provided by the Secretary to support the certification failed to demonstrate that an agreement had been reached between the United States and the Russian Federation stating that Russia would close some of its facilities engaged in work on weapons of mass destruction, as the committee had intended.

The committee continues to believe that a binding agreement should be concluded to ensure the U.S. taxpayer that their investment in this program is facilitating closure of some facilities of the Russian nuclear weapons complex, thereby effectively reducing this threat to U.S. national security. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which reiterates its requirement that of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the NCI Program, no funds may be obligated or expended for purposes of providing assistance under this program to more than three nuclear cities, and more than two serial production facilities in Russia in fiscal year 2001, until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy reports to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, in writing, that a signed agreement has been reached between the U. S. Government and the Government of the Russian Federation that provides that Russia will close some of its facilities engaged in nuclear weapons assembly and disassembly work.

The committee notes the similarity between the projects in the NCI and those of the IPP Program. Last year the committee imposed project review procedures for the IPP Program to improve the program management and effectiveness of IPP projects in Russia. Since those requirements were imposed, the IPP Program has been able to demonstrate to Congress an effective process for evaluating projects to identify those that have the greatest likelihood for success and to ensure that these projects are consistent with U.S. national security interests. Since the IPP and the NCI have similar objectives, the committee believes that a similar project review procedure should be instituted for NCI projects. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision requiring that no more than 50 percent of the funds made available for the NCI for fiscal year 2001 may be obligated until after the Secretary of Energy establishes and implements project review procedures for projects under the NCI. These procedures must ensure that all scientific, technical, and commercial projects proposed under the NCI: will not enhance Russian military or weapons of mass destruction capabilities; are not inadvertently transferred or utilized for military purposes; are commercially viable; and have a commercial, industrial or other nonprofit entity partner. A report on the project review procedures established and implemented for NCI projects shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House not later than January 1, 2001.

International Nuclear Safety Program

The budget request included $20 million for the International Nuclear Safety Program. The committee supports this request, however the committee is troubled by the expanding scope of the program. The committee believes the program has inappropriately expanded beyond its mission of working to improve the safety of Soviet-designed reactors and upgrading the nuclear safety infrastructure of the countries where these reactors operate. In particular, the committee is concerned that program funds are being used to fund such items as environmental centers and DOE representative offices in Paris and Tokyo. Since the program has not yet completed its safety and training mission, the committee is concerned that its expanding scope has hampered the program from realizing its intended goal of nuclear safety. The committee believes that the program should refocus its efforts on addressing the most immediate safety concerns, such as providing fire doors for these facilities to prevent fires from spreading from area to area within these reactor facilities, and providing sufficient training to minimize human error, a lead cause of reactor accidents. The committee directs the funding authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2001 for the International Nuclear Safety program shall be available only for purposes of providing basic nuclear safety upgrades and training related to preventing nuclear operator error and improving the operational safety of Soviet designed nuclear reactors.

Long-Term nonproliferation initiative

The budget request included $100.0 million for a new long term nonproliferation initiative proposed by the Secretary of Energy. The committee believes the case for this initiative has not been made by the DOE. Therefore, the committee does not authorize the $100.0 million requested for this initiative.

The committee believes funding this initiative is premature. DOE requested $70.0 million of the initiative for long term nuclear fuel cycle cooperative research and development. The committee is concerned that to date the DOE has been unable to provide clear, fundamental program planning parametes necessary to ensure successful implementation, management, oversight, and accountability for the initiative. The DOE is unable to demonstrate clear program parameters in the initiative, such as how the initiative would be able to expend effectively the $70.0 million requested during fiscal year 2001. In addition, the initiative lacks any government-to-government agreements with the Russians to indicate Russia's commitment to the initiative.

The remaining $30.0 million in the request for the initiative consists of additional funding for ongoing programs within the Nonproliferation and National Security Account. The committee is concerned that requests for these ongoing programs were made not only through the Nonproliferation and National Security Account, but also under this initiative, and that these activities have been described as new initiatives by DOE. These activities are already being funded under existing programs. Therefore, the committee will not fund these activities under this new initiative.

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development

The budget request included $232.9 million for the Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program. The committee strongly supports the ongoing work in this program and recommends an increase of $30.0 million over the budget request. The committee believes the vital technologies being developed and tested in this program play a critical role in detecting and deterring weapons of mass destruction proliferation, monitoring nuclear explosions, and detecting and responding to chemical and biological weapons attacks.

It is the committee's understanding that the Secretary of Energy is concerned with the high emphasis on nonproliferation programs with Russia, while possible proliferation activities and threats from other countries of concern remain relatively understudied and unanalyzed. The committee concurs with the Secretary of Energy's concerns for the need for broader regional arms control research. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to utilize a portion of the amounts for this program to conduct evaluations of the technical capabilities of other geographic areas of concern to U.S. national security to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction.

Modification of counterintelligence polygraph program (sec. 3154)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to waive the requirement that certain Department of Energy (DOE) employees and DOE contractor employees successfully pass a counterintelligence polygraph exam before such employees can be granted access to high-risk programs. The provision would allow the Secretary to waive this requirement for any individual for a period not to exceed 120 days, if the Secretary determines that: (1) such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; (2) the covered employee has been granted a security clearance; and (3) the covered employee signs a written acknowledgment that the employment is conditional upon successfully passing a counterintelligence polygraph exam within 120 days of the date of signing such an acknowledgment. The provision would also allow the Secretary to waive this requirement for any individual who the Secretary determines: (1) has completed successfully a full-scope counterintelligence polygraph exam while employed with another federal agency; or (2) should not be examined by reason of treatment for a medical or psychological condition.

Employee incentives for employees at closure project facilities (sec. 3155)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide incentives for retention and separation of federal employees at closure facilities of the Department of Energy (DOE) established pursuant to section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106). Incentives would include

the accumulation of annual leave up to 720 hours, lump sum retention allowances, authority to pay voluntary separation incentive payments (also referred to as buyouts), freeze the cost of and continue health benefits for employees who are either voluntarily or involuntarily separated, and authority to make temporary assignments of certain DOE employees to private sector organizations, on a non-reimbursable basis.

The committee notes that, currently, only the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology and Ohio Field Office sites are designated as defense closure facilities, but that additional facilities may be so designated in the future if such sites meet the requirements established in section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104- 106). The committee believes that incentives are needed to mitigate the anticipated high attrition rate of certain federal employees with critical skills. The committee expects the Department to use this authority to retain such critical skills during potentially disruptive reductions-in-force at those sites designated to close prior to fiscal year 2006.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3171)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend excepted service hiring authority for up to 200 positions, originally authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337). The committee understands that this provision would allow the Department of Energy to continue to compete more effectively for high quality employees with the specialized technical skills needed by the Department.

Updates of report on nuclear test readiness postures (sec. 3172)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to update the nuclear test readiness report established by section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) on a biannual basis. The Secretary would be required to submit the first updated report to the congressional defense committees beginning on February 15, 2001. The reports would include a listing and description of those workforce skills and capabilities that are essential to carry out the missions of the site, a listing and description of the required infrastructure and physical plant that are essential to carry out the missions of the site, and an assessment of the readiness status of the workforce and infrastructure. The report would be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

Frequency of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data and formerly restricted data (sec. 3173)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3161 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) by requiring the Secretary of Energy to report inadvertent releases of restricted data

and formerly restricted data on a quarterly basis rather than 30 days after any such release.

Form of certifications regarding the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3174)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the annual certification to the President regarding the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile be submitted in classified form.

The committee notes that, beginning in 1996, the Department of Energy (DOE) weapons laboratory directors, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, and the Nuclear Weapons Council have certified to the President on an annual basis that the U.S. nuclear deterrent is safe, effective, and reliable, and that there is no need to resume underground nuclear testing at this time. To date, these certifications have been submitted in unclassified form. The committee is concerned that should an issue arise in the future that would require a higher classification level, the current process might provide a disincentive to report such issues for fear of advertising a problem with the stockpile. The committee believes that any such disincentive to report fully issues regarding the condition of the U.S. nuclear stockpile should be removed. The committee further notes that the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile recommended in its November 8, 1999, report to Congress that such annual certification reports to the President be submitted in classified form.

Engineering and manufacturing research, development and demonstration by plant managers of certain nuclear weapons production plants (sec. 3175)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a Plant Manager Research, Development and Demonstration (PMRDD) program to support innovative engineering and systems activities at the nuclear weapons production plants. The program would be limited to the Y–12 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, the Kansas City plant in Kansas City, Missouri, and the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas. The program would be authorized at a level not to exceed two percent of the funds available for weapons activities at such plants.

The committee anticipates that the PMRDD program would be used to explore viable tools and techniques for understanding and replacing sunset technologies and for developing more agile manufacturing techniques. The committee believes the creation of this program will support recommendations for addressing workforce problems at the production plants identified by the Commission on Retaining Nuclear Weapons Expertise (also known as the Chiles Commission), by assisting with recruiting and retention of outstanding engineers and craftsmen.

Cooperative research and development agreements for government-owned, government-operated laboratories (sec. 3176)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C.

3710) to streamline the approval process for cooperative research and development agreements (CRADA) at government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) facilities by authorizing federal agencies to substitute an annual strategic plan for individual joint work statements. The provision would further streamline the CRADA process for GOCO facilities by authorizing federal agencies to permit routine CRADAs to be negotiated and signed by GOCO employees, rather than federal employees.

Commendation of Department of Energy and contractor employees for Exemplary Service in Stockpile Stewardship and Security (sec. 3177)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to award a certificate of commendation for meritorious service to current and former Department of Energy (DOE) employees, and current and former DOE contractor employees who worked in programs related to stewardship of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.

The committee notes that the dedication, intellect, and hard work of the scientists and craftsmen employed at DOE laboratories and manufacturing plants are essential to maintaining a credible U.S. nuclear deterrent. The committee further notes that former scientists and craftsmen at DOE laboratories, plants, and materials production sites were instrumental in ensuring that the United States prevailed during the Cold War. The committee recommends this provision in an effort to recognize the contributions of former employees at these facilities and to highlight the Nation's continued reliance on the capabilities of the skilled workers at DOE weapons laboratories and manufacturing plants. The committee commends these individuals for their continued service to the Nation and for the peace that they have helped to preserve.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Department of Energy participation in the Interstate Technology Reciprocity Council

The committee commends the Department of Energy (DOE) and state environmental agencies for their cooperative efforts to accelerate the deployment of innovative technologies at DOE and Department of Defense cleanup sites. The committee notes that over 30 states have joined with the DOE Environmental Management program to form the Interstate Technology Regulatory Cooperation Working Group, which provides guidance documents, training, and other means to accelerate regulatory acceptance and implementation of advanced technologies that are capable of saving both time and money. The committee encourages DOE to continue its participation and support for this cooperative program.

Laboratory directed research and development

The committee notes that the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) funds available to the Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories were reduced by section 308 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000, from the customary six percent to four percent for fiscal year 2000, and

that the LDRD program was removed from the environmental management program. The committee directs the DOE to return the LDRD program to its full scope and to its full normal six percent funding level in fiscal year 2001.

The committee further notes that this funding, in most instances, would be the only available source of basic funding for research and development (R&D) for the DOE laboratories. The January 27, 2000, external review of the LDRD program by the DOE Laboratory Operations Board found that ". . . the LDRD programs are vital in recruiting, retaining, and integrating the best scientific talent into the laboratories and their mission programs" and that the LDRD program at the DOE laboratories has won more R&D 100 awards than any other organization or program in the world.

Report on Post-closure employee benefits at closure project facilities

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report, not later than June 1, 2001, to the congressional defense committees detailing any plans for the transfer and post-closure administration of benefits for employees of Department of Energy contractors at closure project facilities established pursuant to section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106). The report shall include the following: (1) strategies to ensure that long-term employee and retiree benefits are consistent; in terms of cost and longevity, with such benefits for employees at other DOE facilities; (2) an analysis of the long-term funding required for the administration of pension and health benefits plans at each closure facility; (3) plans for transfer and post-closure administration of any DOE-funded pension plans at each closure facility; and (4) plans for the transfer and post closure administration of DOE-funded long-term health benefits plans at each closure facility.

The committee notes that, currently, only the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology and Ohio Field Office sites are designated as defense closure facilities, but that additional facilities may be so designated in the future if such sites meet the requirements established in section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106).

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends $18.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) for fiscal year 2001, the amount of the budget request.

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65), which established the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) within the Department of Energy (DOE), does not repeal or amend the requirements of Chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The committee further notes that the independent oversight authority of the DNFSB related to health and safety matters at DOE and NNSA defense nuclear facilities was not changed by the National Nuclear Security Administration Act.

The committee commends the DNFSB for its continuing efforts to foster positive change in the safety culture at DOE's defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the DNFSB is an independent technical body that continually assesses safety issues at DOE facilities and submits formal safety findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health, and Congress. The committee believes that the external oversight provided by the DNFSB is comparable to or better than the external regulation that could be provided by another Federal agency, such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As such, the committee believes that the DNFSB is the most cost-effective means of ensuring continuous improvement of the safety culture at DOE nuclear facilities.

The committee remains concerned that establishing a new, untested external regulation regime at DOE weapons facilities could have an adverse effect on U.S. national security interests. The committee is equally concerned that such a regime would draw scarce resources away from high priority, compliance-driven clean up actions and critical national security activities. As a result, the committee does not support any further move toward external regulation of DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has likewise concluded that the cost of implementing a new external regulation regime at DOE defense nuclear facilities would not be cost effective.

TITLE XXXIII—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Minimum price of petroleum sold from the naval petroleum reserves (sec. 3301)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the authority for the Secretary of Energy to sell oil from the naval petroleum reserves for less than full market value.

Repeal of authority to contract for cooperative or unit plans affecting Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (sec. 3302)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7426 of title 10, United States Code, by deleting language that authorized the Federal Government to contract for cooperative or unit plans in the administration of the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 at Elk Hills. The committee notes that the United States interests to Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 at Elk Hills was sold to the private sector.

TITLE XXXIV—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

National defense stockpile (secs. 3401–3402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the stockpile manager to obligate $75.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transfer Fund during fiscal year 2001 for the authorized uses of funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The committee further recommends a provision that would increase the amount of revenues that could be achieved through the sale of unneeded materials from the national defense stockpile.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated March 6, 2000, the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 8129 to the Committee on Armed Services on March 6, 2000. Executive Communication 8129 is available for review at the committee. Senators Warner and Levin introduced this legislative proposal as S. 2481, by request, on April 27, 2000.

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 2001.

Vote: Adopted by a roll call vote of 19–1.

The roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the mark-up have been made public and are available at the committee.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be

included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2001.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Our armed forces remain the best-trained, best-equipped and most capable fighting force in the world. This bill continues the bipartisan partnership between the Congress and the Administration to improve the quality of life for the men and women of our armed forces and their families, and to transform our military forces to ensure that they are capable of meeting all of the threats to America's security in the 21st Century.

We have additional views on two issues addressed in the bill.

1. Vieques

The Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations and others have testified before the Committee that there is no adequate substitute for live training by the Navy on the island of Vieques. Earlier this year, the President entered into an agreement with the Governor of Puerto Rico, which establishes an orderly process for what we all hope will be the resumption of such training. Under this agreement, we would provide $40 million of economic assistance to the citizens of Vieques and transfer unneeded Department of Defense property on the western end of the island to the government of Puerto Rico with no strings attached. If a referendum on Vieques approves a resumption of live-fire training, an additional $50 million of economic assistance would be provided. If the referendum does not approve a resumption of training, Department of Defense property on the eastern end of the island would be transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal.

As of the conclusion of the Committee mark-up, the government of Puerto Rico had lived up to its obligations under the agreement. The Navy training range on the Vieques has been cleared of protestors with the assistance of the government of Puerto Rico. Navy training exercises have now resumed on the island, with the use of inert ordnance as provided in the agreement.

The Committee considered proposed legislation that would have been inconsistent with this agreement. In our view, these unilateral changes to the terms of the agreement, at a time when the government of Puerto Rico is living up to its obligations under the agreement, could have been perceived by some as a continuation of the kind of behavior that the Navy acknowledges got them into problems in Vieques in the first place. Such changes would have offended many citizens of Vieques and others throughout Puerto Rico, undermining the efforts of the Navy, and this Committee, to ensure the eventual resumption of live-fire training on Vieques. For this reason, we are pleased that the Committee did not adopt this proposal.

Instead, the provision in the bill would authorize $40 million of economic assistance, a referendum on the future of training on Vieques, and an additional $50 million of economic assistance if a

resumption of live-fire training is approved—all of which were requested by the President in accordance with the agreement. With regard to the other element of the agreement—the transfer of various lands to Puerto Rico under certain circumstances—the provision is silent, deferring congressional action until a later date. Finally, the provision in the bill would require a study of future requirements at Fort Buchanan and a moratorium on improvements at the facility until the study can be completed, but would not require the closure of Fort Buchanan or any other facility in Puerto Rico in the event of a negative vote on the referendum.

Our preference is to fully implement the agreement between the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico at this time. However, avoiding unilateral changes to the terms of the agreement is the next best outcome.

2. Department of Energy Organization

Last year, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 contained provisions reorganizing the entire Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex by creating a new, "semi-autonomous" National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) within the Department. These provisions, which were added in conference, were inconsistent with legislation passed in the Senate by a vote of 96–1 and went far beyond anything that was even considered by the House of Representatives.

The Secretary chose to implement this legislation by "dual hatting" a number of key NNSA employees, authorizing them to serve concurrently in both NNSA positions and DOE positions outside NNSA. Although the provisions establishing the NNSA did not contain any provision prohibiting dual-hatting and the Secretary received a legal opinion concluding that such dual-hatting was permissible, a number of Members of our Committee felt that this approach was inconsistent with the legislation. This bill responds to that perceived violation of the statute with provisions that would: (1) prohibit DOE from paying any NNSA officials who are "dual-hatted'; and (2) prohibit the Secretary of Energy from changing the organization of the NNSA in any way.

These are unprecedented restrictions on the ability of a Cabinet Secretary to manage his own Department, and undermine our ability to hold Secretary Richardson and his successors accountable for the activities of the Department of Energy.

Dual-hatting is commonplace throughout the government and has been legally permissible since we repealed the Dual Office Holding Act of 1894 more than 35 years ago. We have required the NNSA to handle 18 separate functions, including program management, safeguards and security, emergency management, environment, safety and health operations, contracting, intelligence, counterintelligence, personnel, legal matters, legislative affairs, and public affairs, among others. We may want all of these positions to be staffed overnight, but that doesn't make it happen. During the transition period, somebody has to fill these positions, and dual-hatting was probably the most economical and effective approach for the Secretary to take.

We are particularly concerned that the enactment of this provision would preclude the Department from creating a single

Counter-Intelligence czar, who serves as both the head of the Department-wide Office of Counterintelligence and the Chief of Defense Nuclear Counterintelligence. We believe that this consolidation of responsibilities could actually clarify responsibilities and eliminate opportunities for buck-passing in a way that makes sense.

In any case, the prohibition on reorganization is completely unnecessary in light of the express prohibition on dual-hatting. This provision would go far beyond its stated purpose of addressing dual-hatting, and prohibit the Secretary of Energy from even establishing, altering or consolidating any organizational unit, component or function of the NNSA.

Last year, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board reported that the entire organization of the Department of Energy and its nuclear weapons complex had become "dysfunctional". Much of this organization remains unchanged, despite its transfer to the new NNSA. Yet this provision would prohibit the Secretary from addressing the problem by, for example:

reorganizing the NNSA to eliminate superfluous layers of management and make the organization more efficient;

reassigning functions from one component of NNSA to another, to rationalize the structure of the new Administration;

creating new offices within NNSA to address emerging problems or overarching needs of the new Administration.

In short, this provision not only fails to address the problem identified by its sponsors, it also undermines the ability of the Secretary of Energy to address many of the concerns that led to the enactment of last year's legislation in the first place. We believe that both of the DOE provisions should be deleted from the bill.

CARL LEVIN.
CHUCK ROBB.
TED KENNEDY.
JACK REED.
MARY L. LANDRIEU.
JEFF BINGAMAN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JEFF BINGAMAN

I support the Armed Services Committee markup of this year's National Defense Authorization bill since it provides the necessary resources to meet the nation's increasingly complex military missions while also supporting quality of life improvements for our men and women in uniform. The bill also contains important improvements in health benefits for the nation's veterans, including a comprehensive pharmacy benefit for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries with no enrollment fee or deductible. Although I believe much more needs to be done to honor our commitment to provide adequate health care to veterans, this bill contains an important step toward that goal.

I am particularly pleased that this bill contains important measures honoring the nation's most heroic veterans. The bill contains a provision authorizing an honorarium for the survivors, or surviving spouses, of the Bataan Death March who were made to perform slave labor by the Japanese during World War II. The heroic efforts of those who served in the Phillippines during Bataan and Corregidor are legendary, but have never been fully compensated in the settlement of war claims. In 1952 the Japanese government agreed to provide compensation to American prisoners of war, but never compensated prisoners of war for their forced labor supporting the Japanese war effort. Claims for compensation have been under consideration by the courts for many years, but final settlement has not been reached. In the meantime, veterans of that campaign grow fewer as time passes and remain uncompensated for the sacrifices they made on behalf of the nation. This provision recognizes the importance of honoring those heroic veterans as an expression of the nation's gratitude. I will continue to support efforts to do so until this important gesture is enacted into law.

The bill also looks toward the future as well as recognizing the past. This legislation contains about $8.0 billion in funding for investment in science and technology research. This represents an increase of $446 million over the President's budget request and meets the funding goal for increased investment in future defense technologies that I proposed to the Committee two years ago. I am hopeful that the additional resources will be used to explore new technological concepts that can be used to maintain our edge over potential adversaries not only on the battlefield, but with respect to increasingly urgent requirements to protect the nation's infrastructure from various forms of terrorism including the use of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, increased investment in laser research might provide useful technologies that could meet future military objectives that could also minimize collateral damage.

I remain concerned, however, that the bill does not provide all that could be done to support the most vital national security objec-

tives with respect to non-proliferation and the strategic relationship between the United States and Russia. The President's budget, for example, requested $100 million to expand our efforts to control the threat of "loose nukes" finding their way into unfriendly hands. The "Long-Term Nonproliferation Program for Russia" included a request for funds that would prevent Russia from increasing its stockpile of plutonium separated from spent fuel from nuclear power plants by suspending reprocessing of spent fuel. It included funds to expand DOE's successful Materials, Protection, Control, and Accounting (MPC&A) program that has successfully implemented security regimes at dozens of Russian sites where nuclear materials are stored. The proposal also included funds to close nuclear warhead production facilities at Avangard and Penza–19 and to support displaced nuclear weapons workers to prevent them from seeking employment in unfriendly places.

In addition, the bill reduces funding for the Russian-American Observation Satellite (RAMOS) program, a cooperative technology demonstration project intended to enhance the ability to detect, characterize, and track theater range missiles that could be used against either country. I strongly believe that it is in our national security interest that Russian early warning capabilities be accurate, reliable, and effective. Misunderstandings or misperceptions of either nuclear power when under missile attack could lead to unanticipated and unintended conflict escalation that could decimate both countries. It's in our essential national interest, therefore, to work cooperatively to minimize the risk of such mistakes. In addition, since this program was initially authorized at the highest levels of both governments, it is important as a matter of building confidence and trust to support the original agreement underlying this program. The reduced RAMOS program contained in the bill calls for a restructured program that significantly reduces the benefits to both countries from those originally anticipated when the program was first agreed to.

I am also disappointed to note that, although the bill contains substantial funding in support of the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship Program, it does not contain certain key investments needed to ensure the future effectiveness of that program. As a strong supporter of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, I believe that in order to achieve the non-proliferation goals of that international agreement, key investments must be made now in order to optimize our confidence in the nation's nuclear stockpile for the foreseeable future. The President's budget, for example, requested only a modest amount for the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application (MESA) project, that would invest in cutting edge nanotechnology research that would incorporate advanced microelectronic technologies into the refurbishment and sustainment of our nuclear stockpile. I believe significantly more funding is needed now in order to ensure that we have that capability in the future so that we will be more confident of the reliability of our nuclear stockpile in the absence of testing nuclear weapons. The bill contains no additional funding beyond the requested level for this high priority effort needed to support the nation's non-proliferation goals while meeting nuclear stockpile reliability requirements.

I am particularly concerned that the bill includes provisions restricting the authority of the Secretary of Energy to manage his own department by precluding him from directing any reorganization, consolidation, alteration, or other adjustments to components within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The NNSA, although established as a "semi-autonomous agency" within the Department of Energy, is still subject to the Secretary's authority under the legislation approved last year. Legislation contained in this year's bill would set a dangerous precedent that empowers the Congress to restrict cabinet members' authority in ways that could preclude greater efficiency or modernization needed to keep pace with changing political, economic, or technological environments. I urge my colleagues to reconsider this provision during the remaining steps in the legislative cycle.

Finally, I am concerned that the provision in the bill regarding the agreement between the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico over disposition and use of Vieques island might have unintended results that could ultimately further complicate the Navy's need for realistic training. Given the difficulty of arriving at that agreement and the delicacy that pertains, I believe that any Congressional action that substantially alters that carefully crafted arrangement runs the risk of renewed confrontation and significant political consequences both here and in Puerto Rico.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

SENATOR McCAIN'S MINORITY VIEWS

On most issues, I support the Committee's recommendations in the drafting of the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Authorization bill. I voted against the bill, mostly because of what it does not do. I spelled out my concerns in a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 23, 2000, but was disappointed that the bill that emerged from the committee failed to address important reform issues.

Last year, I was proud to stand with Senator Lott and Senator Roberts as we led the Senate in the passage of our legislation, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999.

This landmark legislation made great strides in providing significant benefits to the entire Total Force. Specifically, we improved the military by: restoring military retirement benefits to a full 50 percent of base pay for 20-year retirees, directing a 4.8 percent pay raise effective last January, crafting pay table reform, implementing Thrift Savings Plan proposals, as well as other significant quality of life improvements. We can take pride in our efforts to take care of our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, the final bill was missing a key provision that was stripped by our colleagues in the House of Representatives—food stamp relief for servicemembers and their families.

I was very disappointed that the current year's authorization bill did not include legislation to provide a Special Subsistence Allowance to help the neediest families in the Armed Forces—numbering at least 12,000—who now require federal food stamp assistance. Earlier this year I again introduced legislation to eliminate the food stamp army. It was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Despite my repeated urging that this critical issue be addressed, the Committee failed to act on the bill.

We should have acted to eliminate the food stamp army—to do less is an affront to our most needy servicemembers and their families. It is unconscionable that the men and women who are willing to sacrifice their lives for their country have to rely on food stamps to make ends meet, and it is an abrogation of our responsibilities as Senators to let this reality go on without some sort of legislative remedy.

One of the areas of greatest concern among military retirees and their families is the "broken promise" of lifetime medical care, especially for those over-age 65. While the Committee included some key health care provisions, they failed to meet what I think is the most important requirement, the restoration of this broken promise.

Last year I was outspoken regarding reports that the aircraft carrier USS ENTERPRISE (CVN–65) deployed to the Persian Gulf undermanned by some 800 sailors. The Navy reports that it has in-

creasing difficulty filling critical sea-going billets. Despite Congress' efforts, we are losing Air Force and Navy pilots to the commercial airlines faster than we can train them. The Army says that five of its 10 divisions lack enough majors, captains, senior enlisted personnel, tankers, and gunners. These Army reports corroborate the disturbingly low readiness ratings of the 1st Infantry Division and the 10th Mountain Division reported last year.

The Committee, however, did spend a great deal of effort authorizing additional dollars for the many shipbuilding interests. For instance, the Committee added $460 million to build another amphibious assault ship, the LHD–8, which was not in the President's budget and for which the Navy has not even approved a procurement plan. The bill also boosted spending for the DDG–51 destroyer program by $144 million above the Navy's and the President's request.

Finally—not to be outdone by the surface shipyards—the submarine shipbuilders received early authorization to procure the next 5 VIRGINIA class submarines, at a cost of $2.1 billion each, accelerating the authorization for the fifth boat by a full year from the Navy's current plan. In effect, the submarine shipbuilders have been given permission to continue the current non-competitive teaming arrangement, instead of allowing the market to determine whether only one shipyard is needed.

I have noted that there has been a significant effort to fund items that were specifically included on the Service Chiefs' unfunded requirements list. However, every year, certain items are funded that are not on the lists and whose merits are questionable. In all my years serving on the House and the Senate Armed Services Committees, I recall no previous instances of one subcommittee chair transferring money to another subcommittee for the purpose of funding a special interest project. The defense bill transferred $3 million from the shipbuilding budget to the personnel budget to fund a new Navy "Call Center" in Cutler, Maine. I wonder why we can't use this same accounting method to fund improvements in the military retiree health care delivery system? Why not shift the money from the unrequested LHD–8 to pay for additional military health care improvements?

When I put on my web site the lists of pork barrel projects that are added by members of Congress, I try not to include high priority programs and activities that are in the President's budget or are listed on the Service Chief's priority lists. However, I have become increasingly skeptical of these lists. These so-called "wish lists" have proven an effective means of ensuring that such funds are apportioned appropriately in terms of what is best for the national interest. There is, however, growing reason for concern that the process by which the wish lists are drafted is being politicized.

This politicization has resulted in lists—especially this year's list from the Department of the Navy—of increasingly questionable merit. The Navy's fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements list includes $1.2 billion for an amphibious aircraft carrier assault ship. Last year, the Navy did not even consider placing partial funding for the ship on their list and, furthermore, last year the Navy rejected a $500 million plus-up from the Senate. This is just one example of how Congress' political meddling has seriously impeded

the military's ability to channel resources where they are most needed.

I could continue in this vein, but it is sufficient to say that the military needs less money spent on pork and more money spent wisely to redress the serious problems caused by a decade of declining defense budgets. Those of us who have been criticized for sounding alarm bells about military readiness now have the empty satisfaction of seeing that there is more to maintaining a strong defense than a politician's history of falsely promising to do so.

We must reform the bureaucracy of the Pentagon. With the exception of minor changes, our defense establishment looks just as it did 50 years ago. We must continue to incorporate practices from the private sector—like restructuring, reforming and streamlining'to eliminate duplication and capitalize on cost savings.

More effort must be made to reduce the continuing growth of headquarters staffs and to decentralize the Pentagon's labyrinth of bureaucratic fiefdoms. Although nearly every military analyst shares these views, the Committee took great measures to increase the size of headquarters staffs, eliminating any incentive for the Pentagon to change its way of doing business with its bloated staffs and its outdated practices.

More must be done to eliminate unnecessary and duplicative military contracts and military installations. Every U.S. military leader who has testified over the past decade has testified as to the critical need for further BRAC rounds. We can redirect from $4 to $7 billion per year by eliminating excess defense infrastructure. There is another $2 billion per year we can put to better purposes by privatizing or consolidating support and maintenance functions, and an additional $5.5 billion can be saved per year by eliminating "Buy America" restrictions that only undermines U.S. competitiveness overseas. Despite these compelling facts, the Senate Armed Services Committee did not address any of these issues.

I voted no on the passage of this bill because we can not continue with this "business as usual" mindset. We must reform the Department of Defense and we must not fall prey to the special interest groups that attempt to warp our perspective and misdirect our spending. We owe so much more to our men and women in uniform who defend our country. They are our greatest resource, and I feel they were woefully under represented. We must do better. The lives of our servicemembers and the national security of the United States are at risk.

JOHN MCCAIN.

○

CONTENT

Purpose of the Bill 00
Committee Overview and Recommendations 00
Explanation of Funding Summary 00
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations 00
Title I—Procurement 00
Explanation of tables 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 00
Chemical demilitarization program (sec. 107) 00
Subtitle B—Army Programs 00
Multiyear procurement authority for certain Army and Navy programs (sec. 111) 00
Army transformation (sec. 112) 00
Other Army Programs 00
Army Aircraft 00
Utility aircraft 00
UH–60 Blackhawk 00
Longbow 00
Kiowa Warrior 00
Avionics support equipment 00
Aircrew integrated systems 00
Army Missile 00
Army tactical missile system—system summary 00
Stinger modifications 00
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles 00
Carrier modifications 00
Breacher system modification 00
Heavy assault bridge system modifications 00
Machine gun, squad automatic weapon 00
Mark–19 grenade launcher 00
M4 carbine modifications 00
Army Ammunition 00
Procurement of ammunition, Army 00
Armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative 00
Other Army Procurement 00
Family of medium tactical vehicles 00
Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support 00
Teams 00
Secure mobile anti-jam reliable tactical terminal 00
Army data distribution system 00
Area common user system modification program 00
Forward area air defense ground based sensor 00
Night vision 00
Forward area air defense command and control 00
Striker—command and control system 00
Standard integrated command post system 00
Lightweight maintenance enclosure 00
Roller, vibratory, self-propelled 00
Deployable universal combat earth mover 00
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 00
CVNX–1 nuclear aircraft carrier program (sec. 121) 00
Arleigh Burke—class destroyer program (sec. 122) 00
Virginia—class submarine program (sec. 123) 00
ADC(X) ship program (sec. 124) 00
Refueling and Complex Overhaul Program of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier (sec. 125) 00
Other Navy Programs 00

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Navy Programs—Continued
Navy Aircraft 00
Airborne low frequency sonar 00
SH–60 helicopters 00
CH–60 helicopters 00
UC–35 aircraft 00
C–40A aircraft 00
T–45 aircraft 00
Joint primary air training system 00
KC–130J 00
EA–6B aircraft automatic flight control system 00
AV–8B precision targeting pod 00
F–18 modifications 00
AH–1W series 00
H–1 series 00
P–3 aircraft modifications 00
Tactical aircraft moving map capability 00
Navy Weapons 00
Joint standoff weapon 00
Weapons industrial facilities 00
Mark 48 advanced capability torpedo modifications 00
Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition 00
Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 00
Laser-guided bomb components 00
Training ordnance 00
Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion 00
Shipbuilding overview 00
LHD–8 advance procurement 00
Other Navy Procurement 00
AN/WSN–7 inertial navigation system 00
Surveillance and security for military sealift ships 00
Integrated condition assessment system 00
AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radar 00
Side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers 00
Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System 00
Aviation life support 00
Gun fire control radar performance improvements 00
Cruiser smart ship 00
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system 00
Civil engineering support equipment 00
Marine Corps Procurement 00
Night vision 00
Radio systems 00
Subtitle D–Air Force Programs 00
Repeal of requirement for annual report on B–2 bomber aircraft program (sec. 131) 00
Other Air Force Programs 00
Air Force Aircraft 00
EC–130J 00
Joint primary aircraft training system 00
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system 00
B–52H aircraft modifications 00
A–10 aircraft integrated flight and fire control computer 00
F–15 aircraft modifications 00
F–16 aircraft modifications 00
C–17 simulator 00
Defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft modifications . 00
ALE–50 towed decoys 00
Compass Call 00
Defense airborne reconnaissance program 00
Air Force Missile 00
Global Positioning System 00
Titan space boosters 00
Medium launch vehicle 00
Air Force Ammunition 00
Procurement of ammunition, Air Force 00

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Air Force Programs—Continued
Other Air Force Procurement 00
Combat training ranges 00
Night vision goggles 00
Defense-Wide Programs 00
Advanced SEAL delivery system design enhancements 00
Special operations forces small arms and support equipment 00
Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defense Enhancement Kits 00
Communications assistance for law enforcement act 00
Subtitle E-Other Matters 00
Pueblo Chemical Depot chemical agent destruction technologies (sec. 141) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Acquisition programs at the National Security Agency 00
Army aviation 00
C–5 aircraft upgrades 00
Electronic digital compass system 00
Single channel ground and airborne radio system 00
Soldier's portable on-system repair tool 00
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 00
Explanation of tables 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 00
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, And Limitations 00
Fiscal year 2002 joint field experiment (sec. 211) 00
Nuclear aircraft carrier design and production modeling (sec. 212) 00
DD–21 class destroyer program (sec. 213) 00
F–22 aircraft program (sec. 214) 00
Joint strike fighter (sec. 215) 00
Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (sec. 216) 00
Unmanned advanced capability aircraft and ground combat vehicles (sec. 217) 00
Army space control technology (sec. 218) 00
Russian American Observation Satellites program (sec. 219) 00
Joint Biological Defense Program (sec. 220) 00
Report on biological warfare defense vaccine research and development programs (sec. 221) 00
Subtitle C—Other Matters (.....
Mobile offshore base (sec. 241) 00
4Air Force science and technology planning (sec. 242) 00
Additional Matters of Interest 00
Army 00
Counter-terrorism basic research 00
Composite materials 00
Advanced missile composite components 00
Smart truck initiative 00
Portable hybrid electric power system 00
Thermoelectric power generation 00
Operational support 00
Equipment readiness 00
Fuel cell auxiliary power units 00
Big Crow program office 00
Army Space and Missile Defense Command Simulations 00
Aero-acoustics instrumentation 00
Acoustic technology research 00
Missile defense flight experiment 00
Radar power technology 00
Scramjet acoustic combustion enhancement 00
Space and missile defense battle lab 00
Supercluster distributed memory technology 00
Tactical High Energy Laser 00
Anti-malarial research 00
Electronic warfare development 00
Threat simulator development 00
Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program 00
Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor 00

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued
Army—Continued
Communications and networking technologies 00
Navy 00
Free electron laser 00
Biodegradable polymers 00
Bioenvironmental hazards research 00
Nontraditional warfare initiatives 00
Communications, command, and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance 00
Cognitive research 00
Ceramic and carbon based composites 00
Nanoscale sensor research 00
Littoral area acoustic demonstrations 00
Computational engineering design 00
Advanced water-jet technology 00
Composite helicopter hangar door 00
Composite modules for ship hull construction 00
Laser welding and cutting 00
Supply chain best practices 00
Virtual test bed for reconfigurable ship 00
Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare 00
Marine Corps advanced technology transition 00
Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships 00
Trident SSGN design 00
Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology 00
Submarine composite sail 00
Joint command and control ship 00
Shipboard simulators for Marine Corps operations 00
Navy common command and decision system 00
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle 00
Marine corps ground combat/support system 00
Extended range guided munition 00
Nonlethal research and technology development 00
Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative 00
Parametric airborne dipping sonar 00
Multi-mission helicopter upgrade development 00
Power node control centers 00
Ship manpower reduction initiative 00
SPY–3 and volume search radars 00
Acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf insertion of multi-purpose processor 00
Submarine antenna technology improvement 00
Submarine common architecture 00
Advanced tactical software for submarines 00
NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system 00
Navy single integrated human resources strategy 00
Marine Corps research university 00
Reentry system applications program 00
Joint tactical combat training system 00
F–14 tactical reconnaissance 00
Software interoperability process tools 00
Satellite communications systems integration initiative 00
Distributed engineering plant 00
Air Force 00
Laser processing tools 00
Resin systems for Air Force applications 00
Thermal protection systems 00
Aeronautical research 00
Polyphenylene benzobisoxozole membrane fuel cell 00
Variable displacement vane pump 00
High frequency active auroral research 00
Space survivability 00
Aluminum aerostructures 00
Hyperspectral research 00
Fiber optical control technology 00

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued
Air Force—Continued
Low cost launch technology 00
Micro-satellite technology 00
Miniature satellite threat reporting system 00
Next generation composite launch vehicle payload fairings and shrouds 00
Solar orbital transfer vehicle 00
Space maneuver vehicle 00
Upper stage flight experiment 00
Space Based Laser program 00
Airborne laser program 00
Rocket systems launch program 00
Wideband gapfiller military satellite communications 00
B–2 advanced technology bomber 00
Milstar satellite communications 00
F–15E squadrons 00
Hyperspectral system development 00
Extended range cruise missile 00
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system 00
Lighthouse cyber security 00
Dragon U–2 00
Defense-Wide 00
Advanced photonic composites research 00
Infrasound detection capability basic research 00
Personnel research initiative 00
Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research 00
Chemical and biological defense basic research 00
Ballistic Missile Defense Organization funding and programmatic guidance 00
Bio-defense research 00
Hybrid sensor suite 00
High definition systems 00
Three dimensional structures research 00
Biological agent sensor technologies 00
Blast mitigation testing 00
Facial recognition access control technology 00

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL INCIDENT RESPONSE FORCE DETECTOR TECHNOLOGIES

00
Consequence Management Information System 00
Reactive materials 00
Complex systems design 00
Competitive sustainment initiative 00
Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability at U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) 00
Integrated data environment technology 00
Demonstration/validation of technology for the remediation of unexploded ordnance at active, inactive, closing, transferred, and transferring ranges 00
Next generation anthrax vaccine 00
Remote Ordnance Neutralization System 00
Cyber attack sensing and warning 00
Information Operations Technology Center 00
Trusted RUBIX 00
Virtual worlds initiative 00
Intelligent spatial technologies for smart mapping systems 00
Joint Mapping Tool Kit 00
Information assurance testbed 00
Joint course of action analysis and targeting support for information operations 00
Advanced lightweight grenade launcher 00
Management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers 00
Augmented reality fire-fighting training 00

Page

Other Items of Interest 00
Aircraft carrier modernization 00
Advanced ship hull demonstrators 00
Crusader 00
Future ship technology research and development 00
Joint training and experimentation 00
Joint operational test bed system 00
Maritime patrol aircraft 00
Patriot theater missile defense 00
Prophylactic pharmaceuticals 00
Radiation hardened electronics investment strategy 00
Small arms fire control system 00
Transition of successful research projects into the acquisition system 00
Title III—Operation And Maintenance 00
Explanation of tables 00
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 00
Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303) 00
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 00
Impact aid for children with disabilities (sec. 311) 00
Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment Teams (sec. 312) 00
Subtitle C—Humanitarian and Civic Assistance 00
Increased authority to provide health care services as humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 321) 00
Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allowances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec. 322) 00
Subtitle D—Department of Defense Industrial Facilities 00
Codification and improvement of armament retooling and manufacturing support programs (sec. 331) 00
Centers of industrial and technical excellence (sec. 332) 00
Effects of outsourcing on overhead costs of centers of industrial and technical excellence and ammunition plants (sec. 333) 00
Revision of authority to waive limitation on performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 334) 00
Subtitle E—Environmental Provisions 00
Environmental restoration accounts (sec. 341) 00
Payments of fines and penalties for environmental compliance violations (sec. 342) 00
Annual reports under Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (sec. 343) 00
Modification of authority for indemnification of transferees of closing defense property (sec. 344) 00
Payment of fines or penalties imposed for environmental compliance violations at certain Department of Defense facilities (sec. 345) 00
Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with the former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia (sec. 346) 00
Environmental restoration activities (sec. 347) 00
Ship disposal project (sec. 348) 00
Report on the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program (sec. 349) 00
Report on Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (sec. 350) 00
Subtitle F—Other Matters 00
Effects of worldwide contingency operations on readiness of certain military aircraft and equipment (sec. 361) 00
Realistic budgeting for readiness requirements of the Army (sec. 362) 00
Additions to plan for ensuring visibility over all in-transit end items and secondary items (sec. 363) 00
Performance of emergency response functions at chemical weapons storage installations (sec. 364) 00
Congressional notification of use of radio frequency spectrum by a system entering engineering and manufacturing development (sec. 365) 00
Monitoring of value of performance of Department of Defense functions by workforces selected from between public and private workforces (sec. 366) 00
Suspension of reorganization of naval audit service (sec. 367) 00

Page

Title III—Operation And Maintenance—Continued
Subtitle F—Other Matters—Continued
Investment of commissary trust revolving fund (sec. 368) 00
Economic procurement of distilled spirits (sec. 369) 00
Resale of armor piercing ammunition disposed of by the Army (sec. 370) 00
Damage to aviation facilities caused by alkali silica reactivity (sec. 371) 00
Reauthorization of pilot program for acceptance and use of landing fees charged for use of domestic military airfields by civil aircraft (sec. 372) 00
Reimbursement by civil air carriers for support provided at Johnston Atoll (sec. 373) 00
Review of costs of maintaining historical properties (sec. 374) 00
Extension of authority to sell certain aircraft for use in wildfire suppression (sec. 375) 00
Overseas airlift service on Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft (sec. 376) .. 00
Additional Matters of Interest 00
Army 00
Real property maintenance 00
Excess carryover-defense working capital fund activities 00
Foreign currency fluctuation 00
Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements 00
Army equipment maintenance 00
Battlefield mobility enhancement system 00
Army aviation spares 00
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 00
Navy 00
Navy spares 00
Ship depot maintenance 00
Oceanography 00
Training range upgrades 00
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 00
Navy information technology center 00
US Navy Call Center 00
Marine Corps 00
USMC initial issue 00
USMC equipment maintenance 00
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 00
Air Force 00
Air Force base operations 00
Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps 00
Air Force readiness spares packages 00
Air Force nuclear, biological and chemical defense 00
Defense-Wide 00
Mobility enhancements 00
Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) 00
Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative) 00
Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program 00
Domestic preparedness center 00
Cultural and historic activities 00
Defense Travel System 00
Command information superiority architecture program 00
Guard and Reserve Components 00
Air Force Reserve equipment maintenance 0
National Guard initial issue 00
Distributed mission trainer 00
Miscellaneous 00
Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic affairs 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Charlestown, Rhode Island 00
Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund .....
Inventory of financial management and feeder systems 00
Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistics support (JCALS) program 00
Mechanization of Contract Administration Service 00

Page

Title III—Operation And Maintenance—Continued
Other Items of Interest—Continued
National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence 00
Pesticide contamination at the former Fort Devens, Devens, Massachusetts, and other closed and active military installations 00
Revised requirements for report on Defense use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier 00
Title IV-Military Personnel Authorizations 00
Subtitle A-Active Forces 00
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 00
Subtitle B-Reserve Forces 00
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 00
End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) 00
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 00
Fiscal year 2001 limitation on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) . 00
Increase in number of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 415) 00
Subtitle C-Other Matters Relating to Personnel .....
Strengths 00
Suspension of strength limitations during war or national emergency (sec. 421) 00
Exclusion of certain reserve component members on active duty for more than 180 days from active component end strengths (sec. 422) 00
Exclusion of Army and Air Force medical and dental officers from limitations on strengths of reserve commissioned officers in grades below brigadier general (sec. 423) 00
Authority for temporary increases in number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades (sec. 424) 00
Temporary exemption of Director of the National Security Agency from limitations on number of Air Force officers above major general (sec. 425) 00
Subtitle D-Authorization of Appropriations 00
Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 431) 00
Title V-Military Personnel Policy 00
Subtitle A-Officer Personnel Policy 00
Eligibility of Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for position vacancy promotions (sec. 501) 00
Promotion Zones for Coast Guard Reserve Officers (sec. 502) 00
Time for release of officer promotion selection board reports (sec. 503) 00
Clarification of authority for posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 504) 00
Inapplicability of active-duty list promotion, separation, and involuntary retirement authorities to reserve general and flag officers serving in certain positions designated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 505) 00
Review of actions of selection boards (sec. 506) 00
Extension to all Air Force biomedical sciences officers of authority to retain until specified age (sec. 507) 00
Termination of application requirement for consideration of officers for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List (sec. 508) 00
Technical corrections relating to retired grade of reserve commissioned officers (sec. 509) 00
Grade of chiefs of reserve components and directors of National Guard components (sec. 510) 00
Subtitle B-Joint Officer Management 00
Joint officer management (sec. 521—528) 00
Subtitle C-Education and Training 00
Eligibility of children of reserves for Presidential appointment to service academies (sec. 541) 00
Selection of foreign students to receive instruction at service academies (sec. 542) 00
Repeal of contingent funding increase for Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (sec. 543) 00
Revision of authority for Marine Corps platoon leader class tuition assistance program (sec. 544) 00

Page

Title V-Military Personnel Policy—Continued
Subtitle D-Matters Relating to Recruiting 00
Army recruiting pilot programs (sec. 551) 00
Enhancement of the joint and service recruitment market research and advertising programs (sec. 552) 00
Access to secondary schools for military recruiting purposes (sec. 553) 00
Subtitle E-Other Matters 00
Authority for award of Medal of Honor to certain specified persons (sec. 561) 00
Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 562) 00
Ineligibility for involuntary separation pay upon declination of selection for continuation on active duty (sec. 563) 00
Recognition by states of military testamentary instruments (sec. 564) 00
Sense of Congress on the court-martial conviction of Captain Charles Butler McVay, Commander of the USS Indianapolis, and the courageous service of its crew (sec. 565) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Automated in- and out-processing of military personnel 00
Funeral honors for members of the uniformed services 00
Information related to alternatives to the Survivor Benefit Plan 00
Prevention of alcohol-related incidents 00
Study on the use of peyote by military personnel 00
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 00
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 00
Increase in basic pay for Fiscal Year 2001 (sec. 601) 00
Corrections for basic pay tables (sec. 602) 00
Pay in lieu of allowance for funeral honors duty (sec. 603) 00
Clarification of service excluded in computation of creditable service as a Marine Corps officer (sec. 604) 00
Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing (sec. 605) 00
Eligibility of members in grade E–4 to receive basic allowance for housing while on sea duty (sec. 606) 00
Personal money allowance for the senior enlisted members of the armed forces (sec. 607) 00
Increased uniform allowances for officers (sec. 608) 00
Cabinet-level authority to prescribe requirements and allowance for clothing of enlisted members (sec. 609) 00
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special Incentive Pays 00
Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) 00
Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 612) 00
Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 613) 00
Consistency of authorities for special pay for reserve medical and dental officers (sec. 614) 00
Special pay for physician assistants of the Coast Guard (sec. 615) 00
Authorization of special pay and accession bonus for pharmacy officers (sec. 616) 00
Corrections of references to Air Force veterinarians (sec. 617) 00
Entitlement of active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps to special pays and bonuses of health professional officers of the armed forces (sec. 618) 00
Career sea pay (sec. 619) 00
Increased maximum rate of special duty pay assignment pay (sec. 620) 00
Expansion of applicability of authority for critical skills enlistment bonus to include all armed forces (sec. 621) 00
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 00
Advance payments for temporary lodging of members and dependents (sec. 631) 00
Incentive for shipping and storing household goods in less than average weights (sec. 632) 00
Expansion of funded student travel (sec. 633) 00

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances—Continued
Benefits for members not transporting personal motor vehicles overseas (sec. 634) 00
Subtitle D—Retirement Benefits 00
Exception to high–36 month retired pay computation for members retired following a disciplinary reduction in grade (sec. 641) 00
Automatic participation in Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan unless declined with spouses' consent (sec. 642) 00
Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 643) 00
Retirement from active reserve service after regular retirement (sec. 644) 00
Same treatment for federal judges as for other federal officials regarding payment of military retired pay (sec. 645) 00
Subtitle E—Other Matters 00
Reimbursement of recruiting and ROTC personnel for parking expenses (sec. 651) 00
Extension of deadline for filing claims associated with capture and internment of certain persons by North Vietnam (sec. 652) 00
Settlement of claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay (sec. 653) 00
Eligibility of certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (sec. 654) 00
Authority to pay gratuity to certain veterans of Bataan and Corregidor (sec. 655) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Adjustments to the Basic Allowance for Housing 00
Title VII—Health Care 00
Subtitle A—Senior Health Care 00
Extension of TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program (sec. 701) 00
TRICARE senior prime demonstration program (sec. 702) 00
Extension and expansion of demonstration project for participation of uniformed services personnel in the Federal Employee Health Benefit program (sec. 703) 00
Implementation of redesigned pharmacy system (sec. 704) 237 00
Subtitle B—TRICARE Program 00
Additional beneficiaries under TRICARE prime remote program in CONUS (sec. 711) 00
Elimination of copayments for immediate family (sec. 712) 00
Improvement in business practices in the administration of the TRICARE program (sec. 713) 00
Subtitle C-jint Initiatives Wth Department of Veterans Affairs 00
Tracking patient safety in military and veterans health care systems (sec. 721) 00
Pharmaceutical identification technology (sec. 722) 00
Medical informatics (sec. 723) 00
Subtitle D-other Matters 00
Permanent authority for certain pharmaceutical benefits (sec. 731) 00
Provision of domiciliary and custodial care for CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 732) 00
Medical and dental care for medal of honor recipients and their dependents (sec. 733) 00
School-required physical examinations for certain minor dependents (sec. 734) 00
Two-year extension of dental and medical benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members (sec. 735) 00
Extension of authority for contracts for medical services at locations outside medical treatment facilities (sec. 736) 00
Transition of chiropractic health care demonstration program to permanent status (sec. 737) 00
Use of information technology for enhancement of delivery of administrative services under the Defense Health Program (sec. 738) 00
Patient care reporting and management system (sec. 739) 00
Health care management demonstration program (sec. 740) 00
Studies of accrual financing for health care for military retirees (sec. 741) 00

Page

Subtitle D-other Matters —Continued
Augmentation of Army Medical Department by reserve officers of the Public Health Service Corps (sec. 742) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Consultation with schools of pharmacy and nursing 00
Financial assistance for those beneficiaries requiring animal assistance 00
Health care benefits for retirees living overseas 00
Implementation of Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Department sharing initiatives 00
Notification of persons affected by unanticipated adverse outcomes of medical care 00
Special pays for military health care professionals 00
Title VIII-Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and 00
Related Matters 00
Improvements in procurements of services (sec.801) 00
Addition of threshold value requirement for applicability of a reporting requirement relating to multiyear contract (sec.802) 00
Planning for the acquisition of information systems (sec.803) 00
Tracking of information technology purchases (sec.804) 00
Repeal of requirement for contractor assurances regarding the completeness, accuracy, and contractual sufficiency of technical data provided by contractor (sec.805) 00
Extension of authority for Department of Defense acquisition pilot programs (sec.806) 00
Clarification and extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec.807) 00
Clarification of authority of Comptroller General to review records of participants in certain prototype projects (sec.808) 00
Eligibility of small business concerns owned and controlled by women for assistance under the mentor-protEgE program (sec.809) 00
Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec.810) 00
Qualifications required for employment and assignment in contracting positions (sec.811) 00
Defense acquisition workforce (sec.812) 00
Financial analysis of use of dual rate for quantifying overhead costs at army industrial facilities (sec.813) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Application of Cost Accounting Standards to universities 00
Appropriate use of the government purchase card 00
availability of contractor past performance information 00
Contracts for ancillary commercial services 00
Online auctioning 00
Performance goals and measures for quality of equipment and other products 00
Polyacrylonitrile carbon fibers 00
Procurements from the small arms production industrial base 00
Risk management in the acquisition of major systems 00
Technical data rights for items developed exclusively at private expense 00
Title IX-Department of Defense Organization and Management 00
Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901) 00
Overall supervision of Department of Defense activities for combating terrorism (sec. 902) 00
National Defense Panel 2001 (sec. 903) 00
Quadrennial National Defense Panel (sec. 904) 00
Inspector General investigations of prohibited personnel actions (sec.905) 00
Network centric warfare (sec. 906) 00
Additional duties for the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 907) 00
Special authority for administration of Navy Fisher Houses (sec. 908) 00
Organization and management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 909) 00268
Responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program (sec. 910) .. 00268
Supervisory control of Armed Forces Retirement Home Board by Secretary of Defense (sec. 911) 00268

Page

Title IX-Department of Defense Organization and Management —Continued
Consolidation of certain Navy gift funds (sec. 912) 00
Temporary authority to dispose of a gift previously accepted for the Naval Academy (sec. 913) 00
Title X-General Provisions 00
Subtitle A-Financial Matters 00
Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000 (sec. 1002) 00
United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1003) 00
Annual OMB/CBO joint report on scoring budget outlays (sec. 1004) .. 00
Prompt payment of contractor vouchers (sec. 1005) 00
The repeal of certain requirements relating to timing of contract payments (sec. 1006) 00
Plan for prompt posting of contractual obligations (sec. 1007) 00
Plan for the electronic submission of documentation supporting claims for contract payments (sec. 1008) 00
Administrative offsets for overpayment of transportation costs (sec. 1009) 00
Subtitle B-Counter-Drug Activities 00
Extension and increase of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1011) 00
Recommendations on expansion of support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1012) 00
Review of riverine counter-drug program (sec. 1013) 00
Subtitle C-Strategic Forces 00
Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1015) 00
Plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1016) 00
Correction of scope of waiver authority for limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles (sec. 1017) . 00
Study and report on hardened and deeply buried targets (sec. 1018) .. 00
Subtitle D-Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements 00
Annual report of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff on combatant command requirements (sec. 1021) 00
Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 1022) 00
Preparedness of military installation first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1023) 00
Date of submittal of reports on shortfalls in equipment procurement and military construction for reserve components in future years defense programs (sec. 1024) 00
Management review of defense logistics agency (sec. 1025) 00
Management review of defense information systems agency (sec. 1026) 00
Subtitle E-Information Security 00
Institute for defense computer security and information protection (sec. 1041) 00

INFORMATION SECURITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (SEC. 1042)

00

Process for prioritizing background investigations for security clearances for Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1043) 00

AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD CERTAIN SENSITIVE INFORMATION FROM PUBLIC DISCLOSURE (SEC. 1044)

00

Protection of operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 1045) 00
Subtitle F-Other Matters 00
Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 1051) 00
Eligibility of dependents of American Red Cross employees for enrollment in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools in Puerto Rico (sec. 1053) 00
Grants to American Red Cross for Armed Services Emergency Services (sec. 1054) 00

Page

Subtitle F-Other Matters —Continued
Transit pass program for certain Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1055) 00
Fees for providing historical information to the public (sec. 1056) 00
Access to criminal history record information for national security purposes (sec. 1057) 00
Sense of Congress on the naming of the CVN–77 aircraft carrier. (sec. 1058) 00
Donation of civil war cannon (sec. 1059) 00
Maximum size of parcel posts transported overseas for Armed Forces Post Offices (sec. 1060) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Department of Defense export control procedures 00
Firefighting equipment 00
Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile 00
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Policy 00
Computer/electronic accommodations program (sec. 1101) 00
Additional special pay for foreign language proficiency beneficial for United States national security interests (sec. 1102) 00
Increased number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service (sec. 1103) 00
Extension of authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories (sec. 1104) 00
Work safety demonstration program (sec. 1105) 00
Employment and compensation of employees for temporary organizations established by law or executive order (sec. 1106) 00
Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1107) 00
Electronic maintenance of performance appraisal systems (sec. 1108) 00
Approval authority for cash awards in excess of $10,000 (sec. 1109) ... 00
Leave for crews of certain vessels (sec. 1110) 00
Life insurance for emergency essential Department of Defense employees (sec. 1111) 00
Civilian personnel services public-private competition pilot program (sec. 1112) 00
Extension, expansion, and revision of authority for experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1113) 00
Title XII—Matters Relating to Other Nations 00

TRANSFERS OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES (SEC. 1201)

00
Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1202) 00
Repeal of restriction preventing cooperative airlift support through acquisition and cross servicing agreements (sec.1203) 00
Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training (sec. 1204) 00

BIANNUAL REPORT ON KOSOVO PEACEKEEPING (SEC. 1205)

00
Mutual assistance for monitoring test explosions of nuclear devices (sec. 1206) 00
Consolidated annual report on Cooperative Threat Reduction assistance and activities (sec. 1207) 00
Limitation on use of funds for construction of a Russian facility for the destruction of chemical weapons (sec. 1208) 00
Limitation on the use of funds for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program (sec. 1209) 00
Title XIII—Navy Activities on the Island of Vieques, ...
Puerto Rico 00
Navy activities on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico (secs. 1301–1308) 00
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 00
Title XXI—Army 00
Summary 00
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 00

Page

Division B—Military Construction Authorizations —Continued
Title XXI—Army —Continued
Family housing (sec. 2102) 00

IMPROVEMENT TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS (SEC. 2103)

00
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) 00
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 projects (sec. 2105) 00
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1999 project (sec. 2106) 00
Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 1998 project (sec. 2107) 00
Authority to accept funds for realignment of certain military construction project, Fort Campbell, Kentucky (sec. 2108) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Presidio Housing, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California 00
Title XXII—Navy 00
Summary 00
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) 00
Family housing (sec. 2202) 00
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) 00
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) 00
Correction in authorized use of funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia (sec. 2205) 00
Title XXIII—Air Force 00
Summary 00
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) 00
Family housing (sec. 2302) 00
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) 00
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) 00
Title XXIV-Defense Agencies 00
Summary 00
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) 00
Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) 00
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Certification of requirement for military construction projects, Manta Air Base, Ecuador 00
Planning and design, Defense Intelligence Agency 00
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security .....
Investment Program 00
Summary 00
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) 00
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) 00
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities 00
Summary 00
Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Support for Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams
00
Title XXVII—Expiration and Extension of Authorizations 00
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701) 00
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1998 projects (sec. 2702) 00
Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2703) 00
Effective date (sec. 2704) 00
Title XXVIII—General Provisions 00
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 00

Page

Title XXVIII—General Provisions —Continued
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes —Continued
Joint use military construction projects (sec. 2801) 00
Exclusion of certain costs from determination of applicability of limitation on use of funds for improvement of family housing (sec. 2802) 00
Replacement of limitations on space by pay grade of military family housing with requirement for local comparability of military family housing (sec. 2803) 00
Modification of lease authority for high-cost military family housing (sec. 2804) 00
Applicability of competitive policy to alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2805) 00
Provisions of utilities and services under alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2806) 00
Extension of alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2807) 00
Inclusion of readiness center in definition of armory for purposes of construction of reserve components facilities (sec. 2808) 00
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 00
Increase in threshold for reports to Congress on real property transactions (sec. 2811) 00
Enhancements to military lease authority (sec. 2812) 00
Expansion of procedures for selection of conveyees under authority to convey utility systems (sec. 2813) 00
Subtitle C–Defense Base Closure and Realignment 00
Scope of agreements to transfer property to redevelopment authorities without consideration under the base closure laws (sec. 2821) .. 00
Subtitle D–Land Conveyances 00
Part I–Army Conveyances 00
Land conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois (sec. 2831) 00
Land conveyance, Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2832) 00
Land conveyance, Colonel Harold E. Steele Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2833) ... 00
Land conveyance, Fort Lawton, Washington (sec. 2834) 00
Land conveyance, Vancouver Barracks, Washington (sec. 2835) ... 00
Part II—Navy Conveyances 00
Modification of land conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California (sec. 2851) 00
Modification of land conveyance, Defense Fuel Supply Point, Casco Bay, Maine (sec. 2852) 00
Modification of land conveyance authority, former Navy Training Center, Bainbridge, Cecil County, Maryland (sec. 2853) 00
Land conveyance, Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine (sec. 2854) 00
Part III—Defense Agencies Conveyance 00
Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Farmers Branch, Texas (sec. 2871) 00
Subtitle E–Other Matters 00
Naming of the Army missile testing range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll (sec. 2881) 00
Other Items of Interest 00
Report on Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 00
Report on requirement for Education Center at Fort Stewart, Georgia 00
Study on commercial leases 00
Study regarding the location of the National Museum of the United States Army 00
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 00
Title XXXI–Department of Energy National Security Programs 00
Atomic energy defense activities 00
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 00

Page

Title XXXI–Department of Energy National Security Programs—Continued
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations—Continued
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 00
Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102) 00
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 00
Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3104) 00
Energy employees compensation initiative (sec. 3105) 00
Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3106) 00
Subtitle B–Recurring General Provisions 00
Reprogramming (sec. 3121) 00
Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122) 00
Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123) 00
Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124) 00
Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125) 00
Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126) 00
Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127) 00
Availability of funds (sec. 3128) 00
Transfer of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129) 00
Subtitle C–National Nuclear Security Administration 00
Term of Office of person first appointed as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (sec. 3031) 00
Membership of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 3132) 00
Scope of authority of Secretary of Energy to modify organization of National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3133) 00
Prohibition on pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3134) 00
Organization plan for field offices of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3135) .....
Future-years nuclear security program (sec. 3136) .....
Cooperative research and development of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3137) .....
Subtitle D—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations .....
Processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3151) .....
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (sec. 3152) .....
Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program (sec. 3153) .....
Modification of counterintelligence polygraph program (sec. 3154) .....
Employee incentives for employees at closure project facilities (sec. 3155) .....
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....
Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3171) .....
Updates of report on nuclear test readiness postures (sec. 3172) .....
Frequency of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data and formerly restricted data (sec. 3173) .....
Form of certifications regarding the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3174) .....
Engineering and manufacturing research, development and demonstration by plant managers of certain nuclear weapons production plants (sec. 3175) .....
Cooperative research and development agreements for government-owned, government-operated laboratories (sec. 3176) .....
Commendation of Department of Energy and contractor employees for Exemplary Service in Stockpile Stewardship and Security (sec. 3177) .....
Other Items of Interest .....
Department of Energy participation in the Interstate Technology Reciprocity Council .....
Laboratory directed research and development .....
Report on Post-closure employee benefits at closure project facilities ..
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board .....

Page

Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board—Continued
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201) .....
Title XXXIII—Naval Petroleum Reserves .....
Minimum price of petroleum sold from the naval petroleum reserves (sec. 3301) .....
Repeal of authority to contract for cooperative or unit plans affecting Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (sec. 3302) .....
Title XXXIV—National Defense Stockpile .....
National defense stockpile (secs. 3401–3402) .....
Legislative Requirements .....
Departmental Recommendations .....
Committee Action .....

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate .....
Regulatory Impact .....
Changes in Existing Law .....
Additional Views of Senators Levin, Kennedy, Bingaman, Robb, Landrieu and Reed .....
Additional Views of Senator Bingaman .....
Minority Views of Senator McCain .....

106TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
106–292

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MAY 12, 2000.—Ordered to be printed

FILED, UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE ORDER OF THE SENATE OF MAY 11, 2000

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2549]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 2001 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 2001;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 2001;

64–303

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 2001;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

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

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2001; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2001.

Committee overview and recommendations

The national security challenges that the United States will face in the new millennium are many and diverse " new adversaries, new battlefields, and new weapons. It is important that we remain vigilant, forward thinking, and prepared to address these challenges.

While the Department of Defense (DOD) must plan and allocate resources to meet future threats, ongoing military operations and deployments from the Balkans to Southwest Asia to East Timor continue to demand significant resources in the short term and the foreseeable future. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 provides funding guidelines and policy directives which will allocate some of the most critical readiness, modernization, and recruiting and retention problems facing our military, while addressing complex current and future challenges and threats to the nation's security.

For over a decade, our defense budget has been based on constrained funding, not on the threats facing the nation or the military strategy necessary to meet those threats. The result of this is evident today in continuing recruiting and retention difficulties, declining readiness ratings, and aging equipment.

Last year, the Congress reversed the downward trend in defense spending by approving a defense authorization bill which, for the first time in 14 years, included a real increase in the authorized level of defense spending. This year, the committee continued the momentum initiated last year by authorizing $309.8 billion for defense spending for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $4.5 billion over the budget request, and a real increase of 4.4 percent.

The committee's support for additional funding for defense is based on an in-depth analysis of the threats facing U.S. interests, and testimony from senior military leaders on the many shortfalls in the defense budget.

It is evident that the world remains a complex and violent place. The greatest threat to our national security today is instability; instability fueled by ethnic, religious, and racial animosities that have existed for centuries, but are now resulting in conflicts fought with the weapons of modern warfare. Many have turned to the United States, as the sole remaining superpower, to resolve the many conflicts around the world and to ensure stability in the future. However, this military power does not ensure our security. As Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet told the committee in January, "The fact that we are arguably the world's most powerful

nation does not bestow invulnerability; in fact, it may make us a larger target for those who don't share our interest, values, or beliefs."

U.S. military forces are involved in overseas deployments at an unprecedented rate. Currently, our troops are involved in over 10 contingency operations around the globe. At an October 1999 hearing of the Committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Hugh Shelton, stated that, "Two factors that erode military readiness are the pace of operations and funding shortfalls. There is no doubt that the force is much smaller than it was a decade ago, and also much busier." Over the past decade, our active duty manpower has been reduced by nearly a third, active Army divisions have been reduced by almost 50 percent, and the number of Navy ships has been reduced from 567 to 316. During this same period, our troops have been involved in 50 military operations worldwide. By comparison, from the end of the Vietnam War in 1975 until 1989, U.S. military forces were engaged in only 20 such military deployments.

The fiscal year 2001 defense budget submitted by the administration was a positive development. Encouraging elements of the plan included full funding of the pay raise as directed by Congress last year, achieving the procurement goal of $60.0 billion a year, and initiatives to improve military health care. After careful examination, however, it was clear that many shortfalls remained that required action by the committee.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have testified that they have a remaining shortfall in funding of $9.0 billion for fiscal year 2000, a requirement for an additional $15.5 billion above the budget request to meet shortfalls in readiness and modernization for fiscal year 2001, and a requirement for an additional $85.0 billion in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). The committee has provided additional funding to meet the most urgent requirements identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but remains troubled by the negative impact of the large number of contingency operations on our smaller military force. Unfortunately, there appears to be no end in sight for many of these operations.

The high operations tempo of our armed forces has a negative impact on recruiting and retention. Last year, the committee took action to provide a pay raise and a package of retirement reforms and retention incentives in an effort to recruit and retain highly qualified personnel. The committee also took action to require intense senior level management of the personnel tempo of the armed forces. The committee has received testimony that these changes are having a positive impact. This year the committee has focused on improving military health care for our active duty and retired personnel and their families.

The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the service chiefs have all highlighted the many problems associated with implementing a user-friendly health care program for active duty service members, military retirees, and their families. The committee strongly supported initiatives that ensure our active duty personnel and their families receive quality healthcare, and initiatives that begin to fulfill our commitment to military retirees. These initiatives include accelerating improvements in TRICARE, expanding TRICARE benefits to families of military personnel serv-

ing in the remote locations, increasing access to health care and providing pharmacy benefits for military retirees, and expanding the long- standing cooperative relationship between the DOD and the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Last year, NATO conducted its first large-scale, offensive military operation with the 78–day air war on behalf of Kosovo. The lessons learned from that operation, addressed during a series of committee hearings, highlighted not only shortfalls in weapon systems and intelligence programs, but also the complexities of engaging in coalition operations. As noted in the combined testimony of Operation Allied Force commanders, General Wesley Clark, Admiral James Ellis, and Lieutenant General Michael Short, the campaign " . . . required (that) we adapt (U.S.) military doctrine and strategy to strike a balance between maintaining allied cohesion, striking key elements of the Yugoslav armed forces, minimizing losses of allied aircraft, and maintaining collateral damage." Of paramount concern to the committee was applying the lessons learned from the air campaign over Kosovo to ensure the future preparedness of the U.S. armed forces. The committee added funding above the amount requested to address some of the most essential lessons learned from Kosovo.

Over 38,000 combat sorties were conducted during the Kosovo air campaign with no combat casualties. While the committee understands that no military operation is without risk, limiting the risk to military personnel is clearly an important goal. Every day, advances in technologies such as computing and telecommunications are being integrated into warfighting equipment.

The committee believes that the Defense Department must further pursue these technological advances in an effort to provide advanced warfighting capabilities, while at the same time limiting the risk to military personnel. To this end, the committee directed the DOD to aggressively develop and field unmanned combat systems in the air and on the ground so that within 10 years, one-third of our operational deep strike aircraft would be unmanned, and within 15 years, one-third of our ground combat vehicles would be unmanned. The committee has provided an additional $200.0 million for this initiative.

Personnel

This year the Personnel Subcommittee focused on some of the most pressing issues facing the DOD and the military services. Recruiting and retention, pay and compensation, personnel tempo, and health care are identified in every survey, poll and informal gathering of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines as the areas that affect decisions on joining or continuing to serve in the armed forces. The committee prioritized its efforts to address each of these issues.

When the Cold War ended and the nation began to reduce the active forces, it became clear that the pressures caused by the reduction in the number of medical personnel and facilities and the increase in medical costs made it almost impossible for the military health care system to meet its wartime missions, as well as fulfill its mission to provide health care to the families of active duty personnel and retired personnel and their families. As a result, in 1993 Congress directed the DOD to take the bold step of imple-

menting a nationwide managed care system in which the DOD partnered with the private sector to deliver health care. This system, known as TRICARE, is struggling with implementation problems. The committee devoted a significant amount of time and effort to examining TRICARE and determining how that system might be improved and made more efficient and effective.

On February 23, 2000, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced S. 2087, the Military Health Care Improvement Act of 2000, to address the most urgent medical needs of our active duty and retired personnel and their families. In addition to providing for improvements in the TRICARE program, this bill would provide, for the first time, an entitlement to military health care for Medicare-eligible military retirees and their families. The most significant benefit of this bill is a pharmacy benefit for Medicare-eligible military retirees. The committee has determined that access to prescription drugs is the single most critical unmet need of Medicare-eligible military retirees.

The committee has incorporated the provisions of S. 2087 and additional initiatives in this bill. The committee views this as only the first step toward providing a comprehensive health care benefit to all military health care system beneficiaries, including those who are Medicare-eligible.

The Personnel Subcommittee has made recruiting and retention a priority for each of the past three years. Despite efforts on behalf of recruiters, military leaders, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Congress, the disturbing trends of declining numbers and missed goals in both recruiting and retention continue.

While last year's legislative initiatives have slowed the decline, more needs to be done if we are to recruit and retain quality personnel to defend the nation's vital interests around the world. Once these young men and women have been trained in their military skills, it is essential that the services retain these developing military leaders so that we can benefit from their experience and use their abilities to train those recruits who will follow.

The committee recognizes that if the services cannot man the force with qualified, well-trained personnel, readiness will continue to suffer. The committee believes that the proposals, resources and policies recommended in this bill will assist the military services in recruiting and retaining the numbers of quality personnel required to meet the national military strategy.

Readiness and Management Support

Aging equipment, spare parts shortfalls, manning and experience gaps continue to manifest themselves in terms of declining mission capable rates and decreasing unit readiness ratings. According to the DOD Quarterly Readiness Report to the Congress, October through December 1999, ". . . the pace of contingency operations continues to stress the readiness of certain segments of the force." Most troubling are indications that problems are emerging in the readiness of forward deployed and first-to-fight units.

During the past year, the committee focused on the readiness of the armed forces to meet the challenges of today while preparing for those of tomorrow. Maintaining a ready force is particularly difficult if military personnel are not provided with sufficient opportunities to receive the training necessary to perform their difficult

missions. The committee notes the prohibition of live-fire training by Atlantic fleet units at Vieques is resulting in significant degradation of unit readiness. Ensuring that our armed forces receive the necessary training to make certain they have safe and successful deployments continues to be one of the committee's highest priorities.

The committee is also concerned with continuing reports of readiness problem as a result of the declining materiel condition of military equipment, primarily due to shortfalls in spare parts and increasing equipment age. The committee added significant resources to the defense budget in previous fiscal years to ensure that the current inventory of equipment was adequately maintained until the modernization programs could provide sufficient replacements. Unfortunately, with the pace of operations continuing to place strains on both maintenance personnel and supply availability, the increased funding has not prevented declines in materiel condition.

Military construction

Although the overall DOD request for fiscal year 2001 is more than $11.0 billion higher than the previous year, neither military construction nor family housing construction benefitted from this increase. In fact, the military construction and family housing Request is $400.0 million less than the administration's fiscal year 2000 incrementally funded military construction program, and $500.0 million less than the amount authorized in fiscal year 2000.

One noteworthy shortfall is that the budget request for fiscal year 2001 did not include construction contingency funds which are critical to correct design flaws or unforseen construction problems. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness an Management Support, service officials stated that the elimination of the $128.0 million for contingency construction will cause significant difficulty in executing construction programs.

The committee is deeply disturbed that for two consecutive years the Department has used budgetary gimmicks in funding the military construction program. The committee urges the Department to refrain from such practices in future years.

To correct the deficiencies in the budget request, the committee recommends an increase of $430.0 million for military construction. The focus of the additional funding is on quality of life projects and on critical projects for the reserve components, whose construction programs continue to be underfunded. In addition, the committee did include contingency construction funding for each project the committee added.

Emerging Threats and Capabilities

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued to provide an effective forum for highlighting such issues as the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, the ever increasing danger of terrorist attacks both in the United States and overseas, the impact of narco-trafficking on U.S. national security and regional stability, and the growing threat cyber-attacks on the military's critical information infrastructure. The committee continued its review and assessment of the Department's ability to respond to these threats. The committee believes it is of the utmost importance that the Department

prepare for these and other emerging threats through robust investments in technology and exploration of new warfighting concepts.

Unfortunately, the terrorist threat to our citizens and service members—both at home and abroad—shows no signs of diminishing. During the weeks leading up to the millennium celebrations, numerous individuals suspected of planning terrorist attacks directed against U.S. citizens were arrested in the United States and abroad. With the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the threat of a terrorist attack with a chemical, biological or nuclear weapon is increasing at an alarming rate. We, as a nation, must be prepared.

This committee will continue to play a leading role in ensuring that the DOD is adequately funded and structured to perform its critical role in the overall U.S. government's efforts to combat terrorism. Last year, the committee conducted a comprehensive review of the Defense Department's activities to combat terrorism, with the goal of making the Department's efforts in this critical area more visible and better organized; and of increasing the capabilities of DOD assets to assist in the event of a terrorist attack on U.S. soil involving the use of a weapon of mass destruction.

This year, the committee has taken action to build on last year's efforts by assigning overall policy and budgeting oversight of the DOD activities for combating terrorism to the assistant secretary of defense for special operations and low- intensity conflict; and by adding funding for the establishment of five new Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams to bring the total number of such teams to 32 by the end of fiscal year 2001.

During the post-Cold War decade, the U.S. government has spent over $4.7 billion in the former Soviet Union to reduce the threat posed by the possible proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, weapons-usable nuclear materials, and scientific expertise. After nearly a decade of working in Russia and the other states of the former Soviet Union on this effort, the committee believes it is important to review what these programs have achieved. The committee is concerned that for the significant investment made in some areas, the return in terms of reducing the threat has been relatively small. For example, the General Accounting Office (GAO) found that $481.2 million has been spent since fiscal year 1993 on a program designed to secure weapons-usable nuclear material in Russia and the states of the former Soviet Union, but only seven percent of the total nuclear material identified as being at risk has been secured. The committee is troubled by the progress achieved in light of this significant investment.

In March 2000, the GAO testified that the costs associated with achieving threat reduction will continue to remain high due to Russia's inability to pay its share of the costs of these programs, Russia's reluctance to provide the United States with needed access to its sensitive facilities, and expanding program budget requirements. The committee recommends several initiatives to obtain greater Russian commitment and necessary access so that the programs will have a greater chance of attaining their intended threat reduction objectives.

In the area of chemical and biological warfare defense, the committee notes that the Department has continued to maintain

steady increases in funding since fiscal year 1996. The committee is concerned, however, that the Department's efforts to focus on the acquisition of the anthrax vaccine may be taking an inordinate amount of personnel and financial resources from other critical elements of the chem-bio defense program. While the Department's fiscal year 2001 request represents a nearly 20 percent increase for procurement of chemical and biological defense equipment and programs, a significant portion of this increase is to address issues associated with the anthrax vaccine acquisition program. The committee is concerned with the risks associated with continuing to support the current Anthrax acquisition strategy, and believes that the Department should develop an alternative plan to ensure that a vaccine will be available to meet ongoing and future requirements.

In the year since the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities was created, cyber threats to the United States, including the DOD, have increased dramatically. During the subcommittee's March 1, 2000 hearing on cyber-security, the DOD reported that computer attacks on Defense Department systems increased from under 6,000 in 1998 to over 22,000 in 1999. There is every indication that this trend will continue.

The committee remains concerned that many important information assurance programs designed to protect against such cyber-attacks, remain underfunded by the DOD. At the March 1, 2000, subcommittee hearing, witnesses from the Department once again confirmed that such funding shortfalls remain significant, and presented a list of almost $500.0 million in unfunded requirements in this area.

Due to the expanding nature of the cyber threat, the committee recommends increased funding for important information assurance initiatives. In particular, the committee recommends initiatives in the area of information assurance training and education. The committee agrees with the conclusion contained in the National Plan for Information Systems Protection, which was released by the White House in January, that ". . . within the Federal Government, the lack of skilled information systems security personnel amounts to a crisis." The committee also recommends funding increases to support information assurance research and development, and procurement of critical information assurance tools and detection devices.

The committee continued its examination of joint experimentation and the prudent transformation of our armed forces to defend against current and future threats to our national security. While encouraged by the progress made by U.S. Joint Forces Command in the area of joint experimentation since its activation with an expanded charter on October 1, 1999, the committee is concerned with the slow pace of robust experimentation, noting that the first true joint field experiment is not scheduled until 2004. Additionally, the committee is concerned that there is not yet an institutionalized process to rapidly integrate lessons learned into the overall service and defense-wide requirements process. During a hearing before the subcommittee on April 4, 2000, the Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, indicated that a review was underway to revise and strengthen this joint requirements process. At that same hearing, the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Com-

mand expressed interest in accelerating the pace of joint experimentation. These are welcome developments which the committee will follow closely.

It is a priority of the committee to maintain a strong, stable investment in science and technology in order to develop superior technology that will permit the United States to maintain its current military advantages, provide flexible options to future warfighters, and hedge against technological surprise. The military dimensions of the next century are likely to be so different from those on which the current force was built that an evolutionary approach—based on correcting near-term deficiencies—will not be sufficient to meet the need for change. We must ensure that our ongoing efforts to maintain current advantages in capability are complemented with bold action that can effect the true transformation required for the 21st Century force. For that reason, the committee has added approximately $200.0 million dollars to the defense science and technology (S&T) program.

It has been an on-going concern that the current S&T planning process appears to focus on the "micro" issue of ensuring that individual projects address legitimate warfighting needs, rather than on the "macro" issue of prioritizing those needs and ensuring that sufficient S&T funding is made available to meet them. Both the Army and the Navy took ambitious steps this year to address that shortcoming in the S&T planning process by prioritizing their own needs on a "macro" basis, and realigning S&T funding to match new priorities.

The Air Force does not appear to have undertaken any comparable planning effort. The committee remains concerned with the serious decline in the Air Force technology investment and the lack of support for science and technology within the Air Force leadership. Critical investment decisions are being made based on numbers rather than need. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which requires the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a thorough review of the S&T program and to certify to Congress that the plans provided and the investments planned will meet their objectives for air and space superiority in the 21st Century and beyond.

Airland

The Airland Subcommittee focused on the impact of inadequate modernization accounts, testing and evaluation activities associated with developmental efforts, the Army transformation initiative and the status of tactical aviation programs.

The committee has conducted an in-depth analysis of the Army transformation initiative that was announced last fall. The committee advocates transformation and recognizes that heavy forces within the Army are difficult to deploy in support of the National Military Strategy. The Army Chief of Staff has challenged the status quo within the Army and initiated a process to transform the Army into a more lethal, lightweight, strategically relevant and deployable force that will be better suited to meet future defense challenges. While the committee has expressed support for the transformation initiative, the committee is concerned about the Army's ability to develop the objective force and field an interim force capability. The committee has particular concerns about the

operational capabilities of the interim force and the Army's acquisition strategy.

Given no significant change in projected Army modernization resources from the DOD, the committee is concerned that the Army will not have adequate resources to recapitalize the existing legacy force to maintain operational readiness, field an interim force capability, and conduct a robust research and development effort designed to lead to the objective force in fiscal year 2012. The committee believes the Army vision should more heavily focus on efforts for the objective force. Near-term interim forces can provide an operational capability available to respond to contingency operations while at the same time provide insights into future force requirements. The committee believes that least cost alternatives, including light, armored vehicles currently available within the Army, should be primarily considered in efforts to fill an interim force.

In response to last year's congressional direction, the Army issued revised aviation and armor system modernization plans in which significant steps have been taken to address long standing deficiencies in service modernization programs. While the committee remains concerned about the ability of future budgets to support these revised plans, the Army is commended for ensuring that these plans more adequately reflect the broad range of requirements that exist across the force.

The committee also focused on a range of tactical aviation issues. The budget request included almost $8.0 billion for continued development and procurement of the three new tactical fighter aircraft: the F/A–18E/F Super Hornet, the F–22 Raptor, and the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). The committee remains concerned about the overall affordability of these systems against the backdrop of increasing average aircraft age, required modifications of legacy aircraft, and precision guided weapon inventory shortages. Particular tactical aviation issues examined by the committee included: F/A–18E/F upgrade funding; F–22 flight test hours and the adequacy of test content; and, JSF validation, program cost growth, and technical challenges.

The lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict presented additional concerns that the committee addressed. In Kosovo after-action reviews, the committee repeatedly heard concerns expressed about low-density, high-demand weapon systems and platforms. Commanders reported having to conserve certain precision weapon systems to prevent depletion. Tactical electronic attack assets were seriously over tasked, as were intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) assets.

The committee added over $700.0 million for programs supporting aircraft precision strike capability, aircraft survivability, and ISR assets.

The committee continues to be concerned about the impact that inadequate modernization funding will have on our ability to modernize our forces. Significant levels of unfunded requirements, as identified by the service chiefs, suggest that significant modernization shortfalls are likely to continue.

Seapower

The committee continued its focus on reviewing the adequacy of Navy and Marine Corps force structure and strategic lift to carry out the National Security Strategy, and the ability of Navy and Marine Corps programs to support new operational concepts to influence events ashore, and from the sea.

Operational commanders presented compelling testimony to the subcommittee that indicated that their commands do not have enough ships and aircraft to shape the international environment and respond to crises within the required time frame. As stated by the Commander, U.S. Second Fleet, even with the current level of 316 ships, there ". . . are not enough resources to meet demands, and the cost of doing business is being borne increasingly by our sailors." The commanding general of the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force and the director of operations and logistics of the U.S. Transportation Command described similar impacts on the Marines and airmen in their command.

Operational commanders also pointed out that aging equipment translates into both operational and fiscal costs. Maintenance personnel routinely work long hours on shifts and into the weekends to keep equipment operational. This testimony was consistent with information gathered by the committee during visits to fleet units.

The Congressional Research Service testified before the subcommittee that the Navy requires a $12.0 billion annual ship construction budget, commencing in fiscal year 2001, to build an average of 8.6 ships per year to maintain a Navy force structure of at least 300 ships. While the Navy acquisition and requirements witnesses agreed with this assessment, the ship construction budget for fiscal year 2001 is only $11.7 billion and is projected to decrease in the outyears. In an effort to provide a long-term look at shipbuilding requirements and plans, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 directed the Secretary of Defense to deliver a long-range shipbuilding report to the Congress no later than February 1, 2000. Unfortunately, that report has yet to be provided.

The Transportation Command testified before the subcommittee that C–17 strategic lift aircraft procurement and C–5 strategic lift aircraft reliability were the two highest Transportation Command priorities, and that the Transportation Command has been unable to respond to all of the requests for strategic airlift support.

In addition to these findings, information obtained by the committee during the course of its deliberations revealed the following:

(1) the present Navy force structure of 316 ships is not sufficient to carry out the National Security Strategy, and the shipbuilding plan of 39 ships planned in the Future Years Defense Program is insufficient to recapitalize the fleet;

(2) changing the DDG–51 acquisition strategy from three to two ships per year is inconsistent with the Navy's previous industrial base studies, and counter to the emphasis on procurement efficiency and smart business decisions that save taxpayer dollars;

(3) the DD–21 destroyer is the key enabler to providing the Marine Corps fire support from the sea, and DD–21 will accomplish that mission at lower acquisition and operating costs compared to other destroyers;

(4) the Joint Chiefs of Staff study on attack submarine force structure states that the requirement for submarines may be significantly more than the 1997 Quadrenniel Defense Review level of 50 submarines;

(5) Marine Corps operational concepts require the capabilities included in new platforms, such as the LPD–17, LHD, and DD–21 ship classes and the performance of new equipment, such as the Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle(AAAV), the Landing Craft Air Cushion (LCAC), the V–22 Tiltrotor aircraft, and night vision and thermal imaging devices; and

(6) within ten years there will be insufficient helicopters to support the operational requirements of destroyers, aircraft carriers, mine warfare, and replenishment ships.

Versatility continues to be the hallmark of the Navy and Marine Corps. This year, maritime forces were moved rapidly between the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf for operations that ranged from war and peacekeeping in Kosovo to humanitarian relief for earthquake victims in Turkey.

The committee concluded that our Navy and Marine Corps forces are an inherently forward-deployed, combat credible, expeditionary force engaged in daily, round-the-clock operations to influence the world's security environment and support world-wide U.S. national security interests. The committee notes that in the 84 months that ended in September 1999, the Navy participated in 80 contingency operations around the world.

While there are insufficient funds to address all of the fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements identified by the service chiefs, the committee will continue to support efforts to identify, prioritize and take action within the constraints of the budget to fund the deficiencies identified by the Navy and Marine Corps. The committee will continue to highlight the risks associated with the budget constraints, and the resulting impact on the ability of our men and women of the armed forces to carry out their duties.

Strategic

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

On February 28, 2000, the Strategic Subcommittee held a hearing on national and theater missile defense programs. Based on this hearing, the committee concluded that the DOD continues to pursue a funding-constrained ballistic missile defense (BMD) program. Although the committee is pleased by Department's decision to substantially increase funding for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, the Strategic Subcommittee found that all of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's major defense acquisition programs remain under-funded. The committee recommends substantial increases in funding for ballistic missile defense programs and technologies, including the NMD program for risk reduction.

On March 8, 2000, the Strategic Subcommittee held a hearing on national security space issues. The committee identified a number of areas in which budget constraints have caused DOD to insuffi-

ciently fund key space programs and technologies. The committee also identified key areas of space technology development that require additional support, as addressed in detail elsewhere in this report.

One of the key findings of the Kosovo after-action reviews was that intelligence processing and dissemination does not always meet the requirements of warfighting forces. The committee has initiated efforts to provide funding and other assistance to ensure that relevant intelligence products are provided to military forces in a timely manner. In particular, the committee recommends funding increases for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency to improve the imagery tasking, processing, exploitation and dissemination process.

Department of Energy National Security Programs

The committee has responsibility for oversight and authorization of over two thirds of the Department of Energy's budget, including the National Nuclear Security Administration; weapons activities; defense environmental management; other defense activities; and defense nuclear waste disposal. The committee also authorizes funds for the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, an independent agency responsible for external oversight of safety at DOE defense nuclear facilities.

The committee held the first congressional hearing to assess the programs of the newly-established National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The committee identified a number of critical issues that must be addressed by the Congress, the Secretary of Energy, and the new NNSA administrator. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has failed to fully comply with the National Nuclear Security Administration Act, which was signed into law by the President as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Pubic Law 106–65).

In the area of weapons activities, the committee remains concerned that the Department has not prepared the long-term program or funding plan for the stockpile stewardship and management program, as directed last year by Congress. The committee notes that the DOD provides a FYDP plan to Congress each year with the annual budget request. The committee believes that DOE should provide comparable budgetary information to Congress.

The committee is concerned with the speculative nature of the science-based stockpile stewardship program. The committee received testimony from the three weapons laboratory directors that it may be as long as 15 years before the DOE stockpile stewardship program can be evaluated as an acceptable substitute for underground nuclear testing.

The committee remains concerned that the Department is moving too slowly in re-establishing pit manufacturing and tritium production capabilities. The committee further notes that the Department has not established any long-term requirements or plans for modernization of its aging weapon production plants.

In the area of environmental management, the DOE continues to make progress in focusing its resources on closure of a limited number of sites and facilities. However, the committee remains concerned that the request for science and technology development continues to decline, despite the Department's increased reliance

on the application of innovative technologies at cleanup sites. The committee notes that the fiscal year 2001 request for technology development is the lowest in over eight years. The committee believes that a vigorous research and development program must be maintained if the Department is to meet its accelerated cleanup and closure goals.

The committee remains deeply concerned with proposals to establish a new, external regulation regime for DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee does not support such efforts. The committee notes that the only DOE defense facility to be placed under regulation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) required almost $500.0 million and three years to establish a new licencing process. The committee believes that placing additional DOE facilities under NRC regulation would not be beneficial or cost-effective. Such moves would waste scarce cleanup funds and jeopardize the pace of cleanup at DOE facilities. The committee believes that the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) continues to provide comparable, independent safety oversight for all DOE defense nuclear facilities with an annual budget of less than $20.0 million a year.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 2001 was $305.3 billion, of which $305.3 billion was for programs that require specific funding authorization.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2001 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 that 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 related to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totaling $309.8 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution.

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
DIVISION A					
TITLE I					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,323,262	426,400	1,749,662	1,323,262	1,749,662
Missile Procurement, Army	1,295,728	86,600	1,382,328	1,295,728	1,382,328
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,874,638	240,500	2,115,138	1,874,638	2,115,138
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,131,323	93,000	1,224,323	1,131,323	1,224,323
Other Procurement, Army	3,795,870	272,700	4,068,570	3,795,870	4,068,570
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army					
Operation & Maintenance	607,200	(607,200)	0	607,200	0
Procurement	121,900	(121,900)	0	121,900	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	274,400	(274,400)	0	274,400	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,963,858	782,100	8,745,958	7,963,858	8,745,958
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,434,250	45,700	1,479,950	1,434,250	1,479,950
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,649	67,100	496,749	429,649	496,749
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	12,296,919	603,157	12,900,076	12,296,919	12,900,076
Other Procurement, Navy	3,334,611	43,700	3,378,311	3,334,611	3,378,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,171,935	9,100	1,181,035	1,171,935	1,181,035
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,539,602	428,769	9,968,371	9,539,602	9,968,371
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	638,808	28,000	666,808	638,808	666,808
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,061,715	(55,800)	3,005,915	3,061,715	3,005,915
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,699,127	25,400	7,724,527	7,699,127	7,724,527
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,275,308	(90,700)	2,184,608	2,275,308	2,184,608
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense-Wide					
Operation & Maintenance		607,200	607,200	0	607,200
Procurement		121,900	121,900	0	121,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation		274,400	274,400	0	274,400
Procurement, Defense Health Program	290,006	0	290,006	0	0

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	3,300	0	3,300	0	0
Total Procurement	60,563,409	3,005,726	63,569,135	60,270,103	63,275,829
TITLE II					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946	5,260,346	5,461,946
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865	8,476,677	8,665,865
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836	13,685,576	13,927,836
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142	10,238,242	11,052,142
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	201,560	21,500	223,060	201,560	223,060
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	37,862,401	1,468,448	39,330,849	37,862,401	39,330,849
TITLE III					
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,123,731	(95,200)	19,028,531	19,123,731	19,028,531
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,300,154	(46,000)	23,254,154	23,300,154	23,254,154
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,705,658	40,900	2,746,558	2,705,658	2,746,558
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,346,977	42,100	22,389,077	22,346,977	22,389,077
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,920,069	53,500	11,973,569	11,920,069	11,973,569
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,521,418	5,000	1,526,418	1,521,418	1,526,418
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	960,946	5,000	965,946	960,946	965,946
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	133,959	5,000	138,959	133,959	138,959
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859	1,885,859	1,890,859
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,182,335	40,000	3,222,335	3,182,335	3,222,335
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,446,375	4,500	3,450,875	3,446,375	3,450,875
Office of the Inspector General	144,245	0	144,245	147,545	147,545
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	0	8,574	8,574	8,574
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	0	389,932	389,932	389,932
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	0	294,038	294,038	294,038

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	0	376,300	376,300	376,300
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	23,412	0	23,412	23,412	23,412
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	186,499	0	186,499	186,499	186,499
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	836,300	9,000	845,300	836,300	845,300
Defense Health Program	11,310,423	91,300	11,401,723	11,600,429	11,691,729
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	458,400	0	458,400	458,400	458,400
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	64,900	(9,500)	55,400	64,900	55,400
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	25,000
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	4,100,577	0	4,100,577	4,100,577	4,100,577
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	108,746,081	150,600	108,896,681	109,039,387	109,189,987
REVOLVING FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Fund	916,276	0	916,276	916,276	916,276
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	0	388,158	388,158	388,158
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)	0	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)	0	0	0	(210,000)	(210,000)
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	1,154,434	0	1,154,434	944,434	944,434
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	109,900,515	150,600.0	110,051,115	109,983,821	110,134,421
TITLES IV-V-VI					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel	75,801,666	(169,400.0)	75,632,266	75,801,666	75,632,266
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	897,938	(116,859)	781,079 *	897,938	781,079
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	63,949	817,371	753,422	817,371
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	232,522	763,491	530,969	763,491
Military Construction, Defense-wide	784,753	(98,420)	686,333 **	784,753	686,333

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001
(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	122,499	181,629	59,130	181,629
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	111,627	161,806	50,179	161,806
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	10,784	92,497	81,713	92,497
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	16,103	21,988	38,091	16,103	38,091
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	17,822	32,673	14,851	32,673
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369	1,174,369	1,174,369
NATO Infrastructure	190,000	0	190,000	190,000	190,000
Total Military Construction	4,553,427	365,912	4,919,339	4,553,427	4,919,339
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	56,200	218,306	162,106	218,306
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	(19,911)	958,364	978,275	958,364
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	362,822	24,052	386,874	362,822	386,874
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	882,638	(1,071)	881,567	882,638	881,567
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	23,664	247,147	223,483	247,147
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	(18,846)	807,425	826,271	807,425
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	44,886	0	44,886	44,886	44,886
Total Family Housing	3,480,481	64,088	3,544,569	3,480,481	3,544,569

* *Reflects projects previously authorized in PL 106-65 (Fiscal Year 2000, Defense Authorization Act)*

** *Reflects reduction of FOLs proposed in the FY 00 Congressional Emergency Supplemental*

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

National Nuclear Security Adminstration					
Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800	4,594,000	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Secruity Actitivities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035	1,583,635	1,542,035
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824	4,551,527	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0	1,082,297	0

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	BA Implications Request	BA Implications Senate
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	515,000	0	515,000	515,000	515,000
Other Defense Actitivities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322	555,122	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	0	112,000	112,000	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000	17,000	17,000
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)	(85,000)	(85,000)
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0	140,000	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500	18,500	18,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481	13,084,081	12,760,481
Recapitulation					
Department of Defense (Division A)	284,127,991	4,455,374	288,583,365	283,917,991	288,373,365
Department of Defense (Division B)	8,033,908	430,000	8,463,908	8,033,908	8,463,908
Net Other Funds	5,000	(5,000)	0	532,451	527,451
Transfer Authority sec 1001 [Memo Entry]	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Offsetting Receipts		0	0	(1,485,000)	(1,485,000)
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	292,166,899	4,880,374	297,047,273	290,999,350	295,879,724
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481	13,084,081	12,760,481
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	48,000	(48,000)	0	1,250,000	1,202,000
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	305,298,980	4,508,774	309,807,754	305,333,431	309,842,205

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE I			
PROCUREMENT			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,323,262	426,400	1,749,662
Missile Procurement, Army	1,295,728	86,600	1,382,328
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,874,638	240,500	2,115,138
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,131,323	93,000	1,224,323
Other Procurement, Army	3,795,870	272,700	4,068,570
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army			
Operation & Maintenance	607,200	(607,200)	0
Procurement	121,900	(121,900)	0
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	274,400	(274,400)	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,963,858	782,100	8,745,958
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,434,250	45,700	1,479,950
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,649	67,100	496,749
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	12,296,919	603,157	12,900,076
Other Procurement, Navy	3,334,611	43,700	3,378,311
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,171,935	9,100	1,181,035
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,539,602	428,769	9,968,371
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	638,808	28,000	666,808
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,061,715	(55,800)	3,005,915
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,699,127	25,400	7,724,527
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,275,308	(90,700)	2,184,608

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense-Wide			
Operation & Maintenance		607,200	607,200
Procurement		121,900	121,900
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation		274,400	274,400
Procurement, Defense Health Program	290,006	0	290,006
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	3,300	0	3,300
Total Procurement	60,563,409	3,005,726	63,569,135

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Chemical demilitarization program (sec. 107)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide funding for chemical demilitarization in a Department of Defense (DOD) budget line. The budget request for the Army included $1.0 billion for the Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction (CAMD) Program: $607.2 million for operations and maintenance; $121.9 million for procurement; and $274.4 million for research and development.

Section 1521 (f) of title 50, United States Code, states that funds for this program shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department, but shall be set forth in the budget of the DOD as a separate account. The committee is concerned that funds for this program continue to be included in the Army budget accounts, despite the clear and direct statutory requirement to the contrary. Funding for this program should not be balanced against Army modernization plans or funding of continued military operations in the Balkans.

SUBTITLE B-ARMY PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
1	ARL (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	-	-	3	24,300	3	24,300
3	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR/ACS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ROTARY						
4	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	6	81,205	20	196,300	26	277,505
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(16,554)	-	-	-	(16,554)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,127	-	-	-	22,127
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
6	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	22,626	-	-	-	22,626
7	ARL MODS	-	6,553	-	-	-	6,553
8	AH1F MODS	-	423	-	-	-	423
9	AH-64 MODS	-	18,516	-	-	-	18,516
10	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	117,083	-	-	-	117,083
11	CH-47 ICH	-	57,630	-	-	-	57,630
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	26,200	-	-	-	26,200
13	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	11,903	-	-	-	11,903
14	OH-58 MODS	-	462	-	-	-	462
15	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	-	752	-	-	-	752
16	LONGBOW	-	744,846	-	158,000	-	902,846
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,392)	-	-	-	(35,392)

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	35,000	-	-	-	35,000
18	UH-1 MODS	-	4,297	-	-	-	4,297
19	UH-60 MODS	-	3,021	-	-	-	3,021
20	KIOWA WARRIOR	-	41,816	-	35,000	-	76,816
21	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	-	60,042	-	-	-	60,042
23	ASE MODS (SIRFC)	-	4,487	-	-	-	4,487
24	ASE MODS (ATIRCM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	GATM	-	10,073	-	-	-	10,073
26	MODIFICATIONS < $5.0M	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
27	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	-	15,167	-	-	-	15,167
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
28	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
29	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	13,900	-	13,900
30	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	11,926	-	-	-	11,926
31	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	3,490	-	5,900	-	9,390
32	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	74,144	-	-	-	74,144
33	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,419	-	-	-	1,419
34	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
35	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(7,000)		(7,000)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,323,262		426,400		1,749,662
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
1	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	7	29,801	-	-	7	29,801
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
2	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY (MYP)	2,200	296,962	-	-	2,200	296,962
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(11,599)	-	-	-	(11,599)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	3,754	387,959	-	-	3,754	387,959
4	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(15,711)	-	-	-	(15,711)
5	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
6	MLRS ROCKET	-	9,413	-	-	-	9,413
7	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	66	188,689	-	-	66	188,689
8	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	-	15,044	100	77,400	100	92,444
9	ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY	55	230,334	-	-	55	230,334
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	3,547	-	-	-	3,547
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
11	PATRIOT MODS	-	22,929	-	-	-	22,929
12	STINGER MODS	-	21,838	-	15,200	-	37,038

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
13	AVENGER MODS	-	6,828	-	-	-	6,828
14	ITAS/TOW MODS (MYP)	-	64,562	-	-	-	64,562
15	MLRS MODS	-	16,499	-	-	-	16,499
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	20,785	-	-	-	20,785
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	-	2,394	-	-	-	2,394
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	-	969	-	-	-	969
19	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	-	1,341	-	-	-	1,341
20	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	-	3,144	-	-	-	3,144
21	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(6,000)		(6,000)
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,295,728		86,600		1,382,328
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	-	5,331	-	-	-	5,331
2	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	-	359,389	-	-	-	359,389
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,006	-	-	-	20,006
4	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	-	12,098	-	-	-	12,098
5	HAB TRAINING DEVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
6	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	-	14,038	-	-	-	14,038
7	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	-	10,504	-	-	-	10,504
8	MEDIUM ARMORED VEHICLE FAMILY: MAVF	-	537,077	-	-	-	537,077
9	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
10	CARRIER, MOD	-	45,111	-	50,000	-	95,111
11	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	-	31,898	-	-	-	31,898
12	BFVS SERIES (MOD)	-	37,142	-	-	-	37,142
13	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	-	8,060	-	-	-	8,060
14	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	-	5	-	-	-	5
15	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	-	68,385	-	-	-	68,385
16	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	-	-	-	108,000	-	108,000
17	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	-	-	77,000	-	77,000
18	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	1,692	-	-	-	1,692
19	AVLB SLEP	-	15,252	-	(15,200)	-	52
20	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	36,098	-	-	-	36,098
21	M1A1D RETROFIT	-	891	-	-	-	891
22	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	16	36,149	-	-	16	36,149
23	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	551,828	-	-	-	551,828
24	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(213,406)	-	-	-	(213,406)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	174,445	-	-	-	174,445
25	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
26	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	135	-	-	-	135

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
27	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	9,250	-	-	-	9,250
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
28	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,196	12,449	-	-	1,196	12,449
29	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	-	-	4,280	18,300	4,280	18,300
30	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	581	11,835	386	8,100	967	19,935
31	M16 RIFLE	10,314	4,793	-	-	10,314	4,793
32	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	230	3,085	-	-	230	3,085
33	5.56 CARBINE M4	8,309	5,190	-	-	8,309	5,190
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
34	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,813	-	-	-	1,813
35	M4 CARBINE MODS	-	2,504	-	1,300	-	3,804
36	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	-	9,956	-	-	-	9,956
37	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)	-	495	-	-	-	495
38	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	-	3,507	-	-	-	3,507
39	M119 MODIFICATIONS	-	4,705	-	-	-	4,705
40	M16 RIFLE MODS	-	9,592	-	-	-	9,592
41	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	787	-	-	-	787
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
42	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,182	-	-	-	1,182
43	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	5,152	-	-	-	5,152
44	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	3,604	-	-	-	3,604
45	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	3,506	-	-	-	3,506
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SPARES						
46	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	29,105	-	-	-	29,105
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(7,000)		(7,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,874,638		240,500		2,115,138
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	-	97,758	-	-	-	97,758
2	CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	873	1,337	-	-	873	1,337
3	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	-	8,990	-	-	-	8,990
4	CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM993	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,487	-	-	-	2,487
6	CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	10,646	-	-	-	10,646
8	CTG CAL .50 API MK211 MOD 0	254	1,987	-	-	254	1,987
9	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,004	-	-	-	2,004
10	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	57,780	-	-	-	57,780
11	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	-	9,517	-	6,000	-	15,517
12	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	-	60,788	-	-	-	60,788
13	NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	5	8,397	-	-	5	8,397
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
14	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	-	28,673	-	5,000	-	33,673
15	CTG 81MM INFRARED (IR) ILLUM XM816	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
16	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	24	930	-	-	24	930
17	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE M931	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/MO FUZE	62	45,031	8	6,000	70	51,031
19	CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE M929 W/MO FUZE	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	26	24,969	-	-	26	24,969
	TANK AMMUNITION						
22	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	87	48,477	-	-	87	48,477
25	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	199	101,512	-	-	199	101,512
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
26	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	40	1,807	-	-	40	1,807
27	CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000
29	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CTG ARTY 105MM M927	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	-	130	-	-	-	130
32	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	-	14,682	-	-	-	14,682
33	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	-	14,907	-	-	-	14,907
35	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADA	117	47,674	-	-	117	47,674
36	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	175	35,178	-	10,000	175	45,178
37	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	164	27,432	-	20,000	164	47,432

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
38	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	-	67,005	-	-	-	67,005
	MINES						
39	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	-	3,892	-	-	-	3,892
40	MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	58	7,284	127	16,000	185	23,284
	ROCKETS						
42	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	-	152,767	-	-	-	152,767
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
44	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	16,603	-	-	-	16,603
45	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	20,260	-	-	-	20,260
46	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	13,067	-	-	-	13,067
47	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	3,053	-	-	-	3,053
	MISCELLANEOUS						
48	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	6,750	-	-	-	6,750
49	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	-	4,298	-	-	-	4,298
50	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	10,145	-	-	-	10,145
51	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	9,476	-	-	-	9,476
52	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	5,118	-	-	-	5,118
53	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	-	5,764	-	-	-	5,764
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
54	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	47,748	-	-	-	47,748

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
55	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,215	-	-	-	3,215
56	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	12,267	-	-	-	12,267
57	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	84,799	-	-	-	84,799
58	ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,719	-	20,000	-	24,719
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(5,000)		(5,000)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,131,323		93,000		1,224,323
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	374	12,135	-	-	374	12,135
3	SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,912	-	-	24	1,912
4	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	-	30,213	-	-	-	30,213
5	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	376	20,010	-	-	376	20,010
6	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	67	6,147	-	-	67	6,147
7	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	1,002	110,746	-	-	1,002	110,746
8	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	19	5,208	-	-	19	5,208
9	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	-	438,256	-	77,900	-	516,156
10	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPM	-	14,830	-	-	-	14,830
11	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	-	166,119	-	-	-	166,119
12	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	20	13,453	-	-	20	13,453
13	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	-	42,989	-	-	-	42,989
14	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
15	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	94	17,233	-	-	94	17,233
16	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SL	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	LINE HAUL ESP	362	27,054	-	-	362	27,054
18	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	28,910	-	-	-	28,910
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	-	1,853	-	-	-	1,853
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
20	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	12	2,263	-	-	12	2,263
21	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	35	834	-	-	35	834
22	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	989	-	-	-	989
23	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,021	-	12,500	-	13,521
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
24	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
27	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	13,096	-	-	-	13,096
28	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	5,553	-	-	-	5,553
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
29	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP	-	72,034	-	-	-	72,034
30	SHF TERM	-	38,307	-	-	-	38,307
31	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	3,475	-	-	-	3,475
32	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	21,439	-	-	-	21,439
33	SMART-T (SPACE)	-	48,594	-	(20,000)	-	28,594

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
34	SCAMP (SPACE)	-	4,261	-	-	-	4,261
35	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	-	9,286	-	-	-	9,286
36	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	1,489	-	-	-	1,489
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
37	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	10,355	-	-	-	10,355
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
38	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	-	32,675	-	32,600	-	65,275
39	SINCGARS FAMILY	-	18,340	-	-	-	18,340
40	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	-	972	-	-	-	972
41	ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	-	113,951	-	74,000	-	187,951
42	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	-	3,348	-	-	-	3,348
43	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONIC	-	4,374	-	-	-	4,374
44	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	-	2,459	-	-	-	2,459
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
45	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	1,744	-	-	-	1,744
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
46	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	11,051	-	-	-	11,051
47	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	-	54,374	-	-	-	54,374
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
48	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	2,025	-	-	-	2,025
49	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	3,945	-	-	-	3,945
50	ARMY DISN ROUTER	-	4,339	-	-	-	4,339
51	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	431	-	-	-	431
52	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	-	2,865	-	-	-	2,865

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	57,779	-	-	-	57,779
54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	18,836	-	-	-	18,836
55	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	65,975	-	-	-	65,975
56	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	-	65,412	-	-	-	65,412
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
57	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	869	-	-	-	869
58	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	19,604	-	-	-	19,604
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
59	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	66,671	-	-	-	66,671
60	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	183	26,753	-	-	183	26,753
61	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	-	9,571	-	-	-	9,571
62	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	4	37,789	-	-	4	37,789
63	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	-	66,415	-	-	-	66,415
64	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
65	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	44	20,030	-	-	44	20,030
66	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILIT	-	12,853	-	-	-	12,853
68	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS	-	2,833	-	-	-	2,833
69	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
70	TROJAN (TIARA)	-	4,264	-	-	-	4,264
71	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	224	-	-	-	224
72	CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA	404	1,939	-	-	404	1,939
73	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA)	-	484	-	-	-	484

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
74	SHORTSTOP	-	-	-	-	-	-
75	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	-	2,311	-	-	-	2,311
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
76	FAAD GBS	2	24,188	-	7,300	2	31,488
77	TARGET LOCATION OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
78	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	-	34,146	-	48,000	-	82,146
79	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYST	77	46,156	-	-	77	46,156
80	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	-	1,199	-	-	-	1,199
81	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	1,664	35,348	-	-	1,664	35,348
82	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	-	8,040	-	-	-	8,040
83	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-	14,405	-	-	-	14,405
84	PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (P	-	-	-	-	-	-
85	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-	18,530	-	-	-	18,530
86	DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	1,660	60,802	-	-	1,660	60,802
87	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (L	29	7,093	-	-	29	7,093
88	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	73	1,652	-	-	73	1,652
89	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	36	7,341	-	-	36	7,341
90	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	7	7,018	-	-	7	7,018
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
91	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-	17,260	-	-	-	17,260
92	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	54,452	-	-	456	54,452
93	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-	972	-	-	-	972
94	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	333	27,411	-	-	333	27,411

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
95	FAAD C2	2	17,868	-	14,300	2	32,168
96	FAADC2I MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (A	-	4,859	-	-	-	4,859
98	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	-	17,153	-	-	-	17,153
99	STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33	19,084	17	8,000	50	27,084
100	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	-	1,010	-	-	-	1,010
101	LOGTECH	-	7,505	-	-	-	7,505
102	TC AIMS II	-	10,376	-	-	-	10,376
103	GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	92	8,410	-	-	92	8,410
104	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	-	26,558	-	-	-	26,558
105	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	176	22,935	-	-	176	22,935
106	STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	-	40,015	-	-	-	40,015
107	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	-	35,971	-	17,500	-	53,471
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
108	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	-	35,960	-	-	-	35,960
109	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	172,051	-	-	-	172,051
110	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	-	91,495	-	-	-	91,495
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
111	AFRTS	-	1,519	-	-	-	1,519
112	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	-	3,217	-	-	-	3,217
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
113	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	-	374	-	-	-	374
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
114	GEN SMK MECH:MTRZD DUAL PURP M56	48	11,369	-	-	48	11,369
115	GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	-	5,585	-	-	-	5,585
116	M6 DISCHARGER	-	-	-	-	-	-
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (SMOKE/OBSCURANT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
118	HEAVY DRY SUPT BRIDGE SYSTEM	4	19,224	-	-	4	19,224
119	RIBBON BRIDGE	-	15,669	-	-	-	15,669
120	FLOAT BRIDGE PROPULSION	5	1,942	-	-	5	1,942
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
121	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	2	688	-	-	2	688
122	METALLIC MINE DETECTOR, VEHICLE MOUNTED	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPM	-	5,206	-	-	-	5,206
124	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	-	993	-	-	-	993
125	BN COUNTERMINE SIP	-	7,442	-	-	-	7,442
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
126	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL UNITS (ECU)	150	6,348	-	-	150	6,348
127	FIRETRUCKS	-	-	-	-	-	-
128	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	-	12,580	-	-	-	12,580
129	FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	-	3,984	-	-	-	3,984
131	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	160	1,999	258	4,600	418	6,599
132	FORCE PROVIDER	3	22,263	-	-	3	22,263
133	FIELD FEEDING AND REFRIGERATION	-	11,976	-	-	-	11,976
134	AIR DROP PROGRAM	-	3,971	-	-	-	3,971

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
135	CAMOUFLAGE: ULCANS	-	-	-	-	-	-
136	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS-EQ)	-	1,909	-	-	-	1,909
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
137	FAMILY OF TANK ASSEMBLIES, FABRIC, COLLAPSI	-	2,489	-	-	-	2,489
138	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	7,120	-	-	-	7,120
139	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	-	13,516	-	-	-	13,516
140	PUMPS, WATER AND FUEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
141	HOSELINE OUTFIT FUEL HANDLING	50	5,878	-	-	50	5,878
142	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	-	5,618	-	-	-	5,618
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (POL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
144	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	40,727	-	-	-	40,727
145	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WATER EQ)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	-	31,567	-	-	-	31,567
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
147	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	169	9,650	-	-	169	9,650
148	WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	144	6,042	-	-	144	6,042
149	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	-	5,078	-	-	-	5,078
150	STEAM CLEANER, TRAILER MOUNTED	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
151	MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING	-	1,489	-	-	-	1,489
152	ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	70	4,671	80	5,000	150	9,671
153	COMPACTOR, HIGH SPEED	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
154	LOADERS	5	1,444	-	-	5	1,444
155	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	35	8,282	-	-	35	8,282
156	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	34	14,146	18	7,000	52	21,146
157	CRANES	-	6,089	-	-	-	6,089
158	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
159	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	-	89	-	-	-	89
160	CONST EQUIP SLEP	-	1,986	-	-	-	1,986
161	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	-	2,635	-	-	-	2,635
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
162	SMALL TUG	-	-	-	-	-	-
163	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON	-	-	-	-	-	-
164	LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	LOGISTICS SUPPORT VESSEL (ESP)	1	6,638	-	-	1	6,638
166	CONTAINERIZED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
167	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	-	17,227	-	-	-	17,227
168	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 89 FOOT	-	-	-	-	-	-
169	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	-	6,722	-	-	-	6,722
	GENERATORS						
170	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	-	85,886	-	-	-	85,886
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
171	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER, 53,000 LBS	77	40,031	-	-	77	40,031
172	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	196	24,407	-	-	196	24,407
173	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	4	2,056	-	-	4	2,056
174	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)	-	1,231	-	-	-	1,231

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
175	CTC INSTRUMENTATION SUPPORT	-	81,845	-	-	-	81,845
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	-	91,937	-	-	-	91,937
177	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	-	81,160	-	-	-	81,160
178	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AV	-	14,744	-	-	-	14,744
179	FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	-	1,457	-	-	-	1,457
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
180	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	-	18,828	-	-	-	18,828
181	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	-	65,381	-	-	-	65,381
182	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	-	18,738	-	-	-	18,738
183	ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)	-	17,300	-	-	-	17,300
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
184	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	-	2,330	-	-	-	2,330
185	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	-	18,856	-	-	-	18,856
186	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)	-	-	-	-	-	-
187	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	-	7,399	-	-	-	7,399
188	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	-	28,008	-	-	-	28,008
189	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	-	2,367	-	-	-	2,367
190	BUILDING, PRE-FAB, RELOCATABLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
191	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	-	24,344	-	-	-	24,344
192	MA8975	-	2,332	-	-	-	2,332
193	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA1						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
194	INITIAL SPARES - TSV	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OPA2						
195	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	-	42,401	-	-	-	42,401
	OPA3						
196	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	-	639	-	-	-	639
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(16,000)		(16,000)
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		3,795,870		272,700		4,068,570
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	274,400	-	(274,400)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	121,900	-	(121,900)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	607,200	-	(607,200)	-	-
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY		1,003,500		(1,003,500)		-

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

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Army to enter into multiyear procurement contracts for the Bradley A3 Infantry Fighting Vehicle, the UH–60L Blackhawk helicopter, and the CH–60S Seahawk helicopter. For the Bradley A3 Infantry Fighting Vehicle, the multiyear procurement authority is for a period not to exceed three years, beginning in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes the Army is scheduled to complete the initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) of the Bradley A3, and a subsequent milestone III review in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2000. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the Army successfully completes the IOT&E and milestone III review prior to awarding the multiyear contract.

Army transformation (sec. 112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the objective force process, that describes the following:

(1) operational environments envisioned for the objective force;

(2) threat assumptions for objective force research and development efforts;

(3) potential operational and organizational concepts for the objective force;

(4) anticipated Key Performance Parameters (KPPs) and emerging requirements that will ultimately be reflected in a future operational requirements document (ORD) for the objective force;

(5) program schedule and projected research and development and procurement funding required to support proposed transformation activities through fiscal year 2012, and identification of specific adjustments made to Army programs in both the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and extended planning program to fund the transformation initiative and summarize anticipated investments by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in programs designed to lead to the fielding of a future combat system;

(6) joint warfighting requirements that will be supported by the fielding of the objective force, including a description of planned adjustments to war plans of the regional commanders in chief;

(7) changes to current strategic and tactical lift requirements resulting from the creation and fielding of objective forces; and

(8) the evaluation process that will support future decisions on the course of the transformation initiative leading to the objective force, including a description of operational evaluations and experimentation that will be used to validate the KPPs and ORD requirements associated with objective forces.

In addition, the committee has recommended additional funding, described elsewhere in this report, to support near-term acceleration of the future combat system research and development effort.

The Army has begun an effort to transform itself to meet the new security challenges that the nation faces today. The committee

agrees that the Army needs to transform into a lighter, more lethal, survivable and tactically mobile force. The committee believes that the Army must begin the transformation process and applauds the recognition that the force must be better positioned to meet the significant defense challenges in an uncertain and troubling future. It is clear that these challenges will require our armed services to think and act differently than in the past. The committee recognizes that the Army must be able to provide a mix of light, medium, and heavy forces. Future intervention scenarios will call for different capabilities, requiring that the Army be able to respond to a variety of national security missions, including mechanized warfare, defense of humanitarian sanctuaries, and peace enforcement.

The committee has a long history of supporting Army efforts to transform itself through the advanced warfighting experiment (AWE) process, the Army after next (AAN) activity, and the digitization initiative. The committee has also supported Army modernization activities that the Army later decided to terminate, including the armored gun system (AGS), liquid propellant technology for Crusader, Wolverine, Grizzly, Command and Control Vehicle, Prophet Air, Stinger Block II, and Army Tactical Missile System Block IIA.

The committee realizes that the Army has had several false starts and traveled up several "blind alleys" in pursuit of reforms since the end of the Cold War. The Chief of Staff of the Army also realizes that many previous "reforms" have only lasted as long as the tenure of the proponent Army Chief of Staff. He has said that he wants to achieve "irreversible momentum for change" so that the Army will continue on a path to the new objective force even after his tenure as Chief of Staff.

The committee commends the Chief of Staff for the actions he has taken to begin to transform the Army into a force more relevant to the diverse defense challenges of the new millennium. To achieve these reforms, the Army will have to implement innovative changes to force structure, modernization plans, and spending priorities.

The committee wants to support the Army's current efforts to achieve "irreversible momentum for change," but the committee wants to ensure this momentum is along the proper path, not another "blind alley." The best way to ensure that a transformation process will be reversed by future Army leadership is to start down the wrong path.

The committee strongly agrees with recommendations from a fiscal year 1999 Army Science Board Summer Study report on Enabling Rapid and Decisive Strategic Maneuver for The Army Beyond 2010, which included the following recommendations that:

(1) Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) experiment with alternative, available equipment and recommend, within 12 months, needed procurements;

(2) TRADOC and XVIII Airborne Corps develop split- based support options, to include necessary organizational redesign;

(3) The Army conduct an expeditionary experiment (possibly Joint Contingency Force AWE) and examine within 24 months improvements in early entry deployment and capability; and

(4) TRADOC examine both traditional platform centric solutions as well as non traditional "ensemble" solutions for future combat systems. Army concept experimentation is needed.

The committee finds the recommendations of the Army Science Board compelling.

The committee believes that the Army's transformation process must focus on the objective force, first and foremost. However, the committee notes that the current Army plans do not adequately address how, or if, the Army Science Board recommendations will be implemented.

The committee, therefore, directs the Army to establish a process of operational analysis, experimentation, and platform demonstrations that will serve to determine optimum organizational structures, equipment types and numbers, and operational concepts for the objective force. The committee directs that the Army fully integrate this process with the joint experimentation activities conducted by the Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Consistent with the committee's view that the objective force must be preeminent in the planning process, the committee believes that the interim capability adjustments that the Army is intending to pursue must not displace the attention and resources appropriate for the objective force. Army forces continue to age precipitously because the Army has not been able to afford sufficient modernization to support even the current force structure. Absent significant additional investment, the situation will only grow worse. The committee recognizes that the Army modernization program has not competed well for resources within the Department of Defense budget process. This fact alone makes it clear that the Army can ill afford a major misstep in pursuing the goal of transformation.

While pursuing the objective force capability, the Army must also focus on how it reforms in the mean time. The committee notes that there is great merit in Army plans to transform one heavy and one light brigade into a medium brigade configuration. The Army effort involves fielding interim brigade combat teams (IBCT) designed to bridge a perceived near-term capability gap. Actions designed to field IBCT's are focused on requirements for medium weight forces that are strategically deployable with a combat capability that exceeds those capabilities provided by existing light forces. The committee agrees that such a reconfiguration is necessary to provide insights into force structure, equipment, and tactics alternatives for full-spectrum operations while optimizing these forces for the challenges of peacekeeping.

In context of very limited resources, however, the committee believes that Army cannot afford to establish an interim medium force capability when the primary aim is to serve as a rotational peacekeeping force. The committee believes that an effective evaluation of alternatives and review of equipment evaluation data are critical to making informed funding decisions. The Army must further define and validate interim force operational concepts, force structure, equipment requirements, and funding alternatives before making acquisition commitments beyond the two brigades described in the Chief of Staff's transformation implementation letter. As the IBCT effort is clearly designed to provide an interim capa-

bility, the committee believes that life cycle cost factors should be a primary consideration in determining equipment solutions for IBCT requirements.

While the committee understands the established Army goal to achieve commonality among medium combat vehicle types and the perceived need for momentum, these should not be the primary objectives. Principal objectives should include: (1) focusing on fielding the objective force; and (2) ensuring that interim medium forces are formed based on least-cost alternatives that lead to the most combat ready and cost effective solution that ensures successful operations in a broad range of environments. The committee believes it is possible that the Army may already have equipment in the inventory that could meet the requirements established for the interim force and allow the service to focus more of its resources on developing the objective force.

Current acquisition policy requires the services to first explore the potential for existing equipment to meet emerging mission requirements. The use of existing equipment could allow the Army to avoid expensive new equipment acquisition costs, as well as a requirement to establish a new logistical support system that would result from the fielding of new equipment. The committee recognizes that the Army does not own a mobile gun system (MGS) that could meet IBCT requirements. Fortunately, the requirement for a MGS is relatively small. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army appears to be preparing to select a mobile gun system without conducting a performance and reliability evaluation of candidate systems.

Therefore, the committee believes it essential that the Army conduct an operational evaluation of alternative systems that explores, at a minimum, measures of operational and cost effectiveness between medium armored vehicles already in the Army inventory compared with any new system selected to meet IBCT requirements. The committee recognizes that this evaluation will be in addition to actions the Army has already identified in the acquisition strategy report for interim armored vehicles.

The committee's recommended provision would also support, on a track parallel to the objective force development activity, the fielding of three interim brigades through fiscal year 2003. This provision would provide guidance on analysis required to support the fielding of IBCTs and establish two additional reporting requirements for the results of that analysis. Moreover, the committee has supported the full budget request for the Army's plan to field a new armored vehicle family in the IBCTs.

The first report would be required to describe the Army's plans for conducting the side-by-side comparison of existing versus new hardware implementations. The provision would require that the Secretary of the Army:

> (1) provide a report, no later than February 1, 2001, on plans to conduct an operational analysis of medium armored combat vehicles that will be selected later in fiscal year 2000 to meet IBCT infantry battalion requirements compared with medium armored vehicles currently found in the Army inventory. The assessment will determine cost and operational effectiveness differences between new and existing medium armored combat

vehicles, and will be made on a comparative basis with at least one infantry battalion fielded with existing medium armored vehicles similarly structured to IBCT infantry battalions;

(2) submit the plan to the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, for review and comment;

(3) include the comments of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation as an attachment to the Army report;

(4) describe how the results of the operational evaluation will guide future acquisition decisions for additional interim brigade combat team equipment; and

(5) identify specific adjustments made to Army programs in both the FYDP and extended planning program to fund interim force fielding requirements. The second report would include the Army's analysis of the results of the side-by-side comparisons. This would require that the Secretary of the Army provide the results of the comparative operational analysis to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2002. Additionally, the provision would require that the Secretary of Defense certify that the conclusions of the operational analysis contained in the second report support the Army's proposed acquisitions for additional IBCT equipment in fiscal year 2003 and beyond.

The provision would limit obligations of the fiscal year 2001 funds to 60 percent of the total amount authorized and appropriated for the new armored vehicle family until 30 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Army submits the first report to the congressional defense committees. The provision would also limit obligations of the funds for fiscal year 2002 funds provided for the fielding of a second IBCT to 60 percent of the amount authorized and appropriated for the new armored vehicle family until 30 days after the date in which the Secretary of the Army submits the second report on the conclusions of the operational analysis.

The committee does not intend to impede current Army IBCT fielding plans, but believes that the comparative operational analysis will serve to strengthen the transformation process and might ultimately accelerate the fielding of future brigades at lower costs. The Army cannot be confident that what it is buying is what it needs, absent normally required testing and evaluation. The Army transformation process cannot afford more false starts.

OTHER ARMY PROGRAMS

Army Aircraft

Utility aircraft

The Army budget request included no funding for fixed-wing, medium range, utility aircraft, but these aircraft were included on the Army's unfunded priorities list. This aircraft is used for small unit movements to remote airfields, and is necessary to replace an aging system. The committee recommends an increase of $24.3 million for the procurement of three UC–35 aircraft.

UH–60 Blackhawk

The budget request included $81.2 million to procure six UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters. The committee has watched with great interest actions taken to revise an inadequate Army aviation modernization plan. While the committee still has several outstanding concerns about the overall viability of the Army plan, it is pleased to note decisions taken by the Army to retire both AH–1 Cobra and UH–1 Huey helicopters as soon as practicable. This action will ultimately result in a pure fleet of UH–60L Blackhawk helicopters for both active and reserve component utility helicopter requirements. These aircraft will provide a more capable fleet and support crew rotation requirements associated with military operations across the spectrum of conflict. The committee understands that the difficult decisions taken to address utility helicopter requirements have resulted in an increased requirement for UH–60L Blackhawk aircraft. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $196.3 million to procure 20 UH–60L aircraft, a total authorization of $277.5 million. The committee does not support the acquisition of UH–60Q medical evacuation helicopters in fiscal year 2001. Current Army plans call for the acquisition of these aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2002. The committee expects the Army to address outstanding UH–60L Blackhawk requirements in future budget requests.

Longbow

The budget request included $744.8 million for the acquisition of AH–64D Apache Longbow helicopters. The committee recognizes the AH–64 Apache helicopter as the most advanced and lethal attack helicopter in the world. The committee notes with concern that there is a range of known problems associated with the AH–64 Apache attack helicopter that have existed for the last several years. Program delays in providing for required improvements to correct system component deficiencies has, in part, resulted in aircraft groundings and serious questions about the long-term reliability of these critical aircraft. The committee applauds actions taken by the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army to thoroughly review and consolidate outstanding issues associated with the Apache program and address these deficiencies in a corrective action program. The committee recognizes that the Army had already identified a significant unfunded requirement to provide upgrades to existing critical components for fielded aircraft. In light of lessons learned from the operation in Kosovo and critical warfighting requirements that depend on the future viability of AH–64 aircraft, the committee believes it is essential to pursue immediate action designed to ensure the viability of these aircraft. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $158.0 million to support critical component upgrades, as identified in the Army's unfunded requirements list, a total authorization of $902.8 million for the Apache Longbow program. The committee expects the Army to budget for any additional upgrades that may be required after the ongoing program review is completed.

Kiowa Warrior

The budget request included $41.8 million for Kiowa Warrior upgrade requirements. The committee strongly supports actions intended to improve the nature and scope of training currently provided for Army aviators. The committee notes the significant action taken by the Army in the recently revised aviation modernization plan to address deficiencies in the training base associated with the Army aviation center at Fort Rucker, Alabama. New Army training plans will provide more flight training for new aviators and a corresponding need for additional TH–67 training aircraft. These aircraft have been identified as a near-term unfunded requirement for the Army. The committee supports this effort and recommends an increase of $35.0 million to procure 19 TH–67 aircraft, a total authorization of $76.8 million for the Kiowa Warrior line.

Avionics support equipment

The budget request included no funding for avionics support equipment. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for AN/AVS–6 (ANVIS) helmet mounted night vision devices. The committee has consistently supported the capability of the armed forces to operate effectively at night and during periods of reduced visibility. The committee recommends an increase of $13.9 million to procure 1,603 ANVIS devices to meet outstanding Army aviation requirements.

Aircrew integrated systems

The budget request included $3.5 million for aircrew integrated system equipment requirements. The committee was pleased to note the development of advanced laser eye protection (ALEP) visors produced through a Joint Service program designed to address battlefield eye protection requirements for military aviators. The committee supports this effort and believes these visors should be fielded to Army aviators as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $5.9 million for aircrew integrated systems, to procure 12,640 ALEP visors, a total authorization of $9.4 million.

Army Missile

Army tactical missile system-system summary

The budget request included $15.0 million for Army tactical missile system (ATACMS) fielding and production line shutdown. The committee notes a critical unfunded requirement for additional ATACMS block IA missiles necessary to meet the Army acquisition objective. Additionally, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has identified a requirement for additional ATACMS block IA missiles on the unfunded requirements list. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $77.4 million to procure 100 ATACMS block IA missiles necessary to meet war reserve, a total authorization of $92.4 million.

Stinger modifications

The budget request included $21.8 million for Stinger missile modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for

additional Stinger block I missile modifications necessary to meet Force Package 3 and 4 fielding requirements. These block I missiles have improved performance against advanced countermeasures and improved the accuracy of the Stinger system. The committee recommends an increase of $15.2 million to procure 651 Stinger block I missiles, a total authorization of $37.0 million.

Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles

Carrier modifications

The budget request included $45.1 million for M113 armored personnel carrier modifications. The committee notes the Army has over 17,000 M113 armored personnel carriers in the inventory today. The M113 has been in Army combat units for decades and requires upgrades necessary to improve mobility, reliability, and survivability. As these vehicles represent almost one-half of the tracked combat vehicle fleet, it is critical that they be upgraded as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million to modify 227 vehicles, a total authorization of $95.1 million.

Breacher system modification

The budget request included no funding for the Grizzly (M1 Breacher) system. The committee believes that critical mobility systems like the Grizzly armored engineer vehicle must be continued to correct critical operational shortfalls for deployed forces. Operations in Iraq, Somalia, and Bosnia continue to highlight the critical need for combat engineer equipment necessary to clear obstacles and support maneuver forces. The ability of our fast-moving M–1 Abrams tanks and M–2 Bradley fighting vehicles to operate successfully on the battlefield is dependant on the ability of these vehicles to maintain their momentum and speed of maneuver. Finally, the committee notes that a request for funds necessary to restore this program was one of the top Army unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $108.0 million to restore the Grizzly program. The committee expects the Army to ensure that this program is funded in future budget requests.

Heavy assault bridge system modifications

The budget request included no funding for the heavy assault bridge system modifications. The committee has noted with great concern decisions that terminated the effort to field the Wolverine heavy assault bridge. One of the major tenets of combat for our forces is movement at a rapid pace to ensure a decisive engagement that will result in the defeat of enemy forces. The Wolverine heavy assault bridge is a critical element on the battlefield to ensure the mobility of our forces. The committee believes that this program should be restored and that the armored vehicle launch bridge (AVLB) service life extension program (SLEP) effort should be terminated. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $77.0 million to restore the Wolverine heavy assault bridge program and a corresponding decrease of $15.2 million to the AVLB

SLEP program. The committee expects the Army to ensure that this program is funded in future budget requests.

Machine gun, squad automatic weapon

The budget request included no funding for the squad automatic weapon (SAW). The committee notes an outstanding requirement for an additional 4,280 weapons necessary to meet the Army procurement objective. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $18.3 million to procure 4,280 weapons and complete the acquisition of the SAW system, a total authorization of $18.3 million.

Mark-19 grenade launcher

The budget request included $11.8 million for Mark-19 grenade launchers. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional Mark-19 systems necessary to avoid a break in production prior to acquiring the total number of systems necessary to meet the acquisition objective. The committee recommends an increase of $8.1 million to procure 386 Mark-19 systems and avoid a break in production, a total authorization of $19.9 million.

M4 carbine modifications

The budget request included $2.5 million for M4 carbine modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional modular weapon systems (MWS) for the M4 carbine necessary to mount the weapons optical systems. The committee recommends an increase of $1.3 million to procure 7,201 MWS for the M4 carbine, a total authorization of $3.8 million.

Army Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Army

The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Chief of Staff of the Army identified a requirement of $242.9 million for ammunition programs that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. For the past several years, field commanders have expressed concern regarding the inadequate stocks of ammunition to support their training and war reserve requirements. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Army ammunition procurement:

Item	*Millions*
30 mm	$6.0
60 mm	5.0
105 mm M915	.15.0
120 mm M934	6.0
155 mm M107	10.0
MACS	20.0
Wide Area Munition	16.0
Subtotal	78.0

Armament retooling and manufacturing support initiative

The budget request included $4.7 million for the continuation of the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) program. The committee is aware this does not satisfy all proposals

that would reduce the operating costs of Army Ammunition plants. This program has had great success, saving the Army $37.0 million each year in program and operating costs, while preserving hundreds of jobs for skilled workers. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for this program. The committee expects these funds to be utilized in the most effective manner to ensure preservation of those facilities most likely to be required to fulfill the military's needs to support the national military strategy.

Other Army Procurement

Family of medium tactical vehicles

The budget request included $438.3 million to procure family of medium tactical vehicle (FMTV) trucks to replace an aging fleet of medium trucks found in the Army today. The Army has identified an unfunded requirement for additional FMTV trucks necessary to meet Force Package 2 fielding requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $77.9 million, to procure additional FMTV trucks necessary to accelerate the fielding of these trucks to reserve component units, a total authorization of $516.2 million.

Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team (WMD–CST) program. This funding will establish five additional WMD–CSTs and provide additional equipment for the WMD–CST program. The $25.0 million is authorized as follows: $3.2 million in military personnel; $7.5 million in Operations and Maintenance, Army; $1.8 million in Contamination Avoidance, Chemical Biological Defense Program, Procurement, Defense-Wide; and $12.5 million in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army.

The WMD–CSTs, formerly know as Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams, are comprised of 22 full-time National Guard personnel who are specially trained and equipped to deploy and assess suspected nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological events in support of local first responders. The committee recommends an increase of $21.0 million, included in the categories listed above, for the addition of five WMD–CSTs which will result in a total of 32 WMD–CSTs by the end of fiscal year 2001. The committee reaffirms the commitment it made last year to ultimately provide funding for the establishment of a WMD–CST in every state and U.S. territory.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million, included above in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army, for the purchase of two additional Unified Command Suites (UCS) and Mobile Analytical Labs (MALS) in order to provide the WMD–CST program with needed spare equipment. The committee is concerned that, under the Department of Defense's current plan for WMD–CSTs, no provision has been made to provide spare equipment for the teams. The committee understands that the spare UCSs and MALs that had been available for the initial 10 teams are being used to outfit the 17 teams authorized last year. Provision should be made for spare equipment to support a military capability that

must respond rapidly to a crisis. The committee also recommends an increase of $500,000, included above in Special Purpose Vehicles, Other Procurement, Army, for the purchase of 35 tactical mobility systems for use by the WMD–CSTs to improve survey operations of potentially contaminated areas by rapidly moving Reconnaissance and Survey teams. This system would also facilitate the expeditious recovery of WMD–CST response force personnel who may become casualties.

The committee also expresses some concerns with the WMD–CST program. First, the committee is concerned with the Department's failure to formulate a plan and provide funding to rapidly deploy WMD–CSTs to each state and U.S. territory as recommended in the January 1998 DOD report entitled "Department of Defense Plan for Integrating National Guard and Reserve Component Support for Response to Attacks Using Weapons of Mass Destruction". Second, the committee is concerned with the Department's delay in submitting the reprogramming request necessary to stand up the 17 WMD–CSTs authorized in fiscal year 2000. As a result of this delay, very little of the funding authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2000 for the 17 additional teams has been spent. Third, the committee is concerned with the Department's decision to locate a second WMD–CST in California, while many states do not have a WMD–CST. The committee believes that each state and territory should be provided with a WMD–CST before additional capabilities are provided to a single state.

The result of this behavior by the Department is that vast areas of the United States are currently not covered by WMD–CSTs. If the Department had acted swiftly to deploy the 27 teams previously authorized and appropriated by Congress, the committee would have been in a position to provide funding for more than five additional teams in fiscal year 2001. Given the growing terrorist threat to the United States, the committee is troubled by the lack of urgency on the part of the Department to fund and field these teams.

Secure mobile anti-jam reliable tactical terminal

The budget request included $48.6 million for the Secure Mobile Anti-jam Reliable Tactical Terminal (SMART–T), the Army's secure, multi-channel satellite terminal used with the Milstar satellite communications system. In its report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (S. Rept. 106–50), the committee noted significant developmental problems associated with the SMART–T program and cited a review by the Department of Defense Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, which concluded that ". . . the SMART–T is not operationally suitable," and which recommended temporary cessation of production while the Army and the contractor sought to solve the problems. Unfortunately, significant problems remain and the Army does not currently believe that these problems can be resolved in time to award the currently planned production option. SMART–T fielding has

been stopped pending the launch of the next Milstar II satellite. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in Army Other Procurement for SMART–T.

Army data distribution system

The budget request included $32.7 million for Army data distribution system (ADDS) requirements. The committee recognizes the critical role that the enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) plays in supporting Army digitization efforts. Future military operations will continue to demand more data throughput to meet the demands of a dynamic and complex battlefield. The Army has identified an opportunity to improve existing EPLRS systems that will ultimately result in five times the communications throughput currently available. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $5.3 million to support EPLRS software development requirements. The committee also notes that requirements for EPLRS equipment continues to grow as the Army works to digitize the force. The committee also recommends an increase of $27.3 million to procure 634 EPLRS systems and accelerate efforts to meet the Army acquisition objective for this system, a total authorization of $65.3 million for ADDS requirements.

Area common user system modification program

The budget request included $114.0 million for area common user system (ACUS) modification program requirements. The committee recognizes and supports ongoing efforts by the Army to digitize the force and enhance the situational awareness and warfighting effectiveness of our land forces. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for warfighter information network down-sized communications switches, which are mounted on high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles instead of the larger five ton trucks that housed older TTC–39D switching equipment. Additionally, the Army has additional requirements for high mobility DGM assemblages (HMDA) to support communications requirements for reserve component signal battalions. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure 27 down-sized communications switches and 229 HMDA devices. Additionally, the committee notes the successful use of TS–21 Blackjack facsimile machines throughout the force. The committee also recommends an increase of $14.0 million to accelerate the fielding of 2,901 TS–21 Blackjack secure facsimile machines. The committee recommends a total authorization of $188.0 million for the ACUS modification program.

Forward area air defense ground based sensor

The budget request included $24.2 million for forward area air defense (FAAD) ground based sensor (GBS) procurement. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement for additional Sentinel systems necessary to meet operational requirements and to obtain a minimum economic order quantity. The committee recommends an increase of $7.3 million, for a total authorization of $31.5 million, to support Sentinel production requirements and modifications for these critical systems.

Night vision

The budget request included $34.1 million for Army night vision devices. The committee has consistently supported night vision development and fielding efforts in recognition of service focus on night operations. The committee notes that the Army identified significant unfunded requirements for night vision devices in fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends the following increases:

(1) $18.1 million to procure 5,000 AN/PEQ–2A and 10,000 AN/PAC–4C target pointer/aiming lights;

(2) $14.9 million to procure 18,600 AN/PVS–7 night vision binoculars; and

(3) $15.0 million for 25mm image intensification tubes for AN/PVS–4 and AN/TVS–5 night vision weapon scopes.

The committee recommends a total authorization of $82.1 million for night vision devices.

Forward area air defense command and control

The budget request included $17.9 million for forward area air defense (FAAD) command and control (C2) requirements. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement to upgrade existing FAAD hardware and software to meet evolving threat capabilities and operational requirements and to enable full materiel release of air defense brigade and higher headquarters prototype FAAD C2 systems. The committee recommends an increase of $14.3 million to support identified requirements for additional FAAD C2 hardware and software upgrades necessary to ensure the full materiel release of prototype systems, a total authorization of $32.2 million.

Striker-command and control system

The budget request included $19.1 million for the Striker system. The committee notes the current budget request will only procure 33 Striker systems, which will result in an inefficient rate of production. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million to procure additional Striker systems and achieve an economic procurement level, a total authorization of 27.1 million.

Standard integrated command post system

The budget request included $36.0 million to procure standard integrated command post systems (SICPS). The committee notes an opportunity to complete the fielding of these important systems to force package two units and support critical fielding requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $17.5 million to procure additional SICPS, a total authorization of $53.5 million.

Lightweight maintenance enclosure

The budget request included $2.0 million to procure lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME) units. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for additional funding for LME units to maintain minimum sustaining rates (MSR) for production. The committee recommends an increase of $4.6 million to procure 258 LME units and to meet MSR requirements, a total authorization of $6.6 million.

Roller, vibratory, self-propelled

The budget request included $4.7 million for self-propelled vibratory roller systems. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to procure 80 vehicles necessary to meet the requirements of Army engineer units, a total authorization of $9.7 million.

Deployable universal combat earth mover

The budget request included $14.1 million for deployable universal combat earth movers (DEUCE). The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to procure 18 DEUCE vehicles, a total authorization of $21.1 million.

SUBTITLE C-NAVY PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	10	282,132	-	-	10	282,132
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(55,486)	-	-	-	(55,486)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	42	2,923,960	-	-	42	2,923,960
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(105,407)	-	-	-	(105,407)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	101,068	-	-	-	101,068
5	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	16	1,199,181	-	-	16	1,199,181
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(70,589)	-	-	-	(70,589)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	79,858	-	-	-	79,858
7	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	-	2,452	-	-	-	2,452
8	SH-60R	4	162,327	3	96,000	7	258,327
9	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	5	364,882	-	-	5	364,882
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(112,092)	-	-	-	(112,092)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	68,082	-	-	-	68,082
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
11	CH-60S (MYP)	15	238,457	3	63,000	18	301,457
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(73,386)	-	-	-	(73,386)
12	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	80,411	-	-	-	80,411
13	UC-35	-	-	6	48,600	6	48,600
14	C-40A	-	-	2	117,200	2	117,200

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
15	VP-3 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT	1	50,276	-	-	1	50,276
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
16	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	278,070	3	49,200	15	327,270
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,491)	-	-	-	(9,491)
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	5,142	-	-	-	5,142
18	JPATS	21	74,372	3	7,000	24	81,372
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
19	KC-130J	2	154,818	1	74,600	3	229,418
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
20	EA-6 SERIES	-	203,102	-	21,000	-	224,102
21	AV-8 SERIES	-	40,639	-	79,400	-	120,039
22	F-14 SERIES	-	30,481	-	-	-	30,481
23	ADVERSARY	-	6,947	-	-	-	6,947
24	F-18 SERIES	-	212,614	-	86,900	-	299,514
25	H-46 SERIES	-	16,556	-	-	-	16,556
26	AH-1W SERIES	-	9,758	-	4,000	-	13,758
27	H-53 SERIES	-	19,919	-	-	-	19,919
28	SH-60 SERIES	-	21,088	-	-	-	21,088
29	H-1 SERIES	-	2,642	-	27,500	-	30,142
30	H-3 SERIES	-	61	-	-	-	61
31	EP-3 SERIES	-	25,833	-	-	-	25,833

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
32	P-3 SERIES	-	60,710	-	87,200	-	147,910
33	S-3 SERIES	-	79,050	-	-	-	79,050
34	E-2 SERIES	-	18,485	-	-	-	18,485
35	TRAINER A/C SERIES	-	19,422	-	-	-	19,422
36	C-2A	-	2,596	-	-	-	2,596
37	C-130 SERIES	-	7,921	-	-	-	7,921
38	FEWSG	-	605	-	-	-	605
39	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	-	7,936	-	-	-	7,936
40	E-6 SERIES	-	60,687	-	-	-	60,687
41	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	-	7,632	-	-	-	7,632
42	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	-	4,134	-	-	-	4,134
43	T-45 SERIES	-	9,057	-	-	-	9,057
44	POWER PLANT CHANGES	-	17,062	-	-	-	17,062
45	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	41,889	-	-	-	41,889
46	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	-	71,620	-	9,300	-	80,920
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
47	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	941,553	-	11,200	-	952,753
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
48	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	312,411	-	-	-	312,411
49	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	8,642	-	-	-	8,642
50	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	13,015	-	-	-	13,015
51	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	37,088	-	-	-	37,088

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
52	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,158	-	-	-	12,158
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,508	-	-	-	1,508
54	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		7,963,858		782,100		8,745,958
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT II	12	472,859	-	-	12	472,859
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(38,927)	-	-	-	(38,927)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	28,801	-	-	-	28,801
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES			-	-		
3	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,232	-	-	-	1,232
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
4	TOMAHAWK	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	ESSM	36	40,001	-	-	36	40,001
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
6	AMRAAM	75	38,943	-	-	75	38,943
7	JSOW	636	171,624	180	36,000	816	207,624
8	SLAM-ER	30	27,859	-	-	30	27,859
9	STANDARD MISSILE	86	170,365	-	-	86	170,365
10	RAM	-	23,067	-	-	-	23,067
11	HELLFIRE	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
12	PENGUIN	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	AERIAL TARGETS	-	58,891	-	-	-	58,891
14	DRONES AND DECOYS	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	-	14,902	-	-	-	14,902
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
16	SIDEWINDER MODS	63	27,532	-	-	63	27,532
17	HARM MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	-	50,690	-	-	-	50,690
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
19	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	21,269	-	7,700	-	28,969
20	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	-	180,291	-	-	-	180,291
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,754)	-	-	-	(9,754)
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
22	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,723	-	-	-	2,723
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
23	ASW TARGETS	-	3,180	-	-	-	3,180
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
24	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	-	7,141	-	-	-	7,141
25	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	-	38,926	-	2,000	-	40,926
26	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	-	1,960	-	-	-	1,960
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
27	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	23,740	-	-	-	23,740

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
28	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	-	14,955	-	-	-	14,955
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
29	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,842	-	-	-	1,842
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
30	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	-	909	-	-	-	909
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
31	CIWS MODS	-	964	-	-	-	964
32	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
33	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	GUN MOUNT MODS	-	4,779	-	-	-	4,779
35	MODS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER						
36	PIONEER	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
38	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	53,486	-	-	-	53,486
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,434,250		45,700		1,479,950
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	63,157	-	20,000	-	83,157

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
2	JDAM	672	24,390	-	-	672	24,390
3	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	-	-	9,600	-	9,600
4	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	11,508	-	-	-	11,508
5	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,230	-	6,500	-	11,730
6	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	50,600	-	26,000	-	76,600
7	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	26,461	-	-	-	26,461
8	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,635	-	-	-	10,635
9	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	39,293	-	5,000	-	44,293
10	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	JATOS	-	4,995	-	-	-	4,995
12	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	-	14,948	-	-	-	14,948
13	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	5,723	-	-	-	5,723
14	CIWS AMMUNITION	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	8,733	-	-	-	8,733
16	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,176	-	-	-	5,176
17	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	8,745	-	-	-	8,745
18	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	6,378	-	-	-	6,378
19	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	7,317	-	-	-	7,317
20	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-
21	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	1,343	-	-	-	1,343
22	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300	-	-	-	1,300
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
23	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	23,456	-	-	-	23,456

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
24	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,039	-	-	-	2,039
25	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	40,945	-	-	-	40,945
26	.50 CALIBER	-	7,637	-	-	-	7,637
27	40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,034	-	-	-	2,034
28	60MM, ALL TYPES	-	688	-	-	-	688
29	81MM, ALL TYPES	-	4,981	-	-	-	4,981
30	120MM, ALL TYPES	-	7,633	-	-	-	7,633
31	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	3,931	-	-	-	3,931
32	9 MM ALL TYPES	-	2,657	-	-	-	2,657
33	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	8,358	-	-	-	8,358
34	STINGER SLEP	-	3,925	-	-	-	3,925
35	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	1,592	-	-	-	1,592
36	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	-	322	-	-	-	322
37	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	9,638	-	-	-	9,638
38	FUZE, ALL TYPES	-	249	-	-	-	249
39	NON LETHALS	-	4,480	-	-	-	4,480
40	AMMO MODERNIZATION	-	6,900	-	-	-	6,900
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	952	-	-	-	952
42	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
43	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300	-	-	-	1,300
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		429,649		67,100		496,749

SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY
OTHER WARSHIPS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	4,974,888	-	-	1	4,974,888
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(921,235)	-	-	-	(921,235)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	21,869	-	-	-	21,869
3	NEW SSN	1	2,019,503	-	-	1	2,019,503
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(816,491)	-	-	-	(816,491)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	508,222	-	-	-	508,222
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	705,228	-	-	-	705,228
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(1,787)	-	-	-	(1,787)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000
7	SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	210,414	-	-	1	210,414
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	72,277	-	-	-	72,277
9	DDG-51 (MYP)	3	2,795,581	-	-	3	2,795,581
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(82,022)	-	-	-	(82,022)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	356,843	-	143,157	-	500,000
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	460,000	-	460,000
12	LPD-17	2	1,489,286	-	-	2	1,489,286
12	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,700	-	-	-	20,700
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
14	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	ADC(X)	1	338,951	-	-	1	338,951
16	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	OUTFITTING	-	301,077	-	-	-	301,077
18	POST DELIVERY	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	LCAC SLEP	1	15,615	-	-	1	15,615
20	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	-	263,000	-	-	-	263,000
21	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		12,296,919		603,157		12,900,076
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	6,995	-	-	-	6,995
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	6,257	-	-	-	6,257
3	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	GENERATORS						
5	OTHER GENERATORS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PUMPS						
6	OTHER PUMPS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	PROPELLERS						
7	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	3,757	-	-	-	3,757

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
8	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
9	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	33,425	-	11,000	-	44,425
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
10	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	9,120	-	-	-	9,120
	PERISCOPES						
11	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	18,998	-	-	-	18,998
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
12	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	16,837	-	-	-	16,837
13	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	10,486	-	-	-	10,486
14	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	47,805	-	-	-	47,805
15	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,419	-	-	-	11,419
17	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	12,387	-	-	-	12,387
18	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	6,206	-	-	-	6,206
20	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	5,356	-	-	-	5,356
21	LCAC	-	3,559	-	-	-	3,559
22	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	16,589	-	-	-	16,589
23	HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	58,851	-	5,000	-	63,851
25	SURFACE IMA	-	2,010	-	-	-	2,010
26	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	4,852	-	-	-	4,852

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
28	REACTOR POWER UNITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	REACTOR COMPONENTS	-	203,365	-	-	-	203,365
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
30	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	-	5,649	-	-	-	5,649
31	EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SMALL BOATS						
32	STANDARD BOATS	-	2,696	-	-	-	2,696
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
33	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	3,302	-	-	-	3,302
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
34	OPERATING FORCES IPE	-	2,689	-	-	-	2,689
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
35	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	-	80,870	-	-	-	80,870
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
36	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
37	AN/SPS-49	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	RADAR SUPPORT	-	-	-	8,000	-	8,000
39	TISS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SHIP SONARS						
40	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	14,291	-	-	-	14,291
41	SSN ACOUSTICS	-	106,647	-	-	-	106,647

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
42	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	847	-	-	-	847
43	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
44	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	10,726	-	-	-	10,726
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
45	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	10,697	-	-	-	10,697
46	SSTD	-	-	-	-	-	-
47	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	29,869	-	-	-	29,869
49	SURTASS	-	5,516	-	-	-	5,516
50	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	6,213	-	-	-	6,213
51	CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
52	AN/SLQ-32	-	-	-	-	-	-
53	AN/WLR-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	3,901	-	-	-	3,901
55	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
56	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	-	61,524	-	-	-	61,524
57	COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
58	AN/WLQ-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	17,316	-	-	-	17,316
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
60	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
61	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	15,853	-	-	-	15,853
62	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	-	37,427	-	-	-	37,427
63	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCS	-	46,692	-	-	-	46,692
64	ATDLS	-	19,153	-	-	-	19,153
65	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	8,989	-	5,000	-	13,989
66	SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	16,863	-	-	-	16,863
67	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	9,607	-	-	-	9,607
68	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	9,046	-	-	-	9,046
69	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	15,356	-	-	-	15,356
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
70	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,341	-	-	-	1,341
71	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	21,390	-	-	-	21,390
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
72	MATCALS	-	4,294	-	-	-	4,294
73	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	7,945	-	-	-	7,945
74	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	18,510	-	-	-	18,510
75	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	30,549	-	-	-	30,549
76	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,705	-	-	-	6,705
77	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,124	-	-	-	5,124
78	FACSFAC	-	4,315	-	-	-	4,315
79	ID SYSTEMS	-	14,280	-	-	-	14,280
80	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
81	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	-	11,980	-	-	-	11,980
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
82	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	-	-	-	-	-	-
83	OSIS EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT (OED)	-	-	-	-	-	-
84	TADIX-B	-	32	-	-	-	32
85	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	2,735	-	-	-	2,735
86	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	-	-	-	-	-
87	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	-	47,022	-	-	-	47,022
88	RADIAC	-	8,308	-	-	-	8,308
89	GPETE	-	7,356	-	-	-	7,356
90	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,421	-	-	-	4,421
91	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
92	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	5,378	-	-	-	5,378
93	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,889	-	-	-	4,889
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
95	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
96	PORTABLE RADIOS	-	-	-	-	-	-
97	SINCGARS	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	-	185,143	-	-	-	185,143
99	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
100	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
101	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	-	30,909	-	-	-	30,909
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
102	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	-	31,433	-	-	-	31,433
103	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	-	77,957	-	-	-	77,957

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
104	ADVANCED VLF RECEIVER	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
105	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
106	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	-	252,695	-	-	-	252,695
107	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
108	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	-	2,460	-	-	-	2,460
109	NSIPS	-	1,785	-	-	-	1,785
110	JEDMICS	-	-	-	4,000	-	4,000
111	GCCS EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
112	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	-	176,132	-	-	-	176,132
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
113	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	-	46,563	-	-	-	46,563
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
114	SPECIAL DCP	-	14,964	-	-	-	14,964
115	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	-	17,188	-	-	-	17,188
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
116	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
117	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	-	-	-	-	-	-
118	AN/SSQ-53 (DIFAR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
119	PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	-	-	-	-	-	-
120	AN/SSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln		Request		Change		Recommed	
No	Title	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
121	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
122	AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
123	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
124	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	-	49,466	-	-	-	49,466
125	MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN $5 MILLIO	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
126	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,125	-	-	-	15,125
127	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	-	3,304	-	-	-	3,304
128	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	-	10,676	-	-	-	10,676
129	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	-	36,433	-	-	-	36,433
130	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	-	30,860	-	-	-	30,860
131	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	1,682	-	-	-	1,682
132	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	-	20,374	-	9,900	-	30,274
133	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	-	32,084	-	-	-	32,084
134	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
135	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,928	-	-	-	4,928
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
136	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	18,287	-	4,000	-	22,287
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
137	MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
138	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
139	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
140	NATO SEASPARROW	-	21,716	-	-	-	21,716

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
141	RAM GMLS	-	37,309	-	-	-	37,309
142	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	9,352	-	-	-	9,352
143	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	36,848	-	(17,500)	-	19,348
144	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	70,562	-	-	-	70,562
145	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,883	-	-	-	2,883
146	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	-	6,982	-	-	-	6,982
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
147	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,901	-	-	-	2,901
148	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	-	166,619	-	-	-	166,619
149	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	-	33,814	-	4,300	-	38,114
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
150	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	20,896	-	-	-	20,896
151	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	3,978	-	-	-	3,978
152	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,269	-	-	-	6,269
153	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,904	-	-	-	6,904
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
154	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	-	7,525	-	-	-	7,525
155	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET	-	-	-	-	-	-
156	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (CALIBRATION EQUIPMEN	-	-	-	-	-	-
157	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,613	-	-	-	5,613
158	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
159	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
160	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	7,941	-	-	-	7,941

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
161	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	31,557	-	-	-	31,557
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
162	ARMORED SEDANS	1	197	-	-	1	197
163	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	3	94	-	-	3	94
164	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
165	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	-	1,004	-	-	-	1,004
166	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	-	6,238	-	-	-	6,238
167	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	2,477	-	-	-	2,477
168	TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	10,458	-	10,000	-	20,458
169	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	-	51,615	-	-	-	51,615
170	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
171	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
172	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
173	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	22,154	-	-	-	22,154
174	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	3,433	-	-	-	3,433
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
175	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	7,646	-	-	-	7,646
176	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,196	-	-	-	5,196
177	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	4,081	-	-	-	4,081
178	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	-	144,885	-	-	-	144,885
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
179	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	1,562	-	-	-	1,562
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
180	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,592	-	-	-	15,592
181	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,076	-	-	-	2,076
182	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	7,386	-	-	-	7,386
183	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,993	-	-	-	15,993
184	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	25,003	-	-	-	25,003
185	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	22,247	-	-	-	22,247
186	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	9,629	-	-	-	9,629
	OTHER						
187	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
188	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	208,941	-	-	-	208,941
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		3,334,611		43,700		3,378,311
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	AAV7A1 PIP	170	83,372	-	-	170	83,372
2	RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM	-	4,930	-	-	-	4,930
3	LAV PIP	-	1,709	-	-	-	1,709
4	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	16	42,623	-	-	16	42,623
5	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	20,815	-	-	-	20,815

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
6	ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
7	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	3,891	-	-	-	3,891
8	ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER)	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	6,413	-	-	-	6,413
10	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLIO	-	415	-	-	-	415
	WEAPONS						
11	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	11,105	-	-	-	11,105
	OTHER SUPPORT						
12	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	-	1,347	-	-	-	1,347
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
13	EADS MOD	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	JAVELIN (MYP)	293	29,119	-	-	293	29,119
14	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS)	-	10,550	-	-	-	10,550
16	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	949	-	-	-	949
17	PREDATOR (SRAW)	698	43,355	-	-	698	43,355
	OTHER SUPPORT						
18	MODIFICATION KITS	-	3,598	-	-	-	3,598
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
19	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	4,714	-	-	-	4,714
20	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	8,241	-	-	-	8,241

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
21	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,960	-	-	-	11,960
23	MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	5,041	-	-	-	5,041
24	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	-	402	-	-	-	402
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
26	GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,676	-	-	-	4,676
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
27	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	14,351	-	2,700	-	17,051
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
28	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	-	8,320	-	-	-	8,320
29	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	-	80,656	-	-	-	80,656
30	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	-	9,507	-	-	-	9,507
31	MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	RADIO SYSTEMS	-	3,097	-	6,400	-	9,497
33	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	3,152	-	-	-	3,152
34	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	-	80,564	-	-	-	80,564
35	MOD KITS MAGTF C41	-	7,484	-	-	-	7,484
36	ITEMS < $2M MAGTF C41	-	-	-	-	-	-
37	ITEMS < $2M (OTHER)	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	-	3,152	-	-	-	3,152
39	INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	-	14,666	-	-	-	14,666
40	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	12,343	-	-	-	12,343

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
41	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	33	1,397	-	-	33	1,397
42	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	-	23,368	-	-	-	23,368
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
43	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	1,859	124,448	-	-	1,859	124,448
44	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (MYP)	2,027	325,582	-	-	2,027	325,582
45	LT TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT(LTVR)	-	-	-	-	-	-
46	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT						
47	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
48	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	12,684	-	-	-	12,684
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
49	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,809	-	-	-	3,809
50	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	2,704	-	-	-	2,704
51	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	-	7,651	-	-	-	7,651
52	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	-	655	-	-	-	655
53	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	9,325	-	-	-	9,325
54	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
55	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
56	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
57	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
58	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	5,317	-	-	-	5,317
59	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	5,741	-	-	-	5,741
60	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
61	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	36,311	-	-	-	36,311
62	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	5,846	-	-	-	5,846
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
63	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	1,914	-	-	-	1,914
64	TRAINING DEVICES	-	30,791	-	-	-	30,791
65	CONTAINER FAMILY	-	6,902	-	-	-	6,902
	OTHER SUPPORT						
66	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
67	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
68	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,591	-	-	-	5,591
69	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
70	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	25,382	-	-	-	25,382
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		1,171,935		9,100		1,181,035

CVNX–1 nuclear aircraft carrier program (sec. 121)

The budget request included $ 21.9 million for advance procurement and advance construction of long lead time components for CVNX–1. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure the nuclear aircraft carrier designated CVNX–1, and enter into a contract for the advance procurement and advance construction of that ship.

The Navy's long-term plan is to provide full funding for CVNX–1 in fiscal year 2006. There are a number of castings for the large machinery associated with an aircraft carrier propulsion plant that have a very long production lead time. To maintain the schedule for CVNX–1 and deliver these needed pieces of machinery as required by the construction sequence, the Navy needs to obligate funds for some of these components in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends an authorization of the $22.0 million in advance procurement included in the budget request.

Arleigh Burke-class destroyer program (sec. 122)

The authorization request included a provision to extend the DDG–51 multiyear procurement authorization contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–208). The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) authorize the Secretary of the Navy to extend the 1997 multiyear contract to include the fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005 DDG–51 procurements; (2) express that it is the sense of Congress that the most economical rate for procurement is three ships per year; and (3) direct the Secretary to update the *Arleigh Burke (DDG–51) Class Industrial Base Study of 1993* and the Comptroller General to review this update.

The budget request included $356.8 million for advance procurement for DDG–51 ships. The committee received information that indicated that providing $500.0 million in advance procurement funds for DDG–51 would maximize savings to the taxpayers for procurement of six ships over a two year period: fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

The Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) shows that the Navy plans to buy only two DDG–51 destroyers per year over a three year period (fiscal years 2002–2004) and two destroyers (one DDG–51 and one DD–21) in fiscal year 2005. The Navy's *Arleigh Burke (DDG–51) Class Industrial Base Study of 1993* stated that procurement of three destroyers per year could only sustain the destroyer industrial base if some additional, non-DDG–51 work, were available to each shipbuilder. The study also stated that at a rate of two ships per year, a very substantial amount of non-DDG–51 work would be required for each shipbuilder and risk to survival of one or both shipyards could be high.

The Navy testified that a proposal to build two DDG–51 ships per year would result in potential reductions in shipyard workforces and the workforce skill mix, and that maintaining the industrial base would be perilous. The committee concurred with the Navy's assessment regarding the industrial base at the time of the original study, and does not believe that the assumptions in

that study have changed enough to invalidate its conclusions for the situation the Navy faces today.

It is clear to the committee that stretching out this procurement will cause reductions in workforce skill mix that will result in higher costs for not only the DDG–51 ships, but also for other Navy work in the shipyards that build DDG–51 ships.

In fact, the budget request shows a dramatic cost increase of between $60.0 million and $100.0 million per ship when a projected procurement rate of two DDG–51 ships per year is computed. Therefore, buying six ships at a rate of two ships per year for three years will cost the taxpayers between $360.0 and $600.0 million more than buying the same ships over a two year period. The Navy appears to be willing to pay this premium in an attempt to partially accommodate the destroyer industrial base potential problems (as discussed above: three destroyers per year are required to maintain the industrial base) caused by delaying DD–21 one year.

The destroyer industrial base, which will also be required to build DD–21, should be maintained while maximizing cost savings to taxpayers by buying required ships at proven economical rates.

The Navy testified that the current shipbuilding budget is inadequate to recapitalize at the required rate to provide the number of ships needed to carry out the National Security Strategy. Therefore, the committee believes that every opportunity to save scarce ship construction funds should be considered. The Navy has documented over $1.4 billion in savings by buying three ships per year under the multiyear procurement authority provided by Congress. As discussed above, continuing the proven economical rate of three ships per year and use of multiyear authority would save additional taxpayer dollars on this program which the Navy intends to complete.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $143.2 million in advance procurement for DDG–51 to achieve the maximum savings for the taxpayer and to relieved some pressure on the underfunded shipbuilding account in future years.

The additional advance procurement, coupled with the savings to the taxpayer of buying six ships in two years instead of three years, should result in procurement of six ships on a two year multiyear contract for the approximate cost of five ships procured at a lower rate.

Virginia-class submarine program (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for up to a total of five *Virginia*-class submarines between fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2006. The provision would authorize the Secretary to continue the shipbuilder teaming arrangement authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). The provision would also authorize procurement of material in economic order quantity when cost savings to the taxpayers will result.

The current acquisition and construction strategies for the procurement of the first four *Virginia*-class submarines appears to be yielding positive results to date. However, the two shipbuilders have not yet completed the critical test of joining sections con-

structed in two separate shipbuilder facilities. In addition, the subsystems being developed by a number of subcontractors require continued oversight regarding cost and schedule excursions.

The committee notes the importance of the technology insertion approach of building submarines. This approach provides both the flexibility and opportunity to forward fit and refresh capabilities. Administration officials have supported this approach in testimonies before congressional committees.

Therefore, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with submission of the fiscal year 2002 President's budget to include the following:

(1) a plan for maintaining at least 55 attack submarines through 2015, and a plan for achieving a force of 18 *Virginia*-class submarines by 2015;

(2) assessments of savings to the program of production rates of two submarines per year, if that rate were to begin in fiscal year 2004 and construction were to continue at that rate in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter; and

(3) an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative contracting strategies including multiyear procurement and block buy with economic order quantity.

ADC(X) ship program (sec. 124)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to procure ADC(X)-class ships using the contracting authority most advantageous to the taxpayer. This ship program is important because ADC(X)-class ships will replace the auxiliary vessels that have the oldest average age in the active fleet.

The Navy intends to require at least two shipyards to construct ADC(X) class ships. The committee is concerned that this could result in higher risk in building, which could lead to delays and higher costs. The committee encourages the Navy to minimize the risks associated with constructing the ADC(X)-class ships.

Refueling and Complex Overhaul Program of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract and commence overhaul of the CVN–69 nuclear aircraft carrier during fiscal year 2001. The provision would also authorize the budget request of $703.4 million to commence the overhaul of CVN–69. The committee concurs with the Navy's intention to budget for nuclear aircraft carrier overhauls over a two year period and to commence the overhauls during the first year of authorization and appropriation of funds for that purpose.

OTHER NAVY PROGRAMS

Navy Aircraft

Airborne low frequency sonar

The budget request included $162.3 million for the procurement of four remanufactured SH–60R helicopters. The airborne low frequency sonar(ALFS) is a subsystem of the SH–60R. ALFS is a helicopter borne low frequency dipping sonar system that can be rapidly deployed from aircraft carriers and surface combatants to detect and track submarines both in blue water and the littorals.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for the procurement, installation, and spare parts for the ALFS resulting in a more efficient low rate initial production.

SH–60 helicopters

The budget request included $162.3 million for the procurement of four remanufactured SH–60R helicopters. The SH–60R remanufacturing scope includes the airframe, an avionics upgrade, service life extension and incorporation of engineering change proposals. It represents a significant improvement, providing the battle group with added protection in the coastal littorals and in regional conflicts. The Navy included the procurement of additional SH–60R helicopters on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $90.0 million for the procurement of three SH–60R helicopters.

CH–60 helicopters

The budget request included $238.5 million for the procurement of 15 CH–60S helicopters, less $73.4 million in advanced procurement from prior years. The primary roles of the CH–60S are to conduct vertical replenishment with external transfer of cargo and internal transfer of passengers ship-to- ship, ship-to-shore, and shore-to-ship, and to conduct day and night search and rescue. The Navy has included the procurement of additional CH–60S helicopters on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million for the procurement of three CH–60S helicopters.

UC–35 aircraft

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of UC–35 medium range operational support aircraft (OSA). The Navy and the Marine Corps intend to use this aircraft to modernize their OSA fleet. The Navy will purchase UC–35 aircraft to restore a portion of the capability that was lost when the Navy retired CT–39 aircraft without replacement. Both the Navy and the Marine Corps have included the requirement for UC–35 aircraft on their unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $48.6 million for the procurement of six UC–35 aircraft, three each for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

C–40A aircraft

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of C–40A aircraft, although additional C–40A procurement is sched-

uled in the Future Years Defense Program, and is included on the Navy unfunded requirements list. The C–40A is being procured as a replacement for the aging C–9 to provide intra-theater logistics essential to maintaining the readiness of forward- deployed naval forces. Funding has been provided for five C–40A aircraft to date, with deliveries scheduled to commence in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $128.4 million for the procurement of two C–40A aircraft, including $11.2 million for spare parts.

T–45 aircraft

The budget request included $278.1 million for the procurement of 12 T–45 Goshawk aircraft, less advance procurement of $9.5 million from prior years. The T–45 Goshawk training system consists of aircraft, simulators, and academic materials required to train carrier-based naval aviators. Additional T–45 aircraft are included on the Navy unfunded requirements list.

The committee is concerned that the current budget request indicates the Navy may shut down the production line for the T–45 before the service acquires suffient aircraft to offset attrition or accommodate any potential surge in pilot training rate. The committee recommends an increase of $49.2 million for the procurement of three T–45 aircraft, a total authorization of $327.3 million.

Joint primary air training system

The budget request included $74.4 million for 21 joint primary air training system (JPATS) aircraft for the Navy. The Navy has included additional JPATS aircraft on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the procurement of three JPATS aircraft for the Navy, a total authorization of $81.4 million.

KC–130J

The budget request included $154.8 million for the procurement of two KC–130J aircraft. The Marine Corps is facing a shortfall of aerial refueling aircraft as it uses up the remaining fatigue life of its KC–130F and KC–130R fleet. The Marine Corps has included the procurement of additional KC–130J aircraft on its unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $74.6 million for the procurement of one KC–130J aircraft, a total authorization of $229.4 million.

EA–6B aircraft automatic flight control system

The budget request included $203.1 million for modifications for the EA–6B aircraft. Although the budget request included no funds for automatic flight control systems (AFCS), a new AFCS for the EA–6B was included on the Navy unfunded priorities list. A new AFCS is required to replace the obsolete air navigation computer, and will provide the pilot with axis stability and attitude, speed, and altitude control. The new system will also improve reliability and maintainability for the EA–6B, the only tactical electronic jammer in use by the services. Heavily used in Operation Allied Force, the EA–6B is a high demand, low density platform. The

committee recommends an increase of $21.0 million for the procurement of EA–6B AFCS, a total authorization of $224.1 million.

AV–8B precision targeting pod

The budget request included $40.6 million for modifications to the AV–8B aircraft. The budget request included no funding for Litening II precision targeting pods, although they were included on the Marine Corps unfunded priorities list. The Litening II is a precision targeting system which allows the aircraft to acquire targets and deliver precision munitions. The Marine Corps currently has nine targeting pods on contract, funded through the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

Operation Allied Force demonstrated a continuing requirement for precision weapons and aircraft platforms capable of delivering them. The committee recommends an increase of $79.4 million to procure 47 Litening II precision targeting pods, a total authorization of $120.0 million in AV–8B aircraft modifications.

F–18 modifications

The budget request included $212.6 million for modifications to the F–18 aircraft, including $22.7 million for engineering change proposal 583 (ECP–583), which upgrades Marine Corps F/A–18A aircraft to a configuration with capabilities comparable to Lot 17 F/A–18C aircraft. This upgrade allows these F/A–18A aircraft to remain viable for use on the modern battlefield. Acceleration of this upgrade over what is currently included in the Future Years Defense Program is included in the Navy unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $86.9 million to upgrade 20 F/A–18A aircraft with ECP–583, a total authorization of $299.5 million.

AH–1W series

The budget request included $9.8 million for AH–1W series aircraft modifications. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for four additional night targeting systems (NTS) for reserve component AH–1W series aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million, necessary to complete the last four aircraft upgrades with NTS devices. The committee recommends a total authorization of $13.8 million for AH–1W series aircraft modifications.

H–1 series

The budget request included $2.6 million for H–1 series aircraft modifications.

The Marine Corps is fielding AN/AAQ–22 UH–1N navigation thermal imaging systems (NTIS) to support operational enhancements to fielded aircraft. The committee supports this effort and believes these modifications should be completed as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to procure an additional 28 NTIS upgrades for UH–1N aircraft.

The Marine Corps plans to begin the induction of existing UH–1N aircraft into the remanufacturing process which will convert older aircraft into the future four bladed "November" (4BN) configuration. Due to a shortage of existing aircraft in the operational

fleet, the Marine Corps will have to use aircraft from operating squadrons to start the contractor conversion program. The committee would prefer to avoid such an effect on the operating squadrons. The Marine Corps has informed the committee that there are aircraft currently housed in the aerospace maintenance and regeneration center (AMARC) that could be used to begin the conversion process instead. The committee recommends another increase of $17.5 million to reclaim and convert 14 aircraft from AMARC necessary to initiate the remanufacturing process without impacting operational units. The committee, therefore, recommends a total authorization of $30.1 million for H–1 series modifications.

P–3 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $60.7 million for modifications to the P–3 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $87.2 million in P–3 modifications for two modifications included on the Navy unfunded priorities list, a total authorization of $147.9 million.

The budget request included $31.6 million for installation of previously procured anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) kits, along with associated support items, but did not include the procurement of any additional AIP kits. The AIP modification allows the P–3 to combat emerging third world, limited operations, surface, subsurface, and air threats with simultaneous multi-mission capabilities, a capability proven in Operation Allied Force. The committee recommends an increase of $44.1 million for the procurement of three P–3 AIP kits.

The budget request included $17.7 million for the P–3C Update III common configuration program, also known as the block modification upgrade program (BMUP). This program provides modern processing systems for the mission computer and acoustics sensors to achieve a common P–3C configuration with improved performance. The committee recommends an increase of $43.1 million for the conversion of five aircraft with BMUP kits.

Tactical aircraft moving map capability

The budget request included $71.6 million for common avionics changes, but included no funding for installation of the tactical aircraft moving map capability (TAMMAC) in the F/A–18C/D aircraft. aircraft. TAMMAC is a modular hardware and software base system that helps the aircrew maintain situational awareness by providing a graphical presentation of the aircraft position and relative positions of targets, threats, terrain features, planned mission flight path, no fly zones, safe bases, and other objects. Funding for TAMMAC is included for the F/A–18C/D in the Future Years Defense Program, and it is included on the Navy unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $9.3 million to procure 80 TAMMAC units, the maximum annual rate for F/A–18C/D installations, a total authorization of $80.9 million for common avionics changes.

Navy Weapons

Joint standoff weapon

The budget request included $171.6 million for the procurement of 636 joint standoff weapons (JSOWs) for the Navy. The JSOW is a precision air-to-ground glide weapon capable of attacking a variety of fixed area targets in day, night, and adverse weather conditions. With the increased emphasis on the use of precision guided munitions demonstrated in Operation Allied Force, it is necessary to build up inventories of such weapons for use in contingencies. The committee recommends an increase of $36.0 million for the procurement of 180 JSOWs, a total authorization of $207.6 million.

Weapons industrial facilities

The budget request included $21.3 million for various activities at government-owned and contractor-operated weapons industrial facilities. The committee recommends an increase of $7.7 million to accelerate the facilities restoration program at the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory.

Mark 48 advanced capability torpedo modifications

The budget request included $16.4 million for Mark 48 advanced capability (ADCAP) torpedo modifications. The Mark 48 ADCAP torpedo is the primary anti-ship and anti-submarine weapon for the submarine fleet. However, torpedo modifications are required for effective operations in the littorals. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for Mark 48 ADCAP modifications to field this improved capability in the submarine fleet as soon as possible.

Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps

The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Commandant of the Marine Corps recently identified a requirement for $69.8 million for ammunition programs, and the Chief of Naval Operations identified a requirement for $5.0 million for air expendable countermeasures, that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness—for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Navy and Marine Corps ammunition procurement:

Item:	*Millions*
20 mm	3.0
25 mm	3.5
2.75" Rockets	9.6
MJU–52 Countermeasures	5.0
Subtotal	$21.1
Laser-guided bomb components	

The budget request included $63.2 million for the procurement of general purpose bombs, with $29.2 million for the procurement of laser-guided bomb components. Laser-guided bombs provide the ability to conduct precision attacks while minimizing collateral damage. Recent contingency operations have demonstrated the need for these weapons, and the Navy has included laser-guided bombs on its unfunded requirements list to augment critically low inventory levels. Operation Allied Force highlighted a dramatic increase in the percentage of precision guided munitions versus unguided munitions. The committee directs the Navy to create a separate line item for laser-guided bomb components in future budget submissions. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the competitive procurement of additional laser-guided bombs components, a total authorization of $83.2 million for general purpose bombs.

Training ordnance

The budget request included $50.6 million for practice bombs. The Navy unfunded priorities list includes a requirement for additional laser-guided bombs and associated ordnance to meet critical readiness and training needs. Recent contingency operations have highlighted a dramatic increase in the use of precision weapons. The committee directs the Navy to establish a separate line item for laser-guided bomb training ordnance in future budget submissions. The committee recommends an increase of $26.0 million for the procurement of additional laser guided bombs and associated ordnance to meet critical training and readiness requirements, a total authorization of $76.6 million for practice bombs.

Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion

Shipbuilding overview

The Navy and Marine Corps are a forward deployed force carrying out the National Security Strategy of shaping the international environment, responding to crises, and preparing for an uncertain future. Seventy percent of the world's population lives within 200 miles of coastline. The normal operating areas of Navy and Marine Corps forces, referred to as the littorals, thus have the potential to include numerous future hot spots around the world.

Navy and Marine Corps forces are an inherently forward deployed and combat credible expeditionary force engaged daily to influence the world's security environment and sustain our national security. Navy and Marine Corps forces do not rely on host country airfields, security, or lines of communication. Their capabilities range from humanitarian assistance and strengthening ties with other nations through international exercises to forcible entry and full scale war.

As was demonstrated in the past year, once forward deployed, Navy and Marine Corps forces respond immediately without extensive preparation time to a wide range of national tasks.

The committee has repeatedly received testimony that indicates the burden of inadequate force structure (ships and submarines) falls squarely on the shoulders of the men and women in uniform. The testimony indicates that even at the current fleet size of 316 ships, the Navy and Marine Corps have been ". . . stretched too thin." Under these circumstances, it is the people who man the ships that are being asked to bear a heavier burden to respond to more contingencies than envisioned when the Quadrennial Defense Review decided that a force of about 300 ships would be adequate.

In recognition of the long term view that must be taken for shipbuilding, section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the Secretary of Defense to submit no later than February 1, 2000, a report on the long-range shipbuilding requirements of the Department of Defense. The report is required to include a statement of the ship types and the annual investment required through 2030.

The Secretary did not submit the report on the date required by law. Although Congress still waits for the report, the committee received testimony from a representative of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) on the various analyses CRS has conducted on supporting Navy force levels. The CRS analyses concluded that an annual ship procurement investment of about $10.0 to $12.0 billion and a procurement rate of 8.7 to 10.2 ships per year are required to maintain a fleet of about 300 ships. The CRS estimates did not consider the requirements of, or resources for, strategic sealift ships which have previously been funded in the National Defense Sealift Fund.

Navy witnesses concurred with the CRS conclusions on the annual investment and annual procurement rates required to maintain the fleet. The committee also agrees with the CRS conclusions, but recognizes that a $10.0 to $12.0 billion annual investment alone will not ensure the nation has the ships required to carry out the National Security Strategy.

The committee recognizes there are a number of different approaches to funding shipbuilding in the long-term. One approach would be to defer near-term investment, allow the average age of the force to increase, and permit a large backlog of ship purchases to accrue. This would match the pattern of recent years: we have been building ships at a much lower rate than 8.7 ships per year. However, the committee recognizes that, for every year that we invest less than $10.0 to $12.0 billion and buy fewer than 8.7 ships, we will have to invest more than $10.0 to $12.0 billion and buy more than 8.7 ships in a future year. Continuing at rates that are too low could result in unattainable ship procurement funding levels and will inevitably increase the burden on our men and women in uniform.

The committee also recognizes that, in addition to attaining the required annual investment, the Department of Defense (DoD) should consider more innovative procedures to ensure shipbuilding procurement funds are leveraged to attain the most efficient and productive results. For example, the Navy was persuaded that initiating funding early for CVN'77 would result in protecting the required worker skill base at the shipyard and result in savings. These savings were verified by a Rand Corporation analysis. Multiyear commitment of funding for the DDG'51 program also resulted in over $1.4 billion in savings compared to a normal annual procurement strategy.

In addition, research and development for shipbuilding programs provides an opportunity to drastically lower the life-cycle costs of building, maintaining, and operating ships. Ship research and development is an investment in not only the required war fighting characteristics and capabilities, but also the economic feasibility of operating multi-purpose complex ships.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the DoD take the following actions to alter current budget practices to leverage scarce ship procurement funding when economic advantage or beneficial program stability can be achieved:

(1) include total ownership costs as an explicit independent variable when determining requirements for all future ship classes;

(2) maximize production efficiencies of economic order quantities for block buy and multiyear contract opportunities;

(3) maximize use of advance procurement to retain vendor base efficiencies and critical skill mix learning curve progress; and

(4) budget for auxiliary ships and strategic lift ships in the National Defense Sealift Fund.

The committee believes that the Navy should use specific criteria in evaluating the alternative budgeting approaches in items (2) through (4) above. These criteria are analogous to those specified for evaluating multiyear procurement programs in section 2306(b) of title 10, United States Code. These criteria include whether:

(1) the use of such alternative budgeting will result in savings in total contract costs;

(2) there is reasonable certainty that the need for the program will not change;

(3) there is reasonable expectation that the Navy will continue to budget for the program;

(4) the ship design is stable, and the technical risks are not excessive; and

(5) cost estimates are realistic.

The committee recommends action elsewhere in this report to increase the new ship procurement funding authorization to achieve potential savings of $1.1 billion in new ship construction and encourages the DoD to make the recommended budget process changes. The committee encourages the administration to submit legislative initiatives that would assist in leveraging shipbuilding research and development and procurement funding.

LHD–8 advance procurement

The budget request included LHD–8 advance procurement in fiscal year 2004 and full funding in fiscal year 2005 as part of the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP).

In the statement of managers accompanying the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (H. Rept. 105–736), Congress authorized $50.0 million for advance procurement of long lead materials for construction of LHD–8 in lieu of a future service life extension program for LHA–1. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) authorized the procurement and advance construction of components and authorized $375.0 million for that purpose as a confirmation that building LHD–8 was preferred to extending the life of LHA–1.

The Navy and Marine Corps included, as a priority, the $1.2 billion remaining cost for LHD–8 on their fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements priorities list.

The committee realizes that actual cost savings and price will depend on the final procurement funding profile.

The committee continues to be concerned that the FYDP plan would cause an unnecessary interruption of learning curve efficiencies and the loss of long-term vendor pricing economies. However, fiscal year 2001 advance procurement of LHD–8 would accomplish the following:

(1) save taxpayers between $500 and $630 million dollars by leveraging skilled labor force and vendor base efficiencies resulting from the continuous LHD construction for the past 16 years;

(2) provide the Marine Corps required warfighting improvements including landing craft, air cushion (LCAC) carrying capacity, improved ship stability, and enhanced communications capability;

(3) initiate life-cycle cost improvements for large deck amphibious ships including gas turbine main propulsion engines; and

(4) take action to address the annual shipbuilding investment required to maintain about 300 ships, mentioned elsewhere in this report, by spreading out the recapitalization of the five ships in the LHA–1 class which will turn 35 years old at a rate of one per year beginning in fiscal year 2011.

The committee reiterates its direction that the Navy structure any contract for LHD–8 to maximize these potential savings and to report same to the Congress. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $460.0 million to continue the advance procurement and advance construction of components for the LHD–8 amphibious ship.

Other Navy Procurement

AN/WSN–7 inertial navigation system

The budget request included $7.3 million for procurement of AN/WSN–7 ring laser inertial navigation systems. The AN/WSN–7 continuously and automatically determines and indicates a ship's position, attitude (heading, roll, and pitch), and velocity. This system replaces three legacy navigation systems and provides equipment commonality between surface combatants, submarines, and aircraft carriers. The annual operating cost of the AN/WSN–7 is projected to be only 10 percent of the cost of operating the legacy navigation systems it replaces. Therefore, accelerated procurement of the AN/WSN–7 could produce a substantial savings in maintenance costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to the budget request for the procurement and installation of additional AN/WSN–7 navigation sets.

Surveillance and security for military sealift ships

The budget request included no funding for thermal imaging surveillance and security for military sealift ships. Military sealift ships may operate independently in high threat areas. Thermal imaging capabilities could improve the ability of these ships to navigate and operate in reduced visibility while improving their overall self protection capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for thermal imaging surveillance and security pro-

curement and installation on Military Sealift Command (MSC) ships.

Integrated condition assessment system

The budget request included $11.3 million for integrated condition assessment system (ICAS) for ships. The ICAS is a system that electronically monitors the operating parameters of machinery and electronic systems, thus reducing man-hours spent taking readings on equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for procurement and installation of ICAS equipment for surface ships.

AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radar

The budget request included no funding for procurement and installation of AN/SPS–73(V) surface search radars which would replace a number of aging radars on surface ships with one radar. The AN/SPS–73(V) is a commercial off-the-shelf radar which provides surface ships with a reliable, lower maintenance and lower life-cycle cost surface search radar capability. To capture the reliability and life-cycle cost savings, the Navy is replacing aging surface ship radars with the AN/SPS–73(V). The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement and installation of AN/SPS–73(V) radars.

Side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers

The budget request included no funding for side-scanning sonar for forward deployed minesweepers. Commercial off-the-shelf high resolution side-scanning sonars are available that would enhance the ability of forward deployed minesweepers to detect and classify sea mines located on the bottom of the ocean floor. These sonars have been used by Navy units with great success in locating aircraft wreckage. The Navy's experience with these sonars provides the basis for developing operational expertise to apply this technology to the challenging task of detecting and classifying bottom sea mines.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the procurement and installation of a side-scanning sonar in a forward deployed minesweeper to enhance the ability to detect and classify bottom mines.

Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System

The budget request included no funds for the Joint Engineering Data Management and Information Control System (JEDMICS), the designated Department of Defense standard system for management, control and storage of engineering drawings. This system is designed as an open, client-server architecture and is nearing full deployment for global access to the data in its repositories. However, the JEDMICS data available is not fully accessible to all clients using the joint technical data environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for procurement, integration and accreditation surveys to ensure JEDMICS is fully compliant with the joint technical data environment.

Aviation life support

The budget request included $20.4 million for aviation life support equipment. The committee continues to support efforts designed to improve the ability of Marine Corps flight crews to operate their aircraft at night by providing the most capable night vision systems available. The committee recommends an increase of $9.9 million to procure additional AN/AVS–9 night vision goggles which offer significant improvements over existing AN/AVS–6 goggles, a total authorization of $30.3 million.

Gun fire control radar performance improvements

The budget request included $15.6 million for AN/SPQ–9B gun fire control equipment (GFCE) procurement, installation, and engineering change proposals. The AN/SPQ–9B radar interface is the primary gun fire control radar for surface ships. The AN/SPQ–9B GFCE program provides a low cost product improvement to support both surface and sea skimming target engagements. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to develop and field engineering change proposals to improve the performance of the SPQ–9B radar.

Cruiser smart ship

The budget request included $47.9 million for programs referred to as "smart ship" programs. Of this amount $22.5 million is for smart ship equipment procurement and logistics for Ticonderoga-class cruisers.

The Navy's goal in introducing smart ship programs was to leverage technology to reduce the workload on sailors at sea. Prior year authorizations of funds for the smart ship program were originally justified by expectations that hardware and software installation would enable subsequent manpower reductions. Unfortunately, for the past five years, program delays and software problems have resulted in little progress toward achieving the Navy's goal.

The Navy is currently testing version 11 of the software and has stated that version 12 is required prior to further test and evaluation. The damage control assistant flooding and counter flooding software developed by a fleet sailor almost six years ago on a laptop computer has yet to be introduced as part of the smart ship software for the fleet.

Installation of smart ship equipment has not yet resulted in any personnel savings. The Chief of Naval Operations has instituted a policy which requires a waiting period of one year with smart ship equipment aboard before the Navy will consider realizing any end strength savings. The justification for the smart ship program appears to be evolving to a basis of installing the equipment for a potential reduction of workload on sailors.

The committee recommends a decrease of $17.5 million for procurement of smart ship equipment. The committee will assess, during the review of the fiscal year 2002 budget request, the progress in testing and development of cruiser smart ship software and the results of the Navy's Smart Ship Steering Committee (SSSC). The SSSC is attempting to standardize procurement of hardware, software, and training for surface combatants, amphibious ships, aircraft carriers, and minesweepers.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $33.8 million for procurement and installation of the NULKA anti-ship missile decoy program. NULKA is a proven decoy against anti-ship missiles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million for the procurement of launcher systems and decoys to outfit the fleet with this key self-defense equipment.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million in the Navy operations and maintenance account for critical training on the NULKA system.

Civil engineering support equipment

The budget request included $10.5 million for light and medium duty tactical equipment used mostly by the Naval Construction Force (NCF), Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF), Naval Beach Group (NBG), and other special operating units. The light duty tactical vehicles are used for the movement of personnel and equipment. The medium tactical trucks are essential for rapid deployment of material to support combat construction of airfields, landing zones, road battle damage repair and rapid runway repair.

Heavy use of the equipment to support military and humanitarian assistance operations during the past decade have heavily strained the existing inventory of already over-aged civil engineering support equipment (CESE). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of civil engineering support equipment for the Naval Construction Force.

Marine Corps Procurement

Night vision

The budget request included $14.4 million for Marine Corps night vision equipment. The committee notes an outstanding requirement for the improved night/day fire-control observation device (INOD). The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million to procure INOD devices for the Marine Corps, a total authorization of $17.1 million for night vision devices.

Radio systems

The budget request included $3.1 million for Marine Corps radio system equipment. The committee notes outstanding requirements for additional enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS) equipment necessary to provide network data distribution capabilities and enhance situational awareness. The committee recommends an increase of $6.4 million for additional EPLRS systems necessary to meet requirements associated with the acquisition objective, a total authorization of $9.5 million.

SUBTITLE D-AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F-22 RAPTOR	10	2,428,637	-	-	10	2,428,637
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(278,755)	-	-	-	(278,755)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	396,222	-	-	-	396,222
3	F-15A	-	24,290	-	-	-	24,290
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(24,290)	-	-	-	(24,290)
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	F-16 C/D (MYP)	-	23,317	-	-	-	23,317
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(23,317)	-	-	-	(23,317)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
7	C-17 (MYP)	12	2,555,223	-	-	12	2,555,223
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(343,300)	-	-	-	(343,300)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	266,800	-	-	-	266,800
9	C-17 ICS	-	412,200	-	-	-	412,200
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
10	WC-130	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	EC-130J	-	-	1	90,000	1	90,000
12	C-130H	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	C-130J	2	208,051	-	-	2	208,051
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
14	JPATS	27	113,825	7	18,900	34	132,725
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
15	V-22 OSPREY	4	355,681	-	-	4	355,681
15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(19,915)	-	-	-	(19,915)
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	27,209	-	-	-	27,209
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
17	SMALL VCX	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	C-32A	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	C-32B FEST/DEST AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,548	-	-	27	2,548
21	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
22	TARGET DRONES	-	32,915	-	-	-	32,915
23	E-8C	1	296,342	-	-	1	296,342
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,732)	-	-	-	(35,732)
24	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	46,000	-	46,000
25	E-8C ICS	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	HAEUAV	-	22,388	-	(22,388)	-	-
27	PREDATOR UAV	7	22,078	-	-	7	22,078
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
28	B-2A	-	21,723	-	-	-	21,723

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
29	B-1B	-	48,793	-	-	-	48,793
30	B-52	-	8,425	-	12,000	-	20,425
31	F-117	-	32,005	-	-	-	32,005
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
32	A-10	-	33,891	-	11,200	-	45,091
33	F-15	-	258,247	-	74,900	-	333,147
34	F-16	-	248,830	-	119,500	-	368,330
35	T/AT-37	-	83	-	-	-	83
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
36	C-5	-	95,401	-	-	-	95,401
37	C-9	-	3,271	-	-	-	3,271
38	C-17A	-	97,124	-	26,400	-	123,524
39	C-21	-	1,883	-	-	-	1,883
40	C-22	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	C-32A	-	23,568	-	-	-	23,568
42	C-37A	-	376	-	-	-	376
43	C-141	-	737			-	737
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
44	T-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
45	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	1,949	-	-	-	1,949
46	T-38	-	120,520	-	-	-	120,520
47	T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	89	-	-	-	89
48	T-43	-	4,929	-	-	-	4,929
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
49	KC-10A (ATCA)	-	55,370	-	-	-	55,370
50	C-12	-	1,521	-	-	-	1,521
51	C-18	-	345	-	-	-	345
52	C-20 MODS	-	5,235	-	-	-	5,235
53	VC-25A MOD	-	98	-	-	-	98
54	C-130	-	91,524	-	-	-	91,524
55	C-135	-	328,232	-	-	-	328,232
56	DARP	-	165,540	-	3,000	-	168,540
57	E-3	-	88,654	-	-	-	88,654
58	E-4	-	31,559	-	-	-	31,559
59	E-8	-	33,389	-	-	-	33,389
60	H-1	-	3,535	-	-	-	3,535
61	H-60	-	23,648	-	-	-	23,648
62	OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	28,214	-	-	-	28,214
63	PREDATOR MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
64	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	16,729	-	-	-	16,729
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
65	AIRCRAFT SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	-	356,856	-	-	-	356,856
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
66	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQ & FACILITIES	-	177,943	-	-	-	177,943
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
67	A-10	-	-	-	-	-	-
68	B-2A	-	18,603	-	-	-	18,603
69	B-2B	-	42,700	-	-	-	42,700
70	C-5	-	-	-	-	-	-
71	C-130	-	1,365	-	-	-	1,365
72	E-4	-	1,463	-	-	-	1,463
73	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,267	-	-	-	7,267
74	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	25,464	-	-	-	25,464
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
75	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	25,352	-	-	-	25,352
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
76	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	43,015	-	46,200	-	89,215
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
77	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	398,474	-	27,800	-	426,274
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
78	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,836	-	-	-	4,836
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						
79	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	DARP						
80	DARP	-	98,410	-	8,000	-	106,410
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(32,743)		(32,743)
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		9,539,602		428,769		9,968,371
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS	-	11,466	-	28,000	-	39,466
2	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	2.75 IN ROCKET, FLARE IR	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CARTRIDGES						
5	CARTRIDGES	-	70,090	-	-	-	70,090
6	5.56 MM	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	30 MM TRAINING	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BOMBS						
12	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	32,731	-	-	-	32,731
13	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	30,745	-	-	-	30,745
14	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,400	-	-	-	1,400
15	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	GBU - 37	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	GBU-15	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	2000 LB HE BOMB MK-84	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
21	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	300	107,201	-	-	300	107,201
23	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	9,098	219,848	-	-	9,098	219,848
24	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	6,308	104,046	-	-	6,308	104,046
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
26	ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
27	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-
28	MJU-10B	-	-	-	-	-	-
29	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
30	CAD/PAD	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	LUU-19 FLARE	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	2,431	-	-	-	2,431
33	MODIFICATIONS <5M	-	196	-	-	-	196
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,806	-	-	-	7,806
	FUZES						
35	FLARES	-	37,432	-	-	-	37,432
36	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	-	9,342	-	-	-	9,342
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
37	SMALL ARMS	-	4,074	-	-	-	4,074
38	M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
39	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-
40	M-9 PISTOL	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		638,808		28,000		666,808
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	-	42,308	-	-	-	42,308
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
2	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	2,006	-	-	-	2,006
	TACTICAL						
3	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	174	90,828	-	-	174	90,828
4	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	-	96	-	-	-	96
5	AMRAAM	204	98,687	-	-	204	98,687
	TARGET DRONES						
6	TARGET DRONES	-	-	-	-	-	-
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
7	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,017	-	-	-	3,017
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER						
8	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	-	2,623	-	-	-	2,623
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
9	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	CONVENTIONAL ALCM	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
11	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	-	28,428	-	-	-	28,428
12	MM III MODIFICATIONS	-	375,129	-	-	-	375,129
13	AGM-65D MAVERICK	-	2,042	-	-	-	2,042
14	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	-	4,066	-	-	-	4,066
15	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	-	99	-	-	-	99
16	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $5.0M	-	99	-	-	-	99
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
17	MISSILE SPARES - REPAIR PARTS	-	44,026	-	-	-	44,026
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
18	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,736	-	-	-	25,736
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,765	-	-	-	9,765
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	-	196,937	-	(30,300)	-	166,637
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	13,404	-	-	-	13,404
22	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	1,478	-	-	-	1,478
23	INERTIAL UPPER STAGES(SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
24	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	-	68,582	-	-	-	68,582
25	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	-	106,356	-	-	-	106,356
26	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	-	22,770	-	-	-	22,770
27	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)	-	469,720	-	(10,000)	-	459,720
28	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	287,996	-	-	3	287,996
29	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	-	55,939	-	(10,000)	-	45,939
29	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
30	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	968,498	-	-	-	968,498
32	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	141,080	-	-	-	141,080
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(5,500)		(5,500)
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		3,061,715		(55,800)		3,005,915
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
1	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	16	254	-	-	16	254
2	STATION WAGON, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	BUSES	66	4,101	-	-	66	4,101
4	AMBULANCES	8	646	-	-	8	646
5	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	83	1,706	-	-	83	1,706
6	ARMORED SEDAN	1	200	-	-	1	200
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
7	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
9	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	-	-	-	-	-	-
11	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	-	17,593	-	-	-	17,593
12	TRUCK CARRYALL	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	5,869	-	-	-	5,869

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
14	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	-	13,435	-	-	-	13,435
15	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	TRUCK, UTILITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	CAP VEHICLES	-	768	-	-	-	768
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	29,235	-	-	-	29,235
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
19	HMMWV, ARMORED	-	5,586	-	-	-	5,586
20	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	-	5,042	-	-	-	5,042
21	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	18,373	-	-	-	18,373
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
22	TRUCK CRASH P-19	-	8,761	-	-	-	8,761
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	3,700	-	-	-	3,700
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
24	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	-	4,857	-	-	-	4,857
26	60K A/C LOADER	48	96,948	-	-	48	96,948
27	NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	34	24,144	-	-	34	24,144
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	4,530	-	-	-	4,530
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
29	TRUCK, DUMP	-	1,763	-	-	-	1,763
30	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQUIP	-	5,852	-	-	-	5,852
31	MODIFICATIONS	-	387	-	-	-	387
32	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	8,616	-	-	-	8,616
33	VEHICLE LEASES	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
35	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	-	23,346	-	-	-	23,346
36	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	491	-	-	-	491
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
37	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	-	-	-	-	-
38	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,572	-	-	-	1,572
39	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,530	-	-	-	5,530
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
40	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
41	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	58,663	-	-	-	58,663
42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	15,431	-	-	-	15,431
43	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST	-	33,515	-	-	-	33,515
44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	20,858	-	-	-	20,858
45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	602	-	-	-	602
46	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,447	-	-	-	1,447
47	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
48	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	74,771	-	-	-	74,771
49	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	14,753	-	-	-	14,753
50	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	8,495	-	-	-	8,495
51	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	34,519	-	-	-	34,519

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
52	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	26,003	-	20,000	-	46,003
53	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	1,584	-	-	-	1,584
54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	15,681	-	-	-	15,681
55	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
56	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	23,788	-	-	-	23,788
57	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	56,820	-	-	-	56,820
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
58	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
59	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	177,283	-	-	-	177,283
60	USCENTCOM	-	7,335	-	-	-	7,335
61	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	17,947	-	-	-	17,947
	DISA PROGRAMS						
62	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	9,112	-	-	-	9,112
63	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPAC	-	-	-	-	-	-
64	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	2,674	-	-	-	2,674
65	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	39,094	-	-	-	39,094
66	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	-	92,714	-	-	-	92,714
67	MILSATCOM SPACE	-	53,027	-	-	-	53,027
68	SPACE MODS SPACE	-	25,959	-	-	-	25,959
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
69	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	-	101,222	-	-	-	101,222
70	COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	-	3,104	-	-	-	3,104
71	RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	16,630	-	-	-	16,630
72	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	2,005	-	-	-	2,005

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
73	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	3,227	-	-	-	3,227
74	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	74,301	-	-	-	74,301
75	CAP COM & ELECT	-	386	-	-	-	386
76	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,204	-	-	-	7,204
	MODIFICATIONS						
77	COMM ELECT MODS	-	54,372	-	-	-	54,372
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
78	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	10,106	-	-	-	10,106
79	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	1,105	-	-	-	1,105
80	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,541	-	-	-	9,541
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
81	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	2,833	-	8,000	-	10,833
82	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	6,744	-	-	-	6,744
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
83	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	15,118	-	-	-	15,118
84	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,241	-	-	-	9,241
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
85	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	-	-	-	-	-
86	FLOODLIGHTS	-	10,718	-	-	-	10,718
87	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,187	-	-	-	7,187
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
88	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	15,171	-	-	-	15,171
89	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	17,025	-	-	-	17,025

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
90	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	941	-	-	-	941
91	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	1,838	-	-	-	1,838
92	BLADDERS FUEL	-	-	-	-	-	-
93	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
94	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	6,037	-	-	-	6,037
95	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	-	8,259	-	-	-	8,259
96	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	-	50,021	-	-	-	50,021
97	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
98	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	6,217	-	-	-	6,217
99	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	25,350	-	-	-	25,350
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
100	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	-	38,629	-	-	-	38,629
101	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	-	2,975	-	-	-	2,975
102	DARP RC135	-	12,785	-	-	-	12,785
103	DARP, MRIGS	-	89,049	-	-	-	89,049
104	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-	5,794,849	-	-	-	5,794,849
105	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	-	136,317	-	3,800	-	140,117
106	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	8,985	-	-	-	8,985
107	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	1,148	-	-	-	1,148
108	MODIFICATIONS	-	177	-	-	-	177
109	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	11,294	-	-	-	11,294
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
110	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	31,636	-	-	-	31,636

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT				(6,400)		(6,400)
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		7,699,127		25,400		7,724,527

Repeal of requirement for annual report on B–2 bomber aircraft program (sec. 131)

Since the B–2 bomber is no longer in production, the committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1373), as amended by section 141 of Public Law 104–106 (110 Stat. 213).

OTHER AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Air Force Aircraft

EC–130J

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of EC–130J aircraft, a high demand, low density asset. The EC–130 is used to conduct special missions such as psychological operations, civil affairs radio and television broadcasts, command and control countermeasures, and limited intelligence gathering. The Air Force is converting the inventory EC–130 aircraft to the EC–130J configuration. Procurement of additional EC–130J aircraft is on the Air National Guard unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $90.0 million for the procurement of one EC–130J aircraft.

Joint primary aircraft training system

The budget request included $113.8 million for the procurement of 27 joint primary aircraft training system (JPATS) aircraft. The Air Force has requested additional JPATS aircraft on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $18.9 million for the procurement of seven JPATS aircraft, a total authorization of $132.7 million.

Joint surveillance and target attack radar system

The budget request included no funding for advanced procurement of a 16th E–8C Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft or shutdown of the production line. Funding for either advance procurement or line shutdown was, however, included in the Air Force's unfunded requirements list.

JSTARS provides target information for pairing direct attack aircraft and standoff weapons against selected targets. JSTARS successfully supported Operation Allied Force. General Wesley Clark, Commander in Chief, Europe, in testimony before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, stated that if he were able to have more of anything in support of this operation, it would have been another JSTARS.

The last Quadrennial Defense Review, however, recommended the Air Force inventory objective of JSTARS be reduced from 19 to 13, with the understanding that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would acquire four to six aircraft. This NATO acquisition did not materialize, and the budget request is for the 15th JSTARS aircraft.

The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $46.0 million, to be used, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, either for: (1) long lead funding for aircraft number 16, if the Department

requests funding for a 16th JSTARS aircraft in the fiscal year 2002 budget request; or (2) production line shutdown and last lot costs.

B–52H aircraft modifications

The budget request included $8.4 million for modifications to the B–52H aircraft. The budget request included no funding for ALQ–172 self-protection electronic countermeasures. The Air Force has included continued procurement of self-protection electronic countermeasure equipment for the B–52 on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million in aircraft procurement, Air Force, for the ALQ–172 electronic countermeasures improvement program for the B–52H aircraft, a total authorization of $20.4 million.

A–10 aircraft integrated flight and fire control computer

The budget request included $33.9 million for modifications to the A–10 aircraft, but included no funds for procurement of the integrated flight and fire control computer (IFFCC). Although development of this capability is to be complete in fiscal year 2001, production funding would commence in fiscal year 2002 in the Future Years Defense Program. The IFFCC provides the processing power that handles fire control, flight control, digital terrain system, data link management, situational awareness, and cockpit control and display management. The A–10 IFFCC is included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $11.2 million for the procurement and fielding of IFFCCs for the A–10 aircraft, a total authorization of $45.1 million.

F–15 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $258.2 million for modifications to the F–15 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $74.9 million, a total authorization of $333.1 million. Both increases recommended by the committee are included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

The budget request included $37.3 million for upgrading F–15 engines from the F100–PW–100 to the F100–PW–220E configuration. This upgrade would significantly improve the reliability and maintainability of the engine, and has reduced the unscheduled engine removal rate by 35 percent. Procurement savings are achievable by accelerating this program. The committee recommends an increase of $48.0 million for additional F–15 engine upgrades.

The budget request did not include any funding for the procurement of BOL chaff and flare systems or countermeasures for the F–15 aircraft. The committee understands that the BOL countermeasure system is being evaluated under a foreign comparative test program, and that the system has been successfully integrated on other tactical aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $26.9 million for the procurement of BOL systems and countermeasures for the F–15 aircraft.

F–16 aircraft modifications

The budget request included $248.8 million for modifications to the F–16 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase

of $119.5 million in F–16 modifications, a total authorization of $368.3 million.

The committee also recommends a series of increases to address the fact that the budget request included no funding for other F–16 aircraft modifications. Each of these items were included on an Air Force or Air National Guard unfunded priority list.

The digital terrain system includes precise navigation capabilities and a ground collision avoidance system designed to prevent mishaps. The committee recommends an increase of $16.5 million for the digital terrain system. The committee understands that this amount of funding was removed from the budget request late in the cycle, so recommended offsets for this increase have been taken from other Air Force programs.

Precision targeting pods are the number one unfunded requirement for the Air National Guard. The committee recommends an increase of $34.0 million for the procurement of precision targeting pods.

Compared to other F–16 block aircraft, the thrust of the block 42 is relatively low. For this reason, block 42 F–16 aircraft have not been used in combat. The committee recommends an increase of $69.0 million for the retrofit of Air National Guard block 42 F–16 aircraft with F100–PW–229 engines.

C–17 simulator

The budget request included $97.1 million for modifications to the C–17 aircraft. The committee recommends an overall increase of $26.4 million for C–17 aircraft modifications, a total authorization of $123.5 million.

The budget request included no funding for the procurement of another C–17 cockpit system simulator. Procurement of an additional cockpit system simulator is necessary to meet projected aircrew training requirements, and the Air Force has included the procurement of this simulator on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $14.9 million for the procurement of a C–17 cockpit system simulator.

The budget request included no funding for the C–17 aircraft maintenance systems trainer (AMST), for which $3.5 million in long lead funding was provided in fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends an increase of $11.5 million to complete procurement of the C–17 AMST.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft modifications

The budget request included $165.5 million for modifications to defense airborne reconnaissance program aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the procurement of Senior Year electro-optic reconnaissance system (SYERS) equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the procurement of SYERS equipment, a total authorization of $168.5 million.

ALE–50 towed decoys

The budget request included $43.0 million for war consumables, with $32.3 million dedicated to the procurement of ALE–50 towed decoys. The ALE–50 is a low cost radio frequency countermeasure

that provides increased survivability against semi-active guided missile threats. This countermeasure was credited with saving aircraft and lives during Operation Allied Force. Additional procurement of the ALE–50 is included on the Air Force unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $46.2 million for the procurement of additional ALE–50 towed decoys, a total authorization of $89.2 million for war consumables.

Compass Call

The budget request included $398.5 million for other production charges for the Air Force. Compass Call is the premier tactical airborne information warfare platform. In fiscal year 1993, funding for the block 30 Compass Call mission simulator was cut, and there is no training system fielded for the current configuration. Key Compass Call program content was lost in fiscal year 1999 due to Operation Allied Force costs, which were absorbed out of existing budget authority. Compass Call block 35 improved frequency coverage has been reduced. The committee, therefore, recommends increases of $23.7 million for the procurement of a Compass Call mission training system for block 30/35 aircraft and $4.1 million to provide a technology upgrade to the acquisition subsystem of Compass Call block 35, a total authorization of $426.3 million. Both of the increases recommended by the committee are included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program

The budget request included $98.4 million for the procurement of equipment for the defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), of which, $85.1 million was for equipment for the joint signals intelligence avionics family (JSAF). The committee understands this does not fully outfit the first U–2 aircraft with a complete JSAF unit. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of additional JSAF equipment for the U–2 aircraft.

Air Force Missile

Global Positioning System

The budget request included $210.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, and $250.2 in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for the Global Positioning System (GPS). The committee has recently received an amended budget request for the GPS system that reflects the Air Force's GPS modernization plan. The committee supports this effort. In order to properly align funds according to the amended budget request, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.3 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, and an increase of $10.7 million in PE 35165F.

Titan space boosters

The budget request included $469.7 million for procurement of Titan IV space boosters. Based on current projections, it appears that the Titan IV program may not require this full amount to execute its fiscal year 2001 requirements. Therefore, the committee

recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in Air Force Missile Procurement for Titan space boosters.

Medium launch vehicle

The budget request included $55.9 million for Medium Launch Vehicle (MLV) procurement. As a result of the Department of Defense's Global Positioning System (GPS) modernization plan, the Air Force now plans to delay a number of GPS block IIR launches. This delay reduces the procurement funding requirement for MLV during fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in Air Force Missile Procurement funds for MLV.

Air Force Ammunition

Procurement of ammunition, Air Force

The budget request included $11.5 million for the procurement of 2.75 inch rockets for the Air Force. The committee is concerned with continued reports of inadequate supplies of ammunition for training and war reserves. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force recently identified a requirement for $211.0 million for high priority munition programs, including 2.75 inch rockets, that were not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness—for training and in anticipation of conflict. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $28.0 million for 2.75 inch rockets.

Other Air Force Procurement

Combat training ranges

The budget request includes $26.0 million for procurement of equipment for combat training ranges, of which $18.4 million is for advanced threat upgrades. Realistic simulation of threats in training increases the survivability of our aircraft and aircrews in actual combat situations. The committee understands there are competing systems to fill the Air Force requirement for advanced threat emitters. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to procure additional advanced threat emitters for its combat training ranges, a total authorization of $46.0 million.

Night vision goggles

The budget request included $2.8 million for the procurement of night vision goggles (NVGs) and associated test equipment for aircrew, maintenance, and security personnel. There is a shortage of this equipment, and the Air Force has included procurement of additional NVGs on its unfunded priority list. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the procurement of additional NVGs and associated test equipment, a total authorization of $10.8 million.

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
1	MOTOR VEHICLES	-	321	-	-	-	321
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	-	64,872	-	-	-	64,872
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	-	23,191	-	-	-	23,191
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
5	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	11,535	-	-	-	11,535
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
6	MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECH	-	-	-	-	-	-
7	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	-	26,655	-	-	-	26,655
8	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	-	3,233	-	-	-	3,233
9	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	-	19,399	-	-	-	19,399
10	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	-	3,671	-	-	-	3,671
11	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	5,136	-	-	-	5,136
12	STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	-	2,469	-	-	-	2,469
13	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	14,429	-	-	-	14,429
14	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
16	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-	82,863	-	-	-	82,863
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
17	VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
18	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,714	-	-	-	4,714
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	28,171	-	-	-	28,171
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
22	PATRIOT PAC-3	40	365,457	-	-	40	365,457
23	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	-	74,530	-	-	-	74,530
24	C4I	-	3,975	-	-	-	3,975
25	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY						
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
27	VEHICLES	-	145	-	-	-	145
28	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	44,034	-	-	-	44,034
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
29	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	656	-	-	-	656
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS						
30	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS	-	4,695	-	-	-	4,695
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE						
31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE	-	1,546	-	-	-	1,546
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
32	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	68,480	-	-	-	68,480

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
33	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	2,364	-	-	-	2,364
34	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	10,403	-	-	-	10,403
35	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	4	8,533	-	-	4	8,533
36	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	13,871	-	-	-	13,871
37	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	26,237	-	-	-	26,237
38	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	2,186	-	-	-	2,186
	SHIPBUILDING						
39	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	-	33,477	-	3,300	-	36,777
39	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(7,977)	-	-	-	(7,977)
40	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,472	-	-	-	22,472
41	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	-	-	-	-	-	-
42	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	1,559	-	-	-	1,559
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
43	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	36,632	-	-	-	36,632
44	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	25,978	-	-	-	25,978
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
45	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	74,444	-	-	-	74,444
46	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	32,309	-	-	-	32,309
47	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	11,829	-	21,700	-	33,529
48	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	-	909	-	-	-	909
49	NAVAL SPC WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	-	-	-	-	-
50	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	-	14,511	-	-	-	14,511
51	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	11,780	-	-	-	11,780
52	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	5,801	-	-	-	5,801

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
53	DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
54	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	14,376	-	-	-	14,376
55	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	2,021	-	-	-	2,021
56	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	105,547	-	-	-	105,547
57	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	-	7,575	-	-	-	7,575
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
58	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	108,725	-	-	-	108,725
59	DECONTAMINATION	-	12,195	-	-	-	12,195
60	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	-	141,781	-	-	-	141,781
61	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	-	36,179	-	-	-	36,179
62	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	-	175,056	-	4,300	-	179,356
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9	490,358	-	(120,000)	9	370,358
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		2,275,308		(90,700)		2,184,608
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	-		274,400	-	274,400
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	-		121,900	-	121,900
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						

Title I- Procurement

(Dollars in Thousands)

Ln No	Title	Request Qty	Request Cost	Change Qty	Change Cost	Recommed Qty	Recommed Cost
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	-		607,200	-	607,200
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-WIDE		-		1,003,500		1,003,500
	Defense Health Program		290,006	-	-	-	290,006
	Office of the Inspector General		3,300	-	-	-	3,300

Advanced SEAL delivery system design enhancements

The budget request included $33.5 million for the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) Program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.3 million in the Defense Wide Procurement, Special Operations Command, ASDS account to fund design enhancements required to implement necessary changes and enhancements on subsequent ASDS production vehicles.

ASDS design enhancement costs are estimated to be $10.0 million. Special Operations Command has funded $6.8 million of ASDS design costs with savings in its ongoing ASDS developmental testing program. Full funding of these design enhancements could result in a $10.0 million reduction in procurement unit cost for the remaining five ASDS vehicles.

The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–301) required the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command (CINCSOCOM) to report on various aspects of the ASDS program, including whether the program should be elevated to a major acquisition program. The CINCSOCOM provided a report on technical aspects of the ASDS program, but failed to address whether the program had been reviewed by the Department of Defense (DOD), and why the program was not elevated to the category of a major defense acquisition. The committee expects the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to provide a report explaining why he decided not to elevate this program to a higher level of review, as was required.

Special operations forces small arms and support equipment

The budget request included $11.8 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Small Arms and Support Equipment, but did not include funding to continue procurement of SOF Body Armor Load Carriage System, the Modular Integrated Communications Helmet, or the SOF Peculiar Modifications to the M–4 Carbine. The Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command (CINCSOCOM), identified procurement of this improved body armor, improved helmets, and special modifications to individual weapons, as his highest set of priority unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001. The committee has followed developments in this area closely and is encouraged that equipment that will enhance the survivability, flexibility, and precision of our special operations forces is now available for general procurement.

The committee understands this equipment has been rigorously tested and fielded to some SOF elements. The committee applauds the efforts of CINCSOCOM to field this important equipment to all SOF operators. The committee recommends an increase of $21.7 million for SOF Small Arms and Support Equipment to be distributed as follows: $4.9 million for SOF Body Armor Load Carriage System; $4.7 million for SOF Modular Integrated Communications Helmet; and $12.1 million for SOF Peculiar Modifications to the M–4 Carbine. This represents approximately one-half of the funding requested by CINCSOCOM to fully equip all SOF operators. The committee further directs that CINCSOCOM fully evaluate the

suitability of this equipment for all SOF operators across the wide spectrum of activities conducted by SOCOM and report back to the defense committees of Congress his assessment of the suitability of these enhancements for all SOF operational elements and any recommendations for improvements to meet the unique needs of the various, diverse operational elements of SOCOM. Upon receipt of such an assessment, the committee would consider additional authorizations to complete procurement of this equipment for all SOF operators.

Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Defense Enhancement Kits

The budget request included no funding for Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Defense Enhancement Kits. The Marine Corps continues to require the development of NBC force protection training and equipment support packages for deploying Marine Expeditionary Units. The NBC Defense Enhancement Kits will provide equipment to on-scene leaders to allow for isolation of NBC contaminated areas, agent detection and identification, and decontamination. The Marine Corps has a requirement for thirteen NBC kits; nine kits have been procured. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in the Chemical and Biological Defense Program for four NBC Defense Enhancement Kits to complete the planned acquisition.

Communications assistance for law enforcement act

The budget request included $120.0 million for the Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund, which was created as a result of the Communications assistance for law enforcement act of 1994. The committee is concerned that this may represent an inappropriate first step by the Department of Defense towards involvement in placing wiretaps on communications system of American citizens. Court-authorized wiretaps are, and should remain, the responsibility of law enforcement agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $120.0 million to the budget request for this activity.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Pueblo Chemical Depot chemical agent destruction technologies (sec. 141)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the destruction of the stockpile of lethal chemical agents at the Pueblo Chemical Depot either by incineration or any technology demonstrated by the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment on or before May 1, 2000.

Residents and leaders of communities surrounding the Pueblo Chemical Depot continue to voice concerns about delays in the destruction of chemical agents at the Pueblo depot and the attendant risk to community safety. The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) has reported on several occasions about the risk associated with the prolonged storage of chemical agents and munitions. According to the NAS, this risk increases significantly with time.

Approximately eight percent of the total U.S. chemical weapons inventory is stored at the Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado. Community leaders have expressed support for the baseline incineration method and the technologies developed through the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program. This provision is intended to expedite destruction activities utilizing one of these technologies at the Pueblo Chemical Depot in the interest of community safety.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Acquisition programs at the National Security Agency

There are substantial challenges facing the National Security Agency (NSA) as it seeks to modernize its operations and infrastructure. The United States has relied on the NSA for vital information in the past, and will need a significant contribution from NSA as we face the new demands of the future.

The committee believes that the Director of the NSA is making significant progress in making fundamental reform within the agency. The committee encourages the Director to continue this important process.

Although the Director has indicated the need to improve the acquisition process, the committee has become concerned that the current acquisition management procedures may not provide sufficient structure, accountability, or visibility for these important programs.

The committee directs that NSA and the Department of Defense manage the current NSA modernization effort as though it were a major defense acquisition program, as defined in section 2430 of title 10, United States Code. The committee does not intend that these programs be merged into a single contracting vehicle, rather these programs should be elevated to a higher level of review to ensure that the overall modernization effort receives appropriate review and management attention within the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Further discussion of this issue is included in the classified annex to this report.

Army aviation

The committee has been very pleased with Army efforts over the last year to revise outdated and incomplete aviation modernization plans. The committee applauds the outstanding efforts of active Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve leaders to establish a plan that will ultimately result in a seamless force of modernized aircraft. The most significant action taken will be that of retiring legacy UH–1 Huey and AH–1 Cobra aircraft by fiscal year 2004 and replacing these aircraft with UH–60 Blackhawks. Most of these aircraft, largely found in the reserve components, have reached the end of their useful life and must be retired as soon as practicable. The revised modernization plan will result in an aviation force structure that is common across both active and reserve components, will reduce the number of rotary wing platforms from seven to four, and will facilitate crew rotation requirements for the broad range of missions that will challenge the Army over the next decade.

The committee still has serious questions about the ability of the Army to fund some of the critical requirements in the revised plan. In fact, despite congressional direction that the Secretary of the Army to fully fund the revised plan, the Army plan remains underfunded by at least $400.0 million each year.

C–5 aircraft upgrades

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support in March, 2000, the Secretary of the Air Force stated that the decision regarding the priority for upgrade of the C–5As or the newer C–5Bs was pending the results of the outsized and oversized cargo portion of the larger Joint Chiefs of Staff mobility requirements study 05 (MRS–05). The Air Force budget documentation, however, clearly indicates a schedule for upgrade of the C–5Bs before C–5As. The budget documentation also includes a plan to continue kit development options for two aircraft. The committee is concerned that the Air Force will upgrade the newer C–5Bs to optimize strategic airlift operational readiness rates in the near-term, with severe effects on the overall airlift force readiness in the not-too-distant future. This is one of several key decisions being delayed pending the results of MRS–05. Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report based on MRS–05 to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2000. The Secretary of Defense has asked for an extension of this requirement until September 30, 2000. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report by February 15, 2001, which contains the analysis to support the Air Force recommendation on sequence of C–5 aircraft upgrades based on the lift requirements outlined in MRS–05. The kit development efforts for the two aircraft should be for one C–5A and one C–5B. The analysis should project lift capabilities for ten years based on most likely operational readiness rates under the scenario of upgrading the C–5As before the C–5Bs and under the scenario of upgrading the C–5Bs before the C–5As.

Electronic digital compass system

The committee continues to support the Army digitization effort, which will establish a tactical internet for enhanced situational awareness. The output from the Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver on Army combat and tactical vehicles is key to the knowledge of friendly positions. GPS is generally an effective device, but has its limitations, such as susceptibility to blockages from terrain and foliage, enemy electronic countermeasures, including jamming, constellation misalignments, and multi-path errors. The committee is concerned that there is currently no backup to GPS, other than the enhanced position location reporting system, to ensure that critical situational awareness inputs to the tactical internet are not interrupted. This backup could be improved at modest cost by an electronic digital compass system, which can also provide steer-to navigation capabilities. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report assessing the utility and costs involved in integrating and procuring electronic digital compass systems for

combat and tactical vehicles of the first digitized division and the digitized corps.

Single channel ground and airborne radio system

The committee is aware of outstanding requirements for additional single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) to provide necessary voice and data communications for a small number of Army National Guard units that are still operating with earlier generation equipment. The committee recognizes plans within the Department of Defense to begin an acquisition program that will procure the next generation joint tactical radio system. Unfortunately, these radios will not be available in the near-term and there are still units in the Army that must be modernized. The committee encourages the Army to review the plans and programs associated with communications fielding requirements and identify alternatives that will meet outstanding requirements as soon as practicable.

Soldier's portable on-system repair tool

For the last several years, the committee has monitored the fielding of the soldier's portable on-system repair tool (SPORT) and is aware that the current contract will expire in fiscal year 2001. SPORT is the on-system tester designed to augment the built-in test equipment of all major Army weapon systems, including the M1 Abrams, the M2 Bradley, the UH–60 Blackhawk, the Paladin, and the multiple launch rocket system. In addition, SPORT has served as a significant maintenance diagnostic tool for many other Army systems. The committee is concerned that any interruption in the fielding of SPORT could have a significant impact on overall readiness. The committee directs the Army to review outstanding requirements for SPORT equipment, identify an acquisition strategy designed to meet those requirements, and provide the Congress with a report on that strategy.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

EXPLANATION OF TABLES

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE II			
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	201,560	21,500	223,060
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	37,862,401	1,468,448	39,330,849

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Fiscal year 2002 joint field experiment (sec. 211)

The committee has worked closely with the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to develop a credible, comprehensive joint experimentation program. The creation of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) on October 1, 1999, with an organizational element dedicated to joint experimentation, institutionalized this process. The committee has noted, with great interest, the strides made by USJFCOM in implementing this program.

The committee is encouraged that a joint experimentation program has been established, but was disappointed to learn that the first fully planned, joint field experiment is not scheduled until fiscal year 2004. While the need to carefully build this program is appreciated, this has to be balanced against the need for urgency. Many of the transformation concepts being explored by the respective services will have evolved considerably by 2004, without the benefit of experimentation and evaluation within a joint war fighting context.

The committee is concerned that familiar problems continue to plague joint operations. Many of the lessons learned in the recent Kosovo operation were noted in previous military operations. Combatant commanders continue to appear before the committee with recurring concerns, including: incompatible command and control; interoperability problems; no combat identification standard; insufficient strategic lift; insufficient intelligence assets (intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance); and inadequate theater-level force protection capabilities. While efforts appear to be underway to correct these deficiencies, questions are continuously raised regarding the priority and urgency assigned to these requirements, and the absence of a detailed, defense-wide strategy to guide transformation of our forces.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense plan in fiscal year 2001 and conduct in fiscal year 2002, a joint field experiment focused on exploring the most critical war fighting challenges at the operational level of war which will confront U.S. joint military forces. This experiment should incorporate elements of all military services and special operations forces. In addition, the Secretary of Defense is directed to ensure that each military service and U.S. Special Operations Command participate with elements representative of their future force concepts, e.g., Air Force Expeditionary Aerospace Force, Army medium-weight brigades, and Navy Forward from the Sea vision. The committee sees merit in each of these individual service initiatives, and believes that combining these concepts in a joint context has potential for improving our military capabilities, individually and collectively. The committee directs the services to adjust their fiscal year 2001 planning activities and fiscal year 2002 experimentation activities to accommodate participation in this experiment and evaluation of capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63727N to accomplish the necessary planning and preparation for this joint experiment in fiscal year 2001. The committee expects

the Department of Defense (DOD), the military departments and USJFCOM to include adequate funding in the fiscal year 2002 budget request to properly conduct this experiment.

The Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on DOD War Fighting Transformation, published in August 1999, observed that there is no comprehensive DOD-wide strategy and road map for a coordinated transformation of our armed forces and that there are no apparent standards to measure progress. The committee recommends that the Secretary use the opportunity presented by this joint field exercise to accomplish the following: collect the data that will enable a more specific description of the desired attributes of the objective joint forces for Joint Vision 2010; establish the standards to measure progress; and establish achievable, affordable milestones.

Nuclear aircraft carrier design and production modeling (sec. 212)

The budget request included $38.3 million in PE 64567N for aircraft carrier contract design. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Navy to convert nuclear aircraft carrier design to a three-dimensional, computer based system. The budget request did not include funds specifically designated for this effort. However, minimal conversion of paper designs has occurred from funds designated for aircraft carrier research and development and shipbuilding and conversion. The Navy conversion effort thus far has proven to be cost-effective in saving taxpayer dollars.

The Navy intends to develop a three-dimensional product model for portions of CVNX–1. The committee also understands that the Navy intends to build certain sections of CVN–77 that will be major new designs derived from the CVN–76 baseline. The Navy recently made the decision that CVNX hulls will be based on the Nimitz-class hull design. Because of this decision, it may now be possible to achieve cost savings in designing, constructing, and modifying CVNX and sections of CVN–77 through use of a computer-aided design and product model. Such a product model might also be beneficial in supporting the Nimitz class ships in the fleet.

Major new construction shipbuilding programs, including the Flight IIA Arleigh Burke-class destroyer, the Virginia-class submarine, and the San Antonio-class amphibious ship, using the three-dimensional, computer-based product models have resulted in over $184.0 million savings. The Navy predicts that additional savings will continue to accrue throughout the life cycle of the ships when they are repaired and modified. These product models were developed and funded through the ship class' research and development and construction funds.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64567N to develop an electronic product model of the CVNX–1 and applicable sections of CVN–77 nuclear aircraft carrier design. The committee also directs the Navy to provide an analysis of the potential costs and benefits of extending this product model effort for use in supporting the Nimitz-class ships in the fleet.

DD–21 class destroyer program (sec. 213)

The budget request included $549.7 million for research and development for DD–21, the Navy's new destroyer program. The committee recommends authorization of the budget request for fiscal year 2001 and fully supports the DD–21 as the future destroyer required to replace Spruance-class destroyers and Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates. The committee concurs that the administration's research and development budget request is required to attain a fiscal year 2005 start of construction and that additional resources would most likely be required for a fiscal year 2004 construction start.

While the committee fully supports DD–21, the committee has not been provided adequate explanation of the following issues:

(1) the advisability of delaying the initial operational capability for three years;

(2) maintaining key capabilities required for completion of the mission of DD–21;

(3) the need for a one year delay in the start of construction of DD–21;

(4) the requirement for extending the construction performance period by two years; and

(5) the inclusion of all life-cycle maintenance in a non-competitive life-of-the-ship contract award.

DELAYING THE INITIAL OPERATING CAPABILITY

It would appear that the Navy has given a lower priority to the mission of DD–21, providing ordnance on target to influence the events ashore (land attack), than that of building a technologically superior ship in the first hull. The one year delay in the DD–21 program without analysis of technology insertion approaches, successful in previous ship procurement programs and presently being used in the CVN(X) and the Virginia- class attack submarine programs, requires additional explanation. While Marine Corps witnesses testified that the two 155 millimeter guns on the DD–21 would be the first at-sea system to fully meet the Marine Corps requirements for fire support since decommissioning of the battleships, Navy witnesses did not provide information regarding the risks to the Marines caused by the one year delay in commencing construction and two year delay in delivery of the first DD–21.

Maintaining Key Capabilities

The Marine Corps has stated a requirement that all naval surface fire support weapon systems be easily sustainable via underway replenishment. The Navy apparently intends to provide the surface fire support with options that includes both gun- fired 155 millimeter ammunition and land attack missiles. The committee understands that the Navy is working with the contractor teams to specify underway replenishment requirements and fully supports the continued refinement of capabilities. The committee encourages the Navy to fully involve the Marine Corps with the review of requirements which affect Marine Corps concepts of operations including whether the land attack missile at-sea resupply requirement is valid for the DD–21.

One Year Delay

The Navy has consistently emphasized the need for a destroyer which has lower procurement and operating costs than the present fleet of destroyers and frigates. In attempting to bring such a ship to reality, the Navy determined that manning the ship was the main cost driver in operating the ship. To reduce manning requirements, the Navy challenged two industry teams to develop a new destroyer design which would reduce total ownership cost. The Navy directed the two teams to include in their design proposal justification of the requirement for each member of the crew and consideration of the life-of-the-ship cost of maintaining each piece of equipment when determining what equipment would be included in their design.

Without the advantage of analysis, the Navy set a goal of a 95 person crew and a threshold of a 150 person crew. Consequently, the focus of design and scheduling efforts for the land attack destroyer, thus far, appear to have been on manning and total operating costs. Again, apparently without a thorough analysis, the Navy determined that the design teams could not produce a design which met the 95 person crew and life cycle costs criteria in time to commence construction in fiscal year 2004, the time frame both teams had been working toward. This determination resulted in the Navy submitting a Future Years Defense Program for DD–21 which would delay commencing construction of the first DD–21 for one year (from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005).

Extending the Construction Performance Period

The Navy determined that the original five year performance period (fiscal year 2004 through fiscal 2008) for building the first DD–21 would result in unacceptable risk for successful completion of the program. Therefore, the Navy budget supports a two year delay in the delivery of DD–21 (from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2010).

NON-COMPETITIVE AWARD OF LIFE-OF-THE-SHIP MAINTENANCE

The Navy intends to build 32 DD–21 land attack destroyers to replace the aging Spruance-class (DD–963) and Oliver Hazard Perry-class (FFG–7) destroyers. The Navy has discussed the possibility of awarding the winner of the phase II design competition not only the contract to build the first DD–21, but also a contract to provide life-cycle support for all DD–21 ships. The estimated value of a full support contract that includes all ship maintenance for the life of all DD–21 ships would be greater than the contract value for building all 32 ships. If such a maintenance contract were awarded, the winner of the full service support contract could be in a position to determine the ship repair contractors in fleet concentration areas that would be permitted to repair DD–21 ships. The committee believes that this could be a troubling divestiture to a contractor of what is inherently a government function. In addition, the committee is concerned that awarding a full service support contract for maintenance of DD–21 may reduce the flexibility of the operational fleet commanders to maintain all the fleet ships based on a prioritization of overall fleet maintenance requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would:

(1) authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pursue a technology insertion approach to DD–21 that would commence construction of the first DD–21 in fiscal year 2004 followed by a fiscal year 2009 delivery;

(2) express the sense of Congress that there are compelling reasons to commence DD–21 in fiscal year 2004 followed by sequential construction of DD–21 destroyers until a total of 32 are built, and that the Secretary should consider the following when making his decisions regarding DD–21 procurement:

2

2 (a) the Marine Corps requires fire support which the Navy will be unable to provide until the DD–21 155 millimeter guns are introduced in the fleet;

2 (b) a technology insertion approach has been successful for other ship construction programs and is being used in the CVN(X) aircraft carrier and Virginia- class submarine programs;

2

(c) a stable configuration for the first 10 ships of the class could help ensure the greatest capabilities are provided at the lowest cost; and

2 (d) action to acquire DD–21 destroyers should be taken as soon as possible to realize fully the cost savings of construction and operation of DD–21 class destroyers when compared to construction and operation of other classes of destroyers;

(3) direct the Secretary to submit a report not later than April 18, 2001, on a plan, including the resources required, for pursuing a technology insertion approach to DD–21; and

(4) direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report not later than April 18, 2001, that discusses the following:

2 (a) the technical feasibility of commencing DD–21 construction in fiscal year 2004 with a delivery date in fiscal year 2009. For this section of the report, the committee suggests input by an independent entity, such as the Defense Science Board;

2 (b) an analysis of various contracting strategies for acquiring the first 10 ships of the DD–21 class;

2 (c) the effects on the destroyer industrial base and on the costs of other shipbuilding programs of delaying constructing the first DD–21 until fiscal year 2005, and of delaying the construction of the second DD–21 destroyer until 2007; and

2 (d) the effects on fleet maintenance strategies and on commercial maintenance facilities in fleet concentration areas of awarding a shipbuilding contractor team a maintenance contract which includes all maintenance actions above ships force and below depot maintenance levels.

The committee fully supports the DD–21 program and recognizes the difficulty the Navy faces in instituting an acquisition strategy that emphasizes private sector flexibility in meeting general Navy requirements for a complicated ship.

The committee encourages the Navy and the DD–21 program office to make maximum use of the expertise and facilities resident in Navy field activities for analysis, test, and evaluation of private sector proposals and designs.

F–22 aircraft program (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the F–22 program engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) cost cap by one percent, funds for which could only be obligated for testing requirements approved by the Defense Acquisition Executive and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. This provision will add a cushion to the development phase, as it nears completion, to ensure adequate testing has been accomplished. The Defense Acquisition Executive and the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, would share the responsibility for ensuring that the expenditure of any funds above the EMD cost cap would be for testing purposes only.

The performance of the F–22, in testing to date, has been impressive. When introduced as the Air Force's air dominance fighter, it will be far and away the best fighter aircraft in the world. A comprehensive test program now is required to prevent costly retrofits later.

The budget request included $2.2 billion to commence low rate initial production of 10 F–22 Raptor aircraft, $396.2 million for advance procurement items for 16 more aircraft in fiscal year 2002, and $1.4 billion in PE 64239F for continuing F- 22 EMD. The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has voiced concern that the congressionally mandated cost cap for the EMD Phase may drive the Air Force to reduce too much content from the F–22 test program. The committee echoes this concern.

The EMD and production cost caps were established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998. This action was taken after the Air Force canceled the manufacture of four preproduction verification aircraft and slowed aircraft production, transferring $2.2 billion from procurement to cover an EMD overrun. The purpose of the cost caps was to force the program to exercise a greater degree of fiscal discipline. In testimony before the AirLand Subcommittee, the Air Force has given the caps credit for exacting this discipline on both the government and the contractor teams. In its latest annual report on the F–22 program, the General Accounting Office concluded that: "the F–22 development program could still be managed within its cost limitation," but "[s]hould further significant cost increases materialize, the development program may need to be scaled back, or other ways may need to be found to reduce the costs."

In the past year, the F–22 program has implemented two structural fixes: the forward aft tail boom and a structural member in the flaperon. These occurrences are normal in any development program, but because flight testing constitutes the majority of the remaining EMD efforts, funding for fixing these occurrences is more difficult to find without reducing testing effort. The committee is concerned that if the program were to be scaled back due to cost increases in other areas, it would be testing that would be cut. The Air Force has already announced that testing efficiencies

have enabled it to reduce the actual flight test hours from 4,337 hours to 3,757 hours. It is not the committee's intent to prevent the service from finding further testing efficiencies, but rather to ensure the test program remains adequate.

Joint strike fighter (sec. 215)

The budget request for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program included $261.1 million to complete the concept demonstration phase, with $129.5 million in PE 63800F and $131.6 million in PE 63800N. The budget request also included $595.5 million to initiate the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase, with $299.5 million in PE 64800F and $296.0 million in PE 64800N.

The committee fully appreciates the critical need to modernize our aging fleet of legacy aircraft with aircraft possessing the capabilities promised by the JSF program. The purpose of the JSF program is to develop and field an affordable, highly common family of next generation strike fighter aircraft for the U.S. Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, the U.S. Air Force, and allies. The Navy variant (called CV) will be aircraft carrier capable, the Marine Corps variant will be capable of short takeoff and vertical landing (STOVL), and the Air Force variant will be of a conventional takeoff and landing (CTOL) design. Commonality within this family of aircraft is crucial to keeping the overall tactical aviation modernization plan affordable.

Two contractor teams are competing to win a competition to enter into the next phase of the program, the EMD phase. In addition to conducting design and risk mitigation activities, each contractor team is building two concept demonstration aircraft. Although these are not JSF prototypes, they are required to demonstrate key enabling performance criteria, such as slow speed handling characteristics for aircraft carrier approaches, and short takeoff and vertical landing for the Marine Corps variant.

Unfortunately, the schedule for flying the concept demonstrator aircraft has slipped for both of the contractor teams, primarily due to propulsion system problems. The committee understands that, if the program adheres to the current schedule, with no further delays, the STOVL variants will not fly until after the contractor teams deliver their proposals for EMD to the government. While the contractors may still be able to present additional test results to the government on these flights and on the STOVL design, the competitive environment will inevitably restrict the free flow of information after proposal delivery. This leaves uncertainty on the technical readiness of the program to enter EMD along the budgeted schedule.

The committee has also been apprized of a General Accounting Office (GAO) report on the JSF program that raises concerns about the level of maturity of the design at the point when the Department intends to make a decision to proceed into EMD. The GAO report specifically mentioned several enabling technologies whose technical risk will not have been reduced to an acceptable level before the planned transition to EMD.

In addition to the testing maturity, the committee has additional concerns about the nature of the acquisition strategy and how potential changes in that acquisition strategy might affect the pro-

gram. Many have questioned the advisability of continuing the current "winner-take-all" strategy for selecting the winning team for EMD on one of the largest defense programs in history. Losing outright could force one of the teams to leave the fighter development and production business, which would in turn leave the government in the position of depending on a single team for all future tactical aviation modernization. Recognizing the import of this situation, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics has commissioned a review of the currently approved JSF acquisition strategy. The Department of Defense has not completed this review, but expects to make a decision on the appropriate acquisition strategy within the next two months. The time spent making this decision could delay releasing the call for improvement (analogous to a request for proposal), the response to which will be the basis for making the final decision before proceeding to EMD.

The committee continues to be a strong advocate for the JSF program. The committee believes that the JSF program, with certain modest exceptions, has demonstrated how a joint service requirement development process should work and how a joint service program should be implemented. However, with so much at stake in this centerpiece of tactical aviation modernization, the committee believes that it would be terribly shortsighted for the Department to pursue a program that is driven by the calendar, and not by events.

The committee does not believe that it would be prudent to proceed into EMD without having conducted adequate testing, and reduced the data from that testing, for the competing demonstrator aircraft. This is particularly the case for the version possessing the highest technical risk, the STOVL version, which is also on the slowest track to testing.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Department to submit a report, before December 15, 2000, describing: (1) how the program may have been restructured to reflect any changes in the acquisition strategy; and (2) exit criteria that the Department has established to ensure that technical risks are at acceptable levels before the program enters into EMD.

In consonance with this recommendation, the committee also recommends no funding in support of the budget request for EMD funds, specifically a decrease of $595.5 million, including $299.5 million in PE 64800F and $296.0 million in PE 64800N, but recommends an increase of $424.2 million in demonstration and validation funds, including $212.1 million in PE 63800F and $212.1 million in PE 63800N.

The committee believes that the Department should use this time and funding to complete flight testing of the concept demonstrator aircraft, acquire the data from the test program, spend such funds as can be used to reduce risk for technologies that would need to mature during EMD, and define and implement a preferred acquisition strategy.

The committee is not interested in having the contractor team or teams sitting around waiting for the first day of fiscal year 2002. Indeed, the committee would support the Department's moving past the concept demonstration tests with the fiscal year 2001

funds provided. Such activities could perhaps include even selecting a contractor team or teams to conduct various pre-EMD activities to begin planning for EMD. Such committee support, however, presumes that: (1) the Department will have provided the report required by the provision regarding acquisition strategy and technical risk exit criteria; and (2) the results of flight testing the STOVL variants will have been available to inform such decisions.

The committee is also not interested in having the contractors make additional unreimbursed investments in winning this program. The Department has informed the committee that it has recently modified the current JSF demonstration contracts to allow significant contractor investment in the concept demonstration phase. The committee recommends that the Department not propose any restructured program that would allow any further individual contractor investment beyond the levels envisioned by this modification. While the Department has made a reasonable case for implementing the current modification, the committee does not view additional contractor investment during the competition phase as conducive to smooth implementation of any potential acquisition strategy.

The committee is well aware of the considerable international interest in this program. The actions recommended by the committee should in no way be interpreted as a lack of support for the JSF or a lack of appreciation for the critical role that the JSF can play in tactical aviation modernization. At this critical juncture, however, the JSF program is too important to be rushed into the EMD phase until the program is ready to graduate. The committee believes that a more prudent technical and programmatic approach will, in the final analysis, strengthen the process of developing and fielding the family of aircraft that will dominate tactical aviation for the next half century.

Global Hawk high altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (sec. 216)

The budget request included $109.2 million for the development of endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (HAE UAVs), of which $103.2 million was for the continued development of the Global Hawk HAE UAV. The Global Hawk is an advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD), nearing completion of its highly successful military utility phase, and preparing for its engineering and manufacturing (EMD) phase.

The budget request also included $22.4 million for the procurement of long lead items for the first two production Global Hawk HAE UAVs and one common ground station. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has studied the Global Hawk program, and has concluded that production in fiscal year 2001 would be premature. The GAO identified three reasons for arriving at this conclusion:

(1) Global Hawk has not yet begun a scheduled one year EMD phase;

(2) testing of a production representative Global Hawk system will not have been started; and

(3) during EMD, the Global Hawk design will be changing.

The committee strongly supports the continued development of the Global Hawk HAE UAV, but concurs with the GAO that long

lead production for two additional HAE UAVs is premature. The committee recommends a decrease of $22.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, that would allow the Air Force sufficient time to use the EMD program to stabilize the final design.

Although one developmental Global Hawk HAE UAV was destroyed in a mishap, six other developmental Global Hawk HAE UAVs have either been delivered to the Air Force or are at varying stages of production. The Air Force has requested additional electro-optical and infra-red sensor payloads for the Global Hawk HAE UAV on its unfunded requirements list because there are not enough sensors to outfit all six of these Global Hawk HAE UAVs.

The six remaining ACTD HAE UAVs do not meet the operational requirement. The committee believes, however, that these aircraft are still excellent platforms for continuing development and expansion of the current HAE UAV operational concept. For example, advances in the production of active electronic scanned array (AESA) radars and the development of associated technologies, such as modular, scalable antennas could make this an appropriate time to further expand operational concepts to include an airborne surveillance capability. This may be preferable to merely buying more of the current sensor payloads that we know will not meet the Air Force's requirements. The committee also understands that Commander in Chief, Joint Forces Command, is interested in using the existing ACTD Global Hawk aircraft for experimentation after the Air Force begins producing HAE UAVs that meet the operational requirement.

The committee is well aware of how taxing recent operations have been on such low density, high demand units such as the E–3A Airborne Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft. The long endurance capability of the Global Hawk could make it an ideal candidate to substitute for such low density, high demand units as AWACS aircraft in certain situations, if it were to be outfitted with an appropriate payload. Such situations could include such lower threat environments as the area of responsibility of the Commander in Chief, Southern Command. Appropriate missions could include filling the air surveillance requirements in support of counter-drug operations off the coast of Central and South America.

The committee recommends an increase of $18.0 million in PE 35205F to extend the ACTD effort. The Air Force should use $12.0 million of this amount to acquire and integrate a non-developmental AESA radar on Global Hawk, and to demonstrate its operational viability in the Southern Command area of responsibility. This demonstration should be conducted as soon as practicable in fiscal year 2001, with participation and guidance from the Commanders in Chief of the Joint Forces and Southern Commands, to include requirements and scenario planning. To further this goal, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to coordinate a demonstration of the capability of the Global Hawk HAE UAV in an airborne surveillance role in the counter-drug effort, and to provide a report on the technical feasibility and operational concept for using Global Hawk HAE UAVs in this role.

In the long-term, the Air Force should apply the remaining $6.0 million of this total to begin a concurrent development effort for an improved surveillance radar for potential use on the Global Hawk. The committee believes that this development effort should capitalize on the efforts detailed in the report delivered to Congress in April, 2000, on modular, scalable, active electronically scanned antenna (AESA)-based radar development activities.

Unmanned advanced capability aircraft and ground combat vehicles (sec. 217)

The challenges that the United States will face in the new millennium are diverse—new threats, new battlefields, and new weapons. Our armed forces must remain vigilant, forward thinking and prepared to address these challenges. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must exploit the opportunities created by the rapid pace of technological development to provide our men and women in uniform with the most advanced weaponry and leverage these developments in a way that minimizes the risk to those deployed in harm's way.

During the offensive military operation in Kosovo, U.S. forces carried out 78 days of round-the clock operations and over 38,000 combat sorties with no combat casualties. The American people are coming to expect that military operations are casualty free. This is a factor that is more and more influencing the planning of military operations. How else do we explain bombing operations in Kosovo that largely restricted coalition pilots to altitudes between ten and fifteen thousand feet?

Limiting risk to our personnel is clearly an important goal and one of the most advantageous benefits of deploying unmanned combat systems and technologies. An initiative to expand the use of such technologies would allow the Department to aggressively pursue and field remotely controlled combat systems with this goal: within 10 years one-third of U.S. military operational deep strike aircraft will be unmanned and within 15 years one- third of all U.S. military ground combat vehicles will also be unmanned. It is not the intention of the committee to replace pilots and manned aircraft with unmanned combat systems, but to provide added capabilities to manned combat aircraft—added capabilities that would provide alternatives to sending military personnel into the highest risk missions.

Casualty aversion limits the flexibility of foreign policy. Taking full advantage of advances in technology will allow future administrations greater flexibility and, at the same time, reduce exposure of U.S. personnel. For these reasons, the committee recommends an increase of $200.0 million in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) to accelerate the technologies that will lead to the development and fielding of remotely controlled air combat vehicles by 2010 and remotely controlled ground combat vehicles by 2015. The committee has identified three promising programs, initiated by the services, in which to invest these funds:

Air Force Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle (UCAV)

The committee recognizes the on-going joint Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)/Air Force unmanned combat air

vehicle (UCAV) program, initiated in 1998. The committee notes that a small-scale demonstrator will flight test in the Spring of 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 62702E to accelerate risk reduction and "Concept of Operation" evaluation. The additional funds would be applied as follows: design, development of additional demonstrator vehicles; invest in low-cost commercial core engine derivative; demonstrate intelligent decision aids; validate suppression of enemy air defense(SEAD)/strike targeting in realistic environment; and fully validate multi-vehicle flight modes.

Navy Unmanned Combat Air Vehicle

DARPA and the Navy initiated a joint program this year to explore concepts for a Naval unmanned combat air vehicle (UCAV-N). The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million to be applied to a preliminary design of a UCAV-N demonstrator system suitable for ship-based SEAD/strike/surveillance missions.

Army Future Combat Systems (FCS)

In February 2000, the Army signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DARPA to develop a future combat system (FCS) to replace the current generation of armored combat vehicles. Although robotics is a key part of development, there is not a requirement for an autonomous, remotely-controlled vehicle in the current program. The committee recommends an increase of $121.3 million for the FCS program as follows: an increase of $46.3 million in PE 63005A to accelerate the enabling technologies for the FCS program, and an increase of $75.0 million in PE 62702A to add an unmanned, remotely-controlled aspect to the future combat system. The committee expects this requirement to be added to the MOA on FCS.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2001, on: (1) the schedule for this initiative; (2) the funding required for fiscal year 2002 and for the future years defense program; and (3) a description and assessment of the acquisition strategy for remotely-controlled air and ground combat vehicles.

Army space control technology (sec. 218)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $20.0 million for the Army's Kinetic Energy Anti-Satellite (KE-ASAT) program and $5.0 million for other Army space control technology development emphasizing temporary and reversible effects. The provision would limit the obligation of funds for space control technology, other than KE-ASAT, until the funds authorized for the KE-ASAT program have been released to the KE- ASAT program manager.

The committee directs the Commander of the Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) to use the $20.0 million authorized for the KE-ASAT program to advance the three existing KE-ASAT kill vehicles and associated hardware to a point where a flight test could occur one year following any decision to do so. None of the funds authorized for the KE-ASAT program may be

used to support research and development on capabilities to counter satellites in a non-destructive, reversible manner. The Commander of SMDC shall also begin planning and preparation for a KE-ASAT flight demonstration. The committee is aware that the Kodiak Island launch facility in Alaska is well suited to support a launch of a KE-ASAT test vehicle. The committee directs the Commander of SMDC to include an assessment of the Kodiak Island facility as part of the overall flight test planning and evaluation process.

The committee continues to support the KE-ASAT technology program. At the same time, the committee has also directed the Army to develop capabilities to counter satellites in a non- destructive, reversible manner. The committee does not view these two objectives to be incompatible.

Russian American Observation Satellites program (sec. 219)

As detailed elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization plans a two-satellite Russian American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should develop, and seek congressional approval of, a technology protection plan before proceeding with the RAMOS program, regardless of the program's structure and focus. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any funds for RAMOS until 30 days after the Secretary submits to Congress a report explaining how the Secretary plans to protect U.S. advanced military technology that may be associated with the RAMOS program.

Joint Biological Defense Program (sec. 220)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation of funds to procure the vaccine for the biological agent anthrax until the Secretary of Defense: (1) notifies the congressional defense committees in writing that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved the current production facility of the anthrax vaccine for FDA-approved vaccine production operations; and (2) provides a report to the congressional defense committees that addresses contingencies associated with relying on the current manufacturer to produce the vaccine. The report will include recommended strategies to mitigate the risk of the loss of the current sole-source manufacturer of the vaccine and a budget to support these strategies. The report will also provide recommended strategies to ensure that an FDA-licensed anthrax vaccine can be procured should the sole-source manufacturer fail to obtain FDA approval to release stockpiled or newly produced vaccine, or the manufacturer terminates anthrax vaccine production permanently. The Secretary will report the funding requirements and the criteria for implementing these strategies.

In the Senate report accompanying S. 2060 (S. Rept 105–189), the committee noted that the anthrax vaccine is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and has been used by cattle and sheep ranchers since the 1970s. The committee also emphasized the criticality of maintaining sufficient supplies of the vaccine to immunize U.S. military personnel against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

The Department of Defense (DOD) currently relies on a single-source manufacturer to supply the military services with the anthrax vaccine. The vaccine manufacturer, however, failed to maintain required FDA approvals for the vaccine production facility and the stockpiled vaccine. As a result, the DOD delayed the start of phase two of the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP). In addition, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) conducted audits of the manufacturer's financial capability in June 1999, and February 2000, and reported after both reviews that there is ". . . substantial doubt . . ." that the manufacturer will be financially able to continue performing on government contracts. The committee believes that it is incumbent on the Department to assess the implications of the FDA, DCAA, and other federal agency reviews of the current procurement plan, and to ensure that an effective plan is in place to provide a vaccine to immunize U.S. military personnel against the anthrax virus.

Report on biological warfare defense vaccine research and development programs (sec. 221)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to report on the progress of the Department of Defense (DOD) program to develop and procure vaccines for biological warfare agents. The Secretary will provide this report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2001. The report will include: an evaluation of the ability of the commercial sector to meet the vaccine requirements of the Department; a design for a government owned/contractor operated (GOCO) vaccine production facility at an alternative site determined by the Secretary; and a comparison of the costs and benefits of the current acquisition strategy, a GOCO facility at an alternative site determined by the Secretary, and other acquisition alternatives. The design recommendation for the GOCO facility at the alternative site determined by the Secretary will include: a recommendation, in consultation with the U.S. Surgeon General, on the possibility of the GOCO providing support for civilian vaccine requirements and the related impact on the operating costs of the GOCO vaccine production facility; and an analysis of the impact of international requirements for vaccines on the operating costs of the GOCO.

The biological warfare capability of the government of Iraq during Operation Desert Storm led to a requirement for vaccines to immunize military personnel against biological agents. Since that time, the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) biological warfare threat list now includes over twenty biological agents that are in some stage of development, from basic research to production, by several countries. During this same period, the Department has initiated a mandatory program to immunize all active and reserve military personnel against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

During an April 14, 2000, hearing of the Subcommittee on Personnel, witnesses from the DOD and General Accounting Office identified many of the challenges associated with vaccine development and acquisition. These challenges included the reluctance of large pharmacuetical companies to participate in vaccine development and production, the speculative costs associated with working with start-up commercial vaccine research and production companies, and the requirement to pay a premium to the private sector

for vaccine research and development due to the relatively limited quantities of vaccines required by the DOD. The committee notes the recommendation of Project Badger in the early 1990s for a GOCO vaccine production facility and subsequent DOD plans and budgeting to construct a facility at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Based on the work that has already been done, the committee believes that the Secretary should give strong consideration to the Pine Bluff Arsenal as the site for the alternate facility. Given these issues, the committee believes a reevaluation by the DOD of the issues relating to vaccine development and production, and the merits of a GOCO facility at an alternative site are necessary at this time.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Mobile offshore base (sec. 241)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with the results of the operational utility cost- benefit analysis. The provision would also require the Secretary to designate a lead service and tentative program schedule if the Secretary decides to continue the MOB program.

The Senate report accompanying S. 1059 (S. Rept. 106–50) directed the Secretary of Defense to initiate an analysis of the operational utility of the mobile offshore base (MOB), and report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000. The analysis was to include the results of the technical feasibility studies, assessment of the operational utility versus the life- cycle cost of such a system, and a recommendation on whether to proceed with predevelopment or development activities. The report further directed that, if the recommendation were to proceed with the program, the Department of Defense should designate an executive service and provide an estimate of fiscally phased resources for program execution.

The Navy delivered a report to the congressional defense committees in April, 2000. This report, however, only detailed the technical work accomplished and described the effort that would need to be accomplished were the program to be initiated, along with cost estimates of the remaining effort. There was no mention of operational utility versus life-cycle cost, nor was there a recommendation on whether to proceed with the program.

Air Force science and technology planning (sec. 242)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the long-term challenges and short term objectives of the Air Force science and technology (S&T) program.

The committee was deeply disappointed by the science and technology budget proposed by the Air Force for fiscal year 2000. This budget not only failed to measure up to the congressional goals established in section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105- 261), but also risked mortgaging the future of the Air Force by sacrificing long-term technological superiority in favor of short-term readiness. The science and technology budget proposed by the Air Force for

fiscal year 2001 shows some improvement, but the committee remains concerned that the Air Force has made deep cuts to some programs without undertaking a comprehensive planning process to ascertain its long-term technology needs and how those needs can be supported by the science and technology program.

Over the last five years, the Department of Defense (DOD) has developed a coordinated planning process for S&T spending, known as the joint warfighting science and technology planning process. This process has helped DOD address redundancies and overlaps, and ensure that the S&T programs funded by the services are appropriately designed to meet the Department's warfighting needs. The result has been a significant improvement in the quality of the Department's science and technology budget submissions. As successful as it has been, however, the current S&T planning process appears to focus on the micro issue of ensuring that individual projects address legitimate warfighting needs, rather than on the macro issue of prioritizing those needs and ensuring that sufficient funding is made available to meet them.

Two of the three services have undertaken ambitious steps to try to address that shortcoming in the science and technology planning process by prioritizing their own needs on a macro basis, and realigning S&T funding to match new priorities. The Army has attempted to identify science and technology spending that is directly linked to the planned transformation of the force, and prioritized that spending over funding for incremental improvements to existing platforms. The Navy has undertaken to reevaluate all science and technology spending from the ground up and focus investments on areas designated as long-term Grand Challenges and more immediate Future Naval Capabilities. By focusing its spending in this way, the Navy hopes to avoid the usual practice of trying to fund a little bit of everything, and ensure that it will have critical mass in the areas that are most important to the Navy of the future.

In view of the serious cuts in the Air Force S&T budget and the danger that these cuts could undermine long-term technological superiority in key areas, the provision recommended by the committee would require the Air Force to undertake a comparable planning effort. This process must include not only the Air Force research community, but also the entire warfighter community, requirements community, and acquisition community. It is the committee's hope that the planning process—and the Air Force science and technology program—will be driven by the future needs of the Air Force, rather than the budgetary constraints of today.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Army

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,459	-	14,459
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	132,164	-	135,164
		Counter-Terrorism Research		3,000	
0601104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	54,365	-	54,365
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE		-	-
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	11,557	-	17,557
		Composite Materials		6,000	
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	20,722	-	20,722
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	7,226	-	7,226
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	31,080	-	31,080
0602270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	17,310	-	17,310
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	47,183	-	52,183
		Advanced missile composite component		5,000	
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	993	-	993
0602308A	12	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	30,479	-	30,479
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	63,589	-	67,089
		Smart Truck Initiative		3,500	
0602618A	14	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	49,750	-	49,750
0602622A	15	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,530	-	3,530
0602623A	16	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,415	-	5,415
0602624A	17	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,761	-	33,761
0602705A	18	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	23,869	-	25,369
		Portable Hybrid Electric Power Research		1,500	
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,465	-	20,465
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	12,386	-	12,386

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	15,786	-	15,786
0602720A	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	13,994	-	13,994
0602782A	23	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	23,314	-	23,314
0602783A	24	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	3,987	-	3,987
0602784A	25	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	42,344	-	47,344
		Thermoelectric Power Generation for Military Applications		1,000	
		Operational Support		4,000	
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	11,869	-	11,869
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	24,659	-	24,659
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,729	-	75,729
0602789A	29	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,338	-	1,338
0602805A	30	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,154	-	10,154
0603001A	31	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,469	-	15,469
0603002A	32	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,512	-	16,512
0603003A	33	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,810	-	28,810
0603004A	34	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,738	-	29,738
0603005A	35	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	148,114	-	206,414
		Equipment readiness		8,000	
		Fuel Cell Auxilary Power Units		4,000	
		Enabling Technologies for Future Combat Vehicle		46,300	
0603006A	36	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,505	-	28,505
		Big Crow		7,000	
0603007A	37	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,072	-	3,072
0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	12,217	-	12,217
0603013A	39	TRACTOR DIRT		-	-
0603017A	40	TRACTOR RED	984	-	984

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603020A	41	TRACTOR ROSE	10,892	-	10,892
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,889	-	5,889
0603122A	43	TRACTOR HIP	980	-	980
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEF/PRECISION STRIKE TECH DEMO	21,307	-	21,307
0603270A	45	EW TECHNOLOGY	15,359	-	15,359
0603280A	46	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		-	-
0603313A	47	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,107	-	25,107
0603322A	48	TRACTOR CAGE	3,083	-	3,083
0603606A	49	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,894	-	20,894
0603607A	50	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,469	-	4,469
0603654A	51	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	50,727	-	50,727
0603710A	52	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	33,341	-	33,341
0603728A	53	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,616	-	1,616
0603734A	54	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,207	-	5,207
0603772A	55	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE & SENSOR TECH	15,613	-	15,613
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,573	-	75,773
		Simulation Centers Upgrades		4,500	
		Family of Systems Simulators		3,000	
		Army Space Control		5,000	
		Missile Defense Flight Experiment		14,700	
		THEL		15,000	
		Accoustic Technology		4,000	
		Radar Power Technology		4,000	
		Scramjet Accoustic Combustion Enhance		2,000	
		Aero-Accoustic Instrumentation		4,000	
		Supercluster distributed Memory		2,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		SMDC Battlelab		5,000	
0603619A	57	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	22,803	-	22,803
0603639A	58	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,139	-	30,139
0603653A	59	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	118,139	-	118,139
0603713A	60	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	17	-	17
0603747A	61	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	13,574	-	13,574
0603774A	62	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,968	-	10,968
0603779A	63	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEM/VAL	4,897	-	4,897
0603790A	64	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,920	-	1,920
0603801A	65	AVIATION - ADV DEV	5,848	-	5,848
0603802A	66	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	28,679	-	28,679
0603804A	67	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	6,317	-	6,317
0603805A	68	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYS EVAL & ANALYSIS	13,753	-	13,753
0603807A	69	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	15,259	-	17,259
		Anti-malarial Research		2,000	
0603851A	70	TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	979	-	979
0603854A	71	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	355,309	-	355,309
0603856A	72	SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	20,277	-	20,277
0603889A	73	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS		-	-
0604201A	74	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	42,280	-	42,280
0604220A	75	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	532	-	532
0604223A	76	COMANCHE	614,041	-	614,041
0604270A	77	EW DEVELOPMENT	61,056	-	99,556
		SIRFC/ATIRCM		38,500	
0604280A	78	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	62,218	-	62,218
0604321A	79	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	44,084	-	44,084

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604328A	80	TRACTOR CAGE	2,916	-	2,916
0604329A	81	MODERNIZED HELLFIRE	4,969	-	4,969
0604601A	82	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	2	-	2
0604604A	83	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,959	-	1,959
0604609A	84	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	3,461	-	3,461
0604611A	85	JAVELIN	490	-	490
0604619A	86	LANDMINE WARFARE	15,902	-	15,902
0604622A	87	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES		-	-
0604633A	88	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	2,026	-	2,026
0604641A	89	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)		-	-
0604642A	90	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	9,893	-	9,893
0604645A	91	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.	2,200	-	2,200
0604649A	92	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0604710A	93	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	32,574	-	32,574
0604713A	94	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	86,321	-	86,321
0604715A	95	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	73,295	-	73,295
0604716A	96	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	6,082	-	6,082
0604726A	97	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,771	-	1,771
0604739A	98	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	6,060	-	6,060
0604741A	99	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	16,462	-	16,462
0604746A	100	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	12,956	-	12,956
0604760A	101	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENG DEV	20,689	-	20,689
0604766A	102	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	57,419	-	57,419
0604768A	103	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	96,102	-	96,102
0604770A	104	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	17,898	-	17,898
0604778A	105	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	2,420	-	2,420

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604780A	106	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	18,498	-	18,498
0604801A	107	AVIATION - ENG DEV	7,104	-	7,104
0604802A	108	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	22,505	-	22,505
0604804A	109	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,457	-	20,457
0604805A	110	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	49,316	-	49,316
0604807A	111	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF EQUIP - ENG DEV	6,318	-	6,318
0604808A	112	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	69,584	-	69,584
0604814A	113	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	52,848	-	52,848
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	5,362	-	5,362
0604818A	115	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	33,420	-	33,420
0604819A	116	LOSAT	26,800	-	26,800
0604820A	117	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	8,429	-	8,429
0604823A	118	FIREFINDER	37,363	-	37,363
0604824A	119	DUAP COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS		-	-
0604854A	120	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	20,105	-	20,105
0605013A	121	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	94,170	-	94,170
0604256A	122	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,901	-	18,501
		Threat Virtual Mine Simulator		2,500	
		Threat Information Operations Attack Simulator		2,100	
0604258A	123	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,346	-	13,346
0604759A	124	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	44,019	-	44,019
0605103A	125	RAND ARROYO CENTER	19,872	-	19,872
0605301A	126	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	153,326	-	153,326
0605326A	127	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	15,410	-	15,410
0605502A	128	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605601A	129	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	119,657	-	119,657

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605602A	130	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	33,156	-	33,156
0605604A	131	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	27,248	-	27,248
0605605A	132	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,521	-	14,521
0605606A	133	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,200	-	3,200
0605702A	134	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,927	-	6,927
0605706A	135	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	8,737	-	8,737
0605709A	136	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,582	-	3,582
0605712A	137	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	71,079	-	71,079
0605716A	138	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	26,337	-	26,337
0605801A	139	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,811	-	73,811
0605803A	140	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	26,749	-	26,749
0605805A	141	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	11,276	-	11,276
0605853A	142	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION		-	-
0605854A	143	POLLUTION PREVENTION		-	-
0605856A	144	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE		-	-
0605857A	145	ARMY ACQUISITION POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	5,418	-	5,418
0605876A	146	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E		-	-
0605878A	147	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E		-	-
0605879A	148	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E		-	-
0605896A	149	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E		-	-
0605898A	150	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	5,371	-	5,371
0909999A	151	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
0603778A	152	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,523	-	75,523
		Cost Reduction Effort MLRS/HIMARS		16,000	
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,996	-	26,996
		Design and Manufacturing Program		2,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0203610A	154	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION		-	-
0203726A	155	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	36,816	-	36,816
0203735A	156	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	99,423	-	99,423
0203740A	157	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	48,910	-	48,910
0203744A	158	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	95,829	-	95,829
0203752A	159	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,929	-	2,929
0203758A	160	DIGITIZATION	29,671	-	29,671
0203759A	161	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	63,601	-	63,601
0203761A	162	FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROG	6,021	-	6,021
0203801A	163	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12,365	-	12,365
0203802A	164	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	64,418	-	64,418
0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	3,837	-	3,837
0208010A	166	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	38,926	-	38,926
0208053A	167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	6,267	-	6,267
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	5,215	-	5,215
0303028A	169	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES		-	-
0303140A	170	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,140	-	13,140
		Center for Comunications and Networking		5,000	
0303141A	171	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	71,955	-	71,955
0303142A	172	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	43,229	-	43,229
0303150A	173	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,234	-	14,234
0305114A	174	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	783	-	783
0305204A	175	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	29,427	-	29,427
0305206A	176	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,898	-	4,898
0305208A	177	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	7,894	-	7,894
0708045A	178	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	57,906	-	57,906

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1001018A	179	NATO JOINT STARS		-	-
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(19,000)	(19,000)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946

Counter-terrorism basic research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 61102A for the Army's counter-terrorism research program. Last year, the committee provided the funding to initiate a basic research program in order to explore technologies that deter, resolve, and mitigate terrorist acts, including physical structure and physical effects research. It is of the utmost concern that we conduct research and development not only for near-term solutions, but also for investigating revolutionary approaches in science and techologies that will provide next generation solutions for force protection and terrorist threats. The committee urges the Army to include funding for this important project in the future.

Composite materials

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62105A for composite materials for the next generation armored vehicle for the Army's objective force. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Advanced missile composite components

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the missile technology applied research program (PE 62303A) to develop the enabling technology for the next generation of tactical missiles. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Smart truck initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 62601A, the Army's combat vehicle and automotive technology account for the National Automotive Center, to conduct demonstrations for the smart truck initiative. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Portable hybrid electric power system

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62705A for research in a portable, hybrid electric power system that would combine battery, fuel cell, super-capacitor, and other subsystems. The additional funds would be used to model and assess the tradeoffs as they relate to military missions. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Thermoelectric power generation

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62784A for a feasibility study on thermoelectric power generation for military applications.

Operational support

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in the Army's military engineering program (PE 62784A) for university partnering for operational support. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Equipment readiness

Long lead times and the high costs of procuring and inventory of replacement parts has resulted in soaring operation and support costs with a reduction of equipment readiness rates. The committee understands the Department of Defense has initiated a program to address these problems through the development of a self-contained, mobile manufacturing center that can produce spare parts at the point of need. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63005A for the continuation of this important effort. The committee directs cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Fuel cell auxiliary power units

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63005A for research in fuel cell auxiliary power units for use in the Army's objective force. The Army's transformation strategy includes reducing the size of the deployed logistics footprint and prioritizing the development of vehicles that are smaller, lighter, more lethal, yet more reliable, fuel efficient and survivable. A key component of increased survivability is reducing the signature of future Army platforms. Addressing these logistics and survivability challenges should entail a full evaluation of alternative energy sources.

Big Crow program office

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 63006A for the Big Crow program, a national test asset supporting a wide variety of electronic warfare test and training exercises. The Big Crow program has historically been operated under the Department of Defense Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB), primarily in a test asset role. Recently, however, the operational forces have recognized the asset's potential. The Big Crow program has been deployed operationally to support NATO and U.S. force deployments in southeast Europe as well as Commander in Chief for Space (CINCSpace) activities. The committee understands that the Department is making progress in developing a new strategy to ensure long-term funding for this program that will provide stability to support test and evaluation as well as operational missions. Oversight of the program has been assigned to the Army Space and Missile Defense Command and funding for this program is provided in the Future Years' Defense Program beginning in fiscal year 2002. The additional $7.0 million would provide bridge funding to maintain continuity in operations until the program completes this transition.

Army Space and Missile Defense Command Simulations

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63308A for Family of Systems Simulators and an increase of $4.5 million in PE 63308A for Simulations Center Upgrade.

Aero-acoustics instrumentation

The budget request included no funds for aero-acoustics instrumentation. The committee has supported research and development activities conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command in the area of aero-acoustics. Aero-acoustics instrumentation will enable the Army to understand acoustic coupling of missile airframes to the internal components for vehicles flying as fast as Mach 10. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important research and development.

Acoustic technology research

The committee continues to support research sponsored by the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command in acoustic applications for detection, identification, and tracking of cruise missiles and mobile missile launchers. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued effort in this area.

Missile defense flight experiment

The committee has supported the Army's program to demonstrate critical missile defense kill vehicle technologies through flight testing. To continue this effort, the committee recommends an increase of $14.7 million in PE 63308A.

Radar power technology

The committee continues to support advanced radar power technology development at the Army Missile Defense and Space Technology Center. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important research and development.

Scramjet acoustic combustion enhancement

The committee is aware of research and development activities being conducted by the Army Space and Missile Defense Command in the area of scramjet acoustic mixing. A scramjet engine that can utilize acoustics to more efficiently burn propellant could significantly increase the performance and efficiency of air defense interceptors. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63308A to support continuation of this important research and development.

Space and missile defense battle lab

The committee continues to support the Army's Space and Missile Defense Battle Lab. To support this important modeling and simulation capability, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63308A.

Supercluster distributed memory technology

The budget request included no funds for supercluster distributed memory technology. The committee is aware that supercluster distributed memory technology may provide a cost- effective approach to running complex computer simulations to predict the control forces exerted on a missile over its flight trajectory. To support evaluation of this technology, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million PE 63308A.

Tactical High Energy Laser

The budget request included no funding for completion of testing of the Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL) program. The committee supports expeditious completion of THEL development and testing. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63308A to support continued THEL testing and deployment preparation activities.

Anti-malarial research

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63807A to accelerate the development and fielding of the anti- malarial compound taphenoquine. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Electronic warfare development

The budget request included $61.1 million for Army electronic warfare development activities. The committee notes and appreciates ongoing efforts by the Army to completely identify and understand issues associated with the deployment of Task Force Hawk last year during operations in Kosovo. The committee recognizes an outstanding requirement to install a suite of radio frequency countermeasures (SIRFC) and advanced threat infrared countermeasures (ATIRCM) equipment on Apache helicopters necessary to improve the ability of aircraft crews to survive in future conflicts. The committee recommends an increase of $38.5 million in PE 64270A for electronic warfare development, a total authorization of $99.6 million. Of this amount, $18.0 million would be used to support the development of a SIRFC production line and $20.5 million to complete development of SIRFC and ATIRCM "A" kits for the Apache Longbow helicopter.

Threat simulator development

The budget request included $13.9 million for threat simulator development activities. The committee recognizes the important roles that threat simulators play in preparing our forces to fight and win future battles. The committee recommends an increase of $4.6 million in PE 64256A, a total authorization of $18.5 million. Of the $4.6 million increase, $2.1 million would be used for threat information operations attack simulator development and $2.5 million would be used for threat virtual mine simulator development.

Multiple launch rocket system product improvement program

The budget request included $59.5 million for multiple launch rocket system product improvements. The committee understands

that the Army continues to pursue a cost reduction initiative associated with the multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) improved launcher and the high mobility artillery and rocket system (HIMARS). The committee understands this initiative could result in cost savings of greater than $500.0 million over the life of these programs. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $16.0 million in PE 63728A to support the ongoing MLRS and HIMARS cost reduction initiatives.

Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor

The budget request included $25.0 million for the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) system. The committee is concerned about possible vulnerabilities of an aerostat to climatic conditions and understands that the Army has established an Aerostat Design and Manufacturing (ADAM) program to facilitate the design and manufacture of affordable aerostats with improved performance and availability. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 12419A in support of the ADAM program to provide the type of material and tether technology to make the JLENS system viable.

Communications and networking technologies

The budget request included $8.1 million for Army information systems security research, development, test and evaluation. The committee supports efforts managed by the Army's Communications and Electronics Command (CECOM) in the area of applied communications and networking technology. To support these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140A.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1001018A	179	NATO JOINT STARS		-	-
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(19,000)	(19,000)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	5,260,346	201,600	5,461,946

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0602805N	16	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,067	-	10,067
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,667	-	39,667
0603238N	18	PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	68,555	-	68,555
0603270N	19	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,583	-	17,583
0603508N	20	SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,432	-	57,232
		Supply Chain Best Practices		2,000	
		Virtual Testbed for Reconfigurable Ship		2,000	
		Modular Composite Hull		4,000	
		Composite Helo Hangar Door		5,000	
		Advanced Waterjet-21		4,000	
		Laser Welding and Cutting		2,800	
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	54,749	-	54,749
0603706N	22	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	10,110	-	10,110
0603707N	23	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	26,988	-	26,988
0603712N	24	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADV TECHNOLOGY	24,002	-	24,002
0603727N	25	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	49,506	-	55,506
		Joint Experimentation		6,000	
0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	58,296	-	58,296
0603782N	27	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,618	-	48,618
		Ocean Modeling for Mine and Expeditionary Warfare		3,000	
0603792N	28	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	76,333	-	91,333
		USMC ATT Initiative		15,000	
0603794N	29	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,673	-	29,673
0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,337	-	30,337
0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	7,536	-	7,536
0603254N	32	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,680	-	19,680

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603261N	33	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,956	-	1,956
0603382N	34	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	6,943	-	6,943
0603502N	35	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	97,929	-	102,929
		Minesweeper Integrated Combat Weapons System		5,000	
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE		-	-
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	148,952	-	148,952
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	244,437	-	244,437
0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	107,598	-	107,598
0603526N	41	ADVANCED SOFTWARE AND COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603527N	42	RETRACT LARCH	11,895	-	11,895
0603536N	43	RETRACT JUNIPER		-	-
0603542N	44	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	572	-	572
0603553N	45	SURFACE ASW	6,752	-	6,752
0603559N	46	SSGN CONVERSION	34,762	-	43,762
		SSBN to SSGN Conversion Design Options		9,000	
0603561N	47	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	113,269	-	117,769
		Electric Motor Brush Technology		2,000	
		Advanced Composite Sail Technology		2,500	
0603562N	48	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,356	-	4,356
0603563N	49	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	162	-	162
0603564N	50	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	46,896	-	50,496
		Shipboard Simulation for Marine Corps Operations		20,000	
		JCC(X) Analysis of Alternatives		(16,400)	
0603570N	51	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	168,483	-	168,483
0603573N	52	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,635	-	5,635

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603576N	53	CHALK EAGLE	64,770	-	64,770
0603582N	54	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,966	-	42,966
		Common Command and Decision Functions		10,000	
0603609N	55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	28,619	-	28,619
0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	137,981	-	165,481
		Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle		27,500	
0603612M	57	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV		-	-
0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	23,216	-	40,516
		High Mobility Artillery Rocket System		17,300	
0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	13,131	-	13,131
0603658N	60	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	119,257	-	119,257
0603713N	61	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,371	-	15,371
0603721N	62	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	62,194	-	62,194
0603724N	63	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,942	-	4,942
0603725N	64	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,824	-	1,824
0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	52,886	-	52,886
0603739N	66	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY		-	-
0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	125,222	-	125,222
0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	42,372	-	42,372
0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	13,541	-	13,541
0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	6,610	-	6,610
0603764N	71	LINK EVERGREEN	9,712	-	9,712
0603787N	72	SPECIAL PROCESSES	62,510	-	62,510
0603790N	73	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,992	-	8,992
0603795N	74	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	143,044	-	153,044
		Extended Range Guided Munition		10,000	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603800N	75	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	131,566	-	343,666
		Extend DEM/VAL		212,100	
0603851M	76	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,580	-	31,580
		Nonlethal Research and Technology Development		8,000	
0603857N	77	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)	13,110	-	13,110
0603889N	78	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS		-	-
0604327N	79	HARD & DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYS (HDBTDS) PROG		-	-
0604707N	80	SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENG SUP	34,100	-	38,100
		NAVCIITI		4,000	
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT		-	-
0604212N	82	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	24,393	-	34,393
		Parametric Airborne Dipping Sonar		10,000	
0604214N	83	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	38,061	-	38,061
0604215N	84	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	95,814	-	95,814
0604216N	85	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	69,946	-	77,946
		Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures		8,000	
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	455	-	455
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,051	-	6,051
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,906	-	2,906
0604231N	89	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	57,817	-	57,817
0604245N	90	H-1 UPGRADES	139,680	-	139,680
0604261N	91	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	20,766	-	20,766
0604262N	92	V-22A	148,168	-	148,168
0604264N	93	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,466	-	17,466
0604270N	94	EW DEVELOPMENT	97,281	-	97,281
0604300N	95	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	305,274	-	318,274

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Power Node Control Center		3,000	
		Advanced Food Service Technology		2,000	
		SPY-3 and Volume Search Radar		8,000	
0604307N	96	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	179,684	-	179,684
0604311N	97	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	273	-	273
0604312N	98	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,024	-	2,024
0604366N	99	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,194	-	1,194
0604373N	100	AIRBORNE MCM	47,312	-	47,312
0604503N	101	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	34,801	-	54,801
		Multi-Purpose Processor		15,000	
		Antenna Technology Improvements		5,000	
0604504N	102	AIR CONTROL	13,538	-	13,538
0604507N	103	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	875	-	875
0604512N	104	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,833	-	9,833
0604518N	105	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	3,720	-	3,720
0604524N	106	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	3,642	-	3,642
0604528N	107	SWATH (SM WATERPLANE AREA TWIN HULL) OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIP		-	-
0604558N	108	NEW DESIGN SSN	207,091	-	212,091
		Submarine Common Architecture		5,000	
0604561N	109	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	6,617	-	6,617
0604562N	110	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	20,492	-	24,492
		Advanced Tactical Software Integration		4,000	
0604567N	111	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,204	-	72,204
		CVN-77, CVN(X), and Nimitz Class Smart Product Model		10,000	
0604574N	112	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,291	-	3,291
0604601N	113	MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,968	-	1,968

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604603N	114	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	2,581	-	2,581
0604610N	115	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	9,347	-	9,347
0604612M	116	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV		-	-
0604618N	117	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	26,151	-	26,151
0604654N	118	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,102	-	7,102
0604703N	119	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,271	-	1,271
0604710N	120	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,531	-	5,531
0604721N	121	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	2,232	-	2,232
0604727N	122	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	20,823	-	20,823
0604755N	123	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	85,049	-	87,149
		NULKA Dual Band Spatially Distributed Infrared Signature		2,100	
0604771N	124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	5,273	-	5,273
0604777N	125	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	18,487	-	18,487
0604784N	126	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,710	-	20,710
0604800N	127	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	295,962	-	-
		Extend DEM/VAL		(295,962)	
0604805N	128	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE		-	-
0604910N	129	SMART CARD DEV/MOD	1,240	-	1,240
0605013M	130	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,833	-	6,833
0605013N	131	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,259	-	18,259
		Single Integrated Human Resources Strategy		3,000	
0508713N	132	NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	5,917	-	5,917
0604256N	133	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,293	-	24,293
0604258N	134	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	41,138	-	41,138
0604759N	135	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,707	-	40,707
0605152N	136	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,056	-	8,056

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605154N	137	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,889	-	43,889
0605155N	138	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,886	-	2,886
0605502N	139	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605804N	140	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	949	-	949
0605853N	141	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	17,644	-	17,644
0605856N	142	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,403	-	2,403
0605861N	143	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	53,380	-	53,380
0605862N	144	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	12,045	-	12,045
0605863N	145	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	76,128	-	76,128
0605864N	146	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,327	-	270,327
0605865N	147	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	8,957	-	8,957
0605866N	148	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,262	-	3,262
0605867N	149	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,694	-	12,694
0605873M	150	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,091	-	11,091
		Marine Corps Research University		3,000	
0305885N	151	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	4,666	-	4,666
0909999N	152	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
0603660N	153	ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	207,000	-	207,000
0603661N	154	RETRACT VIOLET	30,161	-	30,161
0604227N	155	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS		-	-
0604805N	156	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	12,485	-	12,485
0101221N	157	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	42,687	-	44,687
		Reentry System Application Program		2,000	
0101224N	158	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,173	-	31,173
0101226N	159	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	879	-	879
0204136N	160	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	248,093	-	248,093

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0204152N	161	E-2 SQUADRONS	18,698	-	18,698
0204163N	162	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	12,012	-	12,012
0204229N	163	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	91,436	-	91,436
0204311N	164	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	16,928	-	16,928
0204413N	165	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	7,911	-	7,911
0204571N	166	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,059	-	32,059
		Joint Tactical Combat Training System		5,000	
0204575N	167	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,924	-	9,924
0205601N	168	HARM IMPROVEMENT	21,355	-	21,355
0205604N	169	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	26,245	-	26,245
0205620N	170	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	29,585	-	29,585
0205632N	171	MK-48 ADCAP	15,853	-	15,853
0205633N	172	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	51,018	-	51,018
0205667N	173	F-14 UPGRADE	1,228	-	10,228
		SAR Reconnaissance System Demonstrator		9,000	
0205675N	174	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,435	-	53,435
0206313M	175	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	96,153	-	96,153
0206623M	176	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	22,124	-	22,124
0206624M	177	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	2,854	-	2,854
0207161N	178	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,705	-	21,705
0207163N	179	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	12,140	-	12,140
0303109N	182	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	37,778	-	37,778
0303140N	183	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	21,530	-	21,530
0303150N	184	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		-	-
0305160N	186	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	19,730	-	19,730
0305188N	187	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	7,795	-	9,795

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Interoperability Process Software Tools		2,000	
0305192N	188	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	7,000	-	7,000
0305204M	189	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES		-	-
0305204N	190	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	113,052	-	113,052
0305206N	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,759	-	4,759
0305207N	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	27,479	-	27,479
0305208N	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,482	-	4,482
0305927N	194	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	2,038	-	2,038
0305972N	195	SPACE ACTIVITIES		-	2,000
		SPAWAR SATCOM Systems Integration Initiative		2,000	
0308601N	196	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,106	-	14,106
		Distributed Engineering Plant		5,000	
0702207N	197	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	34,166	-	34,166
0708011N	198	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,626	-	59,626
0708730N	199	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	9,366	-	9,366
XXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	531,940	-	531,940
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	8,476,677	189,188	8,665,865

Free electron laser

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62111N to complete the development of the infrared free electron laser demonstration project to the 10 kilowatt level. This investment would enable the Department of the Navy to determine capabilities of such a tool for infrared counter-measures and further the technology base in high energy lasers.

Biodegradable polymers

The budget request included no funds for biodegradable polymers. The committee recommends an increase of $1.25 million in PE 62121N to aid in the development of polymer membrane methods for treating graywater (kitchen, shower, and cleaning solution), blackwater (sewage), and bilge water (oily contaminants) to acceptable levels prior to shipboard release.

Bioenvironmental hazards research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62121N for bioenvironmental hazards research. The committee is concerned that there is insufficient knowledge of the full impact and hazards to humans, animals, and plants from the potential use of biological warfare agents. Besides the obvious lethal effects on living organisms, biological warfare agents could have other very serious long-term consequences that would require a dedicated mitigation response or prophylaxis. The additional funds should be applied to research and development of the technologies and methods for better measuring and understanding the full range of impacts of biological warfare hazards to people and other living organisms, and thus improve our ability to develop suitable preparations or responses to such hazards. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Nontraditional warfare initiatives

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62131M for the Marine Corps to conduct applied research directed at their role as first responders. The additional funds should be used to explore innovative concepts for addressing non- traditional tactics and operational challenges arising in the 21st Century. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

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

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62232N to accelerate the introduction of fused hyperspectral, synthetic aperture radar and electronic intelligence. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Cognitive research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62233N for applied cognitive technologies to improve learning. In

a hearing before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, Dr. Delores Etter, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Science and Technology, explained the importance and the growing need for cognitive research, "...an area that we think is one of increasing importance is cognitive readiness. This is really the area of human optimization. The challenges in this area include sustained operations, environmental ambiguity, distributed learning, and the overall information overload that we are presenting to our soldiers." The committee understands that the Chief of Naval and Education and Training has initiated a program to deal with cognitive development for Navy personnel. The additional funds would extend this program's focus to include technological research in cognitive readiness and human optimization.

Ceramic and carbon based composites

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62234N for the continued development, evaluation and testing of ceramic and carbon based composites for use in strategic missiles and hypersonic vehicles. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Nanoscale sensor research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in nanoscale sensor technologies. The additional funding would be expected to support the area designated by the Office of Naval Research as a Grand Challenge to develop highly multi-functional nanoscale architecture devices to their ultimate limits (high speed (100x), small size (0.01x), and low power (0.001x)), that interactively combine sensing, image processing, computation, signal processing, and communication functions, to achieve real-time adoptive response, on-site for Navy missions. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Littoral area acoustic demonstrations

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62435N for acoustic data collection, all source data fusion, and advanced acoustic modeling and signal processing techniques in support of Navy research and development efforts. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Computational engineering design

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62633N for computational engineering research and design for marine and aerospace vehicles. This research provides a focus on the simulation and design of surface ship and submarine applications. It is particularly relevant in the view of the Navy's decision to transfer ship design from the Navy laboratories to the shipyards. There is also some extension of the technology to aerospace based on requirements of the National Aeronautical and Space Adminis-

tration (NASA). The committee expects the Office of Naval Research to fully explore such applications in the execution of the research. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Advanced water-jet technology

The budget request included no funds for advanced water-jet technology. Advanced water-jet technology represents the type of technological improvement in ship propulsion that could reduce both acquisition and total ownership costs. Water-jet technology has the potential to reduce ship signatures critical to maintaining war fighting superiority through battle space awareness. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63508N for advanced water-jet technology.

Composite helicopter hangar door

The budget request included no funds for developing a composite helicopter hangar door. The initiative to design and fabricate a composite helo hangar door for surface combatants has the potential to reduce combatant ship life-cycle costs by improving reliability and reducing maintenance requirements. The program will leverage enabling technologies that can lead to reduced radar signatures and cost and weight savings. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63508N for the design and fabrication of a DDG–51 helicopter hangar door structure using composite materials.

Composite modules for ship hull construction

The budget request included no funding in PE 63508N for development of composite hull modules which may be required for future ship construction. While composites have some war fighting advantages over standard ship construction using steel and aluminum components, the technical expertise for constructing composite modules is limited. It is anticipated that future ship construction may include expanded use of composites.

The committee encourages development of key technologies that will provide the foundation should the Navy decide to pursue the war fighting advantages of composites. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63508N for the development and construction of prototype composite modules for ship construction.

Laser welding and cutting

The budget request included no funding in PE 63508N for development of laser welding and cutting techniques. Navy ships are built using structural shapes and plate steel. Most shapes are currently stripped or split from I-beam stock material. Laser cutting and welding shapes from plate steel could enhance the quality and reduce the cost of producing shapes used in ship construction. Laser cutting and welding also has the potential to enable more creative designs for shapes.

The committee encourages development of key technologies that have the potential to provide higher quality and lower costs for building Navy ships. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 63508N for the development and application to naval ship construction of laser welding and cutting techniques.

Supply chain best practices

The budget request included $37.4 million in PE 63508N for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and engineering systems in support of present and future ships and submarines.

The supply system for ships and submarines requires interface and interaction of a number of different communications and software systems. This incompatibility requires reentry of data which is manpower intensive. Because the supply chain best practices initiative has the potential to improve affordability, quality, and productivity by providing connectivity for an alliance among the Navy, industry, universities, and government agencies, the committee recommends an increase to the initiative.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63508N for supply chain best practices.

Virtual test bed for reconfigurable ship

The budget request included no funds for a virtual test bed for a reconfigurable ship. The Navy is developing a virtual machinery design, test, and evaluation capability for future ship systems. This will enable the combination of real time, interactive, software simulation with the hardware in-the-loop technologies.

The committee fully supports this simulation and testing prior to committing to system configuration. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63508N for a virtual test bed for a reconfigurable ship.

Ocean modeling for mine and submarine warfare

The budget request included $45.6 million for mine and expeditionary warfare advanced technology. Within that amount, the request included funds for algorithm development and modeling and simulation to provide battle space products to the Office of the Naval Oceanographer for promulgation to the war fighting commanders in chiefs (CINCs).

Research and development of products critical to monitoring, modeling, and disseminating environmental data are key factors in battle space awareness. Specifically, the databases and information regarding environments and predictions in littoral regions require emphasis on the mine warfare mission area. Investigation, data analysis, and prediction tools are required for current and eddy flow, bottom contour and content, and thermal layer behavior, cold water phenomena and man-made clutter.

Effective mine and submarine warfare are dependent on correct and timely environmental data. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 603782N for ocean modeling.

Marine Corps advanced technology transition

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63792N for a Marine Corps advanced technology transition initia-

tive focused on the development of expeditionary warfighting technologies identified and developed through experimentation at the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory (CWL). The committee expects the Marine Corps program to be implemented in the same fashion as the current Navy initiative in PE 63792N. The program should demonstrate high risk/high payoff technologies and provide the Marine Corps with the opportunity to identify and move emerging technologies quickly and efficiently from laboratory to field. These projects should be selected by matching technological potential with requirements derived from operational issues of concern to the Marine Corps.

Integrated combat weapons system for mine countermeasures ships

The budget request included $14.4 million in PE 63502N for an integrated combat weapons system (ICWS) for mine countermeasures ships. The global positioning system, autonomous minehunting neutralization, and mine sweeping capabilities contribute to a complex mine warfare information battlefield in ICWS. The mine countermeasures ships have the responsibility of maintaining mine warfare tactical and operational situations. At present, information from multiple sources is gathered and plotted by slow and manpower-intensive methods.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63502N for continuation of ICWS for mine countermeasures ships.

Trident SSGN design

The budget request included $34.8 million for the design of the Trident-class nuclear ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) conversion to a nuclear guided missile submarine (SSGN). In addition, the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) includes $1.1 billion in fiscal years 2002 through 2005 for maintaining additional attack submarine (SSN) force structure by either (1) refueling SSN 688–class submarines which were previously scheduled for decommissioning or (2) refueling and converting, to SSGN configuration, Trident SSBNs which were also previously scheduled for decommissioning. The decision to refuel up to four Ohio-class SSBNs, which would be converted for the SSGN mission, or use the funding to refuel Los Angeles-class SSNs, will be proposed by the administration as part of the fiscal year 2002 budget submission.

The committee recognizes that the design work on the SSGN capability which began in fiscal year 2000 must be sufficient to maintain viable options for converting SSBNs to the SSGN until the fiscal year 2002 decision is made. To meet the requirements for planning coincidental with the refueling of the first available SSBN, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63559N to continue design activity for converting SSBNs to an SSGN configuration.

The study of attack submarine force structure requirements conducted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) evaluated requirements of the commanders in chief (CINCs). That study concluded that a submarine force structure below 55 SSNs in 2015 would be insufficient to meet warfighting requirements and that 68 SSNs would be necessary by 2015 to meet all the CINCs' and national intelligence

community's highest operational and collection requirements. The study focused on intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) requirements of the CINCs.

The committee is concerned that the Navy's decision to refuel Los Angeles-class SSNs or convert Ohio-class SSBNs could be based more narrowly on the ISR deficiencies identified in the JCS study, without giving adequate consideration to the other warfighting capabilities offered by the SSGN, such as those outlined in the March 1999 Navy study of the Trident SSGN conversion option. Therefore, the committee directs the Navy to report to Congress on the attributes used to analyze the options of whether to refuel SSNs or to refuel and convert SSBNs and the distinctions among these attributes in the near-term and long-term. The committee directs that the Navy submit this report with the fiscal year 2002 budget.

Enhanced performance electric motor brush technology

The budget request included $2.2 million in PE 63561N for enhanced performance electric motor brush technology. Electric motors use monolithic carbon brushes to transfer electricity from a stationary stator to a rotating rotor. Carbon brushes wear relatively quickly and must be frequently inspected and replaced. A Navy-funded small business innovative research (SBIR) project demonstrated that fiber metal brushes provide significant wear and survivability improvements compared to carbon brushes. Fiber metal electric motor brushes have the potential to significantly reduce total ownership costs of ships and increase the survivability and operational reliability of electric motors.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63561N for shock and vibration qualification and completion of design and testing of enhanced performance electric motor brush technology.

Submarine composite sail

The budget request included no funding for development of a submarine sail made from composite materials. Preliminary studies indicate that a submarine sail with areas fabricated from composite materials may provide enhanced war fighting capabilities. In addition, the composite sail may provide lower weight and life-cycle costs for submarines. A composite sail is consistent with the technology insertion approach of the Virginia-class submarine program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 63561N for development of an advanced submarine composite sail.

Joint command and control ship

The budget request included $30.8 million in PE 63564N to continue feasibility studies for the joint command and control ship (JCC(X)). The request is an increase of $14.1 million over the amount projected for the effort when the Administration submitted the fiscal year 2000 budget request. Congress authorized and appropriated $11.9 million for this program in fiscal year 2000.

The analysis of alternatives for the joint command and control ship mission is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 2001 and will be followed by the development of an operational requirements document. When the fiscal year 2001 request for JCC(X) is added

to the amount included for the same effort in fiscal year 2000, the total is $42.7 million. However, the Navy required less than $26.3 million for analysis of alternatives and to commence the competition for the ADC(X)-class ship. These efforts for the ADC(X) should be similar in complexity to the JCC(X) effort.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $16.4 million in PE 63564N to bring the research and development for JCC(X) in line with the planning for a ship of similar complexity in the study phase of analysis.

SHIPBOARD SIMULATORS FOR MARINE CORPS OPERATIONS

The budget request included no funding for analysis of shipboard Marine Corps operational simulator technology. The committee is aware of advances made in training simulation technology and the potential that training and rehearsal planning simulators have in supporting Marines deployed at sea. It is clear that technology exists to provide shipboard simulators for many of the expeditionary missions embarked Marines will have to execute. As these simulators will allow Marines an opportunity to train to the fullest extent possible while in transit, the committee believes it is time to explore the availability and applicability of both existing and new training simulators to meet Marine Corps requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63564N to initiate a program to provide enhanced shipboard operational training simulators on amphibious ships for embarked Marines. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report, no later than March 1, 2001, that provides the following:

(1) an assessment of Marine Corps training requirements, plans to enhance future training opportunities, candidate systems that could provide both individual and collective training simulators to enhance the warfighting ability of deployed Marines, and an assessment of existing training simulators available for Marines afloat;

(2) a program to develop and field additional simulation capabilities beyond those currently available; and

(3) plans for obligating the funding provided, and future program adjustments necessary to support the fielding of new training simulation systems.

Navy common command and decision system

The budget request did not include funding for a common command and decision system. The common command and decision system development is a pre-planned product improvement (P3I) to the AEGIS Weapon System and the Mk 2 Ship Self-Defense System (SSDS). The improvement would replace the command and decision capability presently in these systems with a common computer architecture.

This effort will reduce future life-cycle costs by:

(1) reducing the number of computer programs that must be maintained;

(2) enabling the Navy to field new or modified warfighting capability much more quickly and at a lower cost; and

(3) improving warfighting capability by eliminating the redundant and conflicting processing now inherent in these systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63582N for continuation and completion of small business innovative research (SBIR) project for the common command and decision system.

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request included $138.0 million for research and development efforts associated with Marine Corps assault vehicles. The committee has noted with great interest progress made to date in the ongoing evaluation of the advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV). Early testing has yielded positive results and the committee looks forward to the results of future testing as these new combat vehicles continue in development. The committee notes an unfunded requirement for an additional AAAV which would be used to mature the vehicle's software and accelerate reliability testing. The committee recommends an increase of $27.5 million to support efforts to accelerate the development and testing of AAAV hardware and software, a total authorization of $165.5 million.

Marine corps ground combat/support system

The budget request included $23.2 million to support research and development activities associated with Marine Corps ground combat and combat support systems. The committee continues to be concerned about inadequate levels of fire support available to support Marine Corps operations ashore. The committee was interested to note a new effort by the Marine Corps to explore the utility of the Army's high mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS) to meet some of their outstanding fire support requirements. The committee believes this effort could result in a potential near-term solution for longer range general support artillery requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $17.3 million to support the acquisition of two HIMARS systems and to support testing and evaluation of the equipment and rocket systems, a total authorization of $40.5 million.

Extended range guided munition

The budget request included $39.1 million in PE 63795N for development of the extended range guided munition (ERGM). ERGM will provide precision fire support for forces ashore from Naval gunfire support ships. The budget request includes a two year delay (fiscal year 2002 to fiscal 2004) in the initial operating capability for ERGM. However, ERGM has demonstrated success in a number of technical issues and is scheduled for flight tests in calendar year 2000. The program appears to have regained momentum lost after moving the contractor's program office to a new geographic area. This move resulted in having to fill key staff positions with new personnel.

Because the development of ERGM technologies are key to providing extended range fire support to the Marine Corps, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63795N to

reduce the risk in developing the advanced technologies required for ERGM.

Nonlethal research and technology development

The budget request included $23.6 million for the joint nonlethal weapons program. The committee recommends an total increase of $8.0 million in PE 63851M.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63851M for research in nonlethal environmental effects and remediation. Both at home and abroad, Americans, our allies, and innocent populations face an escalating danger of environmental threats and hazards: purposely from rogue elements and inadvertently from the results of adjacent or contiguous conflict. The committee finds current understanding of the environmental effects of emerging military responses to asymmetric and conventional threats and availability of protections from environmental agents woefully inadequate. Protections for civilian populations and their environs do not exist at all.

These additional funds should be applied to develop a program for assessing, determining and optimizing the environmental effects and remediative capabilities of emerging nonlethal weapons, as well as for removing, destroying, neutralizing, or containing environmental hazards once those hazards are deployed by adversaries. Only by assessment, evaluation, and development of methodologies to limit the spread of environmental damage from the fielding of emerging environmental threats and capabilities can new environmental consequences be avoided or countered. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

The committee authorizes the remaining $6.0 million in additional funds be allocated as follows: $2.0 million to continue the nonlethal technology research innovation initiative; an increase of $1.0 million for the neutralization of weapons of mass destruction sites; and $3.0 million for the nonlethal smart mortar casing demonstration. The committee notes that all four of these items were included on the Commandant's unfunded priority list.

Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative

The committee continues to support the Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative (NAVCIITI) to continue development in reliable secure communications and advanced information technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64707N for this purpose.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request included no funds for the parametric airborne dipping sonar (PADS). The PADS program is the continuation of a small business innovative research project that is designed to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate the three dimensional, stabilized steerable acoustic beams for mine avoidance and submarine detection in shallow water. It is the only system that

has the potential to provide airborne active dipping sonars with antisubmarine and anti-mine capabilities for shallow water littoral operations.

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

The dual mine and submarine warfare potential of PADS makes it a flexible and cost effective war fighting enhancement for two deficient missions: mine location and diesel submarine detection. The Navy is encouraged to continue the present testing and development of PADS. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64212N for the continued development of PADS.

Multi-mission helicopter upgrade development

The budget request included $69.9 million for the continued development of the multi-mission helicopter upgrade. Although the Navy had planned to integrate the advance threat infrared countermeasure (ATIRCM) on the SH–60R, a fiscal year 1999 program and schedule restructure has resulted in a funding shortfall to complete this integration on time. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64216N to continue to develop the integrated self-defense suite for the SH–60R, a total authorization of $77.9 million.

Power node control centers

The budget request did not include funding for power node control centers (PNCCs). PNCCs have the potential to integrate all of the shipboard power functions, such as switching, conversion, distribution and system operation and protection. This technology would support present and future surface ship and submarine platforms as a building block for increased use of electrical equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to PE 64300N for PNCCs.

Ship manpower reduction initiative

The budget request included no funding for research and development of technologies that could lead to manpower reductions resulting from altering food service operations on ships. Committee visits to fleet units verified that food service operations at sea are manpower intensive in preparing and serving food, cleaning of food service areas, and maintaining food service equipment.

Civilian cruise ships have developed technologies and methods for food service operations at sea that may be applicable to Navy ships. The Navy is investigating methods of reducing manpower required for food service operations at sea, while maintaining the quality and freshness of meals. These methods could lead to reduced manpower requirements in fleet units. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 64300N for advanced food service technology testing.

SPY–3 and volume search radars

The budget request included $69.6 million for development of the SPY–3 multi-function radar and $57.5 million for development of a new volume search radar (VSR) in PE 64300N. Both radars are being developed for future surface ships including CVN–77 and DD–21.

The goal of the SPY–3 is to provide an affordable, high performance radar for ship defense. It will provide search, detect, track, and weapon control functions that are now provided by two to three different radars.

The VSR will be required to complement the SPY–3 by providing long range above the horizon surveillance and timely cuing to the SPY–3. Development of these radars are keys to reducing life-cycle costs in the combat systems of future surface ships. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million to PE 64300N for the development of the SPY–3 and VSR radars.

Acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf insertion of multi-purpose processor

The budget request included $28.2 million for submarine sonar improvement. The multi-purpose processor (MPP) is the result of a small business innovative research (SBIR) initiative. The MPP provides a capability to transport new, advanced software to existing hardware installations more easily. It lies at the heart of the Navy's acoustic rapid commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) insertion (ARCI) program. This program is designed to permit anti-submarine forces to regain acoustic superiority over diesel and nuclear submarines of other navies.

The committee believes that the proven success of MPP and ARCI in attack submarines should be applied to other platforms such as surface ships, integrated undersea surveillance systems (IUSS), and maritime patrol aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 64503N for continuation of the SBIR follow-on for advanced development of MPP transportable software technology, technology insertion, advanced processor software builds, and for providing MPP units and training throughout the fleet and the Navy research and development community.

Submarine antenna technology improvement

The budget request included $0.9 million in PE 64503N for submarine communications antenna systems improvement. Submarine communications are vital to the evolving submarine littoral operational concepts. The submarine's ability to remain undetected while communicating depends on continuous development of submarine antenna technology. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64503N for submarine antenna technology improvements.

Submarine common architecture

The budget request included no funding in PE 64558N for migrating the Virginia-class submarine architecture to the Los Angeles-class submarines. Systems engineering and integration to define and manage common network interfaces enables low cost and

low risk capability improvements for the Los Angeles, Ohio, and Seawolf-classes' submarine non-propulsion electronics and tactical integrated electronics systems. Therfore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64558N for development of a submarine common architecture.

Advanced tactical software for submarines

The budget request included $20.5 million in PE 64562N for software upgrades to integrate improved submarine weapons capabilities. Integration and installation planning for implementation of the Navy's family of processors and displays, the AN/UYQ–70, will enable maximum results from submarine combat systems software upgrades.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64562N for the system engineering necessary to integrate advanced tactical software into existing combat control systems for submarines.

NULKA anti-ship missile decoy system

The budget request included $1.1 million for continued development and testing of the NULKA active countermeasures decoy. Development of a dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload is required for defense against advanced heat-seeking anti-ship missiles (ASMs).

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

The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 64755N for the development and operational testing of the dual band, spatially distributed infrared signature payload upgrade.

Navy single integrated human resources strategy

The budget request included $15.3 million PE 65013N for information technology development. The Navy has been designated the lead agency for development of software which will be used by all services to consolidate pay and personnel reporting systems. However, there are a number of service-specific systems which will provide information to the joint system that is under development. The Navy's single integrated human resources strategy (SIHRS) will update legacy systems which will provide input data to the joint personnel and pay system. SIHRS has the potential to provide enhanced system performance, workload reduction, and reduced cost.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65013N for the business process re-engineering of Navy legacy systems through the single integrated human resources strategy (SIHRS).

Marine Corps research university

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 65873M for the Marine Corps Research University. The Marine Corps Research University, initiated by the Corps and competi-

tively awarded to Pennsylvania State University in May of 1999, was established to assist the Marine Corps to enter the 21st Century. The rush of the information age and increased operational requirements has taxed the capabilities of the Corps to remain on the cutting edge of a broad range of issues routinely dealt with on a university campus. These and other factors led the Marine Corps to seek a relationship with a major multi-disciplinary research university. Additional funds should be used to provide support initiatives and critical research in areas, such as the new Marine Corps Integrated Logistics Concept (ILC), the Human Effects Advisory Panel (HEAP) which supports non-lethal weapons development, the V–22 alternative metals study, the Probable Cause Detection System (PCDS) for Chem-Bio detection, continuing and distance education courses, and supply-chain courses in support of logistics education.

Reentry system applications program

The committee continues to support the reentry system applications program (RSAP) as a sustaining technology program. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 11221N to support the RSAP program. Also, the committee directs that the Navy establish a separate project category for the RSAP program within PE 11221N to ensure program continuity and execution.

Joint tactical combat training system

The budget request included $27.1 million for consolidated training systems development. Of this amount, $7.8 million was for the joint tactical combat training system (JTCTS). JTCTS is a joint Navy and Air Force program to provide realistic combat training for joint air and sea forces through a combination of simulated and real targets, instrumented aircraft, and ship participants. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 24571N to accelerate hardware and software integration of JTCTS, a total authorization of $32.1 million.

F–14 tactical reconnaissance

The budget request included $1.2 million for operational systems development of the F–14 aircraft. The F–14 remains the only near-term tactical reconnaissance aircraft organic to the carrier battle group. Weather and battlefield conditions with smoke and dust continue to hamper tactical reconnaissance platforms for both pre-strike reconnaissance and battle damage assessment. Synthetic aperture radar (SAR) systems offer a technical solution to all-weather, day and night reconnaissance that is missing on our tactical reconnaissance platforms. The committee understands that there are potentially two non- developmental SAR systems that could be demonstrated for suitability on strike fighter aircraft, neither of which is being procured for U.S. tactical aircraft at this time. Recent experience in Operation Allied Force in marginal weather again emphasized the need for all weather reconnaissance and battle damage assessment capabilities to match the all weather weapons now available. Because of the high military utility provided to operational commanders, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 25667N to demonstrate the military utility of

non-developmental SAR reconnaissance systems, a total authorization of $10.2 million.

Software interoperability process tools

The budget request included $0.9 million for joint command control communications computer intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) operational architectures. The operational architectures will provide the baseline to identify war fighter requirements, design and structure assessments, and generate functional metrics.

Software interoperability process tools prevent interoperability problems by anticipating needs and shortfalls and implementing solutions. The process tools have the potential to reduce software development time lines by providing essential analysis that complements the joint communications infrastructure synchronization initiative. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35118N for software interoperability process tools.

Satellite communications systems integration initiative

The budget request included no funding for the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) satellite communications (SATCOM) systems integration (SSI) initiative. The SSI initiative is intended to facilitate improved identification and evaluation of new and emerging communication and network technologies in the area of SATCOM that can distribute a wider diversity of information products. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 35972N for the SSI initiative.

Distributed engineering plant

The budget request included $9.1 million in PE 38601N for modeling and simulation activities including development and analysis. It is the Navy's intention to continue a new focus for battle group pre-deployment hardware and software testing by leveraging shore based facility capabilities. The linking of the shore based facilities with battle group assets is referred to as a distributed engineering plant (DEP). The DEP will be used to feedback information into the acquisition cycle as well as to test software and hardware compatibility in both actual and virtual environments.

The East Coast Command Control Communications and Computers Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Engineering Center is a critical node in the DEP. Three of the C4ISR focus areas that will improve the connectivity and responsiveness of the DEP are:

(1) fusing geographically distributed simulators using the high level architecture to conduct end-to-end system interoperability testing;

(2) adapting visualization and computer-aided design tools to shipboard C4ISR configuration management; and

(3) integrating systems for distributed simulation/stimulation in end-to-end Navy and joint testing.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 38601N for the three C4ISR battle center focus areas described in the above paragraph.

Air Force

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206,149	-	206,149
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	72,815	-	80,315
		Resin Systems for Engine Applications		2,000	
		Laser Processing Tools		4,000	
		Thermal Protection Systems		1,500	
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	48,775	-	54,775
		Aeronautical Research		6,000	
0602202F	4	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	62,619	-	62,619
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	116,262	-	124,262
		Variable Displacement Vane Pump		3,000	
		PBO Membrane Fuel Cell		5,000	
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE SENSORS	65,644	-	65,644
0602269F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		-	-
0602601F	8	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	57,687	-	68,287
		Tech-Sat 21Transfer		(5,000)	
		Aluminum Aerostructures		3,000	
		Space Survivability		5,600	
		HAARP		7,000	
0602602F	9	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	45,223	-	45,223
0602605F	10	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	32,337	-	32,337
0602702F	11	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	78,749	-	78,749
0602805F	12	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,144	-	10,144
0603106F	13	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	13,895	-	13,895
0603112F	14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,678	-	21,678
0603202F	15	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	34,440	-	34,440

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603203F	16	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	28,311	-	34,311
		Integrated Demonstration & Applications Laboratory (IDAL)		6,000	
0603205F	17	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	2,445	-	4,445
		Fiber Optic Control Technologies		2,000	
0603211F	18	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	12,961	-	12,961
0603216F	19	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	41,964	-	41,964
0603227F	20	PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	6,491	-	6,491
0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	12,479	-	12,479
0603245F	22	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	13,184	-	13,184
0603253F	23	ADVANCED SENSOR INTEGRATION	5,350	-	5,350
0603270F	24	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	25,882	-	25,882
0603302F	25	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	24,283	-	24,283
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603401F	27	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	97,327	-	146,327
		Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS)		5,000	
		Upper Stage Flight Experiment		5,000	
		Scorpius		5,000	
		Space Maneuver Vehicle		15,000	
		Solar Orbital Transfer Vehicle (SOTV)		5,000	
		Micro-Satellite Technology (XSS-10)		12,000	
		Composite Payload Fairings and Shrouds		2,000	
0603410F	28	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,412	-	3,412
0603444F	29	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	4,625	-	4,625
0603601F	30	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	22,731	-	22,731
0603605F	31	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	33,371	-	33,371
0603707F	32	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY		-	-

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603723F	33	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603726F	34	AEROSPACE INFO TECH SYS INTEGRATION	7,429	-	7,429
0603728F	35	BATTLESPACE C2 TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603789F	36	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,468	-	19,468
0603876F	37	SPACE-BASED LASER	63,216	-	93,216
		SBL Integrated Flight Experiment (IFX)		30,000	
0603260F	38	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,401	-	4,401
0603319F	39	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	148,637	-	241,037
		Program Restoration		92,400	
0603430F	40	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	246,396	-	246,396
0603432F	41	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	26,068	-	26,068
0603434F	42	NAT POLAR-ORBITING OP ENVIRON SATELLITE SYS (SPACE)	76,654	-	76,654
0603438F	43	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,728	-	9,728
0603441F	44	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603617F	45	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	7,828	-	7,828
0603690F	46	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY	991	-	991
0603742F	47	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,933	-	10,933
0603790F	48	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H)	5,509	-	5,509
0603800F	49	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	129,538	-	341,638
		Extend DEM/VAL		212,100	
0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,488	-	24,488
0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	39,246	-	58,446
		RSLP GPS Range Safety		19,200	
0603854F	52	WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	134,029	-	116,029
		Wideband Gapfiller Satellite Design		(18,000)	
0603856F	53	AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)	3,370	-	3,370

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603859F	54	POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL)	2,543	-	2,543
0603860F	55	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	18,092	-	18,092
0603876F	56	SPACE-BASED LASER		-	-
0604237F	57	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT		-	-
0604327F	58	HARD & DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROG		-	-
0604012F	59	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,312	-	1,312
0604201F	60	INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	712	-	712
0604222F	61	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	10,133	-	10,133
0604226F	62	B-1B	168,122	-	168,122
0604227F	63	DISTRIBUTED MISSION TRAINING (DMT)	3,782	-	3,782
0604233F	64	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	23,853	-	23,853
0604239F	65	F-22 EMD	1,411,786	-	1,411,786
0604240F	66	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	48,313	-	53,313
		SATCOM Connectivity		5,000	
0604270F	67	EW DEVELOPMENT	58,198	-	58,198
0604441F	68	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	569,188	-	569,188
0604442F	69	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD	241,021	-	241,021
0604479F	70	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	236,841	-	232,841
		Excess Satellite Engineering Effort		(4,000)	
0604480F	71	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)		-	-
0604600F	72	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0604602F	73	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,876	-	8,876
0604604F	74	SUBMUNITIONS	4,775	-	4,775
0604617F	75	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	668	-	668
0604618F	76	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,157	-	1,157
0604703F	77	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	5,929	-	5,929

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0604706F	78	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	14,758	-	14,758
0604708F	79	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,746	-	2,746
0604727F	80	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	1,498	-	1,498
0604735F	81	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	12,559	-	12,559
0604740F	82	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	214	-	214
0604750F	83	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,298	-	1,298
0604754F	84	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,745	-	8,745
0604762F	85	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	11,621	-	11,621
0604779F	86	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL C2 SYS (JINTACCS)	5,825	-	5,825
0604800F	87	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	299,540	-	-
		Extend DEM/VAL		(299,540)	
0604805F	88	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	19,851	-	19,851
0604851F	89	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	18,325	-	18,325
0604853F	90	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) - EMD	332,952	-	332,952
0605011F	91	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	14,204	-	14,204
0207249F	92	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS	3,965	-	3,965
0305176F	93	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	10,842	-	10,842
0604256F	94	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,785	-	34,785
0604258F	95	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	191	-	191
0604759F	96	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	54,057	-	54,057
0605101F	97	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	24,080	-	24,080
0605306F	98	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,356	-	4,356
0605502F	99	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH		-	-
0605712F	100	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	28,238	-	28,238
0605807F	101	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	386,205	-	386,205
0605808F	102	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING		-	-

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605854F	103	POLLUTION PREVENTION		-	-
0605860F	104	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,906	-	7,906
0605864F	105	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	46,476	-	46,476
0909900F	106	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		-	-
1001004F	107	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,773	-	3,773
0101113F	108	B-52 SQUADRONS	50,787	-	50,787
0101120F	109	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	4,182	-	4,182
0101122F	110	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	6,457	-	6,457
0102325F	111	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		-	-
0102326F	112	REG/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MOD PROG	992	-	992
0102411F	113	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM		-	-
0102445F	114	COUNTERDRUG AEROSTATS		-	-
0207027F	115	AIR AND SPACE COMMAND AND CONTROL AGENCY (ASC2A)	24,769	-	24,769
0207131F	116	A-10 SQUADRONS	8,615	-	8,615
0207133F	117	F-16 SQUADRONS	124,903	-	124,903
0207134F	118	F-15E SQUADRONS	61,260	-	68,860
		BOL Integration		7,600	
0207136F	119	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,670	-	14,670
0207141F	120	F-117A SQUADRONS	3,912	-	3,912
0207161F	121	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,706	-	21,706
0207163F	122	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	53,707	-	53,707
0207247F	123	AF TENCAP	9,826	-	11,826
		Hyperspectral Technology		2,000	
0207248F	124	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	75,443	-	75,443
0207253F	125	COMPASS CALL	5,834	-	5,834
0207268F	126	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	166,926	-	166,926

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0207320F	127	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS		-	-
0207323F	127A	EXTENDED RANGE CRUISE MISSILE		86,100	86,100
0207325F	128	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	120,281	-	120,281
0207412F	129	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	19,873	-	19,873
0207414F	130	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM		-	-
0207417F	131	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	35,653	-	35,653
0207423F	132	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,867	-	2,867
0207424F	133	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	81,027	-	81,027
0207433F	134	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	90,713	-	90,713
0207438F	135	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	41,068	-	41,068
0207581F	136	JOINT SURVEILLANCE & TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYS (JOINT STARS)	144,118	-	151,318
		Global Air Traffice Management (GATM)		7,200	
0207590F	137	SEEK EAGLE	19,472	-	19,472
0207591F	138	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	266,458	-	266,458
0207601F	139	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	17,624	-	17,624
0207605F	140	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	3,874	-	3,874
0208006F	141	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	20,755	-	20,755
0208021F	142	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	1	-	1
0208031F	143	WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,475	-	1,475
0208060F	144	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	19,824	-	19,824
0208160F	145	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	98,263	-	98,263
0208161F	146	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	74,240	-	74,240
0301357F	151	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		-	-
0302015F	153	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	34,410	-	34,410
0303110F	154	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	7,328	-	7,328
0303112F	155	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)	11,478	-	11,478

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0303131F	156	MIN ESSENTIAL EMERG COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	15,302	-	15,302
0303140F	157	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,212	-	12,212
		Lighthouse Cyber-Security		5,000	
0303141F	158	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	46,369	-	46,369
0303150F	159	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,743	-	3,743
0303401F	160	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	4,857	-	4,857
0303601F	161	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	17,797	-	20,797
		B-2 Connectivity		3,000	
0304311F	163	SELECTED ACTIVITIES		-	-
0305099F	164	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	8,508	-	8,508
0305110F	165	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	58,643	-	58,643
0305111F	166	WEATHER SERVICE	19,942	-	19,942
0305114F	167	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, & LANDING SYS (ATCALS)	18,093	-	18,093
0305119F	168	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)		-	-
0305128F	169	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	467	-	467
0305137F	170	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	200	-	200
0305138F	171	INERTIAL UPPER STAGE (IUS)		-	-
0305144F	173	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	25,815	-	25,815
0305158F	174	TACTICAL TERMINAL	238	-	238
0305159F	175	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	45,149	-	45,149
0305160F	176	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	25,372	-	25,372
0305164F	177	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	66,975	-	66,975
0305165F	178	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYS (SPACE & CONTROL SEGMENTS)	250,197	-	260,897
		Transfer from Missile Procurement		10,700	
0305182F	180	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	53,654	-	53,654
0305202F	181	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	27,546	-	33,546

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		U-2 SYERS		6,000	
0305205F	182	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	109,215	-	127,215
		Improved Radar for Global Hawk		6,000	
		Global Hawk Air Surveillance Demonstration		12,000	
0305206F	183	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	136,913	-	136,913
0305207F	184	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS		-	-
0305208F	185	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	21,330	-	21,330
0305906F	186	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	19,309	-	19,309
0305910F	187	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	2,553	-	2,553
0305911F	188	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	9,462	-	9,462
0305913F	189	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	17,088	-	17,088
0305917F	190	SPACE ARCHITECT		-	-
0305953F	191	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE (EELV) (SPACE)		-	-
0308601F	192	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,177	-	1,177
0308699F	193	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	4,219	-	4,219
0401115F	194	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	60,496	-	60,496
0401119F	195	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	92,530	-	92,530
0401130F	196	C-17 AIRCRAFT	176,439	-	176,439
0401214F	197	AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)		-	-
0401218F	198	KC-135S	487	-	487
0401219F	199	KC-10S	19,526	-	19,526
0404011F	200	SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	1,109	-	1,109
0702207F	201	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,515	-	1,515
0708011F	202	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	53,082	-	53,082
0708026F	203	PROD, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	15,227	-	15,227
0708071F	204	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,238	-	11,238

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0708611F	205	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	32,258	-	32,258
0708612F	206	COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMP PROGRAM (CRSIP)	2,356	-	2,356
0901218F	207	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,209	-	7,209
1001018F	208	NATO JOINT STARS	3,270	-	3,270
XXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	4,123,225	12,500	4,135,725
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(42,100)	(42,100)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	13,685,576	242,260	13,927,836

Laser processing tools

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62102F for the development and application of a high power, tunable, ultraviolet laser processing tool for the fabrication of micro-engineered components and subsystems pertinent to aerospace applications. A high-average power free electron laser with ultraviolet capability would allow processing materials and micro make micro- and nano-devices for space systems applications. This research would also assist in enabling the Air Force's ability to manufacture low-cost pico and nano-satellites, and microsystems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Resin systems for Air Force applications

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62102F for the development and demonstration of high temperature resin systems for Air Force engine applications. The committee understands that this technology could reduce the cost of high temperature components in turbine engines for fighter aircraft. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Thermal protection systems

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62102F for the development of thermal protection systems for hypervelocity vehicles and atmospheric flight trajectories. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Aeronautical research

The committee remains gravely concerned with the failure of the Air Force to properly fund critical aeronautical research. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62201F for advanced concepts research and technology development for long term aeronautical systems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Polyphenylene benzobisoxozole membrane fuel cell

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62203F for research in polyphenylene benzobisoxozole (PBO) films for fuel cell membranes. The committee notes that fuel cells can provide a lower cost, lighter weight, higher performance and more energy efficient fuel cell. The microporous PBO substrate may provide a component solution that will increase the strength and high temperature capabilities currently inhibiting fuel cell technologies. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Variable displacement vane pump

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62203F to complete the development and demonstration of the variable displacement vane pump (VDVP) as an alternate engine fuel pump. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

High frequency active auroral research

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to continue experimentation in the high frequency active auroral research program as follows: an increase of $7.0 million in PE 62601F and an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63714D.

Space survivability

The committee recommends an increase of $5.6 million in PE 62601F to continue critical research in clutter mitigation, space weather effects on spacecraft, ionospheric effects on global positioning systems (GPS), communication and geolocation, and space environment distributed anomoly resolution sensor research.

Aluminum aerostructures

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 603112F for the development and demonstration of methodology for producing advanced aluminum aerostructures. This effort is critical for improved afford ability, maintainability, and enhanced performance of current and future Air Force systems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Hyperspectral research

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 63203F to complete the development of a multi-spectral synthetic battlespace simulation capability to address the critical needs of the Air Force's advanced air and space sensor technologies. The committee directs that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Fiber optical control technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63205F for the development and demonstration of all optical control interface with an electro-mechanical flight actuator. The committee understands this technology has the potential to improve performance and survivability while lowering operating costs for future Air Force flight vehicles. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Low cost launch technology

The committee continues to support the development of a range of low-cost launch technologies, including the Scorpius concept. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million

in PE 63401F for low cost launch technology development, including Scorpius.

Micro-satellite technology

The committee continues to support the Micro-Satellite Technology program. The committee was disappointed that the Air Force Research Laboratory was unable to complete preparations for the launch of the XSS–10 micro-satellite with funds available in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $5.0 million requested for the Tech-Sat 21 program in PE 62601F to PE 63401F for an overall increase of $12.0 million in PE 63401F to complete work on and launch the XSS–10.

Miniature satellite threat reporting system

The budget request included no funding for the Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS). The committee continues to support MSTRS to develop the capability to protect satellites from uplink jamming, interference, or intrusion. The committee also supports efforts to develop sensors capable of detecting laser threats. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F for the MSTRS program.

Next generation composite launch vehicle payload fairings and shrouds

The committee supports the development of composite manufacturing and processing technologies for the next generation of payload fairings and shrouds to improve the performance of U.S. space systems while reducing overall production cost. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63401F to support this effort.

Solar orbital transfer vehicle

The committee has supported development of the solar orbital transfer vehicle (SOTV) technology program. The SOTV program combines thermionic technology for electricity production and thermal propulsion. To continue this effort, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F.

Space maneuver vehicle

The committee continues to support the Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) partnership to develop a reusable upper stage vehicle. The committee supports the Air Force effort to acquire a "second tail number" of NASA's X–37 as a Space Maneuver Vehicle operational technology demonstrator (X–40B). Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63401F to support acquisition of the "second tail number" X–40B SMV demonstrator.

Upper stage flight experiment

The Air Force has developed a program to demonstrate advanced upper stage technologies to lower the cost of space launch. To support the launch of this experimental rocket motor in the near future, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63401F.

Space Based Laser program

The budget request included $137.7 million for the Space Based Laser (SBL) program, including $63.2 million in the Air Force budget and $74.5 million in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization budget. Although the Air Force and BMDO have structured a viable program to launch an SBL integrated flight experiment (IFX) in the fiscal year 2012–2014 timeframe, this program remains funding-constrained. Therefore, the committee recommends in increase of $30.0 million in PE 63876F to support acceleration of the IFX and its integrated test facility.

Airborne laser program

The budget request included $148.6 million for the Airborne laser (ABL) program. Although the committee has raised concerns regarding the maturity of the ABL technology in the past, the committee is concerned by the Air Force's decision to significantly reduce funding for the ABL program in fiscal year 2001, and throughout the years of the Future Years Defense Program. The committee notes that the Air Force has implemented a range of risk reduction measures that the committee had previously directed, including efforts in the area of atmospheric compensation being conducted at the North Oscura Peak test facility in New Mexico. As required by the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2000, the Air Force reviewed progress in five specific risk reduction areas. Pursuant to this requirement, the Secretary of the Air Force reported to Congress on December 6, 1999, that "[e]xcellent progress has been made in all five areas," and that "[t]he ABL Program continues to meet or exceed every technical and programmatic milestone and remains on- cost and on-schedule."

In light of this positive report, the committee does not understand or support the Air Force's decision to significantly reduce the ABL program funding. This cut jeopardizes the ability to complete the initial ABL test aircraft in a timely manner. The first test aircraft is critical to determining whether all necessary ABL technologies are ready for production. The committee supports rapid demonstration of these key technologies and thus strongly opposes the delay in the completion of the Program Definition and Risk Reduction (PDRR) aircraft. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $92.4 million in PE 63319F, the amount needed in fiscal year 2001 to keep the PDRR aircraft on schedule to conduct the first lethal demonstration during fiscal year 2003. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to spend these additional fiscal year 2001 funds consistent with the fiscal year 2000 program plan. Absent the development of technical problems, the ABL program should remain on schedule for a lethal demonstration in fiscal year 2003 and initial operational capability in fiscal year 2007.

Rocket systems launch program

The committee continues to support the Rocket Systems Launch Program (RSLP), which utilizes excess strategic missile rocket motors to launch small payloads. The committee recommends an increase of $19.2 million in PE 63851F to demonstrate quick reaction

launch capabilities, Global Positioning System range safety, and common strategic missile technology.

Wideband gapfiller military satellite communications

The budget request included $92.3 million in research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E), Air Force, for the Wideband Gapfiller satellite communications system (WGS). The committee notes that, as a result of the Department of Defense policy to fully fund satellites with procurement funding, the fiscal year 2001 RDT&E budget request for WGS was increased by $34.1 million over fiscal year 2000 projections. The committee recommends a decrease of $18.0 million in PE 63854F for WGS satellite design.

B–2 advanced technology bomber

The budget request included $48.3 million for continued development of the B–2 advanced technology bomber. The Air Force unfunded requirements list included a request for additional risk reduction for connectivity. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE64240F for the connectivity risk reduction for the B–2 advanced technology bomber.

The budget request also included $17.8 million for the operational system development of military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) terminals. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE33601F for risk reduction efforts in MILSATCOM terminals specific to integration with the B–2 advanced technology bomber.

Milstar satellite communications

The budget request included $236.8 million for Milstar satellite communications research, development, test and evaluation, including an increase of $11.0 million over fiscal year 2000 budget projections for satellite engineering requirements. The committee believes that this growth is not fully justified. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in PE 64479F.

F–15E squadrons

The budget request included $61.3 million for continued operational systems development of the F–15 aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the integration of the BOL countermeasure system on the F–15 series of aircraft, although it was included on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. Integration of this system will dramatically increase the chaff and flare capacity of the F–15, giving it preemptive expendable capability. The committee recommends an increase of $7.6 million in PE 27134F for BOL countermeasure system integration on the F- 15, a total authorization of $68.9 million.

Hyperspectral system development

The committee supports research and development of hyperspectral technology for use in high altitude and space applications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 27247F to support these efforts.

Extended range cruise missile

The budget request included no funding for the extended range cruise missile (ERCM). Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on replacement options for the conventional air-launched cruise missile (CALCM). The CALCM has become the Air Force weapon of choice in recent conflicts, and as such, its inventory has been seriously depleted. This report defined near-term, mid-term, and long-term solutions to address this required capability. The near-term solution, which is ongoing and funded, is to convert the remaining, available air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs) to CALCMs. The mid-term solution, which is not funded in the fiscal year 2001 budget request, is to begin a two to three-year ERCM development to upgrade an existing cruise missile design. This development will be followed by a four-year production run to build up the cruise missile stockpile. Funding for the initiation of this development is very high on the Air Force unfunded priorities list. The committee recommends an increase of $86.1 million in PE 27323F to commence ERCM development.

Joint surveillance and target attack radar system

The budget request included $144.1 million for operational system development of the E–8 joint surveillance and target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft and weapons system. The global access, navigation, and safety strategic management plan, published in fiscal year 1999, included a requirement for installation of global air traffic management (GATM) equipment in the E–8 JSTARS aircraft. This modification will be required to maintain current access to oceanic and continental routes in Europe, ensuring that missions can be safely and effectively flown. The Air Force has included development of GATM modifications for the E–8 on its unfunded requirements list. The committee recommends an increase of $7.2 million in PE 27581F for development and integration of GATM on the JSTARS aircraft, a total authorization of $151.3 million.

Lighthouse cyber security

The budget request included $7.2 million for Air Force information system security research, development, test and evaluation. The committee supports the Lighthouse Cyber Security Program managed by the Air Force, which focuses on computer system vulnerabilities and threats, and provides guidance and corrective courses of action through the use of modeling and prototype tools. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140F to support the Lighthouse Cyber Security Program.

Dragon U–2

The budget request included $27.5 million in PE 35202F for operational systems development of the U–2 aircraft. The budget request included no funding for the continued development of the Senior Year electro-optic reconnaissance system (SYERS). The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 35202F for further SYERS development, a total authorization of $33.5 million.

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE-WIDE			
0601101D	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,007	-	2,007
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	90,415	-	90,415
		Advanced Photonics Research		[3,000]	
0601103D	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	253,627	-	259,127
		Personnel Research Institute		4,000	
		Infrasound Detection Basic Research		1,500	
0601105D	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	16,978	-	16,978
0601111D	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RES	6,715	-	6,715
0601114D	6	DEF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RES	9,859	-	24,859
		Program Increase		15,000	
0601384BP	7	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	33,197	-	38,197
		Chemical Agent Detection-Optical Computing		2,000	
		Thin Film Technology		3,000	
0602110E	8	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	15,000	-	15,000
0602173C	9	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	37,747	-	49,747
		Wide Band Gap		2,000	
		NTW Follow-On Kill Vehicle Technology		10,000	
0602227D	10	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	15,029	-	15,029
0602228D	11	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	14,236	-	14,236
0602234D	12	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	18,602	-	20,702
		Bio-Defense Research		2,100	
0602301E	13	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	376,592	-	376,592
0602302E	14	EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	69,282	-	69,282
0602383E	15	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	162,064	-	162,064
0602384BP	16	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,600	-	81,600

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		Hybrid Sensor Suite		8,000	
0602702E	17	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	121,051	-	321,051
		Remotely Controlled Combat Systems Initiative		200,000	
0602708E	18	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,761	-	38,761
		High Definition Systems		7,000	
0602712E	19	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	249,812	-	252,812
		3-D Structure Research		3,000	
0602715BR	20	NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIES	230,928	-	230,928
0602787D	21	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,680	-	8,680
0305108K	22	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH		-	-
0603002D	23	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,043	-	2,043
0603104D	24	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,964	-	8,964
0603121D	25	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,622	-	8,622
0603122D	26	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	41,307	-	51,307
		Chem-Bio Detectors		5,000	
		Blast Mitigation Testing		3,000	
		Facial Recognition Acess Control Technology		2,000	
0603160BR	27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADV DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES	77,391	-	77,391
0603173C	28	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADV TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	93,249	-	130,249
		Magdalena Ridge Observatory		9,000	
		Wide Band Gap		10,000	
		Excalibur		3,000	
		Atmospheric Inteceptor Technology		15,000	
0603174C	29	SPACE BASED LASERS (SBL)	74,537	-	74,537
0603225D	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,670	-	16,670
0603232D	31	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,534	-	7,534

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603285E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	26,821	-	26,821
0603384BP	33	CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROG - ADVANCED DEV	46,594	-	67,694
		Chem-bio Individual Sampler		2,700	
		Consequence Management Information System		6,400	
		Chem-bio Advanced Materials research		3,500	
		Small Unit Bio Detector		8,500	
0603704D	34	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,777	-	15,777
		Complex System Design		5,000	
0603711BR	35	ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	52,930	-	52,930
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,082	-	31,082
		Competitive Sustainment Initiative		8,000	
0603716D	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,357	-	51,357
0603727D	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,607	-	7,607
0603738D	39	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH		-	-
0603739E	40	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	191,800	-	191,800
0603747E	41	ELECTRIC VEHICLES		-	-
0603750D	42	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,425	-	116,425
0603755D	43	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	164,027	-	164,027
0603760E	44	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	128,863	-	128,863
0603761E	45	COMMUNICATION AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY		-	-
0603762E	46	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	182,225	-	182,225
0603763E	47	MARINE TECHNOLOGY	30,304	-	30,304
0603764E	48	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	134,249	-	134,249
0603765E	49	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	101,387	-	101,387
0603805S	50	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS		-	-
0603832D	51	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	56,971	-	61,971

Title II-RDT and E
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		WMD Simulation Capability		5,000	
0605160D	52	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,483	-	1,483
0603228D	56	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	35,108	-	35,108
0603708D	57	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS		-	-
0603709D	58	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	10,294	-	10,294
0603714D	59	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,534	-	20,534
		HAARP		5,000	
0603736D	60	CALS INITIATIVE	1,585	-	3,585
		Integrated Data Environment (IDE)		2,000	
0603790T	61	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0603851D	62	ENVIRON SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROG	24,906	-	34,906
		Remediation of Uexploded Ordnances		10,000	
0603857J	63	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)		-	-
0603861C	64	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603868C	65	NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	382,671	-	442,671
		Accelerate NTW SM-3 Incerceptor		60,000	
0603869C	66	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	63,175	-	63,175
0603870C	67	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEF ACQ - DEM/VAL		-	-
0603871C	68	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	1,740,238	-	1,869,238
		Risk Reduction		129,000	
0603872C	69	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL		-	5,000
		BMD Liquid Fueled SurrogateTarget		5,000	
0603873C	70	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	231,248	-	231,248
0603874C	71	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	270,718	-	280,218
		Advanced Optical Data and Sensor Fusion		3,000	
		Advanced Research Center		6,500	

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0603875C	72	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	116,992	-	104,992
		RAMOS		(20,000)	
		Arrow System Improvement Plan		8,000	
0603876C	73	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	22,621	-	22,621
0603884BP	74	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	83,800	-	83,800
0603892D	75	ASAT		-	20,000
		KE-ASAT		20,000	
0603920D	76	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	12,728	-	12,728
0603923D	77	COALITION WARFARE	11,839	-	11,839
0604722D	78	JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		-	-
0605104T	79	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS		-	-
0605110T	80	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MGT SYS (PIMS)	1,932	-	1,932
0901585C	81	PENTAGON RESERVATION	4,772	-	4,772
0604384BP	82	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	100,815	-	102,915
		Next Generation Anthrax Vaccine		2,100	
0604709D	83	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	11,553	-	13,153
		WMD Response System		1,600	
0604764K	84	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	14,685	-	14,685
0604771D	85	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,250	-	16,250
0604805D	86	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE		-	-
0604861C	87	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	549,945	-	549,945
0604865C	88	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	81,016	-	81,016
0604867C	89	NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	274,234	-	274,234
0605013D	90	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,000	-	12,000
0605013S	91	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,671	-	1,671
0605014S	92	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (FIELD ACTIVITY)	26,797	-	26,797

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605015S	93	INFORMATION TECH DEV (STANDARD PROCUREMENT SYSTEM)	15,772	-	15,772
0303129K	94	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	11,340	-	11,340
0303140K	95	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	18,210	-	18,210
0303141K	96	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	22,287	-	22,287
0305840K	97	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	28,094	-	28,094
0603858D	98	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,204	-	1,204
0604942D	99	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS		-	-
0604943D	100	THERMAL VICAR	4,882	-	4,882
0605104D	101	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,597	-	30,597
0605110BR	102	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	3,927	-	3,927
0605114E	103	BLACK LIGHT	5,000	-	5,000
0605116D	104	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	3,769	-	3,769
0605117D	105	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	32,173	48,100	80,273
0605123D	106	AFCC ENGINEERING AND INSTALLATION	6,000	-	6,000
0605124D	107	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	9,122	-	9,122
0605126J	108	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	21,200	-	21,200
0605128BR	109	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		-	-
0605128D	110	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)		-	-
0605130D	111	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,697	-	31,697
0605160BR	112	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT		-	-
0605384BP	113	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	23,907	-	23,907
0605502BP	114	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH - CHEM BIO DEF		-	-
0605502D	115	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605502E	116	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		-	-
0605710D	117	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	641	-	641
0605790D	118	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMIN	1,728	-	1,728

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0605798S	119	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,048	-	5,048
0605801K	120	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	45,350	-	45,350
0605803S	121	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING & EVALUATION	8,776	-	8,776
0605804D	122	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	43,915	-	43,915
0605898E	123	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT)	34,679	-	34,679
0604805D	124	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	9,629	-	9,629
0208045K	125	C3 INTEROPERABILITY	37,072	-	37,072
0208052J	126	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	11,941	-	11,941
0302016K	130	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	641	-	641
0302019K	131	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	5,704	-	5,704
0303126K	132	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,416	-	1,416
0303127K	133	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	5,019	-	5,019
0303131K	134	MIN ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	7,099	-	7,099
0303140G	135	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	290,771	-	317,571
		Information Operations Technology Center Alliance		5,000	
		Trust Rubix		1,800	
		Cyber Attack Sensing and Warning		20,000	
0303149J	136	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	5,486	-	5,486
0303149K	137	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	405	-	405
0303153K	138	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,735	-	8,735
0304210BB	139	SPECIAL RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES (SRC) PROGRAM	3,800	-	5,800
		Virtual Worlds Initiative		2,000	
0305102BQ	141	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	74,975	-	81,975
		Smart Maps		2,000	
		NIMA Viewer		5,000	
0305127V	142	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	444	-	444

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
0305159I	143	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)		-	-
0305190D	144	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	25,182	-	35,182
		JCOATS-IO		5,000	
		Information Assurance Testbed		5,000	
0305202G	145	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	4,379	-	4,379
0305206G	146	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,514	-	13,514
0305207G	147	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,543	-	4,543
0305208L	150	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	994	-	994
0305885G	152	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	95,671	-	95,671
0305889G	153	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT		-	-
0708011S	154	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,090	-	7,090
0902298J	155	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	12,540	-	12,540
0902740J	156	JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	24,095	-	24,095
1001017D	157	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES		-	-
1160279BB	158	SM BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RES/SMALL BUS TECH TRANS PILOT PROG		-	-
1160401BB	159	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,360	-	7,360
1160402BB	160	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,778	-	7,778
1160404BB	161	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	133,520	-	133,520
1160405BB	162	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,022	-	3,022
1160407BB	163	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,065	-	2,065
1160408BB	164	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	87,071	-	92,671
		Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher		5,600	
XXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,323,435	140,000	1,463,435
		ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT		(1,500)	(1,500)
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEF-WIDE	10,238,242	813,900	11,052,142

Title II-RDT and E

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account	No.	Title	Request	Change	Recommend
		DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)		-	-
0605130D	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING		-	-
0605804D	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION		-	-
		TOTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	121,401	-	141,401
		Program Increase		20,000	
0605118D	2	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	17,172	-	17,172
0605131D	3	LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,712	-	11,212
		Reality Fire-Fighting Training		1,500	
0605804D	4	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	53,275	-	53,275
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	201,560	21,500	223,060

Advanced photonic composites research

The budget request includes $90.1 million for defense research sciences (PE 61101E). The committee recommends that, of the funds, $3.0 million be used to extend the Advanced Photonic Composites Research Program in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Photonic composite materials are complex material systems whose key optical property is described by a periodic function. The optical property typically is an index of refraction or some non-linear optical behavior. Due to their complex three dimensional nature, photonic composite materials are very difficult to produce. However, these materials offer great promise for the development of photonic devices with greatly improved performance due to their inherent ability to substantially reduce the volume of material required to achieve certain optical effects.

Infrasound detection capability basic research

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61103D for basic research in the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty verification. The additional funds will be used to develop and evaluate infrasound sensors and conduct studies and analysis for use in developing more effective and efficient infrasound detection capability to support the detection of nuclear explosions on a global basis. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Personnel research initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 61103D for the defense personnel research initiative. The additional funds will support basic research efforts in manpower and personnel including operations research, economics, cognitive and experimental psychology with the objective of reducing attrition, increasing retention, and ensuring an efficient allocation of military forces.

Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research

The budget request includes $9.9 million for the Defense Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DEPSCoR) to broaden the infrastructure for universities that support national defense research. The research conducted is peer reviewed and competitively awarded. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 61114D to continue efforts in this merit-based program.

Chemical and biological defense basic research

The budget request included $33.2 million in PE 61384BP for chemical and biological defense basic research. The goal of this program is to improve the operational performance of the military services by concentrated research in areas that can contribute to defense against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 61384BP for basic research, to be distributed as follows: $2.0 million for optical com-

puting chemical agent detection; and $3.0 million for continued research in thin film technology development.

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization funding and programmatic guidance

The budget request included approximately $4.9 billion for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), including Procurement, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) and military construction. The committee's recommended changes to the budget request for BMDO procurement and RDT&E are provided below. The committee's recommendations for BMDO military construction are provided elsewhere in this report.

Support Technology

The committee continues to support BMDO's efforts in the area of wide bandgap electronics materials and devices. To support this important technology effort, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62173C and an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63173C.

The committee continues to support the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT) program to develop advanced interceptor kill vehicle technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63173C to support the AIT program.

The committee believes that BMDO should immediately begin to define and develop the necessary technology for the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) block II kill vehicle. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62173C to support the development of advanced NTW kill vehicle concepts employing light-weight non-toxic pumped-propulsion and active/passive sensor technology.

The committee has supported BMDO's efforts to evaluate innovative and low-cost launch technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63173C to support low cost launch technology, including the Excalibur concept.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63173C to support the Magdalena Ridge Observatory.

National Missile Defense

The budget request included approximately $1.8 billion for the National Missile Defense (NMD) program, including Procurement and RDT&E. The committee notes that the Director of BMDO has identified an additional $300.0 million that could be utilized to further enhance risk reduction and testing activities. Of this amount, the Director identified $129.0 million as critical risk reduction unfunded requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $129.0 million in PE 63871C for NMD risk reduction.

The committee understands that BMDO is considering entering into a competition for the NMD X-band ground-based radars (GBR) that would be deployed following the initial deployment of the Alaska GBR site. The committee directs the Director of BMDO to conduct an analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of a competitive approach to follow-on GBR development and deployment, and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001.

Navy Theater Wide

The committee continues to support the NTW program and urges the Secretary of Defense to accelerate this important program to the extent permitted by the pace of technological development. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million in PE 63868C to accelerate the NTW SM–3 interceptor.

BMD Technical Operations

The committee continues to support the Army Space and Missile Defense Command's Advanced Research Center (ARC). The ARC provides a valuable tool in support of both theater and national missile defense programs. The committee recommends an increase of $6.5 million in PE 63874C in support of the ARC.

The committee supports BMDO's efforts to improve missile defense technologies and capabilities against advanced theater ballistic missile threats. One promising area of research is in optical data and sensor fusion for detection and discrimination of advanced threats, missile plumes, and penetration aids using advanced image processing and optical discrimination algorithms. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63874C for BMDO to continue this work.

International Cooperative Programs

The budget request included $117.0 million for BMDO International Cooperative Programs, including $81.2 million for Israeli Cooperative Projects and $35.8 million for the Russian- American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program.

The committee is pleased that the budget request includes funding to support continued acquisition of the Arrow Third Battery. The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63875C to initiate the Arrow System Improvement Plan.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has revised the Russian-American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program from its fiscal year 2000 approach to a restructured two-satellite program. The committee understands that this revised program is intended to improve the prospects for technical success with a greater focus on defense objectives, while also protecting sensitive U.S. technology. Under the revised proposal, Russia would build, launch and operate two essentially identical satellites that carry U.S.-built infrared sensors. The U.S. is attempting to devise a plan to place these sensors in tamper-resistant containers and have monitors to ensure proper handling to preclude unauthorized technology transfer.

Although this revised two-satellite program is a significant improvement over the previous two-satellite RAMOS concept, the committee continues to have serious concerns. The committee is concerned that, one year after the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) determined that RAMOS was of marginal benefit to BMDO, the Department now proposes to spend approximately $350.0 million on the development and production of two satellites over the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP), and that this entire amount is to be paid for by DOD. In contrast, BMDO's core technology program is widely recognized to be under-funded throughout the years of the FYDP. The committee also is not convinced that

the United States can provide infrared sensors for integration into Russian- built and launched satellites without compromising this technology or otherwise providing significant technical assistance to Russia to accommodate the integration and proper functioning of the U.S.-built sensors. In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to restore the RAMOS program to the approach presented to Congress in the fiscal year 2000 budget request, which was approved by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Consistent with this approach, the committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in PE 63875C for the RAMOS program.

BMD Targets

The committee continues to support BMDO's effort to develop a theater missile defense surrogate target based on a liquid fuel engine. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63872C to continue this effort.

Bio-defense research

The budget request included $18.6 million for PE 62234D, the Lincoln Laboratory research program. This reflects a 10 percent decrease that has not been explained or substantiated by the Department of Defense. The reduction included in the budget request will have a significant impact on the advanced bio-defense development activities, a project that the Department has extolled as "best in its class". Performance was rated "beyond expectation". The effort is to develop an integrated bio agent detection, identification, and warning sensor system that is smaller, lighter and quicker; the actual target is an integrated system the size of a mailbox.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 62234D to continue the development and demonstration of this bio-defense technology in the vital national security interest.

Hybrid sensor suite

The budget request included no funding in PE 62384BP for a lightweight, man-portable hybrid sensor suite using thin film technology. The committee notes the requirement for a low-power, inexpensive chemical agent detector. Therefore, The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62384BP for a hybrid sensor suite using thin-film technology.

High definition systems

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 62708E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's high definition system program. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that no projects be pursued without an industry cost share.

Three dimensional structures research

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62712E for the development, optimization and demonstration of fabrication processes for highly integrated three dimensional microcircuits. The committee directs that all applicable competitive pro-

cedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Biological agent sensor technologies

The budget request included $300,000 for combating terrorism technology support to continue to develop aerogel and fiber optic based technologies for chemical and biological collector and detector prototypes that meet the requirements of multiple federal agencies. The committee notes that since calendar year 1997, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has provided an estimated $2.9 million for technology base development of aerogel-based chemical and biological sample collector and sensor systems. The research efforts of DARPA indicate that aerogel properties can be tailored to meet or exceed the requirements of existing and future collector and sensor platforms. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63122D to transition the continued development of aerogel and coupled fiber optic-based biological sensor technologies from the DARPA Biological Defense Program to the Technical Support Working Group support program.

Blast mitigation testing

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63122D, Combating Terrorism Technology Support, to accelerate the testing and certification of blast mitigation effects technology. These funds would allow the Department of Defense to accelerate the testing and analysis of building components and improve building design standards and guidelines for use in new construction applications.

Facial recognition access control technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63122D, Combating Terrorism Technology Support, for facial recognition access control technology. These funds will be used to further the Department of Defense's efforts to develop, test and evaluate this surveillance, identification, and access control technology, and allow prototype development and testing.

Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force detector technologies

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for the Chemical and Biological Individual Sampler (CBIS) or the Small Unit Biological Detector (SUBD) programs. The committee notes the continuing requirement of the Marine Corps for chemical and biological detectors and analyzers in conjunction with the Chemical and Biological Incident Response Force capability requirements. The committee continues to support CBIS and SUBD research and development initiatives and recommends an increase in PE 63384BP of $11.2 million, to be distributed as follows: $2.7 million for the CBIS program to carry forward multiple, mature technologies and allow for operational assessments by the Joint Forces Command; and $8.5 million for the SUBD program to evaluate component detection sensitivity, and to fabricate prototypes.

Consequence Management Information System

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for a Consequence Management Information System. The committee notes the requirement for a program to enable civilian and military incident responders, such as Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams, to access and share selected information for operational planning and execution. The committee supports this initiative and recommends an increase of $6.4 million in PE 63384BP for a Consequence Management Information System.

Reactive materials

The budget request included no funding in PE 63384BP for the evaluation of advanced materials that contain reactive technologies. These technologies have demonstrated the potential to increase protection to the warfighter when incorporated into clothing, tentage, and shelters for defense against chemical and biological agents. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million in PE 63384BP for the evaluation of advanced materials that contain reactive technologies.

Complex systems design

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63704D to continue the development of the multi-view data standards for integrated digital environment for complex systems design. The Department of Defense currently employs a number of computer-based synthesis and analysis tolls that advance all phases of the life cycle of complex defense systems. From concept design, through development and production, and throughout life cycle ownership of a complex system, these tools have dramatically improved the efficiency and reduced the costs of each discrete phase. However, since each tool employs its own unique data representation and data storage mechanism, there exists, with few exceptions, no substantial interoperability between tools at the semantic level for interchange of similar data structures. This inability to collaborate results in a development process that remains largely manual, with no means for even semi-automated configuration management of the total project design. Congress has expressed strong support of this effort. The committee requires the Department to conduct a review of the project and report back to congressional defense committees on the Department's plan to implement this technology once it is completed.

Competitive sustainment initiative

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62712S for the competitive sustainment initiative. This initiative provides the foundation for forging new, more cooperative links between the Department of Defense and the supply base to eliminate waste and improve the velocity of logistics. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability at U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM)

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63832D, Joint Wargaming Simulation Management Office, for the development and installation of a Weapon of Mass Destruction Attack-Effects-Response Assessment capability for the Joint Task Force-Civil Support that was recently established as part of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM). This program will allow USJFCOM, along with government agencies, state, and local authorities, to model chemical, biological or radiological incidents from the initial detection of the attack and initial effects through the medical response to the incident in an integrated, interoperable manner.

Integrated data environment technology

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63736D for the continuous acquisition life-cycle support initiative's integrated data environment program. This technology addresses the critical issues of life-cycle costs and logistic support for the warfighter. The committee directs that cost sharing for this project be used to the maximum extent practicable.

Demonstration/validation of technology for the remediation of unexploded ordnance at active, inactive, closing, transferred, and transferring ranges

The budget request included $9.0 million for research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) related to the environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance (UXO), $5.0 million for development of UXO technology through the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)(PE 63716D) and $4.0 million for demonstration/validation through the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (ESTCP)(PE 63851D). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in ESTCP (PE 63851D) for demonstration/validation of UXO remediation technology.

The committee has previously expressed concern (S. Rept. 106–50) about the lack of focus or support in the Department of Defense (DOD) RDT&E base for UXO remediation. Based on information provided to the committee, it is evident that increased emphasis in this area is absolutely essential, particularly for demonstration/validation of technology that has been developed through SERDP and other DOD programs. It is the committee's expectation that the increased funding will be used for the demonstration/validation of viable, cost effective solutions that will help the military departments meet the extraordinary challenge of UXO remediation at active, inactive, closed, transferred, and transferring ranges. Moreover, the committee intends that ESTCP shall establish performance measures for UXO remediation technologies in order to determine the resulting level of implementation within the DOD.

Next generation anthrax vaccine

The budget request included $400,000 in PE 64384BP for a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare

agent anthrax. The committee recommends an increase of $2.1 million in PE 64384BP for continued research and development of a recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare agent anthrax.

The U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) developed a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological warfare agent anthrax in 1995. The committee notes that the vaccine currently utilized by the Department of Defense in the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP) was licensed in 1970 and has been certified as safe and effective by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). The committee is concerned that there is inadequate support for continued research and development of a second generation, recombinant vaccine against the biological agent anthrax and provides additional funding for this effort.

Remote Ordnance Neutralization System

The budget request included $11.6 million for the Joint Robotics Program, PE 64709D. The committee recommends an increase of $1.6 million in PE 64709D to develop and test improvements to the Remote Ordnance Neutralization System (RONS). These funds would allow the Department of Defense to upgrade RONS to a digital system and improve operator interface capabilities.

Cyber attack sensing and warning

The committee is aware of efforts being undertaken by the Department of Defense to develop technologies to detect and respond to cyber attacks on the defense information infrastructure. To support the development and deployment of such sensors, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 33140G.

Information Operations Technology Center

The committee strongly supports the efforts by the Information Operations Technology Center (IOTC) to develop information operations/information warfare tools. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 33140G to support these important efforts by the IOTC.

Trusted RUBIX

The budget request included no funding to complete evaluation of the Trusted RUBIX multilevel security database guard. The committee recommends an increase of $1.8 million in PE 33140G for evaluation and certification of the Trusted RUBIX information system security technology for interface with multilevel security software.

Virtual worlds initiative

The U.S. Special Operations Command has developed a program for integrating various sources of imagery and other information into three-dimensional products to support special operations forces. In order to support development of a scene generation database and other elements of the Virtual Worlds Initiative, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 34210BB.

Intelligent spatial technologies for smart mapping systems

The committee recognizes the importance and technological challenges involved in developing intelligent spatial technologies for military applications. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in the advanced research and development component of PE 35102BQ for intelligent spatial technology development in spatio-temporal database research for smart maps.

Joint Mapping Tool Kit

The committee continues to support the development of the Joint Mapping Tool Kit (JMTK) by the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA). The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35102BQ for continued development of the JMTK and the NIMA viewer.

INFORMATION ASSURANCE TESTBED

The budget request included no funding to support the Information Assurance Testbed. Section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106- 65) established an Information Assurance Testbed within the Department of Defense (DOD) to facilitate simulations, wargames, exercises and experiments in the area of information assurance and information warfare. The Testbed was also intended to provide an organizational structure with which DOD could interact with other departments and agencies and with the private sector on matters related to cyber security and cyber threats. The committee continues to support this important effort. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35190D to support the Testbed.

Joint course of action analysis and targeting support for information operations

The committee supports the Secretary of Defense's efforts to coordinate and de-conflict activities in the Department of Defense in the area of information operations (IO). The joint course of action analysis and targeting support for IO (JCOATS- IO) program is intended to establish a centralized process for IO-based capabilities. To support this important initiative, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35190D.

Advanced lightweight grenade launcher

The budget request included $87.1 million for Special Operations Forces (SOF) Operational Enhancements. The committee recommends an increase of $5.6 million in SOF Operational Force Enhancements (PE 1160408BB) to fund the continued research and development of the advanced lightweight grenade launcher.

Management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers

Congress has addressed the issue of management reform for Department of Defense test and evaluation centers twice in the last two years.

Section 907 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) required the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive review of the management of

the test and evaluation centers. Section 907 specifically required the Secretary to develop a plan, includinga schedule for establishing a cost-based management information system for the test and evaluation centers. The statement of managers on the conference report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–301) added the requirement that the Department report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of financing test and evaluation facilities through a working capital fund.

The committee is concerned that the Department has not yet submitted the plan and schedule required by section 907 or the report required by the statement of managers. The committee directs the Department to ensure that these requirements are fully implemented in a timely manner. In particular, the committee understands that the Department has developed a cost- based information system for use by the major range test facilities base (MRTFB). In accordance with the requirements of section 907, the Department should develop a schedule to implement this system for all test and evaluation centers and to ensure that the data collected by this system is actively used to make management and investment decisions.

The committee is also aware of certain cases in which developmental testing has been conducted outside the Department's test and evaluation base to reduce program costs. The committee directs the Department to review these decisions and ensure that the quality and integrity of the testing program has not been compromised by these cost-cutting decisions.

Furthermore, the committee has serious concerns with the budget request for the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program (CTEIP). CTEIP provides critical test and evaluation capabilities for joint and multi-service system test requirements. In this role, CTEIP provides a corporate means to leverage test investments for the services and defense agencies. This year funding decreased even though the Annual Report of the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation for 1999 stated the clear and pressing need for new investments in the test and evaluation infrastructure, "...with its emphasis on such efforts as improving and test efficiencies, promoting increased use of modeling and simulation, creating common instrumentation, and developing capabilities for test information systems, the CTEIP is clearly focused on developing the test capabilities we will require to meet the test challenges of the next century."

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64940D to be applied to critical upgrades at the defense test and evaluation facilities as determined by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). The committee directs that the additional funds be awarded in accordance with the standards provided in the assessment of the centers from the MRTFB criteria. The DOT&E should report back to committee on the allocation of such funds and the criteria used to determine the recipients.

Augmented reality fire-fighting training

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 65131D for augmented reality fire-fighting training. Augmented re-

ality is the use of live and virtual (computer generated) objects. The current project has demonstrated the basic technology in a multi-room office environment. This follow-on would focus on a shipboard system that would allow the actual crew to train in the actual environment during a deployment. The Live Fire Test and Evaluation Office is chartered with ensuring timely and accurate assessments of system survivability, vulnerability, and munitions effectiveness of weapons systems. One of the leading causes of casualties, in wartime or peace, is fire or fire effects. Evaluation of the training of ship crews under realistic combat emergency conditions is of critical importance to total ship survivability assessments.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Aircraft carrier modernization

The Navy is acquiring the next nuclear powered aircraft carrier in the Nimitz-class, the CVN–77. In order to reduce the total operational cost and improve system capability, the Navy intends to rely on the contractor team to provide total systems integration effort for the combat system, a function that has previously been managed by the Department of the Navy. The Navy believes that this approach will take advantage of commercial-based design to improve overall capability.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is conducting a review of the process by which we acquire electronic warfare programs. This review has been generated because of the Department's repeated experience of cost, schedule and technical problems associated with such acquisitions.

The committee believes that the Department of the Navy should apply appropriate lessons derived from this on-going study to the aircraft carrier program. In particular, the committee believes that the Navy should give due consideration to risk, cost, and benefit of newer electronic warfare systems compared to other alternatives.

Advanced ship hull demonstrators

The budget request included no funding in PE 63792N for advanced ship hull demonstrators. However, within PE 64300N and PE 64558N, both destroyer and submarine hull designs are being tested.

Tactics and operational concepts for littoral operations from the sea continue to evolve. The introduction of new capabilities requires the review of both strategic and tactical doctrine. Although it is not feasible to build a full scale prototype test vehicle for the many advanced hull designs proposed to the Navy, the Navy should leverage investments in advanced hull designs made by other entities including those of allied/foreign navies.

Rapid evaluation of advanced hull design tactical and strategic advantages should provide the Navy with valuable information for the development of operational concepts and tactics.

The committee is encouraged by Navy War College innovative concepts for applying available and future ship capabilities to influence both strategic and tactical operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends the Navy demonstrate capabilities inherent in advanced hulls where those capabilities have

the potential to provide valuable insights for use in modeling, simulation, war gaming, operational concept development, and ship construction. In addition, the committee encourages the Navy to take advantage of authority previously provided to them, by including the use of advanced hull designs in joint and combined exercises, as well as fleet battle experiments.

Crusader

The committee noted with interest decisions made by the Secretary of the Army to restructure the Crusader artillery system development program. The committee has supported efforts to develop and field this next generation system to fully modernize a heavy corps, and is concerned that adjustments made to the program appear to make this outcome unlikely. The committee understands the Chief of Staff has directed the program manager to determine the feasibility of producing a 40–ton system that will be easier to deploy but just as operationally capable as the existing concept. While the notion of lightening this system is admirable, this action will further delay any potential fielding of a system that has been in development for more than a decade. Most troubling is the revised schedule that now calls for a production decision to be delayed until the first quarter of fiscal year 2009. The committee does not understand how this delayed program fits with efforts to field an objective force, with common platforms, in the fiscal year 2012 time frame. The committee directs the Army to provide a report, by March 1, 2001, that describes how the current development and acquisition strategy for Crusader will fit with efforts designed to field the objective force described in the Army transformation initiative.

Future ship technology research and development

The budget request includes significant investments in future ship research and development. These investments are key to ensuring future ships have the technology required to maintain a war fighting advantage. In addition, some technologies may lower operating and construction costs. The Navy is encouraged to review the following technologies which have the potential to provide a technological edge and/or reduce life-cycle costs for future ships:

(1) applying multi-purpose processor technology to advanced integrated electronic warfare systems;

(2) developing a battle force tactical trainer with an upgraded personal computer system;

(3) modernizing aircraft carrier design software;

(4) pursuing advanced hull, mechanical, and engineering development of integrated topside structures and reduced ship signatures;

(5) emphasizing total ship engineering for enhanced damage control and survivability;

(6) modifying surface ship sonars for advanced mine detection;

(7) developing a damage control action management system;

(8) reviewing life-cycle cost benefits of an inter- cooled recuperated gas turbine engine;

(9) commercial off the shelf desktop computers which are capable of processing both secure information and unclassified data;

(10) wireless, low power level onboard and off-board personnel tracking and monitoring device with applications for shore material tracking;

(11) developing interfaces between Navy legacy human resources systems and the Global Combat Support System; and

(12) developing business process re-engineering of legacy Navy and Naval Reserve personnel systems.

Joint training and experimentation

The committee has noted with great interest the ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) to establish the organizational and procedural mechanisms to promulgate doctrine, concepts, and requirements for joint military operations. The establishment of the U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) on October 1,1999 was a major milestone on this path.

The steps taken by USJFCOM to date are promising. The joint experimentation program is underway. The Joint Warfighting Center continues to make progress in standardizing joint training and procedures across the entire force. The federation of the various service and defense agency battle labs to eliminate unnecessary duplication and provide a unifying vision for future efforts was especially notable.

In its December 1997 report on the Quadrennial Defense Review, the National Defense Panel recommended the establishment of a joint national training center. Other official and independent studies have made similar recommendations to make use of the capabilities of the existing training centers, e.g., Joint Readiness Training Center, National Training Center, Nellis Air Force Base, 29 Palms, and the San Diego Navy training facilities, for joint training and concept development. During his testimony before the committee on March 1, 2000, General James Jones, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, stated that the Marine Corps and Army were discussing the possibility of physically joining the 29 Palms Training Center and the Army National Training Center at Fort Irwin, CA.

Such proposals appear to have great merit and potential for further enhancing joint training and experimentation. While each service clearly has specific core competencies it must train to at its own centers, the benefits that would accrue from having a joint organization that monitors and leverages these training activities for future joint concept development and periodically coordinated joint training and experimentation activities seem compelling.

The committee directs the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2001, containing an assessment of the advisability and feasibility of establishing a joint national training center. The report shall include a summary of actions taken, planned or under consideration regarding the establishment of such a center.

Joint operational test bed system

The Commander, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) intends to establish a joint operational test bed system (JOTBS) to conduct joint interoperability testing and experimentation. The committee understands that, under the current plan, JFCOM intends to demonstrate interoperability of Predator unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and the tactical control system (TCS). The committee encourages JFCOM to continue this JOTBS activity and other efforts to continue fulfilling its mandate for ensuring interoperability among various services' systems. The committee also encourages the services to provide appropriate assistance to JFCOM to continue these efforts.

Maritime patrol aircraft

The committee is concerned about the overall state of maritime patrol and reconnaissance forces. The recent cancellation of the P–3 sustained readiness program is cause for concern about the age and condition of these aircraft, and whether there will be sufficient assets to meet unified and fleet commander in chief requirements. Insufficient funding of capability upgrade programs for the P–3, such as anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) and the block modification upgrade, further exacerbates the problem by causing over- utilization of the limited numbers of aircraft with these modifications. The capability of AIP-equipped P–3s was demonstrated in Operation Allied Force with the destruction of multiple targets with standoff land attack missiles.

The committee is aware of the recent acquisition decision by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, which approved entry into concept exploration of the multi-mission maritime aircraft (MMA) and directed an analysis of alternatives for such a program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, which outlines the current status of the MMA concept exploration, to include the impact of funding requested in the fiscal year 2002 budget request to prevent near-term shortfalls in this critical mission area.

Patriot theater missile defense

The committee notes that Patriot is the first system that the United States has deployed specifically to counter theater ballistic missile threats, and is evolving toward significantly improved capabilities with the PAC–3 system. The Army currently has almost 3,000 Patriot PAC–2 missiles deployed and has recently commenced low-rate production of the Patriot PAC–3 missile. The Army is planning to upgrade approximately 1,500 PAC–2 missiles into the Guidance Enhanced Missile Plus (GEM+) configuration by fiscal year 2005. The Army has also invested significant resources in the development of the Patriot Anti-Cruise Missile (PACM) upgrade to PAC–2. At the same time, the Army and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) are seeking to reduce the per-unit cost of the PAC–3 missile. To be successful, BMDO will have to increase the production rate for the PAC–3 missile. Further complicating the dilemma regarding the Patriot force composition and funding priorities is the fact that the Army has recently discovered

a number of technical problems associated with the fielded Patriot inventory. Therefore, the Army and BMDO need to balance the needs of the existing PAC–2 force with those of the future PAC–3 force. The committee strongly supports both the GEM+ and PAC–3 programs and directs the Secretary of the Army and the Director of BMDO to develop an investment strategy that properly balances the need to upgrade the PAC–2 system and accelerate deployment of PAC–3.

Prophylactic pharmaceuticals

Many life-threatening diseases today are treated by multiple drug efforts that can include vaccines. The committee notes the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to procure a vaccine and develop a second generation vaccine to protect service personnel against the biological agent anthrax. Relying on a single medical approach strategy rather than multiple drug therapies may expose protection efforts to undue risk should a vaccine procurement or development effort fail. Relying on a single medical approach may also deny service personnel the full range of modern pharmaceutical treatment that may be available from the medical research community.

The committee is aware of medical research involving synthetic compounds which inhibit the anthrax enzyme NAD Sythetase. Application of this synthetic compound could possibly be developed into a man-made prophylactic pharmaceutical to protect against exposure to anthrax and cure post-infection exposure.

The committee supports efforts to explore a multi-tiered medical approach to defending military service members against biological agents. The committee directs the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID) to report to the congressional defense committees the results of a cost- benefit analysis of a prophylactic pharmaceutical development program that is based on current medical research to develop synthetic compounds that inhibit the anthrax enzyme NAD Sythetase. USAMRIID will also report on the funding requirement to fully develop this research into a prophylactic pharmaceutical. The development program will have the following goals: (1) to develop synthetic pharmaceutical compounds that can be taken prophylactically immediately before exposure to anthrax spores and offer additional post-exposure protection against the germinating spore for non-vaccinated personnel; and (2) to develop a novel mechanism of action-based drugs that would kill the infectious anthrax bacteria whether it was a natural strain or a genetically engineered strain.

Radiation hardened electronics investment strategy

The committee strongly supports the Secretary of Defense's establishment of a Radiation Hardened Oversight Council and other initiatives to ensure the availability of radiation hardened microelectronic components to meet the Department of Defense's unique requirements for future national security systems. The investment strategy directed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, would ensure adequate funding to meet science and technology, engineering, and production needs from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2005. The committee supports

this strategy and urges the military departments and defense agencies to support the investment strategy goals.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of the Radiation Hardened Electronics Investment Strategy, including the degree to which the relevant military departments and defense agencies are fulfilling their directed investment goals.

Small arms fire control system

The committee notes with great interest progress made to date in developing the small arms fire control system (SAFCS). This lightweight, automated, optical sight system greatly enhances the accuracy of fire for both the Mark 19 grenade launcher and the M2 .50 caliber machine gun. The committee was pleased to note that the Army has recognized the critical role this system can play in ground combat operations and has requested the funding necessary to continue the development of this system. The committee encourages the Army to complete the development of SAFCS as soon as is practical and begin a robust procurement program to enhance the ability of our ground forces to fight and win decisively.

Transition of successful research projects into the acquisition system

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has a long history of successfully providing innovative technologies and revolutionary warfighting systems concepts to the services. In recent years, DARPA has worked closely with the services to identify areas of opportunity and technological needs where DARPA can play an effective role. Unfortunately, the percentage of DARPA initiatives transitioned to the services continues to be relatively low. In some cases, this transition problem appears to be attributable to the rapid pace of technological developments and the comparatively slow pace of the acquisition system. As a result, a research program may be successfully completed before the money is available, leaving a budget gap that adversely affects the program.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review this problem and report to the congressional defense committees not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act on alternative approaches to ensuring that successful research initiatives are fielded in a timely manner. The review should consider possible changes to the acquisition and budgeting systems, including, but not limited to, the development of a transition opportunity fund that would provide the Department greater flexibility to take advantage of rapidly developing technology.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 2001 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted explicitly in the report, all changes are made without prejudice.

SUBTITLE A-AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE III			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS			
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,123,731	(95,200)	19,028,531
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,300,154	(46,000)	23,254,154
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,705,658	40,900	2,746,558
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,346,977	42,100	22,389,077
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,920,069	53,500	11,973,569
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,521,418	5,000	1,526,418
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	960,946	5,000	965,946
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	133,959	5,000	138,959
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,182,335	40,000	3,222,335
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,446,375	4,500	3,450,875
Office of the Inspector General	144,245	0	144,245
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	0	8,574
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	0	389,932
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	0	294,038
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	0	376,300
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	23,412	0	23,412
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	186,499	0	186,499
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	836,300	9,000	845,300
Defense Health Program	11,310,423	91,300	11,401,723

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	458,400	0	458,400
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	64,900	(9,500)	55,400
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	25,000	0	25,000
Overseas Contingency Operation Transfer Fund	4,100,577	0	4,100,577
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	108,746,081	150,600	108,896,681
REVOLVING FUNDS			
Defense Working Capital Fund	916,276	0	916,276
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	0	388,158
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	(150,000)	0	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess of Routine Sales)	0	0	0
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	1,154,434	0	1,154,434
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	109,900,515	150,600.0	110,051,115

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**3,330,899**	**60,000**	**3,390,899**
010 DIVISIONS	1,174,856	-	1,194,856
Corrosion Control		10,000	
Battlefield Mobility Enhancement System		10,000	
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	321,297	-	321,297
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	350,844	-	390,844
Aviations Spares		40,000	
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	503,390	-	503,390
050 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	980,512	-	980,512
LAND FORCES READINESS	**2,370,841**	**-**	**2,370,841**
060 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,144,565	-	1,144,565
070 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	531,614	-	531,614
080 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	694,662	-	694,662
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**3,879,341**	**95,000**	**3,974,341**
090 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (OPERATING FORCES)	2,698,913	-	2,698,913
100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OPERATING FORCES)	916,378	95,000	1,011,378
110 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	131,042	-	131,042

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	82,388	-	82,388
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	50,620	-	50,620
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**9,581,081**	**155,000**	**9,736,081**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS		**526,913**	**5,000**	**531,913**
140	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	309,219	-	309,219
150	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	130,471	-	130,471
160	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	66,557	-	66,557
170	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (MOBILITY OPERATIONS)	20,666	5,000	25,666
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**526,913**	**5,000**	**531,913**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**364,026**	**5,000**	**369,026**
180	OFFICER ACQUISITION	73,963	-	73,963
190	RECRUIT TRAINING	15,728	-	15,728
200	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	14,618	-	14,618
210	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	134,581	-	134,581
220	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (ACCESSION TRAINING)	75,468	-	75,468
230	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACCESSION TRAINING)	49,668	5,000	54,668

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING		**2,193,890**	**60,000**	**2,253,890**
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	242,799	-	242,799
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	323,414	-	323,414
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	100,260	-	100,260
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	417,639	-	467,639
	Range Upgrade		50,000	
280	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	845,136	-	845,136
290	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	264,642	10,000	274,642
RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING		**895,653**	**3,000**	**898,653**
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	385,251	-	385,251
310	EXAMINING	77,700	-	77,700
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,629	-	87,629
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,207	-	79,207
340	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	77,491	3,000	80,491
350	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (RECRUIT/OTHER TRAINING)	188,375	-	188,375
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**3,453,569**	**68,000**	**3,521,569**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**472,588**	**-**	**472,588**
360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	472,588	-	472,588

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS		**1,551,090**	**-**	**1,551,090**
370	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	488,831	-	488,831
380	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	365,993	-	365,993
390	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	356,748	-	356,748
400	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	339,518	-	339,518
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**3,289,407**	**6,500**	**3,295,907**
410	ADMINISTRATION	327,113	-	327,113
420	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	466,906	-	466,906
430	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	164,992	-	164,992
440	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	154,893	-	154,893
450	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	739,315	-	739,315
460	ARMY CLAIMS	112,851	-	112,851
470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	69,439	-	69,439
480	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	1,076,077	-	1,077,577
	Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness		1,500	
490	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	177,821	5,000	182,821
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS		**249,083**	**-**	**249,083**
500	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	194,381	-	194,381
510	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	54,702	-	54,702
520	EXPANSION OF NATO	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,562,168**	**6,500**	**5,568,668**
UNDISTRIBUTED:			
Civilian Under-execution		(4,600)	
Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(40,500)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(292,100)	
WMD-CST		7,500	
TOTAL		**(329,700)**	**(329,700)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**19,123,731**	**(95,200)**	**19,028,531**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS	**4,267,564**	**157,000**	**4,424,564**
010 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,636,230	-	2,793,230
Aviation Spares		75,000	
TACAMO Spares		82,000	
020 FLEET AIR TRAINING	798,956	-	798,956
030 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	59,407	-	59,407

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	102,182	-	102,182
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	648,745	-	648,745
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,044	-	22,044
SHIP OPERATIONS		**6,334,227**	**312,300**	**6,646,527**
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,237,075	-	2,312,075
	Spares		75,000	
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	539,919	-	539,919
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	393,478	-	393,478
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,113,052	143,300	2,350,352
	AOE Maintenance		40,000	
	LHA Midlife		32,000	
	BMB Maintenance		22,000	
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,703	-	1,050,703
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT		**1,667,580**	**7,000**	**1,674,580**
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	371,080	-	371,080
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	16,452	-	16,452
140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	167,779	-	167,779
150	WARFARE TACTICS	141,835	-	141,835
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	257,981	7,000	264,981
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	548,600	-	548,600

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	163,062	-	163,062
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	791	-	791
WEAPONS SUPPORT		**1,386,942**	**-**	**1,386,942**
200	CRUISE MISSILE	139,779	-	139,779
210	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	816,722	-	816,722
220	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	48,635	-	48,635
230	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	381,806	-	381,806
WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT		**19,100**	**-**	**19,100**
240	NWCF SUPPORT	19,100	-	19,100
BASE SUPPORT		**3,017,265**	**150,000**	**3,167,265**
250	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	866,050	150,000	1,016,050
260	BASE SUPPORT	2,151,215	-	2,151,215
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**16,692,678**	**626,300**	**17,318,978**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES		**428,418**	**-**	**428,418**
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	428,418	-	428,418
ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS		**196,403**	**-**	**196,403**
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,939	-	2,939
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	193,464	-	193,464

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	**44,113**	**-**	**44,113**
300 FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,707	-	23,707
310 INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,112	-	1,112
320 COAST GUARD SUPPORT	19,294	-	19,294
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**668,934**	**-**	**668,934**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
ACCESSION TRAINING	**174,633**	**-**	**174,633**
330 OFFICER ACQUISITION	90,121	-	90,121
340 RECRUIT TRAINING	6,594	-	6,594
350 RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,918	-	77,918
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	**913,264**	**29,300**	**942,564**
360 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	276,861	-	281,161
NULKA Training		4,300	
370 FLIGHT TRAINING	342,553	-	342,553
380 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	107,625	-	107,625
390 TRAINING SUPPORT	186,225	-	211,225
Range Upgrades		25,000	
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	**354,956**	**3,000**	**357,956**
400 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	180,737	-	180,737

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	86,613	-	86,613
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	56,234	-	56,234
430	JUNIOR ROTC	31,372	3,000	34,372
BASE SUPPORT		**522,786**	**15,000**	**537,786**
440	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	198,071	15,000	213,071
450	BASE SUPPORT	324,715	-	324,715
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**1,965,639**	**47,300**	**2,012,939**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**1,346,099**	**-**	**1,346,099**
460	ADMINISTRATION	618,145	-	618,145
470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	19,987	-	19,987
480	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	114,660	-	114,660
490	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	97,812	-	97,812
500	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	187,270	-	187,270
510	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	308,225	-	308,225
520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0	-	0
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT		**1,728,826**	**-**	**1,728,826**
530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,105	-	186,105
540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
550	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	355,482	-	355,482
560	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	721,560	-	721,560
570	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	303,087	-	303,087
580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	61,092	-	61,092
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	47,240	-	47,240
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	54,260	-	54,260
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**622,854**	**-**	**622,854**
610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	622,854	-	622,854
SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS		**8,508**	**-**	**8,508**
620	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,508	-	8,508
BASE SUPPORT		**266,616**	**15,000**	**281,616**
630	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	109,485	15,000	124,485
640	BASE SUPPORT	157,131	-	157,131
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS		**0**	**-**	**0**
650	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	0	-	0
PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS		**0**	**-**	**0**
660	PROBLEM DISBURSEMENTS	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**3,972,903**	**15,000**	**3,987,903**

UNDISTRIBUTED:

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
Civilian Under-execution		(53,800)	
Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(585,700)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(105,100)	
MTAPP		2,000	
Call Center		3,000	
Information Technology Center		5,000	
TOTAL		**(734,600)**	**(734,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**23,300,154**	**(46,000)**	**23,254,154**
OPERATIONAS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	**1,908,545**	**63,700**	**1,972,245**
010 OPERATIONAL FORCES	420,702	-	443,802
Initial Issue		23,100	
020 FIELD LOGISTICS	235,561	-	235,561
030 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,194	33,100	137,794
Corrosion Control		7,500	
040 BASE SUPPORT	760,299	-	760,299

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
050	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	394,789	-	394,789
USMC PREPOSITIONING		**86,281**	**-**	**86,281**
060	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	82,390	-	82,390
070	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,891	-	3,891
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**1,994,826**	**63,700**	**2,058,526**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**86,386**	**-**	**86,386**
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,655	-	10,655
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	300	-	300
100	BASE SUPPORT	55,649	-	55,649
110	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	19,782	-	19,782
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		**205,972**	**-**	**205,972**
120	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	32,975	-	32,975
130	FLIGHT TRAINING	166	-	166
140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,704	-	8,704
150	TRAINING SUPPORT	84,417	-	84,417
160	BASE SUPPORT	50,948	-	50,948
170	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	28,762	-	28,762
RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION		**140,518**	**3,000**	**143,518**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	100,001	-	100,001
190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	17,961	-	17,961
200	JUNIOR ROTC	11,917	3,000	14,917
210	BASE SUPPORT	8,006	-	8,006
220	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,633	-	2,633
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**432,876**	**3,000**	**435,876**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT		**277,956**	**-**	**277,956**
230	SPECIAL SUPPORT	204,293	-	204,293
240	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	31,414	-	31,414
250	ADMINISTRATION	25,811	-	25,811
260	BASE SUPPORT	14,157	-	14,157
270	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,281	-	2,281
CANCELLED ACCOUNT		**0**	**-**	**0**
280	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**277,956**	**-**	**277,956**
	UNDISTRIBUTED:			
	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		**(25,800)**	

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL		(25,800)	(25,800)
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,705,658**	**40,900**	**2,746,558**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR FORCE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS	**8,673,688**	**100,000**	**8,773,688**
010 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,363,665	-	2,363,665
020 PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	306,379	-	306,379
030 COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	205,101	-	205,101
040 AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	774,341	-	774,341
050 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,341,224	-	1,341,224
060 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,093,924	-	1,093,924
070 BASE SUPPORT	1,849,247	100,000	1,949,247
080 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	739,807	-	739,807
COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	**1,536,955**	**-**	**1,536,955**
090 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	680,464	-	680,464
100 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	154,153	-	154,153
110 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	280,971	-	280,971

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
120	JCS EXERCISES	37,052	-	37,052
130	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	124,998	-	124,998
140	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	259,317	-	259,317
SPACE OPERATIONS		**1,279,808**	**-**	**1,279,808**
150	LAUNCH FACILITIES	234,395	-	234,395
160	LAUNCH VEHICLES	116,766	-	116,766
170	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	248,564	-	248,564
180	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	53,473	-	53,473
190	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	114,729	-	114,729
200	BASE SUPPORT	377,605	-	377,605
210	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	134,276	-	134,276
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**11,490,451**	**100,000**	**11,590,451**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION				
MOBILITY OPERATIONS		**3,159,544**	**44,700**	**3,204,244**
220	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,653,084	-	1,653,084
230	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	37,961	-	37,961
240	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	146,133	-	146,133
250	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	305,244	-	305,244
260	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	429,775	-	429,775

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
270	BASE SUPPORT	466,832	44,700	511,532
280	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	120,515	-	120,515
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION		**3,159,544**	**44,700**	**3,204,244**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
ACCESSION TRAINING		**266,841**	**-**	**266,841**
290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	68,142	-	68,142
300	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,302	-	4,302
310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	61,522	-	61,522
320	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	68,220	-	68,220
330	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACADEMIES ONLY)	64,655	-	64,655
BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING		**1,669,169**	**-**	**1,669,169**
340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	256,003	-	256,003
350	FLIGHT TRAINING	618,293	-	618,293
360	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	109,263	-	109,263
370	TRAINING SUPPORT	75,599	-	75,599
380	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,626	-	11,626
390	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	471,268	-	471,268
400	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OTHER TRAINING)	127,117	-	127,117
RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION		**305,491**	**3,000**	**308,491**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
410	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	113,524	-	113,524
420	EXAMINING	3,483	-	3,483
430	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,032	-	87,032
440	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	69,633	-	69,633
450	JUNIOR ROTC	31,819	3,000	34,819
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**2,241,501**	**3,000**	**2,244,501**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS		**3,131,611**	**75,000**	**3,206,611**
460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	985,411	-	1,060,411
	Readiness Spares Packages		75,000	
470	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	396,144	-	396,144
480	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	222,395	-	222,395
490	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	55,398	-	55,398
500	BASE SUPPORT	1,131,172	-	1,131,172
510	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	341,091	-	341,091
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**1,624,374**	**-**	**1,624,374**
520	ADMINISTRATION	153,206	-	153,206
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	322,654	-	322,654
540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	146,783	-	146,783

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	59,073	-	59,073
560	ARMS CONTROL	41,094	-	41,094
570	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	590,249	-	590,249
580	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	35,109	-	35,109
590	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,917	-	13,917
600	BASE SUPPORT	237,050	-	237,050
610	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	25,239	-	25,239
SECURITY PROGRAMS		**685,834**	**-**	**685,834**
620	SECURITY PROGRAMS	685,834	-	685,834
SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS		**13,662**	**-**	**13,662**
630	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	13,662	-	13,662
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**5,455,481**	**75,000**	**5,530,481**
	UNDISTRIBUTED:			
	Excess Carryover--Defense Working Capital Funds		(52,200)	
	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(157,600)	
	NBC Sustainment		29,200	
	TOTAL		**(180,600)**	**(180,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR FORCE		**22,346,977**	**42,100**	**22,389,077**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
010 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	396,489	-	446,489
Mobility Enhancements		50,000	
020 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,263,572	-	1,263,572
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,660,061**	**50,000**	**1,710,061**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
030 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	45,677	-	45,677
TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**45,677**	**-**	**45,677**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
040 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	10,999	-	10,999
050 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,331	2,000	102,331
060 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	15,354	-	15,354
070 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	78,299	-	78,299
080 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,445	-	7,445
090 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,089	-	1,089

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
100	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	49,158	-	49,158
TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**262,675**	**2,000**	**264,675**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
110	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	94,525	-	94,525
120	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	88,431	-	88,431
130	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,207,597	-	4,207,597
140	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (FY 98/99)	0	-	0
150	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (NO YEAR)	0	-	0
160	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	348,658	-	348,658
170	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,416	-	1,416
180	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	184,856	-	184,856
190	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	755,197	-	755,197
200	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	12,596	-	12,596
210	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,143,496	-	1,144,696
	MOCAS Enhancements		1,200	
220	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,827	-	14,827
230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	67,598	-	64,498
	Partnership for Peace		(3,100)	
240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	126,929	-	126,929

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
250	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	215,624	-	215,624
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,434,204	-	1,434,204
270	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	157,883	-	157,883
280	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	22,495	-	22,495
290	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	417,126	-	437,126
	Joint Spectrum Center Data Base Upgrade		25,000	
	Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management		(5,000)	
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	0	-	0
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	43,864	-	43,864
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	299,334	-	299,334
330	NATURAL DISASTERS	0	-	0
340	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	315,000	-	315,000
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**9,951,656**	**18,100**	**9,969,756**

UNDISTRIBUTED:		
Civilian Under-execution	(27,500)	
Foreign Currency Fluctuation	(27,200)	
Legacy	6,100	
Defense Travel System	(20,000)	
Information Security Scholarship Program	20,000	

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
Command Information Superiority Architecture		2,000	
Information Protection Research Institute		10,000	
IMPACT AID		20,000	
TOTAL		**(16,600)**	**(16,600)**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**11,920,069**	**53,500**	**11,973,569**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**680,318**	**-**	**680,318**
010 DIVISION FORCES	9,921	-	9,921
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	22,544	-	22,544
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	218,697	-	218,697
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	103,347	-	103,347
050 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	325,809	-	325,809
LAND FORCES READINESS	**211,288**	**5,000**	**216,288**
060 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	129,020	-	129,020
070 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	35,501	-	35,501
080 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	46,767	5,000	51,767

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**461,815**	**-**	**461,815**
090 BASE SUPPORT	345,771	-	345,771
100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	114,704	-	114,704
110 UNIFIED COMMANDS	0	-	0
120 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,340	-	1,340
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,353,421**	**5,000**	**1,358,421**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130 ADMINISTRATION	34,708	-	34,708
140 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	22,482	-	22,482
150 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	41,594	-	41,594
160 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	69,213	-	69,213
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**167,997**	**-**	**167,997**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**1,521,418**	**5,000**	**1,526,418**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS		**478,297**	**-**	**478,297**
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	355,803	-	355,803
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	0	-	0
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,381	-	17,381
040	AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,384	-	3,384
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	101,391	-	101,391
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	338	-	338
RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS		**130,106**	**5,000**	**135,106**
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	48,182	-	48,182
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	621	-	621
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	11,207	-	11,207
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	68,721	5,000	73,721
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,375	-	1,375
RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT		**34,850**	**-**	**34,850**
120	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	34,850	-	34,850
RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT		**5,436**	**-**	**5,436**
130	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,436	-	5,436
BASE SUPPORT		**206,409**	**-**	**206,409**
140	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	63,728	-	63,728
150	BASE SUPPORT	142,681	-	142,681

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**855,098**	**5,000**	**860,098**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**105,848**	**-**	**105,848**
160 ADMINISTRATION	7,004	-	7,004
170 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,847	-	1,847
180 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	27,713	-	27,713
190 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	63,070	-	63,070
200 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,566	-	5,566
210 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	648	-	648
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	**0**	**-**	**0**
220 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	0	-	0
CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	**0**	**-**	**0**
230 CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	0	-	0
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**105,848**	**-**	**105,848**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**960,946**	**5,000**	**965,946**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
MISSION FORCES			
010 TRAINING	17,938	-	17,938
020 OPERATING FORCES	46,561	-	46,561
030 BASE SUPPORT	17,024	-	17,024
040 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	8,330	-	8,330
050 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	9,014	5,000	14,014
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**98,867**	**5,000**	**103,867**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,907	-	7,907
070 SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,317	-	11,317
080 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	484	-	484
090 ADMINISTRATION	7,628	-	7,628
100 BASE SUPPORT	7,756	-	7,756
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**35,092**	**-**	**35,092**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**133,959**	**5,000**	**138,959**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
010 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,199,990	-	1,199,990
020 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	49,309	-	49,309
030 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	281,177	5,000	286,177
040 BASE SUPPORT	224,138	-	224,138
050 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	45,661	-	45,661
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,800,275**	**5,000**	**1,805,275**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060 ADMINISTRATION	47,817	-	47,817
070 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,094	-	20,094
080 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,562	-	10,562
090 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,457	-	6,457
100 AUDIOVISUAL	654	-	654
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**85,584**	**-**	**85,584**

Title III
Operation Maintenance
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**1,885,859**	**5,000**	**1,890,859**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
LAND FORCES	**1,639,496**	**20,000**	**1,659,496**
010 DIVISIONS	420,846	-	440,846
Initial Issue		20,000	
020 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	743,303	-	743,303
030 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	192,504	-	192,504
040 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	184,399	-	184,399
050 LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	98,444	-	98,444
LAND FORCES READINESS	**262,419**	**-**	**262,419**
060 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	72,247	-	72,247
070 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	190,172	-	190,172
LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	**1,085,439**	**20,000**	**1,105,439**
080 BASE OPERATIONS	460,632	-	460,632
090 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	202,431	20,000	222,431
100 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	422,376	-	422,376
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**2,987,354**	**40,000**	**3,027,354**

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
110 STAFF MANAGEMENT	73,993	-	73,993
120 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	20,115	-	20,115
130 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	33,627	-	33,627
140 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	67,246	-	67,246
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**194,981**	**-**	**194,981**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**3,182,335**	**40,000**	**3,222,335**
OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
AIR OPERATIONS			
010 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,216,504	-	2,216,504
020 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	368,761	-	373,261
Distribution Mission Training		4,500	
030 BASE SUPPORT	291,414	-	291,414
040 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	104,385	-	104,385

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	452,932	-	452,932
TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES		**3,433,996**	**4,500**	**3,438,496**
BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
060	ADMINISTRATION	2,668	-	2,668
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,711	-	9,711
TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		**12,379**	**-**	**12,379**
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTNENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		**3,446,375**	**4,500**	**3,450,875**
TRANSFER ACCOUNTS				
10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	389,932	-	389,932
20	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	294,038	-	294,038
30	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	376,300	-	376,300
40	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,412	-	23,412
50	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	186,499	-	186,499
60	DRUG INTERDICTION	836,300	9,000	845,300
70	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	4,100,577	-	4,100,577
80	PENTAGON RENOVATION	0	-	0

Title III

Operation Maintenance

(Dollars in Thousands)

	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	Request	Change	Recommend
TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS		**6,207,058**	**9,000**	**6,216,058**
MISCELLANEOUS				
90	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	11,310,423	98,000	11,401,723
	Foreign Currency Fluction		(6,700)	
100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE	0	-	0
110	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	458,400	-	458,400
120	INSPECTOR GENERAL	144,245	-	144,245
130	OPPLAN 34A-35 P.O.W.		-	
140	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	64,900	(9,500)	55,400
150	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	25,000	-	25,000
160	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS	0	-	0
170	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	8,574	-	8,574
TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS		**12,011,542**	**81,800**	**12,093,342**
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:		**108,746,081**	**150,600**	**108,896,681**

Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $69.832 million to be appropriated from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for fiscal year 2001.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Impact aid for children with disabilities (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would add $20.0 million to Operation and Maintenance funding for defense-wide activities for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, title 20 United States Code, 7703(d).

Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment Teams (sec. 312)

The budget request included $157.9 million for the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS), but did not include funding to strengthen the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC). The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) requested an additional $12.0 million to obtain the additional analytical expertise required to strengthen the Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessment (JWCA) teams that support the JROC process, thus enabling the JROC to focus on more strategic, future-oriented, overarching issues. The committee is concerned that an investment of $12.0 million for this effort is premature. The committee favors a more modest, focused investment that would allow the CJCS to measure the progress and effectiveness of these reforms before reporting back to the Congress and requesting additional resources.

Therefore, the committee directs that, of the $157.9 million authorized to be appropriated for the JCS under Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, Budget Activity 04, $4.0 million will be available only for the purpose of additional investment in the JWCA teams to re-focus and strengthen their analytical efforts in support of the JROC process. Upon receipt of the CJCS report on the progress to strengthen and re-focus the JROC process, required by a separate provision in this bill, the committee would consider requests for a re-programming, additional authorizations, and/or legislative provisions to support the CJCS in this important, timely effort to improve the joint warfighting capabilities of U.S. armed forces.

SUBTITLE C—HUMANITARIAN AND CIVIC ASSISTANCE

ncreased authority to provide health care services as humanitarian and civic assistance (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow any underserved community, in addition to rural underserved areas, to receive medical, dental, and veterinary services through the humanitarian and civic assistance program.

Use of humanitarian and civic assistance funding for pay and allowances of special operations command reserves furnishing demining training and related assistance as humanitarian assistance (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize pay and allowances from within funds for the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Assistance Account, for reserve members of the U.S. Special Operations Command when these reservists perform humanitarian demining activities. This will enable these individuals to benefit from the same valuable training opportunities currently experienced by their active duty counter-parts, and will help mitigate the high operations tempo of the active component resulting from the numerous requirements placed on them for low intensity engagement operations.

SUBTITLE D—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

The committee is concerned with the long-term efficiency of the industrial facilities of the armed forces including depots, arsenals, and ammunition manufacturing plants. Over the past several years the military services have continued to downsize their force structure, which has reduced the requirement for the products and services of these facilities. However, as a result of the national security requirement to retain an industrial infrastructure capable of surging to meet the military's needs during a conflict, the Department of Defense must maintain industrial facilities that are not required on a day-to-day basis.

In 1992, the Congress enacted the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative which provided the mechanisms necessary to allow the Army's ammunition plants to attract private sector firms to locate at these plants, utilizing the unused surge capacity, and paying rents which were used to offset the Army's cost of maintaining and operating these plants. The private sector jobs also provided for the retention of critical skills at the ammunition plants that would then be available whenever necessary. This initiative has had great success, saving the Army $37.0 million each year and preserving hundreds of skilled workers.

Section 361 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 authorized the Secretary of Defense to designate of each depot level activity of the Department of Defense as a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence in the recognized core competencies of the depot activity, to adopt best-business practices at these facilities in connection with their core competency, and encourage the creation of public-private partnerships at these Centers for the performance of depot-level maintenance and repair in order to maximize the utilization of the capacity at these Centers. It also authorized the lease of excess depot-level equipment and facilities to private sector entities. Unfortunately, because of conflicting legal interpretations and other institutional barriers, the Department of Defense has made only limited use of these authorities.

The committee believes it is important to improve the efficiency of all Department of Defense industrial facilities that are required to maintain a core capability necessary for the repair and manufac-

turing of military ordnance and weapon systems. Therefore, the committee includes a number of provisions to clarify and enhance current legal authorities to provide the mechanisms necessary to more fully utilize these facilities by government and commercial organizations.

Codification and improvement of armament retooling and manufacturing support programs (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would make certain changes and codify in permanent law the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative. The provision would expand the objectives of the program to include a reduction of the cost of ownership and/or disposal of ammunition plants, to enhance best business practices, and foster cooperation with the private sector at these facilities. The provision would also make it easier for non-federal entities to use excess capacity at these facilities, and offset the costs to the Federal Government of ownership by allowing revenues generated through private sector use to be applied to overhead and production costs.

Centers of industrial and technical excellence (sec. 332)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, by devolving the authority to designate the depot-level activities to the respective secretaries of the military departments, including the arsenals of the United States Army. The provision would also expand the activities authorized to be conducted at these centers by employees of the center, the private sector, or other entities outside the Department of Defense, to include the performance of work under contract, or subcontract, in any of the core competencies of the center; the performance of depot-level maintenance and repair at the center; other work consistent with the needs of the Department of Defense that requires the use of any facility or equipment of the center that are not fully utilized by a military department for its own production and maintenance requirements. The full costs of work performed by the employees of the Center under contract from the private sector must be charged to the contract. Any revenues generated, by rents or through other mechanisms, by private sector use of facilities and equipment at these centers would be available to offset the costs of facility operations, maintenance, and environmental restoration at the center where the leased property is located.

The committee believes that the head of the center should use these authorities to maximize the utilization of the capacity at the center, reduce or eliminate the cost of Department of Defense ownership of the center, reduce the cost of products of the Department of Defense produced or maintained at the center, foster cooperation between the armed forces and private industry, and leverage private sector investment in the recapitalization of plant and equipment at the center.

Effects of outsourcing on overhead costs of centers of industrial and technical excellence and ammunition plants (sec. 333)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress thirty days prior to entering into a contract that would result in moving workload, performed by 50 or more employees, from a center or ammunition plant. The report should describe the impact of any reduction in workload at a center or ammunition plant as a result of a contract and describe the overhead costs of that facility

The committee is concerned that the process for determining the costs associated with entering into a contract with a private sector source for the performance of a workload currently performed at a center of industrial and technical excellence, or an ammunition plant, does not include a review of the impact that such a contract will have on the overhead costs of the center or plant.

Revision of authority to waive limitation on performance of depot-level maintenance (sec. 334)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2466 of title 10, to allow the President of the United States rather than the secretary of the respective military service to waive the 50 percent requirement for reasons of national security. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not taken the actions necessary to ensure the Air Force is able to comply with the requirement contained in section 2466 of title 10, that 50 percent of all depot maintenance funds of a military service be spent on depot maintenance services provided by employees of the Federal Government. The committee believes that this requirement is essential to maintain the core maintenance capability necessary to preserve a ready and controlled source of repair and maintenance.

Manufacturing technical assistance pilot program

The committee recognizes the valuable contribution that the manufacturing technical assistance pilot program has made to the development and retention of a skilled private sector workforce capable of supporting the manufacturing requirements of the United States Air Force. The committee believes that this program could also provide great value to the manufacturing and maintenance needs of the other military services, such as the ship building industry that supports the United States Navy.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to support an Atlantic Fleet pilot program for the development and retention of the manufacturing skills necessary to support the Navy's shipbuilding requirements of the 21st Century. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining the results of this pilot program.

SUBTITLE E—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Environmental restoration accounts (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2703(a) of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new paragraph that would designate an account for formerly used defense sites within the Environmental Restoration Account. The provision would also ensure that all site closeout activities would be funded out of an appropriate Environmental Restoration Account.

Payments of fines and penalties for environmental compliance violations (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to seek congressional authorization prior to paying any fine or penalty for an environmental compliance violation if the fine or penalty amount agreed to is $1.5 million or more or is based on the application of economic benefit or size of business criteria. Supplemental environmental projects carried out as part of fine or penalty for amounts $1.5 million or more and agreed to after the enactment of this Act would also require specific authorization by law.

The committee recommends this provision as a result of concerns that stem from a significant fine imposed at Fort Wainwright, Alaska, (FWA), a related policy established by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and an apparent need for further congressional oversight in this area. On March 5, 1999, EPA Region 10 sent FWA a notice of violation (NOV) and on August 25, 1999, EPA sent a settlement offer of $16.07 million: (1) $155,000 for the seriousness of the offenses; (2) $10.56 million for recapture of economic benefit for noncompliance; and (3) an additional $5.35 million because of the "size of business" at FWA.

According to EPA, the $16.07 million fine was imposed to correct excessive emissions of particulate matter from an aging coal-fired central heat and power plant (CHPP) at FWA, and to impose a penalty for years of violations under the Clean Air Act (CAA). The EPA policy or rule that directs the application of economic benefit or "size of business" penalty assessment criteria to federal facilities is based on memoranda dated October 9, 1998, and September 30, 1999, issued by the EPA headquarters Federal Facilities Enforcement Office (FFEO). Notice and comment procedures were not used to promulgate these memoranda.

The compliance and enforcement history of the CHPP provides some insight into this committee's concerns regarding the EPA NOV. In the mid–1980s, EPA delegated its CAA program authority to the State of Alaska. In order to comply with opacity requirements, FWA purchased opacity monitors in 1988 and installed them in 1989, however, the monitors had a high failure and maintenance rate. In March 1994, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) issued an NOV for opacity violations at the FWA CHPP that identified a need for PM emission reductions. In response, FWA negotiated a compliance schedule with ADEC for the construction of a full-steam baghouse for each of the boilers in the CHPP.

FWA continued to work with ADEC from March 1994 to 1999 to: accomplish about $15.3 million worth of numerous CHPP upgrades for controlling air emissions; resolve Department of Defense (DOD) privatization issues; conduct a baghouse feasibility study; and seek military construction authorization for a $15.9 million baghouse project. In the interim, FWA received a CAA Title V Permit completeness determination from the state on February 19, 1998. As a result, FWA continues to operate the CHPP under a CAA Title V permit application, which contains schedules for compliance that were the result of careful coordination with ADEC.

The $15.9 million baghouse was programmed for fiscal year 2000 and was authorized and appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 2000. As planned, the baghouse design complies with all applicable CAA requirements, including compliance assurance monitoring. When the EPA NOV was issued, FWA was in compliance with the Title V schedules for implementing air emission control technologies agreed to with ADEC.

First, the committee questions EPA's regulatory judgement in assessing fines and penalties despite the fact that the installation was operating in good faith under a Title V permit application that is overseen by a state with delegated authority. Second, it is the committee's view that the application of economic benefit or "size of business" penalty assessment criteria to the DOD is inconsistent with the statutory language and the legislative history under section 7413 of title 42, United States Code.

The terms economic benefit and "size of business" suggest market-based activities, not government functions subject to congressional appropriations. In addition, the statement of managers accompanying the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–549; 104 Stat. 2399 (October 27, 1990)) provides that with respect to the economic benefit criterion: "Violators should not be able to obtain an economic benefit vis-a-vis their competitors as a result of their noncompliance with environmental laws." The committee is not aware that the DOD has competitors.

As a practical matter, the functions of DOD facilities are not analogous to private business. The DOD, unlike private sector, must fund all of its operations, to include environmental compliance, through congressional appropriations. "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." (U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7; Anti-Deficiency Act (ADA) 31 U.S.C. 1501). Moreover, the expenditure of federal funds must be consistent with authorization and appropriation acts " Congress and the Office of Management and Budget oversee apportionment of funds to agencies during the fiscal year to avoid overspending " DOD allocates funds to the military departments, which in turn issue allotments to command and staff organizations. (31 U.S.C. 1341(a)(1); Department of Defense Directive 7200.1, Administrative Control of Appropriations (1984)).

The committee has concluded that DOD payment of fines or penalties based on economic benefit or size of business criteria would interfere with the management power of the Federal Executive Branch and upset the balance of power between the Federal Execu-

tive and Legislative Branches, exceeding the immediate objective of compliance. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments from paying such fines and penalties without specific authorization by law.

Annual reports under Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (sec. 343)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the current reporting requirement for the Science Advisory Board to allow for its inclusion in the annual report for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. This provision allows for more streamlined reporting by the Department of Defense.

Modification of authority for indemnification of transferees of closing defense property (sec. 344)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2315) to clarify the application of the existing indemnification authority. The exercise of the current authority under section 330 is predicated upon cumbersome conditions for claimant eligibility, which has resulted in confusion and a complete absence of claims for indemnification. The provision would eliminate ambiguous conditions, streamline claimant access, and facilitate early transfer of base closure properties to assist communities in recovering from the initial effects of base closure.

Consistent with existing authority, the recommended provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to indemnify any state, political subdivision, or any person who acquires ownership or control over transferred surplus base closure property for the costs of legally required remediation. Presently, the capital markets are reluctant to finance certain projects at base closure properties due to the potential for contamination, and liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and analogous state laws. That concern is magnified in those instances in which a military department transfers surplus base closure property for which there is a deferral of covenants under section 120(h)(3)(C) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.)

Payment of fines or penalties imposed for environmental compliance violations at certain Department of Defense facilities (sec. 345)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense (DOD) to pay fines and penalties, or to carry out supplemental environmental projects in accordance with section 8149 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The Secretary of the Army would be specifically authorized to pay following supplemental environmental projects carried out in satisfaction of an assessed fine or penalty: (1) $993,000 for Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.; (2) $377,250 for Fort Campbell, Kentucky; (3) $20,701 for Fort Gor-

don, Georgia; (4) $78,500 for Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado; (5) $20,000 for Deseret Chemical Depot, Utah. The Secretary of the Navy would be specifically authorized to pay the following fines and penalties: (1) $108,000 for Allegany Ballistics Laboratory, West Virginia; and (2) $5,000 for Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas.

Reimbursement for certain costs in connection with the former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia (sec. 346)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay not more than $98,210 from the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites Account to reimburse the Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site Special Account of the Hazardous Substance Superfund, established by section 9507 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9507). The reimbursement is for oversight costs incurred by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on a time critical removal action at the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot performed by the Department of Defense under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (10 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

Environmental restoration activities (sec. 347)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the secretaries of the military departments to use funds available in the environmental restoration accounts, pursuant to section 2703 of title 10, United States Code, to permanently relocate facilities. That authorization is contingent upon a secretary's written determination that such permanent relocation is part of a response action that: (1) has the support of the affected community; (2) has the approval of relevant regulatory agencies; and (3) is the most cost effective response action available. The authority would terminate after September 30, 2003, and be subject to a five percent funding cap within each fiscal year for the funds available under section 2703. The secretary concerned would also be required to provide an annual report to the congressional defense committees on each response action for which there has been a written determination made under this provision.

The committee expects the Department of Defense (DOD) to use this authority judiciously, and ensure that funds are used only for legitimate environmental restoration priorities. It is expected that this provision will provide the necessary flexibility to facilitate environmental restoration at certain formerly used defense sites (FUDS), where progress has been slow.

The committee is concerned about the progress of environmental remediation planning and activities, and the appearance of an overall lack of support for the FUDS Program within the Army and the DOD. (Formerly Used Defense Sites: Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army Audit Agency Report, AA 99–186, April 19, 1999). It is expected that both the Secretaries of Defense and Army shall address with consistency the environmental remediation issues at these sites. Moreover, the Secretaries of Defense and Army shall

ensure that there is adequate funding in the fiscal year 2002 budget request and the Future Years Defense Program to meet environmental remediation requirements and other related activities throughout the FUDS program.

Ship disposal project (sec. 348)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to continue to carry out a ship disposal project in fiscal year 2001 and to use competitive contracting procedures to award task orders within the ship disposal project. The provision would also direct the Secretary to submit, not later than December 31, 2000, a report to the congressional defense committees on the ship disposal project.

Report on the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program (sec. 349)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act, a report to the congressional defense committees. The report shall contain specific recommendations regarding the future mission of the Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program and address issues of concern within the Department of Defense.

Report on Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (sec. 350)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to submit, not later than October 1, 2000, a report to the congressional defense committees that includes the Army's analysis and recommendations regarding future applications for both phases of the Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System (PEPS) technology. The committee notes that PEPS has demonstrated merit as a research and development project (PE 62720A) that could provide the Army and other military departments with the capability to reduce costs associated with treatment and disposal of hazardous and toxic waste streams. The project has been executed in two phases: (1) a fixed- transportable unit demonstration; and (2) a mobile unit demonstration. It is expected that the data produced during both phases of the technology demonstrations should provide the Army with the information necessary to determine PEPS applications within the military user community.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Effects of worldwide contingency operations on readiness of certain military aircraft and equipment (sec. 361)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the effects of worldwide contingency operations on the aircraft of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, and the ground equipment of the Army and Marine Corps. The report shall include the Secretary's assessment of the effects of those operations on the ability of the Department of Defense to maintain a high level of readiness.

The committee is concerned that the continued high OPTEMPO of military forces is wearing out already aging weapon systems.

This is particularly true for aviation assets that have been used to provide extensive support in the no-fly zone over Iraq, to execute the air war over Kosovo, and support the numerous other contingency operations around the world, including East Timor.

This is also true for the ground equipment that is used in these operations.

Realistic budgeting for readiness requirements of the Army (sec. 362)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to develop a new methodology to be used in preparing a budget request that more accurately reflects the Army's requirements. This methodology should be based on the level of training that is required to be conducted to maintain essential readiness, the cost of conducting that required training, and the cost of all other Army operations, including the cost of funding its infrastructure requirements. This methodology should be used in the preparation of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. Army, despite repeated assurances, continues to migrate training funds to its infrastructure support and other accounts as a result of insufficient funding for these programs in the budget request. Over the past several years the Army has included funding for 800 miles of training in its budget, but has only executed between 600 and 650 training miles during the fiscal year. Those funds that were not utilized for training were reprogrammed to pay for such things as real property maintenance and base operations, which have been dramatically underfunded over the past few years. The committee is concerned that this practice indicates there are significant problems with the methodology used to identify resources necessary to fund its operations. The first problem stems from the fact that the current methodology does not accurately reflect the required training that must be conducted to maintain a division's necessary level of readiness. If it did, the Army would not report that its divisions are ready to perform the National Military Strategy when they only execute 75 percent of the funds programmed for this purpose. The second problem stems from the unrealistic budget request for must pay accounts, such as base operations, and other essential accounts, such as real property maintenance. Insufficient funding in these areas will continue to force operational commanders to reprogram funds from their training accounts to their infrastructure accounts in order to ensure the delivery of essential services such as utilities and building maintenance.

Additions to plan for ensuring visibility over all in-transit end items and secondary items (sec. 363)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 349 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 by including specific requirements for monitoring and measuring implementation of the plan to ensure visibility over in-transit inventory items. The requirements would include the assignment of oversight responsibility for each action required to address weaknesses in the controls over in- transit

items, a description of the resources required for oversight, and an estimate of the annual cost of oversight.

Performance of emergency response functions at chemical weapons storage installations (sec. 364)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from converting to contractor performance the emergency response functions of any chemical weapons storage installation currently performed by U.S. government employees until the Secretary certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the plan for conversion of the emergency response functions:

(1) is consistent with the recommendation contained in the General Accounting Office report, Department of Defense Competitive Outsourcing, dated March 2000; and

(2) provides for a transition to contractor performance of emergency response functions that ensure an adequate transfer of the relevant knowledge and expertise regarding chemical weapon emergency response to the contractor personnel.

The Secretary's certification is necessary to ensure that there will be no lapse of capability to perform the chemical weapon emergency response mission at a chemical weapons storage installation during any transition to contractor performance of those emergency response functions.

Congressional notification of use of radio frequency spectrum by a system entering engineering and manufacturing development (sec. 365)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees before a new weapon system is acquired that would outline the frequency that the system will use. The report would also include a statement of whether the Department is designated as the primary user of that frequency and, if not, the unique technical characteristics that make it necessary to use that particular frequency, and a description of the protections that the Department of Defense has been given to ensure that it will not incur costs as a result of current or future interference from other users of that particular frequency. The committee further recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the upgrade of the Joint Spectrum Center data base.

The committee is concerned that in the past the Department of Defense has pursued the development of weapons systems utilizing portions of the radio frequency spectrum that are not designated for military use. This can lead to unintended interference between that system and a commercial system licensed to use the same frequency. This interference could then result in operational constraints, or expensive redesign of the weapon system. The committee is further concerned that there is insufficient funding in the budget request to maintain an effective data base to assist program managers in determining the characteristics of various systems currently operating on particular frequencies, and in testing these systems to ensure non-interference.

Monitoring of value of performance of Department of Defense functions by workforces selected from between public and private workforces (sec. 366)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system for monitoring the performance of functions of the Department of Defense that are performed by 50 or more employees of the Department and have been subjected to a review to determine wether the function should be performed by federal employees or a private sector workforce. The provision would also establish three performance measures; the costs incurred, the savings derived, and the value of the performance by the selected workforce measured against the costs of the performance of the workload by the workforce at the beginning of the review. Finally, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Congress with an annual report outlining the results of the performance reviews conducted over the previous years.

Suspension of reorganization of naval audit service (sec. 367)

The committee is concerned that the Naval Audit Service has launched a program for total consolidation of audit personnel into the National Capitol Region without benefit of a convincing, detailed cost-benefit analysis, an assessment of the impact of the reorganization on the service's auditing mission, including an assessment of the impact of such a consolidation on this highly skilled and critical workforce. The committee is concerned that consolidation will undermine the efficiency and effectiveness of auditing functions throughout the Navy and particularly in the three highest concentrations of naval facilities and activities: San Diego, Norfolk, and Honolulu. The Congress, and the military departments, depend upon the quality of investigation and reporting done by audit agencies as an independent and credible source of information necessary to fulfill oversight responsibilities. The committee is concerned that consolidation could undermine the institutional and individual auditor independence so essential to an effective audit service and the quality of information provided to Navy leadership and the Congress. Therefore, the committee includes a provision that would delay the implementation of further consolidations until such time as the Secretary provides his analysis of the savings that the reorganization will achieve.

Investment of commissary trust revolving fund (sec. 368)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to invest a portion of the Commissary Trust Revolving Fund in public debt securities. Any income resulting from these investments would be credited to and become part of the fund.

Economic procurement of distilled spirits (sec. 369)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the military exchanges to use private distributors to distribute distilled spirits in those cases in which such an option is determined to be the most cost-effective means of distribution.

Resale of armor piercing ammunition disposed of by the Army (sec. 370)

The committee is concerned that excess Department of Defense armor-piercing ammunition could be made available to the public. The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to ensure that excess armor-piercing ammunition that is not transferred to law enforcement or other governmental agencies or made available for foreign military sales is destroyed. This requirement would not apply to the non- armor-piercing components of that ammunition, but such components could not be used to produce armor-piercing ammunition for sale to civilian purchasers.

Damage to aviation facilities caused by alkali silica reactivity (sec. 371)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to test the use of lithium salts to preserve runway integrity and provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining its success in mitigating the impact of Alkali Silica Reactivity (ASR).

The committee is concerned with reports of significant damage to aircraft engines as a result of the ingestion of pieces of cement from runways and parking aprons that have deteriorated because of alkali silica reactivity (ASR). The Corps of Engineers' Research and Development Center recently recommended the application of lithium salts to selected pavements at Fort Campbell to test the ability of this product to reduce or eliminate ASR damage to cement surfaces.

Reauthorization of pilot program for acceptance and use of landing fees charged for use of domestic military airfields by civil aircraft (sec. 372)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize a military service to accept payments for the use of domestic military and shared use airfields by civil aircraft and to use those payments for the operation and maintenance of the airfield. The pilot program would be authorized through fiscal year 2010.

Reimbursement by civil air carriers for support provided at Johnston Atoll (sec. 373)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to require payment from a civil air carrier for support provided by the United States to that carrier at Johnston Atoll that is either requested by the carrier, or determined to be necessary to accommodate the carrier's use of Johnston Atoll. The payment shall be equal to the actual costs incurred by the United States, and shall be credited to either Air Force operation and maintenance accounts or to the Army chemical demilitarization accounts.

Review of costs of maintaining historical properties (sec. 374)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of

the annual costs incurred by the Department of Defense in complying with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)(16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). The committee is concerned that NHPA places a significant burden on the already underfunded real property maintenance budgets of the military services. As those buildings which were constructed during World War I and the Korean War reach fifty years of age, the cost of meeting these requirements has increased and will continue to increase.

The provision would require the Comptroller General to provide the congressional defense committees with a report of the results of the review including the projected costs of maintaining these properties over the next 10 years, an analysis of maintaining only those properties which originally qualified as historic properties when the NHPA was first enacted, the accounts used for paying the costs to comply with the NHPA, and the identity of all properties that must be maintained in order to comply with the NHPA.

Extension of authority to sell certain aircraft for use in wildfire suppression (sec. 375)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the current authority for the Secretary of Defense to sell excess aircraft and spare parts to persons or entities that contract with the Federal Government for the delivery of fire retardant by air in order to suppress wildfires. The provision would extend the authority which currently expires at the end of fiscal year 2000 through fiscal year 2005.

Overseas airlift service on Civil Reserve Air Fleet aircraft (sec. 376)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 41106(a) of title 49, United States Code, to bring it in line with current Department of Defense (DOD) policy regarding the procurement of air transportation services. This provision would require that the DOD procure transportation from air carriers with aircraft in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet(CRAF) for travel from a place in the United States to a place outside the United States, and to the extent practicable, between two locations outside the United States.

The committee understands the need to maintain a viable CRAF to transport military personnel and equipment to a theater of operations during conflict. Following Operation Desert Storm, the General Accounting Office testified before Congress that the CRAF program had saved the DOD between $50.0 billion and $90.0 billion over the 40 year life of the program. United States air carriers commit their aircraft to the CRAF program largely in exchange for DOD international airlift business. DOD has little to offer these carriers in return for their commitment except U.S. Government business.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS OF INTEREST

Army

Real property maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing growth in the backlog of real property maintenance (RPM) throughout the Department of Defense. The current backlog of real property maintenance exceeds several billion dollars. This is a particular problem for our aging Army facilities. The insufficient funding dedicated to maintaining our military infrastructure is having a direct and negative impact on military readiness as necessary repairs on roads, airstrips, rifle ranges, and other training and operational facilities are continually deferred. Furthermore, the underfunding is undermining the quality of life of our military personnel and their families as repairs on the buildings in which they work and live, such as barracks, are also deferred. If this necessary maintenance continues to go unfunded, the Department will be faced with even larger costs to repair damages caused by inclement weather and other environmental conditions. In many cases, this deferral of property maintenance will lead to higher costs in a few short years when the military is already facing a "bow wave" of procurement to replace its aging weapon systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $320.0 million to the operations and maintenance accounts of the military services for the maintenance of real property, as outlined below:

	Millions
Army	120.0
Navy	180.0
National Guard	20.0
Total	320.0

Excess carryover-defense working capital fund activities

Current Department of Defense policy states that three months of carryover is the maximum amount allowable for the Defense Working Capital Fund Business Activities for organic work. Carryover workload is the gross unfilled orders at the end of the prior fiscal year, plus new orders for the current fiscal year, minus work in process for the current fiscal year. This does not include carryover for non-supply intra and inter working capital fund orders, foreign military sales orders, base closure orders, non-Department of Defense orders and contract obligations. The committee is aware that several defense working capital fund activities currently exceed the allowable carryover under the Department of Defense policy. The budget request for fiscal year 2001 in these activities would provide $678.4 million in funding that could not be expended until sometime after December 31, 2001, more than three months after the beginning of fiscal year 2002 when additional resources would be made available.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $678.4 million in the military service operation and maintenance accounts to reflect the funds that cannot be expended during fiscal year 2001, and bring these accounts within the Department's policy. These reductions are distributed, as follows:

	Millions
Army	40.5
Navy	585.7
Air Force	52.2

Foreign currency fluctuation

The committee notes the continuing strength of the American dollar in relation to other currencies. This makes the purchase of services and goods overseas less expensive than was originally believed when the Department of Defense put together the fiscal year 2001 President's budget request. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the foreign currency fluctuation (FCF) account currently contains approximately $639.4 million, or $319.4 million more than the historical level of foreign currency fluctuation reserves. The committee further understands that current exchange rates mean the Department will accumulate an additional $290.4 million in these reserves through the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts during fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for a total of $929.8 million.

The committee believes that this is more than enough to compensate for any unforseen weakening of the dollar in relation to foreign currencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $607.8 million in the military services O&M accounts to reflect the savings that will be realized in fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and to draw down the FCF account to an appropriate level. These reductions are distributed as follows:

	Millions
Army	292.1
Navy	105.1
USMC	25.8
Air Force	157.6
Defense Wide	27.2
Total	607.8

Civilian personnel pay in excess of requirements

The committee notes that the Department of Defense civilian personnel drawdown continues at a more rapid pace than expected. During the past several years, civilian personnel levels in the Department of Defense have been reduced faster than anticipated when the budgets for each succeeding fiscal year were drafted. This drawdown resulted in lower-than-budgeted civilian personnel levels, yielding savings of several million dollars during the past few fiscal years. Analysis performed by the General Accounting Office of the President's budget request indicates that this under-execution will continue during fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction to the military services operation and maintenance accounts to reflect the funds that were requested for civilian personnel budgets but will not be necessary as a result of the lower civilian personnel levels:

	Millions
Army	4.6
Navy	53.8
Defense Wide	27.5
Total	81.9

Army equipment maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment is having on the Army's ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments have led to increased work hours as young soldiers have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the shortfall in equipment maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of this equipment. The committee is also aware of the unfunded requirement for corrosion control treatments on this equipment to slow its rate of degradation. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for Army corrosion control, and $5.0 million for depot level maintenance of Army Reserve equipment.

Battlefield mobility enhancement system

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the purchase of the battlefield mobility enhancement system, a six wheeled vehicle used for logistical support in training and on the battlefield by light infantry divisions.

Army aviation spares

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, and during visits to the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. Furthermore, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the service chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for Army aviation spares.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $77.5 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Army Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Navy

Navy spares

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and in the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. These shortfalls exist for new systems, as well as older, established systems. Furthermore, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $232.0 million for Navy spares including; $82.0 million for TACAMO spares; $75.0 million for spares for other fielded aviation systems; and $75.0 million for ship spares.

Ship depot maintenance

The budget request included $2.2 billion for ship depot maintenance. The committee is concerned with reports of insufficient funding for ship depot maintenance. Recent testimony of the Chief of Naval Operations indicates that there is more than $200.0 million worth of such maintenance that currently cannot be executed because of a lack of funding. The committee is also concerned with reports that many private shipyards, which are essential to maintaining a healthy domestic maintenance capability, are being forced to downsize their operations as a result of insufficient workloads.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $237.3 million for ship depot maintenance, including $40.0 million for the AOE class ships, $32.0 million for LHA maintenance, $22.0 million for berthing and messing barge maintenance, and $143.0 million for general ship depot maintenance. The committee recommends a further increase of $5.0 million for depot maintenance of Navy Reserve vessels.

Oceanography

The budget request included $257.9 million for operational meteorology and oceanography. The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million for the Naval Meteorology and Oceanography Command for operations and collaborative oceanography programs.

Training range upgrades

As a result of insufficient funding over the past several years, much of the infrastructure at our military training ranges is obsolete and degrading. Training range modernization was identified in letters to the committee as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the United States military. Furthermore, the recent difficulties at the Navy's training range on the island of Vieques, together with the significant deployment of U.S. military personnel to combat environments, demonstrates the need to pursue the development of most up-to- date and non-intrusive training areas as soon as possible.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for Army training range upgrades and $25.0 million for Navy training range upgrades.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $31.3 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Navy Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Navy information technology center

The budget request included no funding to support operation of the Navy information technology center (ITC). The Navy recently created the ITC organization to serve under the Navy's Program Executive Officer for Information Technology (PEO IT). The ITC will support the PEO IT organization and will provide officers' organization much like the naval systems commands operate today. The Navy needs funding to span the time between creating the organization and the time when the PEO IT and organizations that

will use the services of the ITC can align their funding and budgets to support the ITC. The committee, therefore, recommends and increase of $5.0 million to support ITC operations.

US Navy Call Center

The budget request included no funding for a contractor- supported national employee benefits call center. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in Operation and Maintenance Navy to establish a contractor-supported national employee benefits call center in Cutler, Maine. This call center would provide a full range of benefit and entitlement information and assistance to civilian employees of the Department of the Navy. The call center would replace eight separate Human Resource Services Centers now in operation.

Marine Corps

USMC initial issue

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not adequately fund personal gear such as cold weather gear and body armor. Adequate funding for this gear is essential to the safety and comfort of our military personnel in the field. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $23.1 million in the operation and maintenance accounts for the Marine Corps to purchase items of individual combat clothing and equipment including ballistic plates, outer vests, and polar fleece pullovers. This will help provide Marines in the field with the clothing, gear, and other equipment they need to survive and sustain themselves during combat operations.

USMC equipment maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment is having on the Marine Corps ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments in corrosive environments have led to increased work hours as young Marines have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the significant shortfall in depot maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of this equipment. The committee is also aware of the unfunded requirement for corrosion control treatments on this equipment to slow its rate of degradation.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $33.1 million for general and depot level maintenance of aging Active Marine Corps equipment, and $5.0 million for equipment of the Marine Corps Reserves. The committee recommends a further increase of $7.5 million for the Marine Corps corrosion control program.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $11.9 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Marine Corps Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Air Force

Air Force base operations

The budget request included $4.6 billion for Air Force base operations. The committee is concerned with the continued underfunding of essential base operations. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force has informed the committee that the Air Force has $144.7 million in base operating requirements, including the installation of communications networks for C–17 support that were not funded within the President's budget request for fiscal year 2001. Insufficient funding for base operations forces unit commanders to migrate funding from training accounts in order to meet the day-to-day requirements of military installations, such as sewer, electricity, and communications. Therefore, the Committee recommends an increase of $144.7 million for Air Force base operations.

Adjustments to Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps

The budget request included $31.8 million for the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps program. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs.

Air Force readiness spares packages

The committee is concerned with the continuing reports of increased cannibalization rates and decreased mission capable rates as a result of insufficient quantities of spare parts. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, and during visits to the field, military officers have listed spare parts shortfalls amongst their principal concerns. Finally, in letters to the Congress, spares were identified as one of the leading unfunded requirements of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million for Air Force readiness spares packages.

Air Force nuclear, biological and chemical defense

The budget request included $12.4 million for Air Force nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) defense readiness programs. An important element of the Department of the Air Force Expeditionary Air Forces (EAF) program is to ensure sustained and effective EAF operations in an environment contaminated with nuclear, biological and/or chemical agents. The Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve require decontamination kits, chemical air processing systems, life support NBC equipment, handheld biological sampling kits, individual protective equipment and training to implement this capability. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $29.2 million for EAF NBC defense readiness programs.

It is imperative that the budget request for the Department of Defense (DOD) fully support requirements for the NBC defense capabilities of each military service. Any review by the DOD to ensure this requirement is fulfilled should be defense-wide and not limited to one military branch. In funding this requirement, the

committee intends to provide the Air Force with the same level of NBC defense capability as the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps.

Defense-Wide

Mobility enhancements

With the end of the Cold War and the reduction in the number of U.S. military personnel stationed abroad, the armed forces are far more dependent upon strategic lift and its supporting mobility infrastructure. Unfortunately, much of this infrastructure, including rail heads and port facilities, experienced significant degradation as a result of insufficient funding to maintain military bases. The committee is concerned that this degraded infrastructure will delay the deployment of military forces to a theater of operations, and thereby increase the risk associated with the successful execution of that operation, unless properly repaired. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million to repair and replace infrastructure associated with the deployment of forces.

Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS)

The budget request included $1.1 billion for the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million for improvements to the Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) System. The increase in funding is necessary for the development of a query tool and enhanced shared data warehouse that will allow contractors to view contract data that resides in the MOCAS data base.

Partnership for Peace Program (Warsaw Initiative)

The budget request included $48.4 million within the Defense Security Cooperation Agency budget line for the Partnership for Peace (PfP) program. The committee recommends $45.3 million for this program for fiscal year 2001, the same amount allocated to the program by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2000. When this program was initiated in fiscal year 1996 as an assistance program jointly funded by the Departments of Defense and State, the money provided by the Department of Defense was intended to be used to strengthen military-to-military relationships through joint military exercises, professional military education, and interoperability programs with the Partnership for Peace nations. The committee is concerned that the money provided for this program is being used increasingly for purposes and projects that are not focused on the military- to-military goals for which this program was intended. For example, the committee notes that $1.0 million of the amount requested for this program is intended to be used to pay for packing, crating, handling and transportation charges associated with the delivery of Excess Defense Articles (EDA) to PfP nations. The committee believes that this is an inappropriate use of defense funds to pay for what is essentially security assistance. Such charges, to the extent they are paid by the PfP program, should be funded by the State Department's portion of this program. The committee believes that the Defense Department should conduct a review of the PfP program to ensure that it is properly focused on improving the military-to-military relationship between

the United States and the PfP nations, and on enhancing military interoperability between NATO and the PfP nations.

Defense Environmental Security Corporate Information Management Program

The budget request included $14.0 million for Defense Environmental Security Information Management (DESCIM) Program. Based on concerns related to program management and performance, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in the DESCIM program. The $5.0 million from DESCIM shall be used in the Environmental Security Technology Certification Program (PE 63851D) to demonstrate/validate technology for environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance.

Domestic preparedness center

The budget request included no funding for a domestic preparedness center. The Congress established the Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness to contribute to providing civilians from federal, state, and local agencies with training and expert advice regarding emergency response to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The center, operated by the American Red Cross, is developing the curriculum and capability to begin training in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for WMD response training. The committee notes that on October 1, 2000, the Department of Justice will be designated the lead federal agency for oversight, management, funding, and execution of the domestic preparedness program, including operations at the Clara Barton Center for Domestic Preparedness.

Cultural and historic activities

The budget request included $300,000 for the Legacy Resource Management Program. The committee recommends an increase of $6.1 million for the recovery and preservation of three Civil War vessels: the H.L. Hunley, a Civil War submarine; the U.S.S. Monitor, a Civil War ironclad warship; and the C.S.S. Alabama, a Civil War commerce raider.

The committee strongly supports continued efforts to recover and preserve these three sunken U.S. vessels, which have gained cultural and historical significance based on their unique design and the circumstances under which they were lost. All three vessels qualify for listing on the National Register under the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.). The importance of these vessels also stems from their identification as potential war graves. As a matter of policy, the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Navy, on behalf of the United States, have asserted sole ownership and survey responsibility for submerged vessels that serve as war graves. In addition, the activities associated with the survey, recovery, and preservation of these vessels have provided Navy salvage divers with essential deepwater diving experience.

The committee notes that the DOD and the Navy have a responsibility to protect and preserve these historic vessels. As a result, these vessels are eligible for funding under the Legacy Resource Management Program. Moreover, it is the committee's expectation

that the Navy would continue to use these historic preservation activities as an opportunity to secure valuable deepwater training for its salvage divers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy in fiscal year 2001 to use the additional Legacy funds to accomplish the following: (1) to raise the H.L. Hunley, recover other remaining artifacts, and conduct related preservation activities; (2) to make preparations for the turret recovery of the U.S.S. Monitor and recover other remaining artifacts, including two cannons; and (3) to survey and recover the artifacts of the C.S.S. Alabama, including the aft pivot gun and the lifting screw.

The committee further directs that, not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that completely describes all prior and current use of Legacy funds and relevant state funds, and the status of recovery and preservation activities related to the H.L. Hunley, the U.S.S. Monitor, and the C.S.S. Alabama. The report should also describe the projected funding and date for completion of all recovery and preservation activities.

Defense Travel System

The committee recommends a reduction of $20.0 million for the Defense Travel System (DTS) Program delays.

The committee is becoming increasingly concerned over the delays in the fielding of this new travel system. The modernization of the massive military travel system will yield significant savings to the Department of Defense as well as the government traveler. The Department spends an estimated $3.0 billion a year on travel, and almost a third of this cost is the processing of the paperwork. After fielding of the DTS, the savings are expected to be more than $300.0 million a year and make trip planning less complex for the traveler.

During fiscal year 2000, the Department used below threshold reprogrammings to reduce the funding for the DTS by more than 22 percent. While the committee is again receiving assurances that the program is on schedule and properly funded, the committee is concerned that the funding for this program will be further reduced from the budget request. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary to treat this program as a congressional interest item under the procedures for prior approval reprogramming.

Command information superiority architecture program

The committee has supported the Command Information Superiority Architecture (CISA) program. This program has focused on command, communications and intelligence architectures and is now oriented toward command-specific communications and computer information architectures (CCIAs). The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, to support CISA's efforts in the area of CCIAs.

Guard and Reserve Components

Air Force Reserve equipment maintenance

The budget request included $281.0 million for Air Force Reserve depot maintenance. The committee is concerned with the continuing impact that aging equipment and extensive deployments are having on the Air Force Reserve's ability to maintain its readiness. Aging equipment and extensive deployments have led to increased work hours as young airmen have labored to prevent mission capable rates from falling. The committee is aware of the significant shortfall in depot maintenance that needs to be performed in order to restore the readiness of Air Force Reserve equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for depot level maintenance of aging Active Marine Corps equipment, and $5.0 million for equipment of Air Force Reserve aircraft.

National Guard initial issue

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not adequately fund personal gear such as cold weather gear. Adequate funding for this gear is essential to the safety and comfort of our military personnel in the field. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System for the Army National Guard to provide protection in combat conditions during cold and wet weather.

Distributed mission trainer

The committee is aware of the $4.5 million unfunded requirement for a 12 year fee-for-service contract and logistics support for F–15 linked simulators to support increased production of F–15 pilots. This will enable linked training among advanced flight training bases. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million for this purpose.

Miscellaneous

Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic affairs

The committee supports the humanitarian demining and emergency humanitarian response activities of the Department of Defense (DOD). These activities have enabled military personnel of the DOD to forge constructive relationships with the armed forces and civilian population of other nations, while carrying out valuable training which enhances the military skills of our troops. However, the committee is concerned that the Department continues to request funding for humanitarian assistance activities in this account that do not enhance military training, do not require military unique capabilities, and should therefore be funded by the Department of State. These activities include paying commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients and procuring food solely for humanitarian relief operations. The committee is also concerned with increased reliance upon the DOD to construct facilities in foreign countries that would more appropriately be funded through the foreign aid account and constructed by local private sector firms.

Therefore, the committee recommends $26.5 million for the humanitarian demining program, an increase of $1.0 million above the President's budget request. The committee further recommends $28.9 million for the humanitarian assistance program that is used by the regional commanders-in-chief for emergency response activities. This represents a level of funding for this program that is equal to last year's level in real terms. However, it does not include the $1.0 million that was requested to pay commercial carriers to deliver privately-donated goods to foreign recipients. The committee directs the DOD to restrict its use of commercial carriers in this area to instances where such use enhances a military activity. The committee is also concerned with the continued reliance upon the DOD for the procurement of humanitarian daily rations that the committee indicated in the Senate report accompanying S. 1059 should be funded through the Department of State.

The committee expects the Department of State in the future to fund those activities and programs that do not require military unique capabilities, and do not enhance the military mission. If the Department continues to request funding for activities that are clearly foreign assistance, rather than activities related to a military mission, the committee will recommend legislation providing strict guidelines on what activities can be funded through this program in the future.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Charlestown, Rhode Island

The Charlestown Naval Auxiliary Landing Field (CNALF), Rhode Island, is a formerly used defense site (FUDS) that was used for pilot and aviation crew training during World War II. In 1970, CNALF was closed and reported as excess to the General Services Administration for disposal in 1974. By deed, dated May 22, 1981, 172.4 acres were conveyed to the Town of Charlestown and in June 1982 an additional 55 acres was conveyed.

The site was determined eligible for the Defense Environmental Restoration Program (DERP) for FUDS. In 1992, the Town of Charlestown, Rhode Island, requested the consideration of a military warehouse and two boiler houses for demolition because of hazards that existed prior to disposal of the site. The town previously had not wanted these buildings to be considered for demolition. In June 1993, the Army recommended a building demolition project for these buildings, which was included in the fiscal year 1994 DERP-FUDS workplan, but has been continually delayed as a result of funding constraints. The Army has now tentatively rescheduled the CNALF building demolition activities for fiscal year 2001.

The committee is generally concerned about the lack of adequate funding for DERP-FUDS. Delayed action at sites like CNALF is further reason for questions regarding the management of the FUDS Program. It is the committee's expectation that the Secretary of the Army would ensure better management of the FUDS program, and specifically the CNALF site. If the site demolition workplan cannot be executed in fiscal year 2001, then the Sec-

retary of the Army shall, not later than January 1, 2002, provide a report to the congressional defense committees that explains the Army's inaction.

Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund

The Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of State (DOS) have numerous programs and authorities to provide education and training to military and civilian personnel associated with foreign militaries. Combatant commanders, who are charged with peacetime engagement with foreign militaries in their respective geographic regions, unanimously attest to the value of foreign military education and training. During hearings this year before the committee, three combatant commanders and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, praised foreign military education and training as a very low-cost investment that produces great results. These results are significant numbers of foreign military officials, many of whom rise to senior leadership positions, military and civilian, within their respective nations who were positively exposed to American democratic values, military professionalism, and the role of the military within a democracy. All of these witnesses stressed that modest increases in foreign military education and training programs would produce significant dividends in the form of friendly, professional, military partners for the United States.

A review of existing DOD authorities and use of available funds in this area revealed that combatant commanders are authorized to use up to $2.0 million of the Commander-in-Chiefs Initiative Fund (CIF) for foreign military education and training. However, the committee is concerned that virtually none of this authority has been used in the past several years, despite the testimony of our senior military and civilian leadership on the importance of such education and training.

Therefore, the committee directs that $2.0 million of the $25.0 million authorized to be appropriated for the CIF (Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, BA 01, Joint Chiefs of Staff) shall be used only for foreign military education and training.

Inventory of financial management and feeder systems

Section 1007 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Department of Defense to include an inventory of financial management and feeder systems in its biennial Financial Management Improvement Plan. Section 1007 requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a detailed plan for ensuring that systems have appropriate interfaces and internal controls.

In addition to the material required to be included in this inventory pursuant to section 1007, the committee directs the Secretary to identify each system listed in the inventory as critical or noncritical and major or non-major, and provide the criteria used in making these designations.

It is the expectation of the committee that the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief Information Officer of the Department will certify the accuracy and completeness of the inventory required by section 1007. The committee directs the Comptroller General to review the Financial Management Improvement Plan and report any

findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees.

Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistics support (JCALS) program

The committee is pleased with the progress that the Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistic support (JCALS) program has made during fiscal year 2000. JCALS is a demonstrated effective tool in the automated technical manual area that has helped the Department of Defense achieve its goals for cost- reduction and moving to paperless operations. Beyond its traditional technical manual capability JCALS has also proven to be an effective tool in addressing the paper-intensive acquisition and procurement processes used by the military services. The committee applauds these efforts by the Department to leverage its significant investment in JCALS to support other initiatives in acquisition and logistics, and would encourage even greater use of the program in the future. The Department's ability to capitalize on existing assets such as JCALS by making them multi-functional rather than single purpose will pay dividends by minimizing investment in duplicative systems development and support for the Department's acquisition and logistics community. The committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, on the progress made to restructure the program to expand the functionality and use of the JCALS program beyond the technical manual capability.

Mechanization of Contract Administration Service

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense will not maintain adequate funding for Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) pending full replacement by the Defense Procurement Payment System (DPPS). The DPPS has experienced system problems that have delayed the implementation of this system. It is critical that the Department maintain the MOCAS system until the conversion is complete. Failure to adequately fund MOCAS will lead to unacceptable delays in the payment of service, commercial, and payment vouchers, and force the committee to seek further action.

National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence

In the statement of managers to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the conferees directed the Secretary of the Army to transfer the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence (NDCEE) to a new program element under the control and oversight of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations and Environment). The conferees directed the Secretary to take such action based on concerns related to management and focus.

The committee notes that, through a memorandum dated March 14, 2000, the Secretary successfully accomplished the transfer and provided specific direction regarding the environmental technology focus of NDCEE. The committee agrees with the Secretary's direction that the NDCEE address technologies for all environmental

quality issues, to include pollution prevention, conservation, compliance, and restoration.

It is the committees view that the NDCEE has significant potential to serve as a national asset that will promote demonstration/validation of innovative technologies. It is anticipated that the NDCEE efforts will serve to reduce the total ownership costs of the Department of Defense (DOD) weapon systems. The committee is particularly interested in an emphasis on demonstration/validation of viable technologies that address the complexities associated with environmental remediation of unexploded ordnance (UXO).

Pesticide contamination at the former Fort Devens, Devens, Massachusetts, and other closed and active military installations

In order to transfer portions of Fort Devens in 1996, the Army made a finding of suitability to transfer (FOST) pursuant to section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.). That finding of suitability certified that a comprehensive assessment had been conducted to identify sources of hazardous contaminants and to specify that all remedial actions had been taken. The FOST was based on the environmental baseline survey (EBS) that identified limited quantities of pesticides in buildings used for storage of such chemicals at Fort Devens. Contrary to the Army's FOST, environmental testing conducted on behalf of Massachusetts Development Finance Agency (MassDevelopment) revealed a widespread and pervasive presence of pesticides in the soils. These undisclosed environmental conditions have jeopardized the MassDevelopment's implementation of its reuse plan at Fort Devens.

In early 1997, MassDevelopment notified the Army of the extraordinarily high levels of pesticide contamination that existed at locations which the Army had not disclosed prior to the 1996 property transfer, and demanded Army remedial action pursuant to section 120(h)(3) of CERCLA. While the Army has participated in discussions with MassDevelopment about the undisclosed environmental conditions, the Army has not formally responded to the MassDevelopment notice or demand. In these discussions the Army suggested that the Army may have no liability for the remediation of the pesticides.

The committee is very concerned about the Army's lack of responsiveness and apparent inclination to deny remedial action liabilities under section 120(h)(3) of CERCLA at Fort Devens. The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to conduct cleanup of the pesticide contamination, consistent with section 120(h)(3) and the relevant congressional intent under CERCLA. The Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments will comply with all environmental legal requirements, to include "...any remedial action found to be necessary after the date of such transfer...." (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

Revised requirements for report on Defense use of smart card as PKI authentication device carrier

The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report not later than December 1, 2000 on the cost and feasibility of existing hard disk storage technology or other technologies that could be used as a Public-Private Key Infrastructure (PKI) authentication device. The Secretary should include in this report a comparison of these technologies on the basis of cost and performance to the Smart Card discussed in the report required by section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. This review should not delay the Department's ongoing deployment of the Smart Card.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000
Navy	372,037	372,000	372,000
Marine Corps	172,518	172,600	172,600
Air Force	360,877	357,000	357,000

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	350,000	350,000	350,088
The Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000
The Naval Reserve	90,288	88,900	88,900
The Marine Corps Reserve	39,624	39,500	39,558
The Air National Guard of the United States	106,678	108,000	108,022
The Air Force Reserve	73,708	74,300	74,300
The Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,500

The increase of 88 in the Army National Guard and 22 in the Air National Guard is necessary to support five additional Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams.

The increase of 58 above the request in the Marine Corps Reserve end strength is necessary to accommodate an additional four officers and 54 enlisted Active Reserve personnel on active duty in support of the reserves to enhance the readiness of the Marine Corps Reserve.

The increase in the Coast Guard Reserve end strength is the continuation of the committee's efforts to restore the Coast Guard Reserve to a robust augmentation force. An Office of Management and Budget study has validated the requirement that the Coast Guard Reserve strength be 12,293. The Coast Guard Reserve is to be commended for recovering from the severe shortfall of the past several years. The committee recommends that the appropriation for the Coast Guard Reserve be increased from $73.6 million to $80.0 million.

End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the full time support end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	22,430	22,448	22,536
The Army Reserve	12,804	12,806	12,806
The Naval Reserve	15,010	14,649	14,649
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,272	2,203	2,261
The Air National Guard of the United States	11,157	11,148	11,170
The Air Force Reserve	1,134	1,278	1,278

The increase of 88 in the Army National Guard and 22 in the Air National Guard is necessary to support five additional Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams.

The recommended increase of 58 above the request in the Marine Corps Reserve end strength will permit the Marine Corps Reserve to retain four officers and 54 enlisted Active Reserve personnel on active duty in support of the reserves to enhance the readiness of the Marine Corps Reserve.

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the minimum level of dual status technician end strengths for fiscal year 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	23,125	22,357	22,357
The Army Reserve	6,474	5,249	5,249
The Air National Guard of the United States	22,247	22,221	22,221
The Air Force Reserve	9,785	9,733	9,733

Fiscal year 2001 limitation on non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish numerical limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2001, as shown below:

	2000 Authorization	Fiscal Year—	
		2001 Request	2001 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	1,180	1,600	1,600
The Army Reserve	1,295	1,195	1,195
The Air National Guard of the United States	342	326	326
The Air Force Reserve	0	0	0

Increase in number of members in certain grades authorized to be on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the control grades for Active Guard Reserve personnel. The recommended control grade increases support changes in the roles and missions of the reserve components.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO PERSONNEL STRENGTHS

Suspension of strength limitations during war or national emergency (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to suspend the grade limitations for senior enlisted personnel and senior reservists on active duty in support of the reserve during time of war or national emergency.

Exclusion of certain reserve component members on active duty for more than 180 days from active component end strengths (sec. 422)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt a number, limited to not more than two tenths of one percent of the active duty end strength, of reserve component members on active duty performing special work in support of the armed forces and the combatant commands from counting against the active component end strengths.

Exclusion of Army and Air Force medical and dental officers from limitations on strengths of reserve commissioned officers in grades below brigadier general (sec. 423)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt reserve component medical and dental officers of the Army and Air Force from the grade ceiling limits on the same basis as active component and Naval Reserve medical and dental officers.

Authority for temporary increases in number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades (sec. 424)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the number of reserve personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in certain grades. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of Defense to increase, by not more than two percent, the number of reserve component personnel serving on active duty or full-time National Guard duty only when the Secretary has authorized an increase in end strength for a fiscal year.

Temporary exemption of Director of the National Security Agency from limitations on number of Air Force officers above major general (sec. 425)

The committee recommends a provision that would temporarily exempt the Air Force officer serving as the Director of the National

Security Agency from the limitations on the number of Air Force officers authorized to serve on active duty in grades above major general. The exemption of the recommended provision would expire on September 30, 2005.

SUBTITLE D—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Authorization of appropriations for military personnel (sec. 431)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $75,632,266,000 to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel.

The budget request of $75,801,666,000 was reduced by $172,600,000 due to adjustments in foreign currency fluctuation and military personnel under execution. $3,200,000 was added to accommodate the recommended increase in full-time reservists in the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Eligibility of Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for position vacancy promotions (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to use a single selection board to recommend Army Reserve colonels and brigadier generals for assignment to vacant positions and to recommend the colonels or brigadier generals for promotion to brigadier general or major general.

Promotion Zones for Coast Guard Reserve Officers (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Transportation the same flexibility as secretaries of the military departments to establish promotion zones for the Coast Guard Reserve based on service need.

Time for release of officer promotion selection board reports (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make public the names of officers recommended for promotion by a selection board prior to approval of the board by the President. The recommended provision would permit reserve component promotion board results to be made public in a more timely manner and in a manner consistent with that used for active component promotion board results.

Clarification of authority for posthumous commissions and warrants (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the existing statute concerning the authority for posthumous promotion to include an officer who had been selected for promotion but died before the service secretary approved the recommendation of the selection board.

Inapplicability of active-duty list promotion, separation, and involuntary retirement authorities to reserve general and flag officers serving in certain positions designated by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude reserve component general and flag officers in certain joint duty assignments from the active duty list for promotion purposes. These reserve component general and flag officers would be considered for promotion on the active-status list of their reserve component.

Review of actions of selection boards (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary concerned to correct a person's military records in accordance with a recommendation made by a special board. The remedy may be restoration to active duty or status, if the person was separated, retired, or transferred to the retired or inactive reserve as the result of a recommendation made by a selection board; or the person may elect to receive back pay and allowances in lieu of restoration. If a special board does not recommend the correction, the action of the original selection board shall be considered as final. The secretaries concerned are to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision, which may include the circumstances under which consideration by a special board requires an application by the person, and applicable time limits. All such regulations are to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

A person challenging the action or recommendation of a selection board, or a secretary's action thereon, is not entitled to relief in any judicial proceeding unless the matter has first been considered by a special board or a secretary has denied such consideration. A court reviewing a special board's action or recommendation or the action of a secretary thereon may hold it unlawful only on the basis that it did not comply with applicable procedures, or was contrary to law. If the review is of a secretary's denial of special board consideration, the bases are the same, with the addition of the arbitrary and capricious standard. The remedies provided under this provision are exclusive. This provision does not limit the jurisdiction of any federal court to determine the validity of any relevant statute, regulation, or policy, but the remedies set out herein are to be the exclusive remedies for any person challenging the action of a selection board on the basis of any invalidity. These provisions also do not limit the secretaries' authority to correct military records through boards for correction of such records under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code. A special board may include a board for correction of military or naval records, if designated by the secretary concerned. For these purposes, a "selection board" includes boards for continuation on active duty, or selective early retirement, but does not include promotion selection boards. Similarly, the term "special board" does not include a promotion special selection board.

The provision would also amend section 628 of title 10, United States Code, the statute dealing with promotion special selection boards, to require exhaustion of a person's remedies before a special selection board (or the Secretary of Defense's rejection of the claim without consideration by such a board). No official or court of the United States may grant any relief on a promotion claim until the officer or former officer has been selected for promotion by a promotion special selection board and the board's report has been approved by the President. A court may review a secretary's determination not to convene a special selection board. If the determination is found to be arbitrary, capricious, not based on substantial evidence, or contrary to law, the secretary concerned shall convene such a board. Similarly, a court may review the recommendation of a special selection board and, if it finds that the recommendation was contrary to law or involved material error, the

secretary must provide for reconsideration of the officer or former officer by another special selection board. The provision has additional requirements on exclusivity and remedies similar to those provided for on continuation and special early retirement boards referred to above. As in the earlier provision, nothing herein would limit the authority of correction boards under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and would apply to all proceedings pending on or after that date, but would not apply with respect to any action commenced in a court of the United States before the date of enactment.

Extension to all Air Force biomedical sciences officers of authority to retain until specified age (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to retain, with the officer's consent, biomedical sciences officers. The recommended provision would provide the Secretary of the Air Force with the same authority to retain biomedical sciences officers as currently used by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy.

Termination of application requirement for consideration of officers for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would terminate the requirement that a reserve officer apply for continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List. The recommended provision would permit the secretary of a military department to offer continuation on the Reserve Active-Status List to an officer who was recommended for continuation by a board without requiring the officer to apply for such consideration. The officer would retain the option to accept or decline such an offer.

Technical corrections relating to retired grade of reserve commissioned officers (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate conflicting provisions regarding the time-in-grade requirement to retire at the current grade held by a reserve component officer. The recommended provision would apply to reserve commissioned officers promoted as a result of a selection board recommendation after October 1, 1996, the effective date of the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act.

Grade of chiefs of reserve components and directors of National Guard components (sec. 510)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretaries of the military departments to, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, increase the grade of the Chief of Army Reserve, Chief of Naval Reserve, Chief of Air Force Reserve, Director of the Army National Guard, and the Director of the Air National Guard to lieutenant general or, in the case of the Navy, vice admiral. The recommended provision would permit the Secretary of the Navy to increase the grade of the Chief of Marine Corps Reserve to lieutenant general.

SUBTITLE B—JOINT OFFICER MANAGEMENT

Joint officer management (sec. 521–528)

The committee recommends a series of provisions that would streamline the designation and management of joint speciality officers. The recommended provisions would simplify the requirements to be designated as a joint speciality officer, would require that Joint Professional Military Training be conducted in residence, would establish the promotion objectives for joint speciality officers as a group to be equal to or greater than the rate for officers of the same armed force in the same grade and competitive category serving on the headquarters staff of that armed force, would establish the minimum tour length to qualify for a joint tour, and would modify the required contents of the annual report to comply with the simplified management requirements.

SUBTITLE C—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Eligibility of children of reserves for Presidential appointment to service academies (sec. 541)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the children of members of reserve components and retired or retirement-eligible reservists eligible for presidential appointments to the service academies on the same basis as children of active duty or retired active duty personnel.

Selection of foreign students to receive instruction at service academies (sec. 542)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the secretaries of the military departments to give priority consideration to foreign students applying for admission to the service academies who have a national service obligation upon graduation from the academy.

Repeal of contingent funding increase for Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (sec. 543)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement that any amount in excess of $62,500,000 appropriated for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program be made available for the Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Revision of authority for Marine Corps platoon leader class tuition assistance program (sec. 544)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize members of the Marine Corps platoon leader class to continue to receive tuition assistance while in pursuit of an undergraduate degree. Currently, participants in the Marine Corps platoon leader class lose their eligibility to use the tuition assistance program once they are commissioned.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO RECRUITING

Army recruiting pilot programs (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to carry out three distinct pilot programs to assess the effectiveness for creating enhanced opportunities for recruiters and to improve the effectiveness of Army recruiting programs. The recommended provision would require the pilot programs to be carried out during a period beginning on October 1, 2000 and ending on December 31, 2005. The Secretary of the Army would be required to submit, not later than February 1, 2006, a separate report that would assess the value of each of the pilot programs and make recommendations for permanent authority to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Enhancement of the joint and service recruitment market research and advertising programs (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary actions to enhance joint and service recruiting and advertising programs through an aggressive market research program and would waive certain requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act to enhance the flexibility of the Secretary of Defense and the military services to react to changes in the recruiting market.

Access to secondary schools for military recruiting purposes (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would, effective July 1, 2002, require local educational agencies to provide military recruiters access to secondary schools on the same basis as colleges, universities, and private sector employers, unless the governing body of the local educational agency acts by majority vote to deny access to military recruiters. The recommended provision would also establish a process to ensure that secondary schools provide military recruiters access to the campus, directories, and student lists on the same basis as that afforded colleges, universities, and private sector employers. The recommended provision would require the relevant military service to send a senior official to meet with the local educational agency within 120 days of a military recruiter being denied access. If the secondary school continues to deny access to military recruiters the Secretary of Defense shall, within 60 days, communicate with the governor of the state requesting assistance in restoring access for military recruiters. A copy of this correspondence shall be provided to the Secretary of Education. If one year after the date of the transmittal of the letter from the Secretary of Defense the local educational agency continues to deny access to at least two of the armed forces, the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate who represent the district or districts in which the local educational agency operates.

Today, more than 600 high schools deny access to military recruiters from three or more services. Thousands of high schools

deny access to military recruiters of at least one service. The Department of Defense, the military services, and the Department of Education have not aggressively pursued restoration of access to these high schools despite the requests of the military recruiters. The recommended provision would establish a process through which the military services, the Department of Defense, the Department of Education, the governors, and the local educational agencies would work together to establish local procedures and practices that would permit military recruiters the same access to high school students as colleges and universities. The committee believes that every high school student deserves the opportunity to learn of the opportunities of military service just as they learn of the opportunities associate with college or private sector employment.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report, not later than March 1, 2001, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives outlining his plan to eliminate the backlog of high schools that currently deny access to military recruiters. The required report shall include specific milestones for each service.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Authority for award of Medal of Honor to certain specified persons (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits and authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman of Boise, Idaho for valor during the Vietnam Conflict; to James K. Okubo of Detroit, Michigan for valor during World War II; and to Andrew J. Smith of Massachusetts for valor during the Civil War.

Waiver of time limitations for award of certain decorations to certain persons (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the statutory time limits for award of military decorations to certain individuals who have been recommended by the service secretaries for these awards.

Ineligibility for involuntary separation pay upon declination of selection for continuation on active duty (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would make an officer, who has twice failed selection for promotion to the next higher grade, and who was offered the opportunity to continue on active duty, and who declines this offer, ineligible to receive involuntary separation pay.

Recognition by states of military testamentary instruments (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would exempt a military testamentary instrument from any requirement of form, formality, or recording before probate under the laws of a state; and would provide that such an instrument has the same legal ef-

fect as a testamentary instrument prepared and executed in accordance with the laws of the state in which it is presented for probate. A "military testamentary instrument" is one prepared with testamentary intent in accordance with regulations prescribed under this provision by a person eligible for military legal assistance, which makes a disposition of that person's property, and takes effect upon his death. An instrument is a valid military testamentary instrument only if: it is executed by the testator (or in his presence, by his direction, and on his behalf); it is executed in the presence of a military legal assistance counsel, whether a judge advocate or a civilian attorney; it is executed in the presence of at least two disinterested witnesses; and it is executed in accordance with any additional requirements as may be provided by regulation. In addition, a military testamentary instrument may be regarded as self-proving with respect to the genuiness of the signature, the testator's status and title, and compliance with applicable regulations if certain prescribed additional formalities are complied with.

Sense of Congress on the court-martial conviction of Captain Charles Butler McVay, Commander of the USS Indianapolis, and the courageous service of its crew (sec. 565)

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of Congress that, on the basis of facts presented in a public hearing conducted by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate on September 14, 1999, the American people should now recognize Captain McVay's lack of culpability for the loss of the USS Indianapolis and the lives of the men who died as a result of the sinking and that Captain McVay's military record now reflect that he is exonerated for the loss of the ship and its crew; and that Congress strongly encourages the Secretary of the Navy to award a Navy Unit Commendation to the USS Indianapolis and its final crew.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Automated in- and out-processing of military personnel

The committee is aware that Fort McPherson, Georgia, a U.S. Army installation, is conducting a pilot program using standard commercial-off-the-shelf software products to implement an electronic one-stop in/out-processing system. The committee believes that any effort that reduces the personnel time lost to in/out-processing and streamlines these processes while improving efficiency is a positive initiative that should be considered for expanded use. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to review the pilot program at Fort McPherson, Georgia, and consider conducting a similar pilot program at several bases. The committee believes that such an electronic one-stop in/out-processing concept would work very well at any installation, especially at an installation that is using smart cards in other base support activities. The committee also urges the secretaries of the military departments to consider expanding the concept of electronic one-stop in/out- processing to civilian employees.

Funeral honors for members of the uniformed services

Section 578 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, upon request, a funeral honors detail be provided for the funeral of any veteran. For the purposes of this provision, the term veteran was defined to include a decedent who served in the active military, naval, or air service. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Commerce, to convene a conference, not later than December 31, 2000, to assess the desirability and feasibility of expanding eligibility for a funeral honors detail to former members of the Commissioned Officer Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report the findings and recommendations resulting from the conference to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2001.

Information related to alternatives to the Survivor Benefit Plan

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has consistently and commendably administered, through the military departments, mandatory Transition Assistance Programs (TAP) for military members prior to separation. Among the mandatory briefing subjects during these pre-retirement programs is a session on the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP). The committee notes that, today, military members are retiring at younger ages and with an increased actuarial longevity in their retirement years. This fact should have a substantial positive impact on the financial condition of the funds supporting SBP. The committee also notes that, many times, during the required TAP seminars, alternatives to the SBP are excluded from presentation or exposure even though many in the retiring population might benefit from considering alternatives to SBP during pre- retirement processing. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide, not later than January 30, 2001, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a description of the TAP program and its content by service, including a description of the methods of exposure, if any, to information on to SBP; the number of retirees by pay grade for the last three years; and the number of individuals in the same categories with full participation in SBP (55 percent), those who elected a reduced SBP between 35 and 55 percent, those who elected a reduced SBP below 35 percent, and those who declined SBP.

Prevention of alcohol-related incidents

The committee is aware of the potential for reducing the incidence of alcohol-related automobile accidents and incidents of misconduct through the use of portable one-step, saliva-based test strips that provide an immediate estimate of blood alcohol concentration. The committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to examine how and if the use of personal, one-step, blood-alcohol concentration tests might enhance ongoing efforts to

reduce the incidence of drunk driving and alcohol- related misconduct on military bases and installations.

Study on the use of peyote by military personnel

The committee is aware that current Department of Defense policy permits, as an accommodation of a religious practice, service members who are Indian Tribe members to use peyote, a hallucinogenic drug, providing it is not used on a military installation and is used at least 24 hours prior to any scheduled duty. Although the committee supports reasonable accommodation of religious practices of military personnel, the committee is also concerned that the Department of Defense has not conducted a comprehensive study of the impact the use of peyote may have on the long-term health of military personnel and on military safety and readiness. To ensure that these concerns are addressed, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study, in coordination with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, on the real and potential hazards related to peyote use. The Secretary of Defense shall report the findings of the study and any recommendations to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to finalizing the Department of Defense directive regarding accommodation of religious practices within the Department.

TITLE VI-COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

SUBTITLE A-PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Increase in basic pay for Fiscal Year 2001 (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would waive section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services by 3.7 percent. This increase would be effective January 1, 2001.

Corrections for basic pay tables (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would make several technical corrections to the basic pay tables for the uniformed services. The recommended provision would change the pay table as it pertains to monthly basic pay for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commandant of the Coast Guard from $12,441.00 to $12,488.70. Since the pay of these officers is capped under other provisions of law, there will be no change in the pay these officers receive. The recommended provision would also change the monthly basic pay for members serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Office of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard from $4,701.00 to $4,719.00. The recommended changes would be effective July 1, 2000.

Pay in lieu of allowance for funeral honors duty (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a reserve component member who performs funeral honors duty using either the stipend authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 or one day of basic pay, as if the funeral honor duty was a unit training assembly.

Clarification of service excluded in computation of creditable service as a Marine Corps officer (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the limitation on creditable service computation as a result of accepting tuition assistance applies only to service as an enlisted member and not as a commissioned officer.

Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing (sec. 605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to prescribe the Basic Allowance for Housing based on the cost of adequate housing for civilians of comparable income levels in the area at rates that would reduce or eliminate the member's out-of-pocket expenses. The recommended provision would eliminate the current requirement that 15 percent of the es-

timated housing expenses for military personnel be paid by the service member.

Eligibility of members in grade E–4 to receive basic allowance for housing while on sea duty (sec. 606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of the basic allowance for housing to members serving in the grade of E–4, without dependents, who are assigned to sea duty in ships. The recommended provision would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit an E–4 assigned to a ship to live off-base and receive the basic allowance for housing while that ship is in port.

Personal money allowance for the senior enlisted members of the armed forces (sec. 607)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of a personal money allowance of $2,000 per year to the Sergeant Major of the Army, the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, the Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, the Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, and the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard. The personal money allowance is intended to defray expenses incurred in connection with official duties not reimbursable through the use of Official Representation Funds. The Personal Money Allowance is currently authorized for certain senior officers.

Increased uniform allowances for officers (sec. 608)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the initial uniform allowance for officers from $200 to $400 and the additional uniform allowance for officers from $100 to $200.

Cabinet-level authority to prescribe requirements and allowance for clothing of enlisted members (sec. 609)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, to prescribe the clothing to be furnished annually to enlisted members and to establish the amount of the cash allowance paid when the prescribed clothing is not provided.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL INCENTIVE PAYS

Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay the special pay for critically short wartime health care specialists in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonuses, the Selected Reserve enlistment bonuses, the special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high priority units in the Selected Reserve, the Selected Reserve affiliation bonus, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, the repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, and the prior service enlistment bonus.

Extension of certain bonuses and special pay authorities for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay certain bonuses and a special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists.

Extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, until December 1, 2001, the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonuses for critical skills, the Army enlistment bonus, the special pay for nuclear qualified officers who extend the period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

Consistency of authorities for special pay for reserve medical and dental officers (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the amount of special pays for reserve medical and dental officers consistent. Currently, reserve component medical officers and reserve component dental officers receive disparate pays for similar qualifications and periods of service.

Special pay for physician assistants of the Coast Guard (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of a special pay to Coast Guard physician assistants on the same basis as non-physician health care providers in the military services.

Authorization of special pay and accession bonus for pharmacy officers (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department or, in the case of the Public Health Service Corps, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to pay a special pay and an accession bonus for pharmacy officers. The recommended provision would provide the military departments and the Public Health Service additional incentives to recruit and retain trained pharmacy officers.

Corrections of references to Air Force veterinarians (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the special pay for board certified veterinarians in the armed forces and the Public Health Service includes Air Force biomedical sciences officers who hold a degree in veterinary medicine.

Entitlement of active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps to special pays and bonuses of health professional officers of the armed forces (sec. 618)

The committee recommends a provision that would make the special pays and bonuses for active duty officers of the Public Health Service Corps equal to those of health professional officers of the armed forces. The recommended provision would eliminate inequities in the special pays and bonuses paid to health professionals of the uniformed services.

Career sea pay (sec. 619)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to establish the rates of career sea pay up to a limit of $750 per month and would increase the maximum career sea pay premium pay from $100 per month to $350 per month for consecutive or cumulative duty at sea.

Increased maximum rate of special duty pay assignment pay (sec. 620)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the limit on special duty assignment pay from $275 per month to $600 per month. The secretary of a military department would retain the flexibility to establish the rate of special duty assignment pay within the maximum limit to meet the needs of the service. For those assignments common to all services, such as recruiters, the Secretary of Defense would ensure that the rate of the special duty assignment pay is consistent among the services.

Expansion of applicability of authority for critical skills enlistment bonus to include all armed forces (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, to all the services, the authority, now available only to the Army, to offer a bonus for enlistment for a period of two years in a critical skill.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Advance payments for temporary lodging of members and dependents (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay the temporary lodging allowance in advance of the incurrence of the expenses. Currently, payment of the temporary lodging allowance must be paid after a service member pays the bills and files a claim. The recommended provision would also require the Secretary of a military department to consider all elements of the cost of living to service members and their families, including the cost of housing, subsistence and necessary incidental expenses, when determining the per diem allowance for a member on duty outside the Continental United States in a travel status.

Incentive for shipping and storing household goods in less than average weights (sec. 632)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a service member a share of the amount of savings resulting from the service member shipping or storing a lower household good or baggage weight than the average weight shipped or stored by members of the same grade and dependent status.

Expansion of funded student travel (sec. 633)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize unmarried military dependents, under the age of 23 and enrolled in an accredited, full-time graduate degree program or an accredited vocational technical educational program in the Continental United States, one funded round trip per year to the sponsor's overseas duty location. Currently, only dependents in secondary or undergraduate educational programs are entitled to this funded travel.

Benefits for members not transporting personal motor vehicles overseas (sec. 634)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to pay a service member a share of the savings that accrue when an authorized member elects not to ship their personal vehicle overseas at government expense. The recommended provision would also limit the amount payable to store a personal vehicle in lieu of the authorized shipment of the vehicle to an amount equal to the cost that would have been incurred by shipping the vehicle overseas and back.

SUBTITLE D—RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Exception to high–36 month retired pay computation for members retired following a disciplinary reduction in grade (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the computation of retired pay for military personnel who retire following a reduction in grade be based on the basic pay of the grade held at the time of retirement rather than the average of the highest three years of basic pay. The recommended provision would correct a situation in which a service member who is reduced in grade as a result of a disciplinary action and subsequently retires would have his or her retired pay computed based on the average of the highest three years of basic pay, effectively circumventing the intention of the reduction-in-grade.

Automatic participation in Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan unless declined with spouses' consent (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would require reserve component personnel notified of eligibility for retired pay upon reaching 60 years of age to make an election regarding coverage under the Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan. The recommended provision would require spousal consent if the member makes an election to decline or to provide less than the full,

immediate annuity for the spouse. Currently, the reserve component member may decline coverage or elect less than full participation without the spouse's knowledge or consent. The recommended provision would treat spouses of reserve component members in the same manner as spouses of active component members.

Participation in thrift savings plan (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 663 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 to establish the effective date for offering the Thrift Savings Plan to active and reserve military personnel, effective not later than 180 days from the enactment of this Act. The recommended provision would also eliminate the requirement for the President to identify mandatory spending offsets that are currently provided in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001.

Retirement from active reserve service after regular retirement (sec. 644)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit a retired active component service member who later serves, and is promoted in an active reserve position, to retire as a member of the retired reserve at the higher grade. The recommended provision would permit such individuals to retire as a member of the retired reserve. Promotion in the reserves is currently authorized by sections 1370, 1406(b)(2) and 12771 of title 10, United States Code.

Same treatment for federal judges as for other federal officials regarding payment of military retired pay (sec. 645)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical correction to ensure that Article III federal judges are treated the same as other federal officials with regard to reduction in military retired pay. Section 651 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 eliminated the reduction in military retired pay for retired uniformed services personnel who are civilian employees of the federal government. The recommended provision makes a technical correction eliminating this reduction of retired pay for retired uniformed services personnel who are employed in certain judicial positions.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Reimbursement of recruiting and ROTC personnel for parking expenses (sec. 651)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretary of a military department to reimburse military recruiters, Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps cadre members, and Military Entrance Processing Command members for parking expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Extension of deadline for filing claims associated with capture and internment of certain persons by North Vietnam (sec. 652)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to pay claims to a person, or the survivor of a person, who demonstrates that he or she served as a Vietnamese operative pursuant to OPLAN 34A or OPLAN 35, was captured, remained in captivity after 1973, has not received any payment for the period spent in captivity, and whose original claim was received after the deadline for submitting claims, if the Secretary considers it necessary to prevent an injustice. The committee is aware of four claims that would qualify under the recommended provision. Payment of the additional claims would be made from within the original appropriations for this program.

Settlement of claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay (sec. 653)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to settle claims for payments for unused accrued leave and to waive time limitations for filing claims for payments for unused accrued leave and for retired pay. The committee encourages liberal use of this authority to ensure that otherwise valid claims of service members and former service members are not denied solely because the claim was not filed within the time required.

Eligibility of certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve for Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (sec. 654)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize volunteers for assignment to a category in the Individual Ready Reserve that is subject to involuntary recall to active duty to participate in the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program.

Authority to pay gratuity to certain veterans of Bataan and Corregidor (sec. 655)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a $20,000 gratuity to a veteran or surviving spouse of a veteran who served at Bataan or Corregidor, was captured and held as a prisoner of war, and was required to perform slave labor by the Japanese.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Adjustments to the Basic Allowance for Housing

The Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) rates for uniformed services personnel are determined by the Secretary of Defense based on the monthly cost of adequate housing for civilians of comparable income levels in the area in which the service member is assigned. Section 403 of title 37, United States Code, includes a protection against reductions in the BAH as long as the member retains uninterrupted eligibility to receive BAH. The committee is aware of cases in which the BAH for service members who have made a no-cost permanent change of station move and who remain in the

same quarters they occupied during their previous assignment has been reduced. The committee believes that implementation of the statutory provisions, as interpreted in the Joint Federal Travel Regulations, is flawed. The committee did not intend that service members would be adversely affected by a no-cost permanent change of station move in which the original quarters continue to be occupied. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the statute and the Joint Federal Travel Regulations, and to make such changes as may be necessary to ensure that service members who make no-cost moves are not adversely impacted by a reduction in BAH. The committee believes these changes should be retroactive, effective as of the date of the BAH legislation.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE

SUBTITLE A—SENIOR HEALTH CARE

Extension of TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the TRICARE senior supplement demonstration program providing health care delivery to the over–64 Medicare eligible population. Congress authorized implementation of several demonstration programs (Medicare Subvention, the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, a Medicare insurance supplement or "medi-gap" type policy, and pharmacy pilot programs). One of these programs is due to expire this year, some have just started, and others are due to start later this year. The recommended provision would extend the TRICARE senior supplement program to allow for continuity of care through calendar year 2005, and to allow the Department of Defense and the Congress time to evaluate and determine the most appropriate long-term health care solutions for these beneficiaries.

TRICARE senior prime demonstration program (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize expansion of the TRICARE Senior Prime, or "Medicare Subvention" program to major medical centers of the Department of Defense and extend the program through calendar year 2005. While the Medicare subvention demonstration program has provided limited data upon which to base evaluation and expansion decisions, it appears clear that the most productive expansion sites are those with the more extensive capabilities of major medical centers. Teaching programs conducted at the medical centers require a more extensive case-load and beneficiary population to support medical educational programs and readiness training requirements.

Although data is still limited, the committee believes that the reimbursement methodology agreed to by the Department of Defense and the Health Care Financing Administration may need modification. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense to engage in consultation with the Health Care Financing Administration to determine what modifications need to be addressed, both in terms of data collection and reimbursement methods, to facilitate expansion of the program.

Extension and expansion of demonstration project for participation of uniformed services personnel in the Federal Employee Health Benefit program (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would remove the limitation on the number of sites covered by the demonstration program allowing participation of Medicare-eligible military beneficiaries and their family members in the Federal Employees

Health Benefits Program. The recommended provision would extend the program through calendar year 2005 to allow for continuity in the provision of care for beneficiaries while the Department of Defense and the Congress analyze approaches to meeting the health care needs of the Medicare-eligible military retiree population.

Implementation of redesigned pharmacy system (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Department of Defense to reduce the enrollment fee and consider using deductibles for the pharmacy pilot program authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. The Department of Defense has been slow to implement this pilot program and there is considerable concern among the beneficiary population over the high cost of participation. The committee believes that the use of deductibles, which apply only when a benefit is utilized, are a more prudent management tool.

SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM

Additional beneficiaries under TRICARE prime remote program in CONUS (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would expand TRICARE prime remote to the uniformed services and to family members of active duty personnel who qualify for TRICARE prime remote. The committee recognizes the importance of providing a uniform and equitable medical benefit to all military members and their families, without regard to where they happen to be stationed in the United States.

Elimination of copayments for immediate family (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate copayments for those immediate family members of active duty service members enrolled in TRICARE Prime who receive care from a source that currently requires copayment.

Improvement in business practices in the administration of the TRICARE program (sec. 713)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to complete implementation of improved health care business practices no later than October 1, 2001. Previous legislation directed the Secretary of Defense to make improvements in providing access to beneficiaries, scheduling appointments, simplifying and making more efficient claims processing and payment systems, and ensuring portability and national enrollment. These improvements have not been fully implemented in a timely manner. The committee directs the Secretary to ensure the systemic changes necessary to achieve improved business practices and increased beneficiary and provider satisfaction are implemented no later than October 1, 2001.

SUBTITLE C—JOINT INITIATIVES WITH DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Tracking patient safety in military and veterans health care systems (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct enhanced cooperation between the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs in the area of patient safety. The two Departments are currently collaborating on a number of joint initiatives, including common information systems and patient safety initiatives. This provision directs the two agencies to work to develop a common set of patient safety indicators and to provide for centralized tracking of those indicators.

Pharmaceutical identification technology (sec. 722)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly develop a plan to bar code pills and to explore a bar code capability for the mail order pharmacy program. Joint initiatives and the commonality they produce can provide opportunities to greatly enhance patient safety.

Medical informatics (sec. 723)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to include two additional sections in the medical informatics report required by section 723(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The recommended provision includes a requirement to report on the progress or growth in medical informatics and how the TRICARE program and the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system can use medical information technology to raise standards of treatment. The provision also directs that, from within the resources of the Defense Health Program, $64.0 million be expended on a computerized patient record system, and $9.0 million be expended on an integrated pharmacy system in fiscal year 2001.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Permanent authority for certain pharmaceutical benefits (sec. 731)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a specific pharmacy benefit for eligible beneficiaries of the military health care system, including those eligible for Medicare. The recommended provision would authorize a national mail order program and a retail pharmacy network. The recommended provision would not require an enrollment fee nor an annual deductible for the mail order program. Drugs obtained through the retail network would require beneficiary cost shares of 20 percent and government coverage of 80 percent. The recommended provision would phase out the current base realignment and closure pharmacy benefit now in effect, in recognition of implementation of the recommended program.

The committee believes that meeting the pharmaceutical needs of our older retirees is a major step in meeting the commitment to en-

sure access to health care for those who have made military service a career. This is the first time the age 65 and over military retiree population will have a legal entitlement to health care benefits. The recommended provision would provide a uniform benefit for all military beneficiaries and would meet the major unmet healthcare need of older retirees, access to a pharmacy benefit.

Provision of domiciliary and custodial care for CHAMPUS beneficiaries (sec. 732)

The committee recommends a provision that would cap the Department of Defense domiciliary and custodial care program costs at $100.0 million per year. The committee understands that the current programmatic estimates are significantly less and expects the Secretary of Defense to move quickly to implement a case management program to address the needs of those with chronic conditions. The recommended provision would also grandfather those that participated in the Department of Defense's home health care demonstration and allow their continued participation in the case management program, without regard to age.

Medical and dental care for medal of honor recipients and their dependents (sec. 733)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend lifetime medical and dental care, to be provided by the Department of Defense, to medal of honor recipients and their dependents. The committee recognizes the significant contributions of these current and former service members and their families, and would extend complete legal entitlement for these beneficiaries.

School-required physical examinations for certain minor dependents (sec. 734)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide eligible dependents a physical examination when such an examination is required by a school in connection with the enrollment in that school. Eligible dependents are between the ages of 5 and 12 years of age. The proposed provision would recognize school requirements for such physicals and, consistent with other provisions in this bill, would require no copayment for TRICARE Prime enrollees. Enrollees in TRICARE options other than Prime would pay appropriate cost shares. The committee expects, to the extent possible, that primary care managers would utilize the results of school physicals to accommodate other requirements for health assessments for school age children, such as sports physical requirements.

Two-year extension of dental and medical benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members (sec. 735)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the medical and dental benefits for surviving dependents of certain deceased members from one year to three years. The committee recognizes the impact on dependents of loss of a family member and that transition to alternate sources of health care may take a period of time longer than previously permitted. The recommended

provision would recognize the sacrifices of these family members and assist in their difficult transition from the military system.

Extension of authority for contracts for medical services at locations outside medical treatment facilities (sec. 736)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend from December 31, 2000 to September 30, 2002, the authority to enter into personal services contracts with physicians for medical screening of enlistment applicants. The Secretary of Defense is currently conducting a test to evaluate whether the employment of fee-basis physicians in medical screening of enlistment applicants should be sustained, or whether an alternate approach is more appropriate. The recommended provision would allow the Secretary of Defense to complete the evaluation of alternative medical screening strategies, and to sustain the pace of medical screening for armed forces applicants by extending contracting authority for an additional period of time.

Transition of chiropractic health care demonstration program to permanent status (sec. 737)

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the provision of chiropractic health care services to military health care system beneficiaries who enroll in TRICARE Prime. The recommended provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a plan to make available chiropractic services using a primary care manager model, that requires referral by a primary care physician. The recommended provision would continue services at existing demonstration sites until 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, at which time TRICARE Prime enrollees at those sites would continue to have available chiropractic services. The recommended provision recognizes the importance of the primary care manager in a managed care program and the value of offering a variety of approaches to meeting the health care needs of the beneficiary population.

Use of information technology for enhancement of delivery of administrative services under the Defense Health Program (sec. 738)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement, in at least one TRICARE region, a managed care support contract using commercially available internet-based systems and products, to assist in simplifying administrative processes in the TRICARE program. The recommended program would comply with patient confidentiality and security requirements and incorporate data requirements that are currently used in the marketplace, to include those used by Medicare and/or commercial insurers. This effort would include such areas as marketing, enrollment, beneficiary and provider education, appointment setting, and claims processing. The committee expects the initiative to enhance efficiency and improve services, as well as match commercially recognized standards of performance.

Patient care reporting and management system (sec. 739)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement a patient care reporting and management system in the military health system. The recommended provision would create a patient care reporting and management system that would identify, track, and report on errors and safety problems in the military medical system. The recommended provision would direct development of a process to study occurrence of errors, identify system factors contributing to occurrences, and provide for corrective actions throughout the military health care system.

Health care management demonstration program (sec. 740)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a test of two models to improve health care delivery in the Defense Health Program. The recommended provision would provide for two tests of health care simulation models: one for studying alternative delivery policies, processes, organizations, and technologies; and the second for studying long term disease management. The recommended provision directs the Secretary of Defense to implement each of these concepts in at least one site in fiscal year 2001 and report, not later than January 31, 2002, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the desirability and feasibility of incorporating these programs throughout the military health care system.

Studies of accrual financing for health care for military retirees (sec. 741)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct two studies, one by the Department of Defense and one by an independent entity, to evaluate the potential of revising the financing of the military medical benefit through an accrual based system. While the committee recognizes the potential of such a proposal, there remain many unanswered questions about administration and budgeting. The required studies will provide the committee with the necessary data to determine if permanently implementing such a concept would be warranted.

Augmentation of Army Medical Department by reserve officers of the Public Health Service Corps (sec. 742)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an agreement to conduct a program under which officers of the Public Health Service Corps Inactive Reserve may be detailed to augment the Army Medical Department, subject to existing legislative authorities.

The recommended provision would require the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to review existing legislative authorities and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2001, on the findings of this review and any recommendations necessary to permit en-

hanced augmentation by the Public Health Service Inactive Reserve.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Consultation with schools of pharmacy and nursing

The committee directs the military services to implement a program in which military treatment facilities and clinics would partner with local pharmacy and nursing schools to incorporate the full range of health care professional resources in health care endeavors. The committee supports integrating all aspects of professional health care delivery. Specifically, students of pharmacy and nursing schools could become a significant resource to pharmacies through participation in patient education programs. Patients would benefit from increased personal interaction, pharmacies would benefit by access to increased professional resources, and students would expand their clinical experience.

Financial assistance for those beneficiaries requiring animal assistance

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the requirements for animal assistance for dependents of military personnel whose medical conditions may require such assistance. The report should include an assessment of the economic impact to families of obtaining animals for such purposes as "seeing-eye" assistance and other medical conditions. The report should include an analysis of the current benefit coverage by the Department of Defense, if any, and, if appropriate, a proposal for coverage of such assistance.

Health care benefits for retirees living overseas

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than March 12, 2001, on the desirability and feasibility of providing health care benefits to military retirees living outside the United States. The committee recognizes that some military retirees make a conscious choice to live overseas but other military members return to their home of origin upon retirement from military service. The study will include an assessment of the numbers of retirees permanently residing overseas, an assessment of how many have returned to their home of origin, and options for providing health care benefits to retirees overseas.

Implementation of Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs Department sharing initiatives

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary for Veterans Affairs to develop a plan and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than January 31, 2001, on the formation of problem solution groups and regional liaisons to facilitate sharing opportunities. Issues to be addressed should include reimbursement and payment, joint contracting, data commonality, and any

other issues inhibiting full and beneficial sharing of resources. The committee continues to observe that additional sharing is of value and that administrative obstacles preclude full benefit of existing arrangements between the two departments.

Notification of persons affected by unanticipated adverse outcomes of medical care

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the process for identifying serious medical errors and notifying affected patients or their families of such error events. The review shall include the mandatory reporting system used in the 500 hospitals and clinics within the Department of Defense, as described in the Report of the Quality Interagency Coordination Task Force to the President, dated February 2000. The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2001, on the current notification process and any additional requirements the Secretary deems necessary after such review.

Special pays for military health care professionals

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2001, on the adequacy of special pays and bonuses for medical corps officers and other health care professionals. The committee directs this review because of the level of competition within the economy for health care professionals and the potential devaluation of current special pays and bonuses, which could have a significant impact on recruiting and retention of health care professionals.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Improvements in procurements of services (sec.801)

The committee recommends a provision that would address concerns about the manner in which the Department of Defense (DOD) contracts for services. The committee is concerned that the DOD has not adjusted its contracting and oversight practices to meet the increasing significance of service contracting. From 1992 through 1999, DOD procurement of services increased from $39.9 billion to $51.8 billion while procurement of goods during that same time period decreased from $59.8 billion to $53.5 billion.

The DOD Inspector General (IG) recently reviewed contracts for professional, administrative, and management support services, which is the largest sub-category of contracts for services valued at $10.3 billion. The IG reviewed 105 contracts and each contract had one or more significant problems. These problems included the non-use of prior history to define requirements (58 out of 84 or 69 percent), inadequate government cost estimates (81 out of 105 or 77 percent), cursory technical reviews (60 out of 105 or 57 percent), inadequate competition (63 out of 105 or 60 percent), failure to award multiple-award contracts (7 out of 38 or 18 percent), inadequate contract surveillance (56 out of 84 or 67 percent) and lack of cost control (21 out of 84 or 24 percent). The IG found that "* * * cost-type contracts that placed a higher risk on the government continued without question for the same services for inordinate lengths of time (39 years in one extreme case) and there were no performance measures in use to judge efficiency and effectiveness of the services rendered."

The committee is concerned about the lack of oversight and accountability in managing these contracts. As a result, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop specific training applicable to services contracting and for the Secretary of each military department to establish centers of excellence in contracting for services. The committee has added $2.0 million to the Defense Acquisition University account to be used at the Defense Systems Management College for this purpose. The committee expects that these centers of excellence will be staffed with trained and experienced personnel that can assist the acquisition community when procuring services, make all acquisition personnel aware of the problems identified by the DOD IG, develop a time-phased plan with goals and performance measures to track improvements in the acquisition of services, and serve as a clearinghouse for best practices in contracting for services in the public and private sectors.

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a contracting preference for performance based contracting in services in which performance work statements would set forth re-

quirements in clear, specific, and objective terms with measurable outcomes. As an incentive for DOD to adopt performance based contracting techniques, performance based contracts for services under $5.0 million may be treated as contracts for a commercial item. The committee expects these improvements to lead to improved oversight and a greater results based focus on service contracting.

Addition of threshold value requirement for applicability of a reporting requirement relating to multiyear contract (sec.802)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the multiyear reporting requirements required by section 809 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Under this provision, the head of an agency may not enter into a multiyear contract if the value exceeds $500.0 million until the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the congressional defense committees a report on the total obligational authority associated with existing and requested multiyear contracts contained in the Future Years Defense Program.

Planning for the acquisition of information systems (sec.803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chief Information Officers of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services to maintain a consolidated inventory of DOD mission critical and mission essential information systems, to identify interfaces between these and other information systems, and to maintain contingency plans for responding to a disruption in the operation of any of these information systems. The DOD in its report to the committee on Year 2000 Lessons Learned stressed the importance of maintaining the information that was developed to meet the Year 2000 problem and stated that "* * * centralized visibility of assets is fundamental to information technology management (e.g. acquisition, configuration management, and information assurance)."

The provision would also require that Department of Defense Directive 5000.1 be revised to establish minimum planning requirements for the acquisition of information technology systems, require registration and oversight by the Chief Information Office before award of a contract for mission critical or essential information technology systems, and prohibit Milestone I, II, or III approval until the Chief Information Officer has determined that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, including capital planning and investment control and performance, results based management techniques, and incremental acquisition.

Tracking of information technology purchases (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries for each military department to administer an automated system to track and manage purchases of information technology products and services in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold.

As a result of recent procurement reforms, there are many new procurement vehicles from which agencies can buy information technology. The Department of Defense (DOD) and the services can choose to buy information technology goods and services from the General Services Administration (GSA) multiple award schedules, government-wide acquisition contracts (GWACs), blanket purchase agreements, indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts, multiple award task order contracts, by credit card directly from vendors, or through a standard competitive contract.

The committee is concerned that there is insufficient data available to effectively support management decisions in determining whether the government is choosing the most appropriate vehicle to obtain the best price or best value for information technology (IT) purchases. For example, DOD and the services are negotiating enterprise software agreements designed to give DOD customers commercial off-the-shelf software products at prices significantly lower than those available on the GSA's Federal Supply Schedules. There is no data, however, to show to what degree buyers are using other agreements to buy the same products at potentially higher prices. In another example, the services, when asked by the committee how much IT was bought through GWACs, could not provide the answer. One military service tried to get this information and was told by the non-DOD agency who administered a GWAC that they would not share sales data with the service. This provision would prohibit any purchase by DOD off GWACs unless sales data is included in the data base required by this provision.

With DOD planning to spend $20.3 billion on information technology it is imperative that the Department have visibility over how these funds are being spent and whether there are more appropriate contracting strategies for achieving the Department's information technology needs. The committee expects DOD to use the data contained in this data base to more efficiently manage IT purchases to obtain best value products and services, while maximizing cost savings, competition, and efficient use of resources.

Repeal of requirement for contractor assurances regarding the completeness, accuracy, and contractual sufficiency of technical data provided by contractor (sec. 805)

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate the requirement for contractors providing technical data to the government to furnish written assurances that the technical data is complete, accurate, and satisfies the requirements of the contract. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense.

The committee understands that the elimination of this requirement will not in any way diminish either the contractor's obligation to provide technical data that meets contract requirements or the government's ability to enforce this requirement. The committee expects that the Defense Contract Management Agency will continue to monitor contractor technical data programs in order to protect government data rights and to ensure the government receives timely and accurate information regarding contractor processes, practice, and controls for developing technical data.

Extension of authority for Department of Defense acquisition pilot programs (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of section 5064 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act (FASA) and authorize the Department of Defense to continue to conduct five Defense Acquisition Pilot Programs through October 1, 2007. The committee notes that it would be inefficient and inappropriate to change contracting approaches in the middle of these programs, and understands that the extension provided in this provision should be sufficient to permit the completion of the programs under the pilot authority.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, on the lessons learned from the section 5064 pilot programs, how these lessons are being incorporated in major weapons systems acquisition, and what specific statutory constraints preclude new weapons systems programs from adopting the practices tested in the pilot programs.

Clarification and extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects (sec. 807)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for three years the other transaction prototype authority under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 and identify appropriate uses of this authority to include cost sharing arrangements and the participation of nontraditional defense contractors. The committee also recommends a pilot program for the transition to follow-on production contracts for prototypes developed under the section 845 authority. Under the pilot program, an item or process developed by nontraditional defense contractors may be treated as a commercial item under a contract or subcontract for less than $20.0 million and purchased under the streamlined procedures established under the Federal Acquisition Regulations (48 C.F.R. Part 12). The committee intends that this provision will test and identify alternative methods to transition successful section 845 prototypes to production.

This provision would support using section 845 authority to attract companies that typically do not do business with the Department of Defense and encourage cost sharing and experimentation in potentially more efficient ways of doing business with traditional defense contractors. Other transaction authority is an important acquisition tool that can facilitate the incorporation of commercial technology into military weapon systems. In an environment where, in many areas, commercial technology is now more advanced than defense technology, it is imperative that the Department continue to have the flexibility to use innovative contractual instruments that provide access to this technology. There are, however, improvements that can be made in managing and overseeing these contractual arrangements.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) recently reviewed the Department's use of section 845 authority for the committee and recommended that the Secretary of Defense provide updated guidance that sets out the conditions for using section 845 agreements and provides a framework to tailor the terms and conditions appropriate for each agreement. In addition, the GAO recommended that

the Secretary of Defense establish and require the use of a set of performance metrics directly related to the use of the agreements. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to implement these recommendations by March 1, 2001, and further directs the GAO to report to the committee on the Department's compliance with these recommendations.

Clarification of authority of Comptroller General to review records of participants in certain prototype projects (sec. 808)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the audit access of the General Accounting Office (GAO) over other transaction prototype authority agreements for those contractors who have only done business with the government under other transaction authority or through cooperative agreements.

Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 required the Department of Defense to ensure that the General Accounting Office has audit access to other transaction prototype authority agreements that provide for payments in excess of $5.0 million, unless a public interest waiver is obtained, or if a party or entity, or a subordinate element of a party or entity, has not entered into any other agreement that provides for audit access in the year prior to the agreement. This provision would clarify audit access by the GAO in those cases where a firm may have had a cooperative agreement or other transaction with the government prior to one year and has had no other government contracts.

Eligibility of small business concerns owned and controlled by women for assistance under the mentor-protege program (sec. 809)

The committee recommends a provision that would add small business concerns owned and controlled by women to the list of entities that are eligible to participate in the pilot mentor-protege program established by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

The pilot mentor-protege program provides incentives to major defense contractors to assist qualified small business to enhance their capabilities as contractors on Department of Defense (DOD) contracts. The mentor-protege program does not guarantee contracts to qualified small businesses. Instead, it is designed to equip these businesses with the knowledge and expertise that they need to win such contracts on their own, in the competitive market place.

The DOD has yet to meet the five percent government-wide annual goal for women-owned business participation in federal contracting required by section 7106 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. The committee encourages the Department to use the authority granted in this section, as well as existing programs, outreach, training and technical assistance to further the participation of women-owned businesses in DOD contracting.

Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (sec. 810)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to Congress on the amount to be expended on the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) contract, the accounts from which the contract will be funded, a

plan for incremental development, the management information specified in section 803(e), and any impact on the existing civilian workforce before beginning performance of the NMCI contract. The provision would require that the Marine Corps, the naval shipyards, and the naval aviation depots be excluded from the performance of the contract in the first year, and that the program be implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 and applicable regulations and directives.

The NMCI is a long-term "seat management" arrangement under which the Navy would transfer to a contractor the responsibility for providing and managing the Navy's desktop computer, server, infrastructure, and communication assets and services. Up to $2.0 billion a year could be expended on the contract over the next five years.

The committee recognizes that each of the military services faces aging information technology infrastructure, which is plagued with severe interoperability and information assurance problems. The committee supports the Navy's efforts to address these problems, and encourages the other military services to address them in an equally comprehensive manner. However, many questions have been raised by the General Accounting Office and others about the effectiveness of the Navy's NMCI contracting approach. To move forward before these questions have been addressed could risk wasting valuable defense resources and put in jeopardy the future use of this innovative contracting concept by the Federal Government.

The committee believes that for the Navy to successfully implement the NMCI, it will have to outline the business case for its information technology investments, demonstrate superior information technology project management expertise, and develop performance metrics based on sound baselines. The NMCI should be managed according to best private and public sector practices, including incremental development, as mandated in the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. The committee also believes that oversight by the DOD Chief Information Office is critical to the success of the program and that effective implementation of the memorandum of agreement between the Navy and DOD officials is a first step in ensuring effective management of the program.

The committee further recommends that the Navy ensure that the contractor for the NMCI program evaluates the use of commercial off the shelf desktop computers capable of securely processing, storing, and networking classified, sensitive, and unclassified data via the NMCI.

Qualifications required for employment and assignment in contracting positions (sec. 811)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a baccalaureate degree and 24 semester credit hours in business disciplines for new entrants into the GS–1102 occupational series and for contracting officers above the simplified acquisition threshold. The 24 semester credit hours may be included within the requirements for the baccalaureate degree or may be in addition to the basic undergraduate degree requirement. The credit hours may be either undergraduate or graduate credit hours or a combination of

both. These requirements will not apply to those who are already serving in these capacities as of September 30, 2000. This provision also does not effect the waiver authority in section 1724(d) of title 10, United States Code, which allows employees who do not meet these requirements to serve in these capacities if it is determined by the acquisition career program board of a military department that they possess significant potential for advancement based on demonstrated job performance and qualifying experience.

Defense contracting has changed significantly since the passage of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act of 1990. This provision will ensure that new entrants into the contracting field have the educational tools they need to effectively perform as contracting professionals in the changing federal marketplace.

Defense acquisition workforce (sec. 812)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a moratorium on further cuts in the acquisition workforce for three years. The Secretary of Defense may waive this prohibition upon certification to Congress that any reductions to the workforce will not negatively impact on the ability of the workforce to efficiently and effectively carry out its legally required functions.

The provision would also require a report on the sufficiency of the acquisition and support workforce of the Department of Defense (DOD). This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to perform a comprehensive reassessment of programmed reductions in the acquisition workforce, assess the impact of impending retirements, develop a plan to address future acquisition workforce challenges and problems arising from past reductions in the acquisition workforce, and identify steps that are being taken or could be taken by the DOD to enhance the tenure and reduce the turnover of program executive officers, program managers, and contracting officers.

The DOD Inspector General (IG) recently reported that DOD has reduced its acquisition workforce from 460,516 to 230,556 personnel, about 50 percent, from the end of fiscal year 1990 to the end of fiscal year 1999, while the workload has remained essentially constant, and even increased by some measures. The committee recognizes that the implementation of acquisition reform has improved efficiency in DOD contracting. However, according to the IG: ". . . staffing reductions have clearly outpaced productivity increases and the acquisition workforce's capacity to handle its still formidable workload."

The IG reported that reductions in the acquisition workforce have resulted in: (1) an increased backlog in closing out completed contracts; (2) increased program costs resulting from contracting for technical support versus using in-house technical support; (3) insufficient personnel to fill-in for employees on deployment; (4) insufficient staff to manage requirements; (5) reduced scrutiny and timeliness in reviewing acquisition actions; (6) personnel retention difficulty; (7) an increase in procurement action lead time; (8) some skill imbalances; and (9) lost opportunities to develop cost savings initiatives. The 14 DOD acquisition organizations reviewed by the IG anticipate additional adverse effects on performance if further downsizing occurs.

In addition to concerns about the impacts of past acquisition workforce reductions, the committee is concerned about the changing demographics of the acquisition workforce as DOD loses a projected 55,000 of its most experienced personnel through attrition by fiscal year 2005.

In a hearing before the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, Administration witnesses testified about the need for innovative personnel changes to address impending demographic changes in the workforce, as well as addressing qualitative shortfalls. As a means to test personnel changes, the committee recommends a provision that would extend for three years the acquisition workforce demonstration project conducted under section 4308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. In addition, the committee recommends, as part of the report required by this provision, that the Secretary report on the lessons learned from this demonstration project and provide any recommendations to improve personnel management laws, policies, or procedures with respect to the DOD acquisition workforce.

Financial analysis of use of dual rate for quantifying overhead costs at army industrial facilities (sec. 813)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a financial analysis of the benefits and costs of permitting the use of dual overhead rates at Department of Army Government-Owned facilities as a means of encouraging commercial use of these facilities. The provision would also require the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees on the results of this study by February 15, 2001.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Application of Cost Accounting Standards to universities

Section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 contained provisions that modified and streamlined the applicability of the Cost Accounting Standards. Section 802(h) provided that these changes should not be construed to modify, supersede, impair, or restrict the applicability of the Cost Accounting Standards to educational institutions. Section 802(h) has been interpreted by some to preclude the Cost Accounting Standards Board (CAS Board) from altering the Cost Accounting Standards in any way, as they apply to universities and other educational institutions. That was not the committee's intent.

The committee understands that the applicability of both the Cost Accounting Standards and the cost accounting provisions in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–21 to universities and other educational institutions has led to confusion and misunderstanding. The committee believes that OMB and the CAS Board should work together to develop a more complete and seamless incorporation of the relevant Cost Accounting Standards into OMB Circular A–21. It is the committee's hope that OMB and the CAS Board will utilize terminology applicable to basic and applied research, and give examples relevant to university operations to provide clear and consistent guidance on the steps that educational institutions must take to maintain compliance with applicable standards.

Appropriate use of the government purchase card

Last year, the committee directed that each of the military services conduct a review of purchase card transactions and report to Congress on their findings no later than March 1, 2000. The committee was disappointed that none of the services sampled the records of actual purchases to identify the items purchased and determine if the prices paid were reasonable. In the absence of such a review, the findings of the three services were inconclusive. For this reason, the committee directs each of the three military services to develop a plan for sampling purchase card transactions in selected commands to determine whether the prices paid were fair and reasonable, and to ensure that the purchase card is being used in an appropriate manner. The committee directs the military services to report their findings to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2001.

While the services provided some data on procurement savings through the use of the purchase card, the committee is concerned that processing costs at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service may have increased due to increased usage of the purchase card. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on this problem by February 1, 2001. The Secretary's report should: 1) provide an estimate of financial processing costs incurred due to the use of the purchase card and compare those costs to estimated contracting savings; and 2) discuss the feasibility of reducing those processing costs by electronically integrating purchases made through the government purchase card with the payment systems of the Department of Defense (for example, through the use of the Standard Procurement System).

Availability of contractor past performance information

The committee is aware that award fee determination information from previous contracts may be used in the assessment of a contractor's past performance for source selection purposes. Past performance information is generally considered to be source selection sensitive and, therefore, exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Once an award fee determination has been made under the previous contract, however, the information underlying the basis for that determination, because it is no longer pre-decisional, may be disclosed under FOIA unless some other express exemption applies. As a result, information may be treated as exempt from disclosure for the purpose of one contract, when it is subject to disclosure as it relates to another contract.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the issue to make a determination whether a clarification in regulation would be in the public interest. The committee directs the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and to the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives on any determinations and actions with respect to this issue, no later than March 1, 2001.

Contracts for ancillary commercial services

Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 clarified that services ancillary to a commercial item, such as installation, maintenance, repair, training, and other support services would be considered commercial services, regardless of whether the services are provided by the same vendor or at the same time as the item, if the services are provided contemporaneously to the general public under similar terms and conditions.

It has come to the committee's attention that commercial practice may be to contract for such services on a basis other than firm-fixed prices under certain circumstances. For example, an elevator repair company may contract for the maintenance and repair of building elevators on a time and materials basis. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should utilize the flexibility provided in Section 8002(d) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act " which requires the use of firm, fixed price contracts "to the maximum extent practicable" " by authorizing the use of other than firm-fixed price contracts for the acquisition of ancillary commercial services when this is the common practice in sales to the general public.

At the same time, the committee has requested that the General Accounting Office undertake a broad review of best practices in the private sector for the acquisition of commercial products and services. In addition, this bill contains a number of provisions directed at improving the Department's management of contracts for commercial products and services. The committee does not believe that the Department should revise the current regulation prohibiting the use of other than firm-fixed price contracts under section 8002(d) for the acquisition of categories of commercial products and services other than ancillary services until the GAO review has been completed, the required management changes have been implemented, and the committee has had an opportunity to review the results.

Online auctioning

The Department of Defense has advised the committee that online auctioning may be well suited for competitive, high volume, commodity type purchases, and has the potential to save the Department significant resources in time, funding, and labor for such purchases. The committee urges the Department to identify specific markets for which the use of online auctioning may be appropriate and develop a pilot program to test the use of this innovate purchasing approach. The Department is directed to provide a progress report on this effort to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate no later than March 1, 2001.

Performance goals and measures for quality of equipment and other products

The committee is concerned that reductions in the acquisition workforce have increased the risk that quality control oversight measures may be inadequate. Recent reports of quality control problems related to satellite launch failures, the continued stocking in the inventory of defective chemical protective suits, and concerns raised about the quality of aircraft carrier catapult parts raise

questions about whether defense quality control problems may be systemic.

The Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) recently reported that the number of defense quality assurance personnel decreased from 12,117 in 1990 to 5,191 in 1999, a 57 percent decrease. The Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), the organization primarily responsible for in-plant quality assurance, stated to the DOD IG that increased quality control risk exists because of continued workforce reductions. DCMA also reported this risk from reduced oversight of contractors in its annual statement of assurance. DCMA commented that some contractors stated that when DCMA stopped performing inspections of all products, so did the contractors.

The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) stated that while customer complaints about the quality of material received have increased, DLA has placed less emphasis on responding to the customer complaints because of acquisition workforce reductions. Another military command stated that reduced staffing caused it to pay little attention to backlogs in Quality Deficiency Reports and Equipment Improvement Reports.

The committee is concerned that while staffing for quality assurance has been reduced, there are no overall DOD performance measures for the quality of products received from contractors. To address this issue, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to require the heads of acquisition activities in the DOD to establish and submit to the Secretary, for the Department's annual performance plan under the Government Performance and Results Act, performance goals and measures for the quality of military equipment and other products received from private sector sources. The Secretary of Defense shall also submit, by February 1, 2001, a report to Congress on how the Department plans to improve its quality assurance program.

Polyacrylonitrile carbon fibers

Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fibers are used in a variety of defense and space applications such as aircraft, missiles, launch vehicles, and helicopters. In 1985, the Department of Defense (DOD) determined that DOD was overly dependent on foreign industry for PAN carbon fibers and directed that one-third of PAN carbon fiber used in defense production should be supplied by domestic sources by the end of calendar year 1988. Congress included in the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1988 (Public Law 100–202) a requirement that by calendar year 1992, 50 percent of the DOD PAN carbon fiber requirements be purchased from domestic sources. To accomplish this objective, the statute also required that all new major systems use U.S. or Canadian manufacturers for all PAN carbon fiber requirements. DOD institutionalized these requirements in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations (DFAR). The statutory restrictions were not renewed after 1991. In 1996, DOD decided to continue the restrictions, but recommended that the issue be revisited in three years. The Department is currently studying whether to maintain the PAN carbon fiber DFAR restriction.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2001, on the domestic and international industrial structure that produces PAN carbon fibers, current and anticipated market trends for this product, and on any decision made to maintain or discontinue the PAN carbon fiber DFAR restriction.

Procurements from the small arms production industrial base

The committee understands that there have been problems with the Department of the Army's process for forwarding waiver requests to the Secretary of Defense to authorize expanded competition on particular small arms critical repair parts contracts, as provided for in section 2473 (a) of title 10, United States Code. The committee reiterates that waivers on small arms critical repair parts contracts should be forwarded to and granted by the Secretary of Defense when it is determined, with regard to a particular procurement, that restricting the procurement is not necessary to preserve the small arms production industrial base, as defined by section 2473(c) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee also reiterates its concern that quality and reliability be paramount in the execution of all small arms procurement. The Army must ensure that all solicitations for small arms, parts, and modifications—regardless of the method of procurement—will result in our troops receiving the safest and most reliable systems possible from reliable suppliers, and that each procurement will be based on detailed analyses of alternatives.

Risk management in the acquisition of major systems

The committee has reviewed a report entitled Report of the Price-based Acquisition Study Group, dated November 15, 1999, prepared for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics. Many of the recommendations of this report could be implemented without any change to existing law, and show significant promise for the reduction of risk in the acquisition of major systems. In this regard, the report is consistent with the recommendations of the General Accounting Office in work conducted for this committee.

For example, the report recommends that the Department: (1) establish a Defense-wide policy for risk mitigation through the use of evolutionary and incremental acquisition strategies, consistent with the requirements established for the acquisition of major systems of information technology in section 5202 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996; (2) establish a Defense-wide policy for using price to help prioritize operational requirements; (3) facilitate the development of competitive pricing through the use of dissimilar competition in major systems acquisitions where it is not practicable to maintain multiple sources; (4) establish a center of excellence in market research to coordinate the use of best practices in market research across the department; and (5) conduct a Defense Science Board study on the impact of contract modifications and changes on contract cost, schedule, and quality. The committee urges the Department of Defense to take strong action to implement these recommendations.

While the committee encourages the Department to implement the recommendations of the Study Group report relating to risk mitigation, the committee is concerned that several other recommendations of the report appear to be inconsistent with the requirements of existing law. In particular, the committee notes that the so-called "Cost or Pricing Analysis Decision Assistance Tool (COPADAT)" developed by the study group would direct results that are inconsistent with the requirements of the Truth in Negotiations Act—encouraging contracting officers to avoid obtaining certified cost or pricing data in circumstances where it is required by law. The committee directs the Department to stop all use of the COPADAT or any similar tool that would dictate a result that is inconsistent with statutory requirements to obtain certified cost or pricing data in sole source procurements of non-commercial items, absent "exceptional circumstances."

Similarly, the report recommends that the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation be revised to express a clear, unambiguous preference for price-based acquisition and that price-based acquisition be addressed in every acquisition plan or equivalent document, even in cases where the statute requires contracting officers to obtain certified cost or pricing data. The committee supports the use of price-based acquisition techniques to supplement the use of certified cost or pricing data in the determination of fair and reasonable prices in sole- source contracts for non-commercial items. However, the use of such techniques is not a substitute for statutory requirements or a basis for waiving the statutory requirements to obtain certified cost or pricing data in such acquisitions.

Finally, the committee notes that section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, established a new "exceptional circumstances" waiver to the Cost Accounting Standards. This waiver authority parallels waiver authority already available to the Department under the Truth in Negotiations Act.

The committee reminds the Department that the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, section 802 expressly limits the use of "exceptional circumstances" waivers to circumstances "...when the agency determines that it would not be able to obtain needed products or services from the vendor in the absence of a waiver." For this reason, the committee directs the Department to clarify that "exceptional circumstances" waivers to the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Cost Accounting Standards may not ordinarily be used to enter a contract with a major defense contractor or any other contractor that routinely does business with the Federal Government in contracts that are covered by the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Cost Accounting Standards.

Technical data rights for items developed exclusively at private expense

Section 2320 of Title 10, United States Code, establishes the statutory basis for regulations governing rights in technical data under Department of Defense contracts. This provision establishes the basic rule that the government has unlimited rights to technical data developed exclusively with federal funds; the government does not generally have rights in technical data established exclusively

at private expense; and rights to data developed in part with federal funds and in part at private expense are negotiable. When the government purchases an item developed exclusively at private expense, however, Section 2320 reserves the government's limited right to technical data that "...is necessary for operation, maintenance, installation, or training (other than detailed manufacturing or process data)."

Department of Defense officials have noted that it is increasingly common that commercially-developed systems or components are either returned to the manufacturer for repair or discarded. In such cases, these officials state, the government does not need technical data, and our insistence that contractors provide such data could discourage commercial companies from doing business with the government.

The committee believes that this concern is based upon a misreading of the statute. Section 2320 requires contractors to provide only technical data that "is necessary" for operation, maintenance, installation, or training. This requirement provides executive branch officials with the flexibility to determine what data, if any, is necessary for these limited purposes. If, in view of the manner in which the system or component will be used, no data is necessary for these purposes, the government should not require the seller to provide any such data. The committee directs the Department to review the regulations implementing Section 2320 and adopt any changes that may be necessary to clarify this point.

TITLE IX-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Repeal of limitation on major Department of Defense headquarters activities personnel (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement to reduce the number of personnel assigned to major Department of Defense headquarters activities. The committee believes the reductions mandated by the previous legislation would adversely impact the ability of the service staffs, the Joint Staff, and the combatant commands to accomplish their missions.

Overall supervision of Department of Defense activities for combating terrorism (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD-SOLIC) as the principal civilian adviser to the Secretary of Defense on, and the principal official within the senior management of the Department of Defense (DOD) (after the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense) responsible for, combating terrorism. The ASD-SOLIC would provide overall direction and supervision for policy, program planning and execution, and allocation and use of resources for the activities of the Department of Defense for combating terrorism, including antiterrorism activities, counterterrorism activities, terrorism consequence management activities, and terrorism-related intelligence support activities. The committee is concerned that there is currently no single individual responsible for policy oversight at the Department to ensure a focused, comprehensive, cohesive, and well-funded DOD combating terrorism policy. The committee believes that there must be one official responsible for policy and budgetary oversight of this important mission. The intent of this provision is also to ensure that the Department's combating terrorism program is fully included in all stages of the Programs, Planning and Budgeting System (PPBS) as a single entity, rather than as separate activities.

As included in the Department of Defense's report, DOD Combating Terrorism Activities, provided to Congress pursuant to section 932 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, the Department's combating terrorism activities are divided into four components: antiterrorism/force protection, counterterrorism, terrorism consequence management, and intelligence support to combating terrorism. Currently, numerous DOD officials are responsible for these various combating terrorism activities. In many cases, responsibilities for these important activities overlap and it is unclear who has oversight for specific activities or ultimate responsibility for program direction. Through this

provision, it is the committee's intent to consolidate the oversight and management of this vital program.

Finally, the committee commends the Department for the fiscal year 2001 congressional justification book (CJB) for Combating Terrorism. This was a good first step in consolidating the numerous programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program. The committee looks forward to working with the Department to make certain modifications that will improve this product. In particular, the committee would like to see the Department separate military personnel costs from the other combating terrorism costs.

National Defense Panel 2001 (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that authorizes the establishment of a National Defense Panel (NDP) in fiscal year 2001 to accompany the fiscal Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) for fiscal year 2001. The Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 (Public Law 105–85) established the QDR and the NDP, but the provision was a one year provision, and did not establish a recurring requirement. The Congress established the QDR as a permanent recurring requirement (10 U.S. Code, 118) in the National Defense Authorization Act of FY 2000, but did not include a requirement for the NDP.

This provision responds to widespread belief that the combination of the QDR and NDP serve to heighten awareness of the administration, the Pentagon, the Congress, and the broader national security establishment on national defense strategies and policies for the future. This provision authorizes establishment of an NDP, consisting of nine recognized national security experts and appropriate support staff, to proceed concurrently with the QDR. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of each Committee on Armed Services, will designate one of the nine members as the Chairman of the NDP.

The intent of this provision is to establish an NDP in fiscal year 2001 that will independently and objectively assess the current and projected strategic environment, assess the most dangerous threats to the national security interests of the United States over the next 10 to 20 years, and identify the strategic and operational challenges for the armed forces in countering these threats. The NDP will provide an interim report to the Secretary of Defense not later than July 1, 2001, that will be of assistance to him as he evaluates the overall QDR process. The NDP will provide a final report to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress not later than December 1, 2001. The Secretary of Defense will provide the defense committees of Congress his comments on the final NDP report not later than December 15, 2001.

Quadrennial National Defense Panel (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision that amends title 10, United States Code, to require that a National Defense Panel (NDP) be established on a recurring basis, every four years in the year preceding the inauguration of a new President. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 105–85) established the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the NDP, but the provision was a one year provision, and did not establish a recurring requirement. The Congress established the QDR as a permanent recurring requirement (10 U.S.C. 118), but did not include a requirement for the NDP.

This provision responds to widespread belief that the combination of the QDR and NDP serve to heighten awareness of the administration, the Pentagon, the Congress, and the broader national security establishment on national defense strategies and policies for the future. This provision authorizes the establishment an NDP, consisting of nine recognized national security experts and appropriate support staff, to precede the QDR. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, in consultation with the ranking member. Three members are to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman and ranking member of each Committee on Armed Services, will designate one of the nine members as the Chairman of the NDP.

The intent of this provision is to establish a recurring NDP that will independently and objectively assess the current and projected strategic environment, assess the most dangerous threats to the national security interests of the United States over the next 10 to 20 years, and identify the strategic and operational challenges for the armed forces in countering these threats. The NDP will serve to provide an incoming Secretary of Defense of a new administration with a range of strategic directions and policy options which may assist him in formulating the strategic framework and guidance to be used by the QDR required to be conducted during the first year of a new administration. Additionally, this provision provides the opportunity for Congress, in accordance with its oversight role, to have insight and an avenue for input into the QDR process.

Inspector General investigations of prohibited personnel actions (sec.905)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, to broaden the definition of "Inspector General" in that section to include any officer of the armed forces or employee of the Department of Defense, not otherwise referred to in that definition, who is assigned or detailed to serve as an inspector general at any level in the Department. This expanded definition would authorize defense agency and joint service inspectors general, and civilian employees serving in such positions elsewhere in the Department, to handle alleged violations of the whistleblower protections afforded members of the armed forces in this statute. The provision also clarifies that the procedures necessary to ensure the expeditious processing and investigation of

such alleged violations shall be set out in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The committee understands that these regulations require that any investigation undertaken pursuant to section 1034 must be conducted by an inspector general who is independent of any individuals who may be subjects of the investigation.

Network centric warfare (sec. 906)

The committee has noted, with great interest, the efforts by Department of Defense (DOD) agencies, the military services, the joint staff, and combatant commanders to establish mechanisms to integrate information systems, sensors, weapons systems and decision-makers. The common terminology for this is network centric warfare (NCW). In conversations with various agencies and organizations, it has become increasingly apparent that many of these efforts are innovative but are unnecessarily redundant and not designed to work in conjunction with each other. More importantly, it appears that there is not an effective overarching concept at the DOD level to fully integrate these various concepts of operation and maximize their potential contribution to information superiority " a cornerstone of Joint Vision 2010.

Although ideas relating to the concepts of NCW have been analyzed within DOD, no clear consensus has emerged as to what priority it should have within broader efforts to transform the military. Additionally, there is no agreement on what fundamental organizational and doctrinal changes need to be pursued in order to most effectively implement these concepts or how the military services should work jointly in this effort. As a result, although the military services and several defense agencies are exploring new organizational concepts, operating procedures, training programs, and technologies to ensure information superiority in their operations, these efforts are often underfunded, low priority, and have not included joint war fighting and interoperability considerations.

Specifically, the committee has noted the following: (1) NCW is a set of concepts being developed to exploit the power of information and U.S. superiority in information technologies to maintain dominance on the battlefield while protecting the infrastructure and information that is critical to the United States; (2) NCW involves the integration of information from combat, combat support, logistics elements and headquarters staffs into a seamless system that provides a common picture of the battlespace that can be simultaneously shared and used by sensors, weapons systems, combat personnel, decision makers, support elements, and other elements of the military services, unified commands, and allied forces operating in that battlespace; (3) a robust joint command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C4ISR) capability involving a networking of all these entities facilitates the timely flow of relevant, processed information that is necessary for achieving the sharing of an accurate common picture of the battlespace; (4) NCW is about networking capabilities, rather than creating separate networks or technologies, and is a means to generate greater combat power, dominance, and synergy through a linking of critical information sources that are geographically or hierarchically dispersed; (5) NCW is inherently joint,

in that new air, sea, and land platforms under development must be able to integrate themselves into a seamless, overarching information architecture to be able to see the battlespace, contribute to the information base, and quickly receive orders to employ required capabilities; (6) being joint in nature, the NCW concepts must be approved at the highest levels of DOD and executed aggressively by a coordinated, iterative effort of all the military services, defense agencies, combatant commands and the joint staff; (7) successful implementation of the concepts will produce numerous benefits, including: (a) significant reduction in fratricide; (b) more adaptive and agile forces capable of engaging effectively across the spectrum of conflict with higher probability of success and reduced risk; (c) enhancement of interoperability among the military services and allied forces; (d) reduced manning requirements and life cycle costs for weapons systems; and (e) efficient combat support operations; (8) the well-intentioned, but separate efforts of the military services and defense agencies have resulted in recurring difficulties and deficiencies, including a number of interoperability failures of critical systems and inefficiencies in recent operations, including Kosovo.

As a result of these findings and concerns, the committee directs that DOD provide three reports to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2001, that summarize their efforts to coordinate NCW activities within the entire Department. The first report will be a comprehensive summary on the development and implementation of NCW concepts in DOD. The report will include: (1) a clear definition of NCW; (2) identification and description of Office of the Secretary of Defense, joint staff and U.S. Joint Forces Command activities to coordinate NCW related activities; (3) recommended metrics for evaluating the progress towards implementing NCW concepts and attainment of fully integrated C4ISR capabilities; (4) recommendations for joint concept development and joint experimentation; (5) progress made, as determined by quantitative standards: (a) toward establishing an overarching conceptual foundation in programs and initiatives currently underway; (b) in fielding force-wide friendly combat identification; and (c) in effective fire control and airspace management; (6) discussion of additional authorities, authorizations and other resources required to effectively implement NCW; (7) joint requirements and acquisition policy changes being made or considered to implement NCW; (8) a discussion of how private sector lessons learned in networking are being incorporated; and (9) a discussion of how DOD NCW systems will integrate with other agencies of the federal government when DOD civil support is required.

Additionally, the committee directs the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command, on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, to conduct a study and submit a report on how to best use service and joint experimentation programs to develop NCW concepts and identify barriers to their implementation.

Finally, the committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to submit a report describing the coordination in several specified areas of the science and technology investments of the military departments and defense agencies in the development of future NCW capabilities.

Additional duties for the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization (sec. 907)

Subtitle C of title XVI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2000 established a Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization. The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1622 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2000 to include additional duties for the commission.

Special authority for administration of Navy Fisher Houses (sec. 908)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the degree to which Navy Fisher Houses may be provided common support equivalent to category B community support activities and would permit the current general schedule employees to continue to serve until they leave those positions.

Organization and management of the Civil Air Patrol (sec. 909)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify the agreement recently reached between the Secretary of the Air Force and the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol. However, the provision would not allow contract employees of the Air Force to commit federal resources.

The committee commends the Secretary of the Air Force and the leadership of the Civil Air Patrol for their efforts to establish a more cooperative relationship. The committee supports the proposal to develop an appropriate oversight mechanism to ensure the responsible expenditure of federal resources.

Responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program (sec. 910)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer responsibility for the National Guard Challenge Program from the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to the Secretary of Defense, and would amend the limitation on federal funding for the National Guard Challenge program to limit only Department of Defense funding. The fiscal year 2001 budget request for the National Guard Challenge is $62,500,000, which is also the maximum permitted by the existing statute. The recommended provision recognizes the concept of civilian control of the military and would clarify that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs is not required to communicate with state National Guard Challenge programs through the National Guard Bureau. The committee expects the National Guard Bureau to continue to be an important element in the National Guard Challenge Program.

Supervisory control of Armed Forces Retirement Home Board by Secretary of Defense (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish that the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board is subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense in the performance of its responsibilities, would give the Secretary of Defense

authority over appointment and terms of board members, and would make the Chairman of the Retirement Home Board responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

Consolidation of certain Navy gift funds (sec. 912)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer all amounts in the Naval Historical Center Fund to the Department of the Navy General Gift Fund and to close the Naval Historical Center Fund. The recommended provision would also authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer all amounts in the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund to the gift fund maintained for the benefit and use of the United States Naval Academy, and to close the United States Naval Academy Museum Fund.

Temporary authority to dispose of a gift previously accepted for the Naval Academy (sec. 913)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Naval Academy to, during fiscal year 2001 and at the request of the donor, transfer a gift previously given to the Naval Academy Gift fund to another entity.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000 (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the emergency supplemental appropriations enacted in the 2000 Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act (Public Law 106–XXX). The supplemental provided funding for fiscal year 2000 expenses related to military operations in Kosovo, Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, and natural disasters.

United States contributions to NATO common-funded budgets (sec. 1003)

The resolution of ratification for the Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on the Accession of Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic contained a provision (section 3(2)(c)(ii)) that requires a specific authorization for U.S. payments to the common-funded budgets of NATO for each fiscal year, beginning in fiscal year 1999, that U.S. payments exceed the fiscal year 1998 total. The committee recommends a provision to authorize the U.S. contribution to NATO common-funded budgets for fiscal year 2001, including the use of unexpended balances from prior years.

Annual OMB/CBO joint report on scoring budget outlays (sec. 1004)

The committee recommends a provision that makes minor administrative changes to the joint annual Office of Management and Budget/Congressional Budget Office (OMB/CBO) report on the scoring of budget outlays.

Prompt payment of contractor vouchers (sec. 1005)

The committee recommends a provision that will require the Secretary of Defense to reduce the backlog of vouchers to be paid by the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) to five percent or less of the total Mechanization of Contract Administration Service (MOCAS) vouchers received. Normal commercial practice, as well as the government's own policy, calls for payment within 30 days for work satisfactorily accomplished. The committee is concerned that this standard is not being accomplished and creates undue hardships for private sector enterprises doing business with the Department of Defense (DOD).

The Committee recognizes the efforts by DFAS to reduce the backlog of vouchers and the electronic initiatives to expedite the processing of these vouchers, and applauds this effort. The DOD is urged to move more aggressively in the areas of electronic com-

merce to develop a common family of invoices, reduce excessive detail and supporting data, and streamline the payment process. Electronic invoicing and payment has demonstrated its value and the Department is urged to be more aggressive in these areas.

The repeal of certain requirements relating to timing of contract payments (sec. 1006)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal two provisions of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–79) concerning the prompt payment act and the shifting of pay days for federal employees.

Plan for prompt posting of contractual obligations (sec. 1007)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan concerning the timely obligation of funds. The committee notes that the ability to obligate funds is not standardized or even centralized within the Department of Defense. This obligation authority resides in the services in some cases and Defense Finance and Accounting Service in others. This lack of uniformity calls into question the Department's ability to reduce the backlog of vouchers and problem disbursements, and to improve the accounting systems.

Plan for the electronic submission of documentation supporting claims for contract payments (sec. 1008)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2001, for the electronic submission of contract supporting transactions (e.g. invoices, receiving reports, and certifications).

Administrative offsets for overpayment of transportation costs (sec. 1009)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide a streamlined offset procedure for amounts overpaid for transportation services, that are below the simplified acquisition threshold of $100,000. The amounts offset would be credited to the appropriation or accounts that funded the transportation service. This provision does not effect the budgetary requirements for these services.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The budget request for drug interdiction and other counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense (DOD) totals $1.1 billion: $836.0 million in central transfer account; $166.5 million in the operating budgets of the military services for authorized counter-drug operations; and $76.8 million in the military construction account for infrastructure improvements at the forward operating locations. This request is in addition to the $137.0 million in the emergency fiscal year 2000 supplemental funding request for Plan Colombia.

The Committee recommends the following fiscal year 2001 budget for the Department's counter-narcotics activities.

Drug Interdiction & Counterdrug Activities, Operations and Maintenance

[In thousands of dollars]

[May not add due to rounding]

Fiscal Year 2001 Drug and Counterdrug Request	$1,070,064
Goal 1 (Dependent Demand Reduction)	$22,736
Goal 2 (Support to DLEAs)	$89,905
Goal 3 (DOD Personnel Demand Reduction)	$74,067
Goal 4 (Drug Interdiction—TZ/SWB)	$447,414
Goal 5 (Supply Reduction)	$435,942
Increases:	
Airborne Reconnaissance Low	$31,000
National Guard Support	$25,000
Decreases:	
DINANDRO Riverine Support	$3,000
DEA Transportation Support (PC–2307)	$1,350
Carribean Law Enforcement Support	$2,703
Supplemental Appropriation	
Forward Operating Location Construction	$76,800
Plan Colombia	$40,000
Total Fiscal Year 2001 Drug and Counterdrug Funding	$1,119,011

Extension and increase of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1011)

The committee recognizes the importance of providing the democratically elected governments of the countries of the Andean Ridge, particularly Colombia, with the tools and training necessary to assert control over their sovereign national territory to prevent the illegal trafficking of narcotics and the regional in stability that narcotics trafficking creates. The committee supports the President's request for the supplemental funding that would be used to help train and equip the military and police forces of these countries. However, the resources requested for these activities would exceed the current authorities. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would extend until fiscal year 2006 the authority for the DOD to provide certain counter-drug assistance to the Government of Colombia. The provision would also increase the level of resources authorized to be expended through this authority to $40.0 million each year.

Recommendations on expansion of support for counter-drug activities (sec. 1012)

The committee understands the valuable contribution that the Department of Defense has made in providing needed assistance to the counter-drug forces of Colombia and Peru. However, the committee is concerned about efforts to seek an expansion of current authority to other nations without a clear plan on how this assistance will be put to the most effective use.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that would outline the Secretary's views regarding what, if any, additional countries should be included; what, if any, additional support should be provided; and a detailed plan for providing support, including the counter-drug activities proposed to be supported.

Review of riverine counter-drug program (sec. 1013)

The committee is concerned with reports of problems in the management and operation of certain portions of the riverine counter-drug program. While this program has made great strides improving the counter-drug capability of some forces, other forces have had far less success.

Therefore, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to review the riverine counter-drug program and provide a report to Congress on the results of that review. The report should include an assessment of the effectiveness of the program for each country receiving support, and a recommendation regarding which of the armed forces, units of the armed forces, or other organizations within the DOD should be responsible for managing the program.

The committee further recommends a reduction of $3.0 million in the support provided to the riverine operations of the Government of Peru.

Airborne Reconnaissance Low

The committee recognizes the critical need for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets to be deployed to the U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) in order to more effectively combat the illegal trafficking of narcotics. In recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Wilhelm, Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, identified a need for more ISR assets. Unfortunately, as a result of requirements in other theaters, and the tragic accident in Colombia last year, there are insufficient quantities of ISR assets to always meet SOUTHCOM's requirements. In recent letters to the committee, General Shinseki, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, and General Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, identified a requirement for an additional Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft that was not included in the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of $31.0 million for the procurement of an Airborne Reconnaissance Low aircraft to be used in the Department's counter-drug mission.

4National Guard counter-drug activities

The committee understands the valuable contribution of the National Guard in the war on drugs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the counter-drug activities of the National Guard including the regional counter- drug operations such as the Gulf States Counter-Drug Initiative, the Regional Counter-Drug Training Academy, and the Northeast Counter-Drug Training Center.

Plan Colombia & Forward Operating Location construction

The committee recommends a decrease of $40.0 million to the fiscal year 2001 budget request for Plan Colombia to reflect the fact that these funds were provided through the counter-drug budget supplemental in fiscal year 2000. The adjustment for the supplemental appropriation for the Forward Operating Location construction is reflected in Division B of this report.

Drug Enforcement Agency transportation support

The committee is concerned with the Drug Enforcement Agency's (DEA) reliance on the DOD to transport DEA personnel around the Carribean. Transportation of DEA personnel does not enhance military capabilities or require unique military assets, is the responsibility of the DEA, and should be funded through the DEA budget. The DOD budget request includes $3.4 million for such transportation services. The committee recommends a decrease of $1.4 million to the budget request for this activity. The committee expects the DEA to assume all costs for this activity after fiscal year 2001.

Carribean law enforcement support

The committee is concerned with the increased reliance upon the DOD to provide assistance to foreign law enforcement agencies where the Department has limited, or no mission responsibility. The budget request includes $6.7 million for assistance to law enforcement agencies of Carribean nations. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.7 million to the request for this activity. The committee expects the State Department to provide the support for this activity in the future.

SUBTITLE C—STRATEGIC FORCES

Revised nuclear posture review (sec. 1015)

Six years have passed since the nuclear posture review of fiscal year 1994. The committee believes that a new nuclear posture review is overdue and should be completed in the near future. Although Presidential Decision Directive 60, signed in November 1997, reaffirmed and updated U.S. nuclear weapons employment policy guidance, there has not been an end-to-end review of U.S. nuclear weapons strategy, requirements, and posture since fiscal year 1994.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a comprehensive nuclear posture review that looks out five to ten years. The review would include: (1) the role of nuclear forces in United States military strategy, planning, and programming; (2) the policy requirements and objectives for the United States to maintain a safe, reliable and credible nuclear deterrence posture; (3) the relationship between U.S. nuclear deterrence policy, targeting strategy, and arms control objectives; (4) the levels and composition of nuclear delivery systems that will be required to implement the U.S. national and military strategy, including any plans for replacing or modifying warheads. The provision would also require that, concurrently with the Quadrennial Defense Review due in December 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report, in unclassified and classified forms as necessary, on the nuclear posture review. Finally, the provision expresses the sense of Congress that a revised nuclear posture review should be used as the basis for establishing future arms control objectives and negotiating positions.

Plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of United States strategic nuclear forces (sec. 1016)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to prepare a plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of U.S. strategic forces. The committee expects that the plan would look beyond current efforts to modernize existing systems and lay out a comprehensive vision for the maintenance of deterrent forces.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy may not be adequately planning for United States strategic nuclear forces in the long term. The committee supports current efforts to provide for continued sustainment of existing strategic delivery systems and warheads, but is concerned that there appears to be no long-range vision of how the United States should preserve strategic deterrent forces. The committee believes that the United States will require such forces beyond the date when existing systems become obsolete.

Correction of scope of waiver authority for limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles (sec. 1017)

Section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 revised the limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles contained in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1998 by permitting the Navy to retire (or otherwise eliminate from strategic nuclear operational status) four of its eighteen Trident ballistic missile submarines. The provision also includes a waiver authority that the President can exercise if the START II treaty enters into force. As drafted, however, the waiver only applies to the retirement of submarines. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would revise the scope of the section 1501 waiver so that it applies to all of the strategic nuclear delivery vehicles covered by section 1501.

Study and report on hardened and deeply buried targets (sec. 1018)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to assess requirements and options for defeating hardened and deeply buried targets. The provision would expressly authorize the Department of Energy (DOE) to conduct any limited research and development that may be necessary to complete such assessments.

The committee notes that a recent legal interpretation of existing law raised questions regarding whether DOE could participate in or otherwise support certain Department of Defense (DOD) studies and options assessments for defeating hardened and deeply buried targets. This provision removes any uncertainty and expressly allows DOE to assist the DOD with a review of these targets and the options for defeating such targets. The committee believes that DOE should provide information and all other assistance required to help DOD make informed decisions on whether: (1) to proceed with a new method of defeating hardened and deeply buried targets and; (2) to seek any necessary modifications to existing law.

The committee is concerned that the ability to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets will continue to be a significant challenge for the foreseeable future.

SUBTITLE D—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Annual report of the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff on combatant command requirements (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 153(d)(1) to require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to include within his report to Congress on the readiness requirements of the combatant commanders, information on the extent to which those requirements are addressed in the future years defense program.

Joint Requirements Oversight Council (sec. 1022)

The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) was formed by the Department of Defense (DOD) after enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. At the request of DOD, title 10, U.S. Code was amended by the National Defense Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 105–85) to establish a legal requirement for the JROC (title 10, U.S. Code, 181). The JROC was formed to assist the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS),in carrying out his title 10 responsibilities to provide the best possible advice to the Secretary on the degree to which defense budget proposals conform to requirements expressed by the combatant commanders, and to ensure that joint war fighting capabilities and joint interoperability issues were highlighted to the Secretary as he prepared his defense budget guidance. Accordingly, the JROC became a mechanism for forging consensus among the services on programming and budgeting issues.

While the JROC has made progress in promoting joint interoperability, much remains to be done. In recent years, the JROC has been increasingly involved in solving short-term unified commander requirements. At an April 4, 2000 Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on joint requirements, capabilities, and experimentation, General Richard B. Myers, USAF, the Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified that the JROC must evolve further, shifting its focus to more strategic, future advanced war fighting requirements. To implement required changes in the JROC, the CJCS, with the support of the service chiefs and the combatant commanders has proposed an initiative, which includes: (1) shifting the primary focus of the JROC to more strategic issues; (2) integrating joint experimentation activities fully into the requirements, capabilities, and acquisition processes; and (3) shifting the focus of the Joint War Fighting Capability Assessment Teams from short-term, narrow issues to directly supporting the JROC in analyzing broader, future joint war fighting requirements.

The committee is encouraged by this initiative and will follow it closely. However, the committee is troubled to hear concerns from combatant commanders about continuing deficiencies in joint military capabilities. A JROC process that recommends solutions to the most critical joint war fighting challenges at the strategic and oper-

ational levels could play a critical role in solving many of these problems.

In order to monitor developments in this area, the committee directs the CJCS to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by February 28, 2001, and semi-annually thereafter, detailing the progress made in reforming and re-focusing the Joint Requirements Oversight Council process. The report must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following: (1) a listing and justification for each of the distinct capability areas selected by the CJCS as the principal domain of the JROC; (2) a listing of joint requirements developed, considered, and/or approved within each of those capability areas; (3) a listing and explanation of decisions made by the JROC during the reporting period, with special note of actions made that were in disagreement with the position presented by the Commander-in- Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command, as the chief proponent of joint and combatant commander requirements; (4) an assessment of the progress made in elevating the JROC to a more strategic focus on future war fighting requirements, integration of requirements, and the development of overarching common architectures; (5) a summation and assessment of the role and impact of joint experimentation on the joint requirements, service requirements, defense acquisition and service acquisition processes and decisions; (6) recommendations as to additional legislation and/or resources required to further refocus and reform the JROC process; and (7) procedural actions taken to improve the JROC.

Preparedness of military installation first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1023)

The committee is supportive of the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to ensure first responder preparedness on military installations. However, the committee is concerned with the timetable for the program and also with the degree of coordination between the services and the local community first responders, particularly with regards to standardized equipment. The committee has included a provision directing, not less than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary of Defense to submit to the committee a report on the Department's program to ensure the preparedness of DOD first responders for incidents involving weapons of mass destruction on military installations. The provision directs the Secretary to include within the report the following: a detailed description of the program; the schedule and costs associated with the implementation of the program; how the program is being coordinated with first responders in the local communities in the localities of the installations; and the plan for promoting the interoperability of the equipment used by the installation first responders with the equipment used by the first responders in the localities.

Date of submittal of reports on shortfalls in equipment procurement and military construction for reserve components in future years defense programs (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 10543(c) of title 10, United States Code, to specify that the report required by the section be submitted not later than 15 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for a fiscal year.

The committee is aware that the current level of funding for the reserve components will not reduce the significant backlog in military construction requirements. The impact will be increased costs for repair and maintenance, declining readiness and quality of life. The backlog problem is further aggravated by the lack of a uniform standard in characterizing the funding requirements. For the past several years, the Air Force has characterized some reserve component military construction projects as being in the "unfunded" future years defense program (FYDP), while the other components have resorted to other means to identify their requirements above those in the FYDP. However, the reporting requirement in section 10543 requires the Department of Defense to identify the highest priority unfunded requirements for the reserve components. It does not equate those unfunded requirements to an "unfunded FYDP". The committee expects the military departments to adhere to the traditional practices of classifying projects as either in the FYDP or not in the FYDP and of inclusion of the highest priority projects in the FYDP. To ensure consistency and that the highest priority construction projects, both unfunded and those in the FYDP, receive appropriate congressional consideration for additional funds, when available, the report required by section 10543(c)(1) shall reflect the highest priority projects whether or not they are included in the FYDP.

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs to increase funding and improve facilities for the reserve components through innovative approaches, such as joint use facilities. However, the ultimate solution is additional funding. The committee urges the military departments to more robustly fund reserve component construction in future budget requests and the future year defense program.

To ensure the funding resources available are devoted to the highest priority needs, the committee stringently follows the criteria established by the sense of the Senate provision on authorization of funds for military construction projects not requested in the President's Annual Budget Request (section 2856 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995). The committee urges the military departments to cooperate in this effort by adhering to this clear standard when identifying military construction projects for authorization that are not in the military construction budget request.

Management review of defense logistics agency (sec. 1025)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of all the functions of the Defense Logistics Agency to assess their efficiency, their effectiveness in meeting customer needs, their ability

to adopt best business practices, and to identify alternative approaches for improving the agency's operations.

An effective, efficient, and responsive logistics system is essential for ensuring a ready and reliable military force capable of successfully executing the national military strategy with a minimum of risk. The committee believes that the Defense Logistics Agency must be capable of meeting its customer requirements in the most efficient manner, exploiting best business practices where practical, and exploring alternative approaches when they make sense.

Management review of defense information systems agency (sec. 1026)

The Committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of the operations of the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) and make such recommendations that the Comptroller General determines would improve the support that this agency provides to the military services.

The increased role that information technology and services play in the national security environment requires that the military services receive the most efficient and effective support from those who provide these services. DISA, as the principal supplier of information services in the Department of Defense, must ensure that it is structured to take advantage of best business practices and to adopt alternative approaches where it makes sense.

SUBTITLE E—INFORMATION SECURITY

Institute for defense computer security and information protection (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an institute for defense computer security and information assurance to address the critical information assurance requirement of the Department of Defense (DOD). The institute would also facilitate the exchange of information regarding cyber threats, technology, tools, and other relevant issues, between government and non-government organizations and entities. The provision would require the Secretary to enter into a contract with a not-for-profit entity or consortium to organize and operate the institute. Finally, the provision would require the use of competitive procedures for the selection of the organization responsible for the operation of the institute, to the extent determined necessary by the Secretary. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for establishment and initial operation of the institute.

The committee strongly supports the information assurance efforts of the DOD. A critical element of this effort is research and development in the area of information and network security. Although the DOD currently undertakes such research in various ways, including through private contractors, federally funded research and development centers and universities, the DOD does not have a central mechanism for coordinating these efforts. Currently a significant amount of research relevant to DOD is not being undertaken in the private sector or within government.

Moreover, some research being done in the private sector is not available to the DOD.

Information security scholarship program (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish an Information Security Scholarship Program within the Department of Defense (DOD) that would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide educational assistance to individuals seeking a baccalaureate or an advanced degree in disciplines related to computer security, network security, and information assurance in exchange for a service agreement. This program would allow active duty military personnel, DOD civilian personnel, and individuals not employed by the DOD to acquire such education in exchange for accepting or continuing employment in the DOD in the area of computer security and information assurance. The committee has received extensive testimony and other reports regarding the importance of education and training to the defense information assurance program and all other facets of cyber security.

The committee notes that Presidential Decision Directive/NSC–63, of May 22, 1998, regarding critical infrastructure protection, states that: "...there shall be Vulnerability Awareness and Education Programs within both the government and the private sector to sensitize people regarding the importance of security and to train them in security standards, particularly regarding cyber systems." The National Plan for Information Systems Protection of January 12, 2000, states that: "...within the Federal Government, the lack of skilled information systems security personnel amounts to a crisis. This shortfall of workers reflects a scarcity of university graduate and undergraduate information security programs." The National Plan calls for the creation of "...a Scholarship for Service Program to recruit and educate the next generation of Federal information technology workers and security managers." According to the National Plan: "...an important part of this program is the need to identify universities for participation in the program and assist in the development of information security faculty and laboratories at these universities."

The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should work with selected universities to develop cyber security curricula that respond to the needs of the DOD. The committee believes that, initially, the Secretary should focus on establishing cyber security programs at two or three institutions of higher education. Such universities should become important sources of recruitment for satisfying the Department's information assurance personnel requirements. Although the committee believes that all qualified universities should be evaluated, it also believes that the universities already identified by the National Security Agency as information assurance centers of excellence should be leading candidates for involvement in the Information Security Scholarship Program. In order for universities to develop the requisite curricula and faculty, the DOD should also involve such universities in research relevant to the Department's information assurance needs. Once the Information Security Scholarship Program has been established at two or three institutions of higher education, the committee urges the Secretary to expand and adequately fund the program to satisfy the personnel needs of the DOD.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for establishment and initial operation of the Information Security Scholarship Program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2001, describing the Secretary's plans for implementing this program.

The committee is also concerned that existing military and civilian education and training programs of the DOD and the military departments are not sufficiently focused on the problem of computer security and information assurance. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the education and training programs of the defense agencies and the military departments to determine the requirements for personnel qualified in the area of information technology security and what education and training programs are available in the area of information technology security. In addition to the review of programs for enlisted and officer personnel, this examination should include a review of the Reserve Officers Training Corps scholarship program in each service to determine whether scholarships leading to degrees in the information technology security area are sufficient to meet the projected officer needs of the military departments and the Department of Defense. The review shall include education and training programs, including internships, for civilian employees as well. Finally, the review shall evaluate the adequacy of cyber security programs at the military service academies. The Secretary of Defense shall report the results of his review to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2001, in conjunction with the Secretary's report on the Information Security Scholarship Program.

Process for prioritizing background investigations for security clearances for Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1043)

The committee is concerned by delays in the background investigation process for granting security clearances to Department of Defense (DOD) personnel and contractors. The Defense Security Service (DSS) has experienced significant delays in processing requests for security investigations, which has resulted in a large backlog of overdue reinvestigations. This situation has imposed significant costs on DOD and its contractors and has delayed important programs. The committee supports the recommendations of the DOD Inspector General, outlined in the April 5, 2000, audit report (Report Number D- 2000–111), which recommends that DOD implement a process for prioritizing security clearance investigations as a way of expediting the most important clearances. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process for expediting the completion of background investigations. This process shall include: (1) quantification of the requirements for background investigations; (2) categorization of personnel on the basis of the degree of sensitivity of their duties and the extent to which those duties are critical to the national security; and (3) prioritization of the processing of investigations on the basis of the categories of personnel.

Authority to withhold certain sensitive information from public disclosure (sec. 1044)

The committee recommends a provision that would protect from unauthorized disclosure two categories of sensitive unclassified information. Many allied and other friendly nations, and some international organizations, have a category of unclassified information that is subject to certain special controls and protected from release outside the government or organization. In addition, many governments have a category of classified information, "restricted", that is not used by the United States. "Restricted" information is normally provided at a level of protection less than that protection afforded to "confidential" in the U.S. classification system.

Information falling into one of these categories is frequently provided to the United States by foreign governments or international organizations under the condition that it be protected from unauthorized release. Under the present U.S. system, the only way that the United States can do so is to classify the information in the interests of national security under Executive Order 12958. This requires that the security requirements for classified information apply, including security clearances, safes, and precautions in transmission. This situation frequently imposes unnecessary costs and has caused problems for cooperative defense programs.

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard when not operating in the Navy), and the Secretary of Energy (with respect to that Department's national security programs) to withhold from public disclosure otherwise authorized by law sensitive information provided by a foreign government or an international organization which is itself protecting the information from disclosure. The information must be the subject of a written request from the government or organization that it be withheld, or have been provided on the condition that it be withheld, or fall within a category specified in regulations as being information the release of which would have an adverse effect on the ability of the United States to obtain similar information in the future. If the secretary of the department having the information transfers it to another agency, that agency shall withhold it from disclosure unless specifically authorized by the secretary of the department transferring it. The prohibition on disclosure will normally extend for the period specified by the country or organization providing the information, or for ten years if no period is so stated. The ten-year rule may be extended at the written request of the entity providing the information, as may the 25–year period applicable to certain information obtained by the United States prior to the enactment of this provision.

This provision does not authorize the withholding of information from Congress, or (except in the case of foreign intelligence or counterintelligence activities) the Comptroller General. The Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Energy are to prescribe regulations to carry out this provision.

Protection of operational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to withhold from public disclosure the oper-

ational files of the Defense Intelligence Agency. These files would be protected from disclosure, under the Freedom of Information Act or otherwise, to the same extent as provided for under section 701 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C 431). The provision also makes applicable to these files the decennial review provisions of section 702 of that Act (50 U.S.C. 432), with the Secretary of Defense exercising the authority granted to the Director of Central Intelligence in that section.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would request the President to issue a proclamation commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which was enacted May 5, 1950, and call upon the Department of Defense, the armed forces, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to commemorate the occasion in a suitable manner.

Eligibility of dependents of American Red Cross employees for enrollment in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools in Puerto Rico (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit dependents of American Red Cross employees performing Armed Forces Emergency Services duties in Puerto Rico to enroll in Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Schools. The recommended provision would require that the Department of Defense be reimbursed for the education services.

Grants to American Red Cross for Armed Services Emergency Services (sec. 1054)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a grant to the American Red Cross up to $9,400,000 in each of fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003 in support of the American Red Cross. The recommended provision would provide that a grant may not be made until the American Red Cross certifies that it will expend, for the Armed Forces Emergency Services, an amount from non-federal sources that equals or exceeds the amount of the grant.

Transit pass program for certain Department of Defense personnel (sec. 1055)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide Department of Defense personnel with a transit pass benefit if they are assigned in areas that do not meet the revised national ambient air quality standards under section 109 of the Clean Air Act and they use means other than a single-occupancy vehicle to commute to or from work.

Fees for providing historical information to the public (sec. 1056)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to charge the public fees for

providing historical information from the services' historical centers or agencies. These fees could be retained by the military departments to defray the costs of responding to requests for information. The fees charged for providing information pursuant to this section may not exceed the costs of providing the information. These fees would not apply to requests from members of the armed forces or federal employees which are made in the course of their official duties, or to requests made under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

Access to criminal history record information for national security purposes (sec. 1057)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, to provide expanded access to criminal history information by the Department of Defense and certain other executive departments and agencies to better evaluate employees and contractors with regard to fitness for assignment or employment. Current law provides access to such information only for security clearances or assignment to sensitive national security duties. This provision would expand that authority to cover also acceptance or retention in the armed forces, and appointment, retention, or assignment to a position of public trust or a critical or sensitive position either while employed by the Federal Government or as a federal contractor employee. This provision would also authorize the Federal Government to obtain such information through the use of common identifiers, such as names or Social Security numbers, rather than the cumbersome submission of paper fingerprint cards, as required under existing law. It would further prohibit states and localities from conditioning the provision of such information on indemnification agreements, thereby clearing up a problem that has existed since 1989, when the Defense Department's authority to enter into such agreements expired. Finally, it would allow access to such information by the most efficient, technologically-advanced means, from any point within or without a particular state or other jurisdiction, and provide for the payment of reasonable fees therefor.

Sense of Congress on the naming of the CVN–77 aircraft carrier. (sec. 1058)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that it is appropriate to recommend to the President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, that an appropriate name for the final Nimitz-class aircraft carrier, CVN–77, is the U.S.S. Lexington.

The provision also expresses the sense of Congress that CVN- 77 should be named U.S.S. Lexington in order to honor the 16 million veterans of the armed forces that served during World War II, and the incalculable number of U.S. citizens on the home front during that war, who mobilized in the name of freedom, and who are today respectfully referred to as the greatest generation.

Donation of civil war cannon (sec. 1059)

The committee recommends a provision that would convey all right, title and interest of the United States to a Civil War era can-

non to the Edward Dorr Tracey, Jr. Camp 18 of the Sons of the Confederate Veterans. This cannon was manufactured by the Confederate States Arsenal at Macon, Georgia. The cannon, on loan from the Army, is currently on public display in Macon, Georgia.

Maximum size of parcel posts transported overseas for Armed Forces Post Offices (sec. 1060)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the authorized size of packages permitted to be mailed to eligible patrons of military post offices overseas to conform with those of the United States Postal Services.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Department of Defense export control procedures

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's focus on improving the performance of its export control responsibilities and supports efforts to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the defense export licensing system. National security concerns must always remain paramount over commercial concerns in this area. At the same time, where appropriate, the United States should not place unnecessary restraints on the ability of the private sector to compete in the global marketplace.

The Defense Department has undertaken an internal review of its practices for processing and scrutinizing export licence applications with an aim toward reducing the time it takes to review licences. The committee supports this effort and encourages the Department to work with the State Department to achieve a system that protects national security, and at the same time does not unnecessarily penalize U.S. industry.

The committee also supports the Department's efforts to modernize computer systems for licensing agencies. This computer modernization is important to ensure that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the State Department's Office of Defense Trade Controls can move, over time, to an all-electronic system. This effort will provide more efficient and comprehensive review of the national security impact of proposed export transactions while providing exporters with a more transparent and timely process.

Firefighting equipment

An important element of the chemical weapons demilitarization program is ensuring that the local cities and towns within the vicinity of destruction facilities receive the necessary education, training, and equipment to ensure community safety in the unlikely event of an accident during the destruction process. The Department of the Army has equipped the Umatilla Army Chemical Depot with firefighting vehicles, including an Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper, for this purpose. To ensure the Umatilla community has continued and unhindered access to the Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper, the Department of the Army is working with the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation to convey the firefighting vehicle to the community. The committee supports this initiative and urges the Department of the

Army to transfer the vehicle to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Tribes as soon as possible.

Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile

Section 1302 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, as amended by section 1501 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, prohibits the use of funds for retiring or dismantling, or preparing to retire or dismantle specified strategic nuclear delivery systems, including the Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missile, until the START II Treaty enters into force. Although the START II Treaty has been approved by the Russian Duma, it has not yet entered into force. Nevertheless, the committee recognizes that the Air Force must take certain steps to be in a position to be able to retire the Peacekeeper system if the START II Treaty, and associated protocols, enter into force. Specifically, the committee understands that the Air Force would need to acquire warhead containers and missile stage storage end rings in the near future if the Air Force is to retain the ability to deactivate the Peacekeeper weapon system by December 31, 2003, and eliminate the associated silos by December 31, 2007. Since the committee has long supported entry into force of the START II Treaty, the committee believes that the acquisition of such equipment is consistent with the current prohibition on preparing to retire or dismantle the Peacekeeper weapon system. Therefore, funds available to the Air Force from within existing appropriations are authorized to be utilized for the acquisition of Peacekeeper warhead containers and missile stage storage end rings.

TITLE XI-DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL POLICY

Computer/electronic accommodations program (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to expand the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program to provide assistive technology, assistive technology devices, and assistive technology services to any department or agency of the Federal Government. The recommended provision limits the cost of the assistance provided to not more than $2.0 million in any fiscal year.

Additional special pay for foreign language proficiency beneficial for United States national security interests (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide additional pay for civilian employees who maintain a foreign language proficiency determined to be beneficial for national security interests.

Increased number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase, by 25, the number of positions authorized for the defense intelligence senior executive service. The committee is concerned by recent reports that the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) and the National Security Agency (NSA) are experiencing significant problems in the area of acquisition and acquisition oversight. Both agencies are seeking to strengthen their acquisition management and need to be able to attract skilled people. The committee expects that the recommended provision would help NIMA and NSA attract such individuals. The committee directs that the additional 25 positions established by the provision would be used by NIMA and NSA only to address acquisition-related deficiencies.

Extension of authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the termination date of the authority for tuition reimbursement and training for acquisition personnel in shortage categories from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2010.

Work safety demonstration program (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a work safety demonstration program in which private sector work safety models would be used to determine whether the work safety record of Department of De-

fense civilian employees can be improved. The demonstration program would begin within 180 days of enactment of the Act and end on September 30, 2002. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit an interim report not later than December 1, 2001 and a final report not later than December 1, 2002, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Employment and compensation of employees for temporary organizations established by law or executive order (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the heads of federal agencies the flexibility to hire and pay individuals under a streamlined process to work in temporary organizations, commissions, boards, etc. that have been established for a period not to exceed three years. The recommended provision would permit federal agencies to hire temporary employees in a timely manner so they can meet the deadlines imposed by the President or Congress. The recommended provision would permit the temporary employees to receive life and health insurance benefits for the duration of their employment. Employees transferred to a temporary position from a career civil service position would have return rights to their former positions at the end of their employment with the temporary organization.

Extension of authority for voluntary separations in reductions in force (sec. 1107)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2005, the temporary authority that would permit civilian employees to volunteer for reductions-in-force.

Electronic maintenance of performance appraisal systems (sec. 1108)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the head of an executive branch agency to administer and maintain the performance appraisal system electronically.

Approval authority for cash awards in excess of $10,000 (sec. 1109)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to grant a cash award up to the maximum of $25,000 without seeking approval from the Office of Personnel Management.

Leave for crews of certain vessels (sec. 1110)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Military Sealift Command to pay civil service mariners, in an extended leave status, a lump-sum equal to the difference between their pay at a temporary promotion rate and their lower permanent grade rates.

Life insurance for emergency essential Department of Defense employees (sec. 1111)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize civilian employees designated by the Secretary of Defense as emergency essential and subject to being deployed to combat areas to elect to participate in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance program.

Civilian personnel services public-private competition pilot program (sec. 1112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a public-private competition pilot program to assess the extent to which the effectiveness and efficiency of providing civilian personnel services could be increased by conducting competitions for the performance of such services between the public and private sectors. The recommended provision would require that the pilot program be conducted during the period beginning on October 1, 2000 and ending on December 31, 2004. The Secretary of Defense would be required to submit, not later than February 1, 2005, a report that would assess the value of the pilot program and make recommendations for permanent authority to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Extension, expansion, and revision of authority for experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1113)

The committee recommends a provision to extend, expand, and revise the authority for the experimental personnel program for scientific and technical personnel established pursuant to section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999(Public Law 105–261). Section 1101 authorized the Secretary of Defense to appoint up to 20 eminent experts in science and engineering to temporary employment positions within the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) without regard to existing civil service laws concerning appointment and compensation.

The committee recognizes that DARPA expects to fill all 20 authorized positions in the near future and would benefit greatly from the expansion of the program. The committee is also aware that the defense laboratories would benefit from similar access to capable scientists and engineers from outside the civil service. For these reasons, the provision recommended by the committee would increase the number of positions authorized for DARPA from 20 to 40 and expand the program to the defense laboratories, authorizing an additional 40 positions for each of the military services and a total of ten additional positions for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) and National Security Agency (NSA). The provision would extend the program for an additional two years and clarify that the maximum pay authorized under the provision is intended to include locality pay adjustments.

TITLE XII-MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Transfers of naval vessels to foreign countries (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer to various countries: on a combined lease-sale basis, four Kidd- class destroyers; on a grant basis, two Thomaston-class dock landing ships; on a grant basis, four Garcia-class frigates; on a combined lease-sale basis, two Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates; on a grant basis, one Dixie-class destroyer tender; on a grant basis, two Knox-class frigates; and, on a combined lease- sale basis, two Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates. The Chief of Naval Operations has certified, pursuant to statutory requirement, that such naval vessels are not essential to the defense of the United States. Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with these transfers would be charged to the recipient. The provision would also:

(1) direct that, to the maximum extent possible, the Secretary of the Navy shall require, as a condition of transfer, that repair and refurbishment associated with the transfer be accomplished in a shipyard located in the United States; and

(2) stipulate that the authority to transfer these vessels will expire at the end of a two-year period that begins on the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that extends, for one year, the Department of Defense's authority to support United Nations(UN)-sponsored inspection and monitoring efforts to ensure full Iraqi compliance with its international obligations to destroy its weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems. The committee is troubled by Iraq's long-standing suspension of UN inspection and monitoring missions, and continued defiance of UN Security Council efforts to resume weapons inspections. Despite the December 17, 1999 adoption by the UN Security Council of Resolution 1284, which established the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) as the successor to the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM), Iraq refuses to comply with this resolution and allow inspectors to resume operations in Iraq. The committee continues to believe that it is imperative that inspections of Iraq weapons sites resume as soon as possible to ensure Iraqi compliance with the disarmament obligations it accepted in 1991 at the end of the Persian Gulf conflict.

Repeal of restriction preventing cooperative airlift support through acquisition and cross servicing agreements (sec.1203)

The committee recommends a provision to eliminate the restriction in section 2350c of title 10, United States Code, that allows the Secretary of Defense to enter into military airlift agreements with allied countries only under the authority of section 2350c. This provision would clear up any ambiguity regarding the Secretary's authority to include airlift in cross servicing agreements for "...logistics support, supplies, and services..." under the authority of section 2342, title 10, United States Code.

Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training (sec. 1204)

The U.S. Army School of the Americas has been subjected to a great deal of controversy, mainly for the actions of a relatively small number of individuals who were graduated from the school many years ago. The committee is aware that the school's curricula has undergone significant positive changes in recent years. The committee believes that there continues to be a need for an institution that would provide professional education and training for the military, law enforcement and civilian (governmental and non-governmental) personnel of the Western Hemisphere.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the statute authorizing the Army to operate the U.S. Army School of the Americas and would authorize the Secretary of Defense to operate a Western Hemisphere Institute for Professional Education and Training. The institute would be operated for the purpose of providing professional education and training to military, law enforcement and civilian personnel of the Western Hemisphere in areas such as leadership development, counterdrug operations, peace support operations, and disaster relief. The curricula of the institution would include, at a minimum, eight hours of instruction relating to human rights, the rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society. There would be a board of visitors, including four members of Congress and six members from academia, the religious community, and the human rights community, to review the institute's curricula and instruction. The board would submit an annual report to the Secretary of Defense. The selection of foreign personnel to attend the institute would be subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of Defense would submit an annual report to Congress detailing the activities of the institute during the previous calendar year.

Biannual report on Kosovo peacekeeping (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a biannual report from the President on the contributions of European nations and organizations to the peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. Specifically, each report shall include detailed information on the commitments and pledges made by the European Commission, the member nations of the European Union (EU) and the European member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) for reconstruction assistance in Kosovo, humanitarian as-

sistance in Kosovo, the Kosovo Consolidated Budget, police (including special police) for the United Nations (UN) international police force for Kosovo, and military personnel for peacekeeping operations in Kosovo; the amount of assistance that has been provided in each category, and the number of police and military personnel deployed to Kosovo by each such nation or organization. In addition, each report shall include a description of the full range of commitments and responsibilities undertaken for Kosovo by the UN, the EU and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the progress made by each in fulfilling those commitments and responsibilities, an assessment of the remaining tasks and an anticipated timetable for completing those tasks. The first report is to be provided to the relevant congressional committees on December 1, 2000.

The committee is concerned with the slow pace of the civil implementation effort in Kosovo and, in particular, with the unsatisfactory progress on the part of European nations and organizations to provide, in a timely manner, the assistance and personnel they have pledged to Kosovo. The committee notes that the United States bore the major share of the military burden for the air war on behalf of Kosovo; in return, European nations agreed to pay the major share of the burdens to secure the peace. Although European nations and organizations have pledged billions of dollars and thousands of personnel for this goal, only a fraction of the assistance has been provided to Kosovo. As a result, U.S. troops, and troops of other nations, serving in Kosovo are performing non-military missions—such as basic police functions—to make up for the shortfalls on the civilian side. These are missions for which military personnel were not specifically trained and which increase their personal risk. The committee believes that more must be done by the international organizations that have accepted the responsibilities for the civil implementation efforts in Kosovo, and by the European nations that have committed to provide a major portion of the assistance, to ensure that the economic and security infrastructure is put in place in Kosovo to avoid an open-ended U.S. military commitment in Kosovo.

The report required by this provision will provide the Congress with the data necessary to evaluate the performance of the organizations and nations covered by this provision in fulfilling their commitments regarding Kosovo.

Mutual assistance for monitoring test explosions of nuclear devices (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Secretary of Defense to remedy problems that may arise with respect to the installation of nuclear test explosion monitoring equipment as part of the International Monitoring System (IMS) of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty or as part of the United States Atomic Energy Detection System. Without this provision, the Department of Defense would be prohibited from accepting funds directly from an international organization to establish, operate, or maintain IMS equipment, owned by the U.S. Government, and to maintain equipment that is not the property of the U.S. Government.

Consolidated annual report on Cooperative Threat Reduction assistance and activities (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate the information found in several Cooperative Threat Reduction reports into one annual report, thereby reducing the number of reports the committee receives each year, but maintaining the information the committee values. This new, consolidated annual report would be due no later than the first Monday in February, with the first report due in February 2002.

Limitation on use of funds for construction of a Russian facility for the destruction of chemical weapons (sec. 1208)

The budget request included $35.0 million for construction activities for the Shchuch'ye Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility in Russia as part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. While the committee recommends the requested amount, the committee has concerns about the construction of this facility. The committee believes that there may be higher priority CTR efforts to reduce the threat posed by chemical weapons in Russia that will provide a greater security return on investment, such as security improvements and maintenance for the seven Russian chemical weapons storage sites, completion and maintenance of the CTR-funded mobile central analytical laboratory, and expansion of the chemical weapons production facility destruction efforts at Volgograd and Novocheboksark.

However, after reviewing the administration's concerns regarding the threats posed by the nerve agent stockpile at Shchuch'ye, the committee recommends a provision that would provide conditional authority for the administration to proceed with the construction of this facility. Specifically, the provision provides that prior to obligating or expending fiscal year 2000 funds, or any funds in subsequent fiscal years, the Secretary of Defense must provide in writing to both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees a certification that: (1) the government of the Russian Federation has annually agreed to provide at least $25.0 million for the construction support and operation of that facility to destroy chemical weapons and for the support and maintenance of the facility for that purpose for each year of the entire operating life-cycle of the facility; (2) the government of the Russian Federation has agreed to utilize the facility to destroy the remaining four stockpiles of nerve agents located at Kisner, Pochep, Leonidovka, and Maradykovsky; (3) the United States has obtained multiyear commitments from governments of other countries to donate funds for the support of essential social infrastructure projects in sufficient amounts to ensure that the projects are maintained during the entire operating life-cycle of the facility; and (4) Russia has agreed to destroy its chemical weapons production facilities at Volgograd and Novocheboksark.

Limitation on the use of funds for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program (sec. 1209)

The request included $32.1 million for the Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium Program as part of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program. While the committee supports the re-

quest, the committee is troubled by the Russian Federation's announcement in February 2000 that due to increasing costs, Russia wanted to change the approach selected for converting its remaining three plutonium producing nuclear reactors. Since that time, meetings between the United States and Russia have failed to determine the future direction of the this program. Because of these circumstances, the committee is concerned that the project will be unable to expend its budget request during the fiscal year.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision prohibiting the obligation of more than 50 percent of the funds provided for this program until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense reports to the committee on an agreement between the U.S. Government and the Government of the Russia Federation regarding any new option selected for shutting down or converting the three Russian plutonium producing reactors. Any such agreement should include the new date on which such reactors will stop producing weapons grade plutonium and the cost sharing arrangement between the United States and Russia in undertaking activities under such an agreement.

TITLE XIII—NAVY ACTIVITIES ON THE ISLAND OF VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO

Navy activities on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico (secs. 1301–1308)

The committee remains concerned with the lack of live fire access to the Naval training facility on the island of Vieques, Puerto Rico, and the resultant negative consequences this has for Navy and Marine Corps readiness. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff along with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated that Vieques provides integrated live-fire training "critical to our readiness." The Secretary of the Navy also testified that "* * * only by providing this preparation can we fairly ask our service members to put their lives at risk." The concern of these individuals was reinforced by operational commanders, including the Commander of the Sixth Fleet of the Navy, who stated that the loss of Vieques would "cost American lives."

The committee recognizes and appreciates the sacrifice that the people of Vieques and other communities throughout America located near military training installations have made over the years to ensure that our military personnel are adequately prepared before being sent into harm's way. The committee is concerned that as a result of the Navy's failure to take those actions necessary to develop sound relations with the people of Vieques, and the tragic accident which resulted in the death of a civilian employee of the Navy, the future of such training is in jeopardy.

Therefore, the committee includes a number of provisions that would support the agreement reached between the Department of Defense and the Government of Puerto Rico intended to restore relations between the people of Vieques and the Navy, and provide for the continuation of live fire training on the island.

Specifically, subtitle 13 would authorize the expenditure of $40.0 million for infrastructure and other economic projects on the island of Vieques, and require the President to conduct a referendum on Vieques to determine whether the people of Vieques approve or disapprove of the continuation of Naval training on the island. The conservation zones on the western side of the island, containing seven endangered and threatened species, would be transferred to the Secretary of Interior to be administered as wildlife refuges.

If the people of Vieques approve the continuation of live fire training, the subtitle would authorize an additional $50.0 million in economic aid for the island residents.

If the people of Vieques do not approve the continuation of live fire training, the subtitle would require the Navy and Marine Corps to cease all training operations on the island of Vieques by May 1, 2003; to terminate any operations at Roosevelt Roads that are related to the use of training ranges on Vieques; and the trans-

fer of all conservation zones on Navy property on the eastern side of the island of Vieques, together with the live impact area and other Navy property on the eastern side of the island, to the Secretary of the Interior until such time as the Congress enacts subsequent legislation regarding the disposition of that land.

If the Navy ceases operations on Vieques and reduces its presence on Roosevelt Roads, the subtitle would place a moratorium on military construction projects at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico, until such time as it can be determined if the active military units at Fort Buchanan can be consolidated on Roosevelt Roads with the remaining Naval units. The Comptroller General of the United States will be required to conduct a review of the continuing requirement for Fort Buchanan and provide the congressional defense committees with a report outlining his recommendations regarding the potential consolidation of active U.S. Army units in Puerto Rico with the Navy at Roosevelt Roads.

DIVISION B-MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
Military Construction, Army	897,938	(116,859)	781,079
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	63,949	817,371
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	232,522	763,491
Military Construction, Defense-wide	784,753	(98,420)	686,333
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	122,499	181,629
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	111,627	161,806
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	10,784	92,497
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	16,103	21,988	38,091
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	17,822	32,673
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369
NATO Infrastructure	190,000	0	190,000
Total Military Construction	4,553,427	365,912	4,919,339
FAMILY HOUSING			
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	56,200	218,306
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	(19,911)	958,364
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	362,822	24,052	386,874
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	882,638	(1,071)	881,567
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	23,664	247,147
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	(18,846)	807,425
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	44,886	0	44,886
Total Family Housing	3,480,481	64,088	3,544,569

* *Reflects projects previously authorized in PL 106-65 (Fiscal Year 2000, Defense Authorization Act)*

** *Reflects reduction of FOLs proposed in the FY 00 Congressional Emergency Supplemental*

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Space & Missile Def Command Building	23,400		23,400
2	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	OTS Academic Fac	3,825		3,825
3	Alabama	Army National Guard	Redstone Arsenal	Patriot UTES&DS Maintenance Shop		8,083	8,083
4	Alabama	Air National Guard	Dothan AGS	Combat Communications Squadron Fac		11,000	11,000
5	Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Central Vehicle Wash Fac	3,000		3,000
6	Alaska	Air Force	Cape Romanzof Radar Site	Generator Fuel Storage	3,900		3,900
7	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Hazardous Material Storage	1,450		1,450
8	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Dormitory (120 RM)	14,540		14,540
9	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Joint Mobility Complex		25,000	25,000
10	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Child Development Center		7,666	7,666
11	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	15,920		15,920
12	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	11,600		11,600
13	Alaska	Navy Reserve	Anchorage	Marine Corps Reserve Training Center	6,403		6,403
14	Alaska	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement (Phase 2)	44,000		44,000
15	Alaska	Air National Guard	Kulis ANGB	Corrosion Control Fac		12,000	12,000
16	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Field Operations Fac	1,250		1,250
17	Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Combat Aircraft Loading Apron	8,200		8,200
18	Arizona	Navy	NAVDET Camp Navajo	Magazine Modernization	2,940		2,940
19	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Physical Fitness Center	7,900		7,900
20	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Chemical Defense Qualification Fac****	15,500	(12,908)	2,592
21	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 5)	43,600		43,600
22	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squadron Ops/AMU	7,960		7,960
23	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Easement "Blackjack Drop Zone"		1,259	1,259
24	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Fitness Center	9,100		9,100
25	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Fort Smith MAP	Fire Training Fac	1,760		1,760
26	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Fort Smith MAP	Operations and Training Fac		7,200	7,200
27	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Barracks Complex - North	31,000		31,000
28	California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Urban Assault Course	2,100		2,100
29	California	Navy	MCAS Miramar	Ground Combat Training Range	7,350		7,350
30	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Infantry Squadron Battle Course	4,000		4,000
31	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Armor/Anti-Armor Tracking Range	4,100		4,100

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
32	California	Navy	NADEP North Island	Component Repair Clean Room Fac	4,340		4,340
33	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	8,260		8,260
34	California	Navy	NAS North Island	Berthing Wharf (Phase 2)	12,800		12,800
35	California	Navy	NAVSTA San Diego	Berthing Pier (Phase 1)	35,700		35,700
36	California	Navy	NAWCWD Point Mugu	ADAL Range Ops Ctr	11,400		11,400
37	California	Navy	NF San Clemente	Aircraft Operations Building	8,860		8,860
38	California	Navy	NSWSES Port Hueneme	Weapon Combat Systems Integration Lab	10,200		10,200
39	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Control Tower		6,299	6,299
40	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Water Treatment Plant & Distribution Line	3,800		3,800
41	California	Air Force	Los Angeles AFB	Fitness Center	6,580		6,580
42	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	4,650		4,650
43	California	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP North Island	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,900		5,900
44	California	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP TwentyNine Palms	Fuel Storage Fac	2,200		2,200
45	California	Special Ops Cmd	NAB Coronado	SOF Applied Instruction Fac	4,300		4,300
46	California	Special Ops Cmd	NAS North Island	SOF Small Craft Berthing Fac	1,350		1,350
47	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Edwards AFB	Med Clinic Replacement/Dental Clinic Alter	17,900		17,900
48	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Fleet Hospital Ops & Trg Cmd Support Fac	2,900		2,900
49	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Horno)	3,950		3,950
50	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Med/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Pulgas)	3,750		3,750
51	California	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	MCB Camp Pendleton	Med/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Flores)	3,550		3,550
52	California	Army National Guard	Bakersfield	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	(1,380)	-
53	California	Army National Guard	Camp Parks	Organizational Maintenance Shop		6,062	6,062
54	California	Army National Guard	Colton	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
55	California	Army National Guard	Escondido	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	(1,380)	-
56	California	Army National Guard	Fresno (Shields Avenue)	Organizational Maintenance Shop		2,847	2,847
57	California	Army National Guard	Fresno	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	(1,869)	-
58	California	Army National Guard	Los Alamitos AFRC	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
59	California	Army National Guard	Richmond	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	(489)	-
60	California	Army National Guard	San Jose	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	(1,869)	-
61	California	Army National Guard	San Mateo	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461	(461)	-
62	California	Army National Guard	Santa Barbara	Organizational Maintenance Shop	483	(483)	-

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
63	California	Navy Reserve	NAS Alameda	Seawall	950		950
64	Colorado	Army	Pueblo Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 2)	10,700		10,700
65	Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Add to and Alter Athletic Facilities	18,960		18,960
66	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	SBIRS Power Connection	2,750		2,750
67	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Computer Network Defense Fac		6,826	6,826
68	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Operations Support Fac	2,260		2,260
69	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	11,000		11,000
70	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Add to Operational Support Fac	8,450		8,450
71	Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Replace Ammunition Maintenance Stor Fac		6,000	6,000
72	Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Drydock Support Fac	3,100		3,100
73	Connecticut	Air National Guard	Orange	Air Control Squadron Complex		12,000	12,000
74	Delaware	Army National Guard	Smyrna	Readiness Center		7,020	7,020
75	Dist of Columbia	Navy	MC Barracks	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	17,197		17,197
76	Dist of Columbia	Navy	NAVDIST Washington	Navy Museum Annex	2,450		2,450
77	Dist of Columbia	Navy	NRL Washington	Nano Science Research Lab	[12,390}		[12,390]
78	Dist of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Child Development Center	4,520		4,520
79	Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field Milton	JPATS T-6A GSE/Aircraft Paint Fac	3,900		3,900
80	Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field Milton	JPATS T-6A Operations Maintenance Fac	1,230		1,230
81	Florida	Navy	NSWC Ft Lauderdale	Seawall & Ship Berthing Fac	3,570		3,570
82	Florida	Navy	Panama City CSS	Amphibious Warfare Integration Fac		9,960	9,960
83	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Upgrade Dormitory (72 RM)	5,600		5,600
84	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Precision Guided Munit Maint Fac	3,340		3,340
85	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Upgrade Access Roads	5,600		5,600
86	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Defense Access Road	2,360		2,360
87	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	DEOMI Fac	12,970		12,970
88	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Operations Fac	6,800		6,800
89	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Maintenance Fac	18,500		18,500
90	Florida	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP MacDill AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	16,956		16,956
91	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Corrosion Control Fac	8,100		8,100
92	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Air Field Readiness Improvements	3,000		3,000
93	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Hot Cargo Pad	7,354		7,354

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
94	Florida	Special Ops Cmd	Eglin Aux Field 9	SOF Age Maintenance/Dispatch Complex	4,750		4,750
95	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Eglin AFB	Hospital ADAL/Life Safety Upgrade	37,600		37,600
96	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Patrick AFB	Medical Clinic	2,700		2,700
97	Florida	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Tyndall AFB	Medical Clinic Addition/Alteration	7,700		7,700
98	Florida	Army Reserve	Orlando	Add/Alter AFR Ctr/OMS/Storage	17,953		17,953
99	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Barracks Complex - Kelley Hill (Phase 3 B)****	24,000	(24,000)	-
100	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	15,800		15,800
101	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks - Hunter AAF(Phase 1C)****	26,000	(26,000)	-
102	Georgia	Navy	MCLB Albany	Renovate Vehicle Storage Fac	1,100		1,100
103	Georgia	Navy	TRIREFITFAC Kings Bay	Sand Blasting/Paint Fac	5,200		5,200
104	Georgia	Air Force	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Air Support Operations Squadron Fac	4,920		4,920
105	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Dormitory		8,818	8,818
106	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Water Treatment Plant	2,500		2,500
107	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Airmen Dining Hall		4,095	4,095
108	Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Munitions Maint and Training Complex	8,500		8,500
109	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters (Phase 1)		5,970	5,970
110	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Fitness Center Expansion	2,650		2,650
111	Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Training Building Addition	1,769		1,769
112	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFB	C-130 Assault Strip	6,032		6,032
113	Hawaii	Army	Pohakuloa Training Facility	Saddle Access Road (Phase 1)		12,000	12,000
114	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks - Wilson Street (Phase 1B)****	46,400	(24,000)	22,400
115	Hawaii	Army	Wheeler AAF	Barracks Complex	43,800		43,800
116	Hawaii	Navy	Camp Smith	CINCPAC Headquarters (Phase 2)	35,600		35,600
117	Hawaii	Navy	FISC Pearl Harbor	Wharf Upgrade	12,000		12,000
118	Hawaii	Navy	NAVUWEC Lualualei	Consolidated Fleet Test Support Fac	2,100		2,100
119	Hawaii	Navy	MCB Kaneohe	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,400		18,400
120	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Relocate Seal Delivery Vehicle Team	14,200		14,200
121	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,500		16,500
122	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Sewer Main (Ford Island)		6,900	6,900
123	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	4,620		4,620
124	Hawaii	Army National Guard	Maui	Readiness Center		11,592	11,592

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
125	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Enhanced Training Range, Idaho (Phase 3)	10,125		10,125
126	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	37,000		37,000
127	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Recruit Barracks	37,700		37,700
128	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Replace RTC Drill Hall	11,700		11,700
129	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Physical Training Fac	35,000		35,000
130	Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Munitions Storage/Land Acquisition	3,830		3,830
131	Illinois	Air National Guard	Scott AFB	KC-135 Simulator Fac	1,500		1,500
132	Illinois	Air Force Reserve	Scott AFB	Support Group Training Fac		6,912	6,912
133	Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 3)	54,400		54,400
134	Indiana	Army National Guard	Delphi	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,563		1,563
135	Indiana	Army National Guard	Elkhart	Organizational Maintenance Shop	2,322		2,322
136	Indiana	Army National Guard	Logansport	Organizational Maintenance Shop	739		739
137	Indiana	Army National Guard	Plymouth	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951		951
138	Indiana	Army National Guard	South Bend	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951		951
139	Indiana	Navy Reserve	MCRC Grissom AFB	Reserve Center		4,730	4,730
140	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Barracks - Infantry Drive (Phase 1C)****	15,000	(5,000)	10,000
141	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Advanced Waste Water Treatment Fac		22,000	22,000
142	Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Install Approach Lighting System		2,100	2,100
143	Kansas	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP McConnell AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	11,000		11,000
144	Kansas	Army National Guard	Kansas City	Organizational Maintenance Shop	641		641
145	Kansas	Air National Guard	McConnell AFB	B-1 Power Check Pad		1,550	1,550
146	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Spt (Phase 2)	8,500		8,500
147	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks - Market Garden Rd (Phase 2C)****	9,400	(9,400)	-
148	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Multi-Purpose Digital Tng Range (Phase 3)****	8,450	(7,850)	600
149	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Flight Simulator Fac	5,400		5,400
150	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Tactical Equipment Complex	6,400		6,400
151	Kentucky	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Campbell	SOF Equipment Maintenance Complex	4,500		4,500
152	Kentucky	Army National Guard	Fort Knox	MATES (Phase 1A)		3,929	3,929
153	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	B-52H Fuel Cell Maintenance Dock		14,074	14,074
154	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	6,390		6,390
155	Louisiana	Army Reserve	Fort Polk	ADAL USAR Ctr/OMS/Equip Conc Site	9,912		9,912

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
156	Louisiana	Army Reserve	New Orleans	USAR Center/OMS/Unheated Storage	10,375		10,375
157	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans	Warehouse Addition for Admin Support	800		800
158	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans	Air Passenger Terminal	590		590
159	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NSA New Orleans	Physical Fitness/Recreational Area		1,670	1,670
160	Maine	Navy	NAS Brunswick	Aircraft De-Ice/Rinse Fac	2,450		2,450
161	Maine	Navy	NSY Portsmouth	Standardize Waterfront Crane Rail System		4,960	4,960
162	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 3)	45,700		45,700
163	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Munitions Assessment/Processing Sys Fac	3,100		3,100
164	Maryland	Army	Fort Meade	Replace Barracks		19,000	19,000
165	Maryland	Navy	Nav Ord Tech Ctr Indian Hd	EOD Equipment Support Fac	6,430		6,430
166	Maryland	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Patuxent River	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	8,300		8,300
167	Maryland	Nat Security Agency	Fort Meade	Route 32	3,459		3,459
168	Maryland	Nat Security Agency	Fort Meade	Critical Utility Control (Phase 2)	769		769
169	Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Renovate Acq Mgmt Fac (Phase 2)		17,851	17,851
170	Michigan	Army National Guard	Augusta	Organizational Maintenance Shop		3,600	3,600
171	Michigan	Army National Guard	Lansing	Combined Maintenance Shop (Phase 1)		22,743	22,743
172	Michigan	Army National Guard	Midland	Organizational Maintenance Shop	3,600	(3,600)	-
173	Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena County RAP	Replace Operations and Training Fac	4,500		4,500
174	Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANGB	Upgrade Runway		18,000	18,000
175	Minnesota	Army National Guard	Mankato	Readiness Center	4,681		4,681
176	Mississippi	Navy	NAS Meridian	T-45 Aircraft Support Fac	4,700		4,700
177	Mississippi	Navy	NAS Meridian	Control Tower and Beacon Tower		1,530	1,530
178	Mississippi	Navy	NOO Stennis Space Center	Warfighting Support Center		6,950	6,950
179	Mississippi	Air Force	Columbus AFB	Corrosion Control Fac		4,828	4,828
180	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Technical Training Fac	15,040		15,040
181	Mississippi	Air National Guard	Jackson IAP	C-17 Corrosion Control/Maintenance Hangar	10,500	2,300	12,800
182	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Basic Training Complex (Phase 1 A)	38,600		38,600
183	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Conventional Munitions Storage Igloos	4,150		4,150
184	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Munitions Assembly Area	7,900		7,900
185	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Minute Man III Missile Maintenance Fac	5,300		5,300
186	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Convert Commercial Gate		3,517	3,517

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
187	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Helicopter Operations Fac		2,362	2,362
188	Montana	Army National Guard	Havre	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461		461
189	Montana	Army National Guard	Kalispell	Organizational Maintenance Shop	493		493
190	Montana	Army National Guard	Libby	Organizational Maintenance Shop	463		463
191	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station		9,765	9,765
192	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Gering	Organizational Maintenance Shop	657		657
193	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Mead	Organizational Maintenance Shop	714		714
194	Nebraska	Army National Guard	North Platte	Organizational Maintenance Shop	508		508
195	Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	Corrosion Control Hanger		6,280	6,280
196	Nevada	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP NAS Fallon	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	5,000		5,000
197	Nevada	Army National Guard	Carson City	USP&FO Administrative Building		4,472	4,472
198	Nevada	Air National Guard	Reno	Fuel Storage Complex		5,000	5,000
199	New Hampshire	Air National Guard	Pease Int Trade Port	Replace Medical Training Fac		4,000	4,000
200	New Hampshire	Army Reserve	Rochester	Land Acquisition	980		980
201	New Jersey	Navy	NWS Earle	Recreation Center	2,420		2,420
202	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Fitness Center	9,772		9,772
203	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Fort Dix	OES Barracks Upgrade		9,975	9,975
204	New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Control Tower		4,934	4,934
205	New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB	Repair Bonito Pipeline		18,380	18,380
206	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Replace Airfield Pavement (Phase 2)		7,352	7,352
207	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Consolidated Soldier Support Ctr (Phase 2)****	10,300	(10,300)	-
208	New York	Army	USMA West Point	Cadet Physical Dev Ctr (Phase 2A)****	13,600	(13,600)	-
209	New York	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Fort Drum	Veterinary Treatment Fac	1,400		1,400
210	New York	Army National Guard	Hancock Field (ANG)	Readiness Center	5,376		5,376
211	New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara ARS	Visiting Airmen Quarters (Phase 1)		6,881	6,881
212	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Butner Road (Phase 1)	26,000		26,000
213	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks - Tagaytay Street (Phase 2 B)****	38,600	(35,492)	3,108
214	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks - Longstreet Road (Phase 1)	45,600		45,600
215	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Ammunition Holding Area	12,600		12,600
216	North Carolina	Army	Sunny Point Army Term	Railroad Equipment Maintenance Fac	2,300		2,300
217	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Aircraft Hangar Improvements	8,480		8,480

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
218	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Control Tower	2,600		2,600
219	North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Aircraft Rinse Fac	800		800
220	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	14,300		14,300
221	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Amphibious Ops/Maint Storage Complex	9,500		9,500
222	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Child Development Center	4,420		4,420
223	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Armories	[14,000]		[14,000]
223	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Armories	10,000		10,000
224	North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Operations/Maintenance Storage Fac	3,650		3,650
225	North Carolina	Navy	NADEP Cherry Point	Aircraft Stripping Fac Addition	7,540		7,540
226	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Dangerous Cargo Pads	24,570		24,570
227	North Carolina	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Cherry Point	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,700		5,700
228	North Carolina	Special Ops Cmd	Fort Bragg	SOF Media Operations Complex	8,600		8,600
229	North Carolina	Def Education Activity	MCB Camp LeJeune	Russell Elementary School	5,914		5,914
230	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Fort Bragg	Military Educational Fac (Phase 1)	8,709		8,709
231	North Dakota	Army National Guard	Wahpeton	Armed Forces Readiness Center		10,960	10,960
232	Ohio	Army	Columbus	Military Entrance Processing Station	1,832		1,832
233	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace West Ramp (Phase 1)	22,600		22,600
234	Ohio	Navy Reserve	NMCRC Rickenbacker	Relocation and Consolidation of Facilities		7,080	7,080
235	Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Tactical Equipment Shop (Phase 2)		10,100	10,100
236	Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	C-17 Cargo Compartment Trainer		2,939	2,939
237	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Depot Corrosion Control Strip Fac	12,380		12,380
238	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	5,800		5,800
239	Oklahoma	Air Force	Vance AFB	Maintenance Hanger		10,504	10,504
240	Oklahoma	Army National Guard	Sand Springs	Armed Forces Reserve Center		13,530	13,530
241	Oregon	Army	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac (Phase 6)	9,400		9,400
242	Oregon	Army National Guard	Baker City	Readiness Center	3,122		3,122
243	Oregon	Navy Reserve	Portland IAP	Reserve Ctr Alter Vehicle Maintenance Fac	1,420		1,420
244	Pennsylvania	Army	Carlisle Barracks	Academic Research Fac	10,500		10,500
245	Pennsylvania	Army	New Cumberland AD	Military Entrance Processing Station	3,700		3,700
246	Pennsylvania	Def Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Replace Controlled Humidity Warehouse	13,000		13,000
247	Pennsylvania	Def Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Child Development Center	4,700		4,700

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
248	Pennsylvania	Air Force Reserve	Pittsburgh IAP	Combat Communications Fac		3,105	3,105
249	Pennsylvania	Air Force Reserve	Willow Grove ARS	Alter Hangar & Fire Suppression	2,400		2,400
250	Rhode Island	Navy	NUWC Division Newport	Shore Based Launch Fac	4,150		4,150
251	South Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Flightline Fire Safety Improvements	3,140		3,140
252	South Carolina	Navy	MCRD Parris Island	Field Training Complex	2,660		2,660
253	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Base Mobility Warehouse		9,449	9,449
254	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Add To Flight Simulator Fac	2,500		2,500
255	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Repair Runway, North Field		10,289	10,289
256	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	USCENTAF Ops Weather Squadron Fac	2,850		2,850
257	South Carolina	Def Education Activity	Laurel Bay	Laurel Bay Primary Classroom Addition	804		804
258	South Carolina	Army National Guard	Leesburg Training Center	Infrastructure Upgrades		5,682	5,682
259	South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Base Civil Engineer Complex (Phase 1)		10,290	10,290
260	Tennessee	Army National Guard	Henderson	Organizational Maint enance Shop (Phase 1)		1,976	1,976
261	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Railyard Infrastructure	26,000		26,000
262	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Railhead Fac (Phase 3)	9,800		9,800
263	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase 1)	16,000		16,000
264	Texas	Army	Red River Army Depot	Ammunition Container Complex	800		800
265	Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	Aircraft Parking Apron	[2,670]		[2670]
266	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Realistic Bomber Training Initiative	12,175		12,175
267	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Fitness Center		12,813	12,813
268	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	5,500		5,500
269	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Child Development Center		4,830	4,830
270	Texas	Air National Guard	Ellington Field	Base Supply Complex		10,000	10,000
271	Texas	Army Reserve	Camp Bullis	USAR Center/Unheated Storage	1,464		1,464
272	Texas	Army Reserve	Fort Sam Houston	USAR Center/OMS/Equip Concentration Site	13,678		13,678
273	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	C-130 Corrosion Control Fac (WCF)	16,500		16,500
274	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Dormitory		11,550	11,550
275	Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	10,300		10,300
276	Vermont	Air National Guard	Burlington IAP	Aircraft Maintenance Complex		9,300	9,300
277	Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Aircraft Maint Instructional Building		4,450	4,450
278	Virginia	Navy	AEGIS CSC Wallops Is	Spy 1-D T&E Fac Addition	3,300		3,300

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
279	Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	Physical Training Fac	8,590		8,590
280	Virginia	Navy	NAB Little Creek	Waterfront Ops Fac	2,830		2,830
281	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	13,300		13,300
282	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	11,800		11,800
283	Virginia	Navy	NAS Norfolk	Taxiway Extension & Lights	6,350		6,350
284	Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	Airfield Improvements	5,250		5,250
285	Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Pier Enhancements	4,700		4,700
286	Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Innovative Technology & Infrastructure	11,300		11,300
287	Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Joint Warfare Analysis Center		19,400	19,400
288	Virginia	Navy	NSY Norflolk, Portsmouth	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,100		16,100
289	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	7,470		7,470
290	Virginia	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Oceana	Replace Fuel Storage Tank	2,000		2,000
291	Virginia	Def Logistics Agency	DSC Richmond	Emergency Services Fac	4,500		4,500
292	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	Classified	Unit Training Fac		2,303	2,303
293	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	FCTC Dam Neck	Operational Support Fac	5,500		5,500
294	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	NAB Little Creek	SOF Air Operations Fac	5,400		5,400
295	Virginia	Special Ops Cmd	NAS Oceana	SOF Operations Support Fac	3,400		3,400
296	Virginia	Army National Guard	Richlands	Organizational Maint enance Shop		1,175	1,175
297	Virginia	Army Reserve	Fort A.P. Hill	USAR Ctr/OMS/Area Maint Support Activity	4,275		4,275
298	Washington	Navy	NAVSUBASE Bangor	Strategic Security Support Fac		4,600	4,600
299	Washington	Navy	NS Everett	Aquatic Combat Training Fac		5,500	5,500
300	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Oily Wastewater Collection	6,600		6,600
301	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Pier Replacement (Phase 1)	38,000		38,000
302	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY Bremerton	Chemical Metallurgical Lab	9,400		9,400
303	Washington	Navy	Strat Wpns Fac Pac, Bremerton	Explosives Handling Wharf Modification	1,400		1,400
304	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Runway Centerline Lights		2,046	2,046
305	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Nose Docks	3,750		3,750
306	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/AMU	6,500		6,500
307	Washington	Army National Guard	Bremerton	Readiness Center	2,639	1,609	4,248
308	Washington	Army National Guard	Yakima Training Center	Readiness Center	5,104	1,418	6,522
309	Washington	Army Reserve	Tacoma	USAR Center/OMS/Area Maint Spt Act, Marine	14,759		14,759

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
310	West Virginia	Air National Guard	Yeager ANG	Upgrade Parking Apron and Taxiway		6,000	6,000
311	West Virginia	Navy Reserve	Eleanor	Reserve Center		2,500	2,500
312	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Minute Man III Missile Service Complex	15,520		15,520
313	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Command And Control Support Fac	10,200		10,200
314	Wyoming	Air Force	F E Warren AFB	Upgrade Storm Water Drainage System		10,394	10,394
315	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Fac	1,810		1,810
316	CONUS Various	Navy	CONUS Various	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and Dining Fac	11,500		11,500
317	Bahrain	Navy	ASU	Operations Center	19,400		19,400
318	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Fac	8,800	(8,800)	-
319	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	860	(860)	-
320	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Aruba	Sm Expeditionary Aircraft Maint Hangar/Apron	590	(590)	-
321	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	3,000	(3,000)	-
322	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Squadron Ops/AMU Unit/Storage	2,200	(2,200)	-
323	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Fac	29,500	(29,500)	-
324	Curacao/Aruba	Office Sec of Defense	Curacao	Aircraft Maint Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	9,200	(9,200)	-
325	Diego Garcia	Air Force	Diego Garcia	Munitions Storage Igloos	5,475		5,475
326	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Rescue Station	2,200	(2,200)	-
327	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Airmen Qts/Dining Fac	4,650	(4,650)	-
328	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	4,900	(4,900)	-
329	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Squadron Ops/AMU Unit/Storage	2,600	(2,600)	-
330	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Officer Quarters	1,600	(1,600)	-
331	Ecuador	Office Sec of Defense	Manta	Aircraft Maint Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	6,723	(6,723)	-
332	Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Barracks Complex - Warner 7005	7,800		7,800
333	Germany	Army	ASG Bamberg	Barracks Complex - Warner 7041	3,850		3,850
334	Germany	Army	ASG Darmstadt	Barracks Complex - Kelley 4164	5,600		5,600
335	Germany	Army	ASG Darmstadt	Barracks Complex - Cambrai Fritsch 4002	5,700		5,700
336	Germany	Army	Kaiserslautern	Child Development Center	3,400		3,400
337	Germany	Army	Mannheim	Barracks Complex - Coleman 2	4,050		4,050
338	Germany	DFAS	Kleber Kaserne	Renovate Administrative Fac	7,500		7,500
339	Germany	Def Education Activity	Hanau	Argonner Elementary School Classroom Add	1,026		1,026
340	Germany	Def Education Activity	Hohenfels	Middle/High School	13,774		13,774

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
341	Germany	Def Education Activity	Schweinfurt	Elementary School Addition	1,444		1,444
342	Germany	Def Education Activity	Wurtzburg	Elementary School Classroom Addition	1,798		1,798
343	Germany	Def Threat Red Agency	Darmstadt	Renovate Admin Fac	2,450		2,450
344	Germany	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Kitzingen	Health/Dental Clinic Life Safety Upgrade	1,400		1,400
345	Germany	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Wiesbaden AB	Health/Dental Clinic Addition/Alteration	7,187		7,187
346	Guam	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Andersen AFB	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	16,000		16,000
347	Guam	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Andersen AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	20,000		20,000
348	Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Community Facilities	[32,969]		[32,969]
348	Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Community Facilities	32,029		32,029
349	Italy	Navy	NSA Naples	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	15,000		15,000
350	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Dormitory (102 RM)	8,000		8,000
351	Italy	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Sigonella	Replace Bulk Fuel Storage Fac	16,300		16,300
352	Italy	Def Education Activity	Sigonella	Sigonella Elementary School/High School Add	971		971
353	Italy	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	NSA Naples	Medical Dental Fac Replacement	43,850		43,850
354	Japan	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP MCAS Iwakuni	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	22,400		22,400
355	Japan	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP Misawa Air Base	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	26,400		26,400
356	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Whole Barracks Renewal Complex	14,200		14,200
357	Korea	Army	Camp Page	Barracks Complex	19,500		19,500
358	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	6,400		6,400
359	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 RM)	11,348		11,348
360	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	10,600		10,600
361	Korea	Special Ops Cmd	Taegu	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Complex	1,450		1,450
362	Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein	Unaccompanied Personnel Hsg Renovation	18,000	(18,000)	-
363	Puerto Rico	Special Ops Cmd	Roosevelt Roads	SOF Boat Maintenance Fac	1,241		1,241
364	Spain	Air Force	NS Rota	Enhance Rota, Various Facilities	5,052		5,052
365	Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Fire Training Fac	1,000		1,000
366	United Kingdom	Def Logistics Agency	DFSP RAF Mildenhall	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	10,000		10,000
367	United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Feltwell	Feltwell Elementary School Classroom Add	1,287		1,287
368	United Kingdom	Def Education Activity	RAF Lakenheath	Lakenheath Elementary School Classroom Add	3,086		3,086
369	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	72,106	2,776	74,882
370	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000		15,000

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
371	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Classified Project	11,500		11,500
372	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation	22,600		22,600
373	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(635)	(635)
374	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,659		7,659
375	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	63,335	758	64,093
376	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(2,889)	(2,889)
377	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	54,237	17,292	71,529
378	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,850		9,850
379	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(15,000)	(15,000)
380	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,800		1,800
381	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,786		6,786
382	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (OSD)	2,900		2,900
383	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction (Defense Level)	3,000		3,000
384	Worldwide	Office Sec of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design (Defense Level)	24,000		24,000
385	Worldwide	Special Ops Cmd	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	3,790		3,790
386	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,694		3,694
387	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	14,729		14,729
388	Worldwide	BMDO	Unspecified Worldwide	NMD Initial Deployment Facilities	85,095		85,095
389	Worldwide	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
390	Worldwide	Defense Agencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(7,115)	(7,115)
391	Worldwide	Defense -Wide	NATO Sec Inv Prog	NATO Security Investment Program	190,000		190,000
392	Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,295	25,000	27,295
393	Worldwide	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,232	3,310	7,542
394	Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	9,119	7,277	16,396
395	Worldwide	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000		4,000
396	Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,917		1,917
397	Worldwide	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,400	809	7,209
398	Worldwide	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,521	38	1,559
399	Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,304	924	3,228
400	Worldwide	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,115		4,115
401	Worldwide	DFAS	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
402	Worldwide	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,196		6,196
403	Worldwide	Def Threat Red Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,600		2,600
404	Worldwide	Energy Cons Imp	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	33,570	(16,785)	16,785
405	Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	22,000		22,000
406	Worldwide	Tri-Care Mgmt Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
407	Worldwide	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment & Closure IV	1,174,369		1,174,369
408	Worldwide	Navy	Various Worldwide	Host Nation Infrastructure Support	142		142
			[xxxxxx] Authorization only				
			****Authorized for Appropriation in FY00 Authorization Act				
				Total	**4,553,427**	**365,912**	**4,919,339**

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
1	Alaska	Army	Fort Wainwright	Family Housing Revitalization (75units)		24,000	24,000
2	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Family Housing Replacement Const (110 Units)	16,224		16,224
3	California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Replacement Construction (79 Units)	13,923		13,923
4	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Replace Family Housing (160 Units)	27,768		27,768
5	Dist of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Military Family Housing (136 Units)	17,137		17,137
6	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Family Housing Replacement Const (72 Units)	15,500		15,500
7	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Hale Moku (98 Units)	22,230		22,230
8	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Radford Ter (112 Units)	23,654		23,654
9	Hawaii	Navy	CNB Pearl Harbor	Replace Family Housing, Pearl City (62 Units)	14,237		14,237
10	Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Replace Capehart South (84 Units)	21,910		21,910
11	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Family Housing Replacement Const (119 Units)		22,694	22,694
12	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Family Housing Replacement Const (56 Units)	7,800		7,800
13	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Family Housing Replacement Const (128 Units)		20,000	20,000
14	Maine	Navy	NAS Brunswick	Replace/New Enlisted Homes (168 Units)	18,722		18,722
15	Maryland	Army	Fort Detrick	Family Housing Replacement Const (48 Units)	5,600		5,600
16	Mississippi	Navy	NS Pascagoula	Family Housing (140 Units) ,Phase 1		21,605	21,605
17	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Family Housing Replacement Const (112 Units)	14,600		14,600
18	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune	Revitalize Family Housing (149 Units)		7,838	7,838
19	North Dakota	Air Force	Cavalier AFS	Construct Military Family Housing (2 Units)	443		443
20	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Military Family Housing (134 Units)	19,097		19,097
21	South Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	Family Housing New Construction (1 Unit)	250		250
22	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Family Housing Replacement Const (64 Units)	10,200		10,200
23	Texas	Army	Fort Sam Houston	Replace Family Housing (80Units)		10,000	10,000
24	Washington	Navy	NAS Whidbey Island	Replace/New Family Housing (98 Units)	16,873		16,873
25	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Family Housing New Construction (60 Units)	21,800		21,800
26	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	6,542	2,200	8,742
27	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvement	63,590		63,590
28	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,374		44,374
29	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	198,101		198,101
30	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payment	1		1
31	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	397,792		397,792

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
32	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	202,011		202,011
33	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	855		855
34	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	90,286		90,286
35	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	44,855		44,855
36	Worldwide	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(19,911)	(19,911)
37	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	183,547		183,547
38	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	19,958		19,958
39	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(5,391)	(5,391)
40	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,239		1,239
41	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	71		71
42	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	165,057		165,057
43	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	30,884		30,884
44	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	142,690		142,690
45	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	393,830		393,830
46	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	84,914		84,914
47	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	63,953		63,953
48	Worldwide	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(1,071)	(1,071)
49	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	174,046		174,046
50	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning	12,760	970	13,730
51	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	27,997		27,997
52	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,332		2,332
53	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	158,959		158,959
54	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	55,685		55,685
55	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	34		34
56	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	114,628		114,628
57	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	428,456		428,456
58	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	38,180		38,180
59	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Prior Years Unobligated Funds		(6,615)	(6,615)
60	Worldwide	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Fluctuation		(12,231)	(12,231)
61	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,564		3,564
62	Worldwide	Defense Intell Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	25,924		25,924

Fiscal Year 2001 Authorization of Appropriations for Military Construction

(Dollars in Thousands)

Item	Location	Service/Agency	Installation	Project Title	Request	Change	Recommend
63	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	271		271
64	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	421		421
65	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	77		77
66	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	316		316
67	Worldwide	Def Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	22		22
68	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	12,554		12,554
69	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	653		653
70	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	415		415
71	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	146		146
72	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	444		444
73	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	15		15
74	Worldwide	Nat Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	64		64
				Total	**3,480,481**	**64,088**	**3,544,569**
				Grand Total	**8,033,908**	**430,000**	**8,463,908**

FY 2001 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Air Force: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 2001

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Texas	Fort Sam Houston	Defense Reutilization and Marketing Organization Complex	12,800
		Total Air Force-BRAC IV Construction	**12,800**

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Summary

The Army requested authorization of $897,938,000 for military construction and $1,140,381,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $781,079,000 for military construction and $1,176,670,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The budget request included 10 military construction projects which were authorized for appropriation by division B of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. Since these projects required no additional authorization, the committee did not authorize $168.5 million based on the prior year authorization. The committee also did not authorize $18.0 million for the renovation of unaccompanied personnel barracks at Kwajalein Atoll based on the fact that the majority of the beneficiaries were not military personnel.

The amounts authorized for military construction reflects a reduction of $20.5 million based on savings in the foreign currency account. The reduction shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXI of this bill.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2001.

Improvement to military family housing units (sec. 2103)

This section would authorize improvements to existing family housing units for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101(a)of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 825) to reduce the funding authorization for Fort Stewart, Georgia, from $71.7 million to $25.7 million due to a technical correction. The provision would also strike the funding authorization for Fort Riley, Kansas, due to a technical correction. The provision would also increase the authorization of appropriations for unspecified minor construction from $9.5 million to $14.6 million and make certain conforming changes.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 1999 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101(a)of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2182) to increase the funding authorization of a barracks project at Fort Riley, Kansas, from $41.0 million to $44.5 million and the Railhead Facility at Fort Hood, Texas, from $32.5 million to $45.3 million. The provision would also make certain technical corrections.

Modification of authority to carry out fiscal year 1998 project (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2101 (a) of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (division B of Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2185)to increase the funding authorization of a barracks project at Hunter Army Airfield, Fort Stewart, Georgia, from $54.0 million to $57.5 million. The provision would also make certain technical corrections.

Authority to accept funds for realignment of certain military construction project, Fort Campbell, Kentucky (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept funds from the Federal Highway Administration or the State of Kentucky to fund the additional costs associated with the realignment of a rail connector military construction at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, authorized in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–210; 110 Stat. 2763). The provision would authorize the Secretary to use the funds received under this authority in addition to the funds authorized and appropriated for the rail connector project. The provision would also specify that the costs associated with realignment include, but are not limited to, redesign costs, additional construction costs, additional costs due to construction delays related to the realignment, and additional real estate costs.

Other Items of Interest

Presidio Housing, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California

The committee notes that base closures in the San Francisco Bay Area have severely reduced the availability of government housing for military families and that the lack of housing in proximity to the duty stations of service personnel impacts on readiness and the quality of life of uniform personnel. The committee further notes that the Army and the Presidio Trust have reached an interim accord on the use of 22 designated housing units at the Presidio through September 2005. Although this agreement will mitigate the near-term housing crisis, it only postpones a problem that must have a long-term solution. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Presidio Trust to develop a long-term agreement on the use of the 22 units by military families. The agreement should provide that the reimbursement for the housing will be no more than the basic allowance for housing. The Secretary shall report on the status of the negotiations to the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 15, 2001. The report shall include the issues relating to the 22 houses, including the rank and grade of senior occupant of each house, the position taken by the Presidio, the cost of alternative housing, and the replacement value of the 22 houses.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Summary

The Navy requested authorization of $753,422,000 for military construction and $1,245,460,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $817,371,000 for military construction and $1,268,441,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect reductions of $3.9 million based on saving in the foreign currency account, $5.3 million to be offset by prior year unobligated funds. The reductions shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXII of this bill.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2001.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

Correction in authorized use of funds, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1997 military construction project at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. The provision would permit the use of previously authorized funds to carry out a military construction project involving infrastructure development at that installation.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Summary

The Air Force requested authorization of $530,969,000 for military construction and $1,049,754,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $763,491,000 for military construction and $1,054,572,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect reductions of $12.0 million based on savings in the foreign currency account and $15.0 million to be offset by prior year unobligated funds. The reductions shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXIII of this bill.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2001.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Summary

The Defense Agencies requested authorization of $784,753,000 for military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $689,333,000 for military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing or fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends a reduction of $76.8 million for the construction of forward operating locations in Ecuador and Curacao/Aruba. The committee takes this action without prejudice and is aware that the funds for these military construction projects will be funded in a supplemental appropriations bill. The amounts authorized for military construction and family housing reflect a reduction of $7.1 million based on savings in the foreign currency account. The reduction shall not cancel any military construction authorized by title XXIV of this bill.

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

This section contains the list of authorized Defense Agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2001. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Defense Agencies budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also would provide an overall limit on the amount the Defense Agencies may spend on military construction projects.

Other Items of Interest

Certification of requirement for military construction projects, Manta Air Base, Ecuador

The budget request included $22.7 million for construction projects at Manta Air Base, Ecuador. The number of projects and funding level is based on the requirement that the facilities would support two E–3s, two KC–135s, three P–3s, three ARL, and one Senior Scout (C–130) missions and accompanying personnel. The committee directs that funds available for construction of large aer-

ial surveillance aircraft related facilities at Manta Air Base, Ecuador, not be obligated until the Secretary of Defense submits a report directed elsewhere in this bill on the demonstration of the Global Hawk HAE UAV in airborne surveillance role in the counter-drug effort.

The committee further directs that the construction of the visiting officers quarters and visiting airmen quarters and dining facility not be executed until the Secretary of Defense certifies that sufficient aircraft are scheduled to operate out of the Manta Airfield on a routine basis to ensure the construction of these facilities is justified.

Planning and design, Defense Intelligence Agency

The budget request included $6,786,000 for the planning and design for Defense Intelligence Agency. The committee is aware of the urgent need to consolidate and relocate the Defense Intelligence Agency activities to a more secure location. The committee supports the Department of Defense plans for a new Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters and directs the Secretary of Defense to expedite the planning and design.

TITLE XXV-NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of $190,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends $190,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

This section would authorize appropriations of $190,000,000 for the contribution of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program.

TITLE XXVI-GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested a military construction authorization of $221,976,000 for fiscal year 2001 for National Guard and Reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2001 of $506,696,000 to be distributed, as follows:

Army National Guard	$181,629,000
Air National Guard	$161,806,000
Army Reserve	$92,497,000
Air Force Reserve	$32,673,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	$38,091,000
Total	$506,696,000

Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the National Guard and Reserve by service component for fiscal year 2001. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Other Items of Interest

Support for Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams

The committee included $25.0 million in the authorization of appropriation for the Army National Guard military construction account for the specific purpose of facilitating the activation of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams. Although these teams are to be assigned to locations that have the facilities to accommodate their needs, the committee understands that the Army National Guard has identified a requirement of approximately $31.0 million for renovation of the facilities to accommodate these teams. The committee is aware that the military construction program for the reserve components is underfunded and that this requirement would place an additional burden on an already constrained Army National Guard military construction program. The committee recommends this additional funding be provided on a one time basis and directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on the expenditure of these funds not later than October 1, 2001.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2701)

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and National Guard and Reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2004, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2003, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1998 projects (sec. 2702)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1998 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2001, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2002, whichever is later.

Extensions of authorizations of certain fiscal year 1997 projects (sec. 2703)

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1997 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2001, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2002, whichever is later.

Effective date (sec. 2704)

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Joint use military construction projects (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, when preparing the fiscal year defense budget request, should identify military construction projects suitable for joint use, specify in the budget request joint use military construction projects, and give priority to joint use military construction projects. The provision would also direct the Secretary to include in the budget request a certification by each secretary concerned that the service screened each construction project in the budget request for the feasibility for joint use. The provision would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than September 30 of each year, a report that included the number of military construction projects evaluated for joint use construction, when the project could be executed, and a list of the military construction projects determined to be feasible for joint use. The provision would also make certain conforming changes.

Exclusion of certain costs from determination of applicability of limitation on use of funds for improvement of family housing (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2825 (b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretary concerned to exclude certain costs from the counting against the limitation for housing improvement. The specific costs that would be excluded are the installation, maintenance and repair of communications, security or anti-terrorism equipment required by the occupant in the performance of his duties. The provision would also exclude the cost of repairing or replacing the exterior of the unit or units if such repair or replacement is necessary to meet historic preservation standards.

The committee directs that whenever the secretary concerned exercises this authority, the secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees and wait 30 days prior to executing any project for which the exemptions apply. The report should include a description of the project, its purpose, and cost.

Replacement of limitations on space by pay grade of military family housing with requirement for local comparability of military family housing (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the limitation on space-by-grade requirement for family housing construction.

The provision would authorize the secretary concerned to construct family housing units that are consistent with similar housing units constructed in the local area. The provision would also direct the secretary concerned to include the net square area when requesting the authorization for construction of military family housing units.

The committee expects the secretary concerned to continue reporting as part of the military construction project data (DD1391) the net square area of each type family housing unit proposed for construction.

Modification of lease authority for high-cost military family housing (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2828 (b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the $60,000 per year cap on the lease of an individual housing unit and to authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into leases for eight housing units in the Miami area for no more than five years. The provision would further amend section 2828 (b) to authorize the Secretary concerned to adjust the maximum cost authorized for family housing leases based on the percentage that the national average monthly cost of housing differ during the two preceding fiscal years. The provision would authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the maximum amount of the eight family housing unit leases in the Miami area by the percent the annual average cost of housing for the Miami Military Housing Area exceeds the annual average cost for the same region for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year.

Applicability of competitive policy to alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Subchapter IV of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned use competitive procedures when exercising the alternative authorities for the acquisition and improvement of military housing. The Secretary concerned could waive competitive procedures if he determines competition would be inconsistent with public interest and notifies the Congress in writing of such determination not less than 30 days before entering the agreement.

Provisions of utilities and services under alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2806)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2872 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries to provide utilities and services to privatized housing units located on a military installation on a reimbursable basis. The payments received for such services would be credited to the appropriate account or working capital fund from which the cost of furnishing the utilities and services was paid.

Extension of alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing (sec. 2807)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2885 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to enter a contract for military housing privatization until February 10, 2004.

Inclusion of readiness center in definition of armory for purposes of construction of reserve components facilities (sec. 2808)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 18232(3) of title 10, United States Code, to equate the term Readiness Center to the term Armory. The provision would also make certain conforming changes.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Increase in threshold for reports to Congress on real property transactions (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the reporting threshold to congressional defense committees for real property transactions from $200,000 to $500,000.

Enhancements to military lease authority (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretary concerned to lease facilities that are under the control of that department and that are not excess to the needs of that department. The secretary concerned would be authorized to accept as compensation for the leases, either payment in-kind or cash. The provision would clarify that in-kind consideration may be applied at any military installation and that it may take the following forms: maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration of any property; construction of new facilities for the department; provision of facilities for use by the department; base operating support services; and other services related to the activity that will occur on the leased property, as the secretary considers appropriate. In the instances where the payment in-kind payment is the construction or provision of new facilities with a value in excess of $500,000, the secretary would not be authorized to enter the lease until 30 days after the date on which a report on the facts of the lease is submitted to the congressional defense committees. The provision would further authorize the secretary concerned to use cash proceeds from leases for maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvements or restoration of property or facilities, construction or acquisition of new facilities, lease facilities, and facilities support. At least 50 percent of the cash payment received would be available for use only at the military installation at which the property is located. The provision would authorize the secretary concerned to construct or acquire facilities in excess of $500,000 only after he submits a report on the facts of the construction or acquisition of such facilities to the congressional defense commit-

tees and waits 30 days. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than March 15 of each year, a report to the congressional defense committees providing an accounting of the rental receipts and a detailed explanation of all leases and amendments to existing leases. The provision would also authorize the secretary concerned to indemnify the leasee from any claim for personal injury or property damage, that results from the release of hazardous substance, pollutants or contaminants, petroleum, or unexploded ordnance as a result of Defense activities on the military installation at which the leased property is located.

Expansion of procedures for selection of conveyees under authority to convey utility systems (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2688(b) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the secretary concerned may use procedures other than competitive procedures only under the circumstances specified in section 2304 (c) through (f) of title 10, United States Code.

The committee believes that maximizing competition in the privatization of utility systems within the Department of Defense is essential to ensuring that the military receives the most efficient and effective service and to ensuring taxpayers derive the maximum value from the government's previous investment in these systems. However, the committee is concerned that the Department may be inadvertently creating barriers to competition. Specifically, the committee believes that the Department may not be giving potential offerors enough time to respond to its requests for proposals. This particularly affects the utilities required to obtain permission from their regulators in order to form teams or partnerships to respond to the Department's requirements. Providing insufficient time for regulated entities, therefore, has the effect of limiting competition. The Department should examine and adjust its existing timetables to ensure that potential competitors have adequate time to respond. Additionally, the committee believes that the Department's efforts to bundle systems or installations into a single solicitation for a large region may exclude entities that are only qualified to provide one type of service, or are limited to operating within a specific geographical area. The committee believes the Department should structure its solicitations in a way that allows interested entities to bid on parts of that which is being offered, as well as the entire package, thereby ensuring that all have a fair chance in the competition.

While the committee supports the Department's competitive privatization efforts, it believes that the Department must be mindful of the impacts of these efforts upon public safety and the public interest in assuming a safe and effective network of utility systems among multiple users. The Department should take steps, either through reliance upon existing public utility regulatory mechanisms or through careful contract provisions and service oversight of privatization contracts, to protect public interests both within and without base installation boundaries. Further, the Department should consider the cost of protecting these public interests in the decision to privatize. Finally, the committee applauds the Department's efforts to work with industry, in particular the two-day,

Utility Privatization Industry Forum. The committee directs the Department to build on that effort by taking action to eliminate barriers to full competition.

SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Scope of agreements to transfer property to redevelopment authorities without consideration under the base closure laws (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2905(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) and section 204(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure Realignment Act (title II of Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) to clarify that the seven-year period to account for the proceeds from any sale or lease of property received by the redevelopment authority begins at the date of the initial transfer of property.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Part I—Army Conveyances

Land conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, as public benefit, if qualified, or at fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 752 acres, including improvements thereon, and known as the Charles Melvin Price Support Center to the Tri-City Regional Port District of Granite City, Illinois, for the development of a port facility and for other public purposes. The property authorized for conveyance may include 158 military family housing units, but only if the Port Authority agrees to accord priority use to members of the armed services for the lease of the housing. The Secretary may include personal property of the Army at the Charles Melvin Price Support Center that the Secretary of Transportation recommends is appropriate for the development or operation of the port facility, and that the Secretary of the Army agrees is excess to the needs of the Army. The provision would authorize the Secretary to provide for an interim lease of the property to the Port District until such time it is conveyed by deed. As compensation for the interim lease, the Secretary may accept payment in-kind at less than fair market value if the Secretary determines that it is in the public interest.

The provision would also authorize the Secretary to retain part of the parcel, not to exceed 50 acres, for the development of an Army Reserve Center. When the Secretary determines the acreage is no longer required, the Secretary shall transfer the acreage to the Port District. In determining the location of the Army Reserve Center, the Secretary shall consider its impact on the Port District's use of the remainder of the property.

The provision would further authorize the Secretary of the Army to require the Port District to lease to the Department of Defense

or any other Federal Agency facilities. Any lease under this authority shall be made under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary and the Port District. The agency leasing the facility shall provide for maintenance of the facility, as required by all Federal, State, and local laws and ordinances. At the end of the lease, the property would revert to the Port Authority. As a further condition of conveyance, the Port District would grant the Secretary of the Army an easement on the property conveyed to permit the Secretary to implement and maintain flood control projects. The Secretary shall be responsible for the maintenance of any flood control project built on the easement.

Land conveyance, Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay Army Reserve Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, to the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a parcel of real property, including improvements, located at 950 Saw Mill Run Boulevard in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and containing the Lieutenant General Malcolm Hay Army Reserve Center. The exact acreage and legal description of the real property would be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey would be borne by the City.

Land conveyance, Colonel Harold E. Steele Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (sec. 2833)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, at fair market value, to the Ellis School, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, a parcel of real property, including improvements, located at 6482 Aurelia Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and containing the Colonel Harold E. Steele Army Reserve Center and Maintenance Shop. The exact acreage and legal description of the real property would be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey would be borne by the Ellis School.

Land conveyance, Fort Lawton, Washington (sec. 2834)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Seattle, Washington, a parcel of real property at Fort Lawton, Washington, consisting of Area 500 and Government Way from 36th Avenue to Area 500. The purpose of the conveyance would be to include the property in Discovery Park, Seattle, Washington.

Land conveyance, Vancouver Barracks, Washington (sec. 2835)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the City of Vancouver, Washington, a parcel of real property, including any improvements, at Vancouver Barracks, Washington. The conveyance includes 19 structures known as the west barracks. The purpose of the conveyance would be to include the property as part of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve.

PART II—Navy Conveyances

Modification of land conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California (sec. 2851)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2811 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1990 and 1991 (division B of Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1650). The provision would change the authority to use the monetary consideration from construction of family housing at Marine Corps Air Station Tustin, California, for the repair of roads and development of facilities at Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California.

Modification of land conveyance, Defense Fuel Supply Point, Casco Bay, Maine (sec. 2852)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2839 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3065) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to replace electric utility service removed during environmental remediation. The provision would also authorize the Secretary, in consultation with the community, to improve the utility services and install telecommunications service, provided the community funds the cost of the improvements.

Modification of land conveyance authority, former Navy Training Center, Bainbridge, Cecil County, Maryland (sec. 2853)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1 of an Act to convey land in Cecil County, Maryland (Public Law 99–596; 100 Stat. 3349) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to reduce the amount of consideration received from the State of Maryland by an amount equal to the cost of restoring the historic buildings on the property. The total amount of the reduction would not exceed $500,000.

Land conveyance, Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine (sec. 2854)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 263 acres known as the Naval Computer and Telecommunications Station, Cutler, Maine, to the State of Maine, any political subdivision of the State of Maine, or any tax-supported agency in the State of Maine. The Secretary may require the recipient of the property to reimburse the Secretary for any environmental assessment or other studies required with respect to the conveyance of the property.

Part III—Defense Agencies Conveyance

Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service property, Farmers Branch, Texas (sec. 2871)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to convey at fair market value a parcel of real

property, owned and purchased by the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, a non-appropriated fund instrumentality, located in Farmers Branch, Texas. As a condition of the conveyance, the provision would require cash payment as consideration and would require that the payment be processed according to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 485 (c)). The provision would waive section 2693 of title 10, United States Code, the provisions of the Federal Property Administrative Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.), and section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411). The provision would also direct the Secretary to submit a report on the conveyance to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the conveyance.

The committee does not intend the waivers of current law to become general policy, instead the waivers pertain to the unique aspect of the property authorized for conveyance. Specifically, the property is not located on a military base, the title of the property is held by a non-appropriated fund property, and no appropriated funds were used to acquire, construct, rehabilitate, or improve the property.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Naming of the Army missile testing range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll (sec. 2881)

The committee recommends a provision that would name the Army missile testing range at the Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Missile Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll.

Other Items of Interest

Report on Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy is considering an increase above the recommended number of submarines in the Quadrennial Defense Review. Anticipating this future need, it is important to ensure that all the organizations providing support to the submarine force have sufficient resources to meet both current and potentially increased future requirements. As the only government facility capable of producing the highest quality silent propellers and related equipment for submarines, the Naval Foundry and Propeller Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is an essential facility for support of the submarine fleet. Because of its unique capability, it is critical that the Center has sufficient facilities, equipment, and trained staff to meet the Navy's current and future requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit, not later than March 1, 2001, a report to the congressional defense committees that analyzes the facility, equipment, and staffing requirements of the Naval Foundry and Propeller Center. This report should also include the funding levels needed in future budgets to provide the needed capabilities and capacity at the Center.

Report on requirement for Education Center at Fort Stewart, Georgia

The committee is aware that the opportunity for continuing education while in the military is a valuable tool for enhancing recruiting and retention of highly motivated individuals. To maximize the available resources, several military installations have or are prepared to enter joint cooperative agreements with State or local university systems. The committee is aware that Fort Stewart, Georgia, has identified an opportunity for a joint cooperative agreement with the University System of Georgia to address the educational needs of the military personnel and family members stationed at the installation. However, the lack of adequate facilities precludes the full achievement of such an agreement. The committee is supportive of such innovative approaches to meeting the educational needs of our military personnel and directs the Secretary of the Army to study the requirement for and feasibility of funding and constructing an education center at Fort Stewart, Georgia. The study should also address the desirability of joint use of such facility by the local community and the cost sharing arrangements that should accompany such joint use. The Secretary should provide the results of the study to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate by January 15, 2001.

Study on commercial leases

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has made progress in reducing the number of commercial leases. However, the committee believes that a more aggressive approach to relocating activities from leased facilities to government-owned space would yield additional savings for the Department.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2001, a report that analyzes the relocation of activities from leased facilities to available DOD owned space in metropolitan areas that currently have vacant or underutilized DOD property. The metropolitan areas studied should include, but not be limited to, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and San Antonio, Texas.

Study regarding the location of the National Museum of the United States Army

The Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, established the precedence that permits each service (to include the Marine Corps) to designate one museum at one location to be the official service museum. In response to this authority, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force have designated official museums. The Army and the Marine Corps have not yet specified a museum, although the committee understands that the Marine Corps is considering a location at the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Virginia.

The Chief of Staff of the Army initiated a National Military Museum of the United States Army site selection process in 1983. This process culminated in the selection of a site within the National Capitol Region. The proposed site was submitted for congressional approval in both the fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1995. For rea-

sons not related to the specific site, the Congress did not approve the procurement of the location. Since 1996, the Army has not made a concerted effort to identify or seek congressional approval for an Army museum in the National Capitol Region.

The committee is aware that communities have an interest in hosting the National Military Museum of the United States Army and have dedicated resources toward that effort. The committee supports the establishment of a museum dedicated to honor the 225–year history of the Army and believes that any further delay in selecting a site would not only be a disservice to the thousands of men and women who wear the Army uniform, but also to the communities eager to host the National Military Museum of the United States Army. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to immediately initiate a new site selection process and provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after enactment of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2001. The report shall include the selected site, if one is judged appropriate, the site selection process, schedule for developing the National Military Museum for the United States Army, and funding sources.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Atomic energy defense activities

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2001, 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 six categories: national nuclear security administration; defense environmental restoration and waste management; defense environmental management privatization; other defense activities; Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The budget request for the atomic energy defense activities totaled $13.1 billion, an 8.3 percent increase over the adjusted fiscal year 2000 level. Of the total amount requested: $4.6 billion was for weapons activities; $1.6 billion was for other nuclear security activities; $4.6 billion was for defense environmental restoration and waste management activities; $1.0 billion was for defense facility closure projects; $540.1 million was for defense environmental management privatization; $555.1 million was for other defense activities; $112.0 million was for defense nuclear waste disposal; $17.0 million was for a Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative; and $140.0 million was for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program.

The committee recommends $12.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities, a decrease of $323.6 million to the budget request. The committee recommends $6.2 billion for the national nuclear security administration (NNSA), an increase of 37.2 million to the budget request. The amount authorized for the NNSA is as follows: $4.7 billion for weapons activities, an increase of $78.8 million to the budget request; $847.0 million for defense nuclear nonproiferation, a decrease of $59.0 million to the budget request; and $695.0 million for naval reactors, an increase of $17.4 million to the budget request. The committee further recommends $5.5 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, including defense facility closure projects, a decrease of $132.0 million to the budget request; $515.0 million for defense environmental management privatization, the amount of the budget request; $466.3 million for other defense activities, a decrease of $88.8 million to the budget request; $17.0 million for a Department of Energy Employees Compensation Initiative, the amount of the

budget request; and $112.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal, the amount of the budget request. The committee recommends no funding for the formerly utilized sites remedial action program, representing a decrease of $140.0 million to the budget request.

The following table summarizes the budget request and the committee recommendations:

SUBTITLE A-NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary of

National Defense Authorization for FY 2001

(In Thousands of $'s)

	Authorization Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
TITLE XXXI-XXXII			
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)			
National Nuclear Security Adminstration			
Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Secruity Actitivities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	515,000	0	515,000
Other Defense Actitivities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	0	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities			
Stewardship Operations & Maintenance			
Directed stockpile work			
Stockpile Research and Development	243,300	6,000	249,300
Stockpile Maintenance	257,994	0	257,994
Stockpile Evaluation	151,710	0	151,710
Dismatlement/Disposal	29,260	0	29,260
Production Support	149,939	0	149,939
Field Engineering, Training, and Manuals	4,400	0	4,400
Total, Directed stockpile work	836,603	6,000	842,603
Campaigns			
Primary Certification	41,400	0	41,400
Dynamic Materials Properties	64,408	0	64,408
Advanced Radiography	43,000	0	43,000
Secondary Certification and Nuclear Systems Margins	52,964	0	52,964
Intertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High Yield	120,800	0	120,800
Certiication in Hostile Environments	15,400	0	15,400
Defense Computing and Modeling	249,100	437,075	686,175
Weapons System Engineering Cerification	16,300	0	16,300
Enhanced Surety	40,600	0	40,600

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Enhanced Surveillance	89,651	0	89,651
Advanced Design and Production Technologies	75,735	0	75,735
Pit Manufacturing Readiness	108,038	10,000	118,038
Secondary Readiness	15,000	0	15,000
Materials Readiness	40,511	0	40,511
Tritium Readiness	77,000	0	77,000
Total, Campaigns	1,049,907	447,075	1,496,982
Readiness in technical base and facilities			
Operations of Facilities	1,313,432	71,300	1,384,732
Program readiness	75,800	0	75,800
Special Projects	48,297	0	48,297
Materials Recycle and Recovery	22,018	0	22,018
Containers	7,876	0	7,876
Storage	9,075	0	9,075
Advanced Simulation and Computing	477,075	(477,075)	0
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	1,953,573	(405,775)	1,547,798
Total, Stewardship Operations & Maintenance	3,840,083	47,300	3,887,383
Secure transportation asset			
Operation and maintenance	79,357	0	79,357
Program direction	36,316	0	36,316
Total, Secure transportation asset	115,673	0	115,673

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Program direction	224,071	(2,500)	221,571
Construction:			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Livermore, CA	2,300	0	2,300
01-D-103 Preliminary Project Design and Engineering, various locations	14,500	0	14,500
01-D-124 HEU materials storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,800	0	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	0	3,000
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	0	5,000
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	0	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	0	6,700
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	0	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	0	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	5,200	0	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	0	2,000
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	0	13,000
99-D-127 Stockpile mgmt restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,765	0	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,998	0	4,998
99-D-132 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, nuclear materials safeguards & security upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	18,043	0	18,043
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium facility modernization and consolidation, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	30,767	0	30,767

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	75,000	0	75,000
98-D-126 Accelerator production of tritium (APT), various locations	0	34,000	34,000
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	35,232	0	35,232
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,918	0	2,918
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	74,100	0	74,100
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) building upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	13,337	0	13,337
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	0	2,713
Total, Construction	414,173	34,000	448,173
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
Less proposed supplemental	0	0	0
Total, Weapons Activities	4,594,000	78,800	4,672,800
Other Nuclear Security Activities			
Defense nuclear nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operation and maintenance	225,990	30,000	255,990
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL, Los Alamos, NM	7,000	0	7,000
Total, Nonproliferation and verification R&D	232,990	30,000	262,990

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES	12,925,581	(183,600)	12,741,981
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	906,035	(59,000)	847,035
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	627,500	17,400	644,900
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400	0	11,400
Construction:			
01-D-200 Major office replacement building Schenectady, NY	1,300	0	1,300
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	0	16,000
Total, Construction	17,300	0	17,300
Total, Naval reactors development	656,200	17,400	673,600
Program direction	21,400	0	21,400
Total, Naval reactors	677,600	17,400	695,000
Subtotal, Other nuclear security activities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0	0	0
Project overrun reserve	0	0	0
Offset for proposed supplemental (Russian Pu)	0	0	0
Addback of proposed rescission (Russian Pu)	0	0	0
Total, Adjustments	0	0	0
Total, Other Nuclear Security Activities	1,583,635	(41,600)	1,542,035

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,177,635	37,200	6,214,835
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management			
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	0	1,082,297	1,082,297
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	901,475	(40,000)	861,475
Construction:			
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion, Idaho National Engineering Lab (INEEL) Idaho Falls, Idaho	500	0	500
01-D-407 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend-down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	0	27,932
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,714	0	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEEL, ID	4,300	0	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	0	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,949	0	3,949
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,512	0	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Aiken, SC	8,879	0	8,879

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	6,177,635	37,200	6,214,835
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management			
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	0	1,082,297	1,082,297
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	901,475	(40,000)	861,475
Construction:			
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion, Idaho National Engineering Lab (INEEL) Idaho Falls, Idaho	500	0	500
01-D-407 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend-down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	0	27,932
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,714	0	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEEL, ID	4,300	0	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	0	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,949	0	3,949
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,512	0	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Aiken, SC	8,879	0	8,879

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
Total, Construction	69,476	0	69,476
Total, Site/project completion	970,951	(40,000)	930,951
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,588,725	(55,000)	2,533,725
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	(25,000)	395,000
Construction:			
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	1,300	0	1,300
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	0	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safc operations, Richland, WA	46,023	0	46,023
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	0	17,385
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	0	27,212
Total, Construction	99,732	0	99,732
Total, Post 2006 completion	3,108,457	(80,000)	3,028,457
Science and technology	196,548	50,000	246,548
Program direction	359,888	(5,000)	354,888
Subtotal, Defense environmental restoration & waste management	4,635,844	1,007,297	5,643,141
Use of prior year balances	(34,317)	(57,000)	(91,317)

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Pension refund	(50,000)	0	(50,000)
Addback of proposed rescission	0	0	0
General reduction	0	0	0
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management	4,551,527	950,297	5,501,824
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	1,082,297	(1,082,297)	0
Defense Environmental Management Privatization			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	540,092	0	540,092
Use of prior year balances	(25,092)	0	(25,092)
Total, Defense Environmental Management Privatization.	515,000	0	515,000
Other Defense Activities			
Intelligence			
Operation and maintenance	36,059	0	36,059
Construction:			
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information fac, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	0	2,000
Total, Intelligence	38,059	0	38,059
Counterintelligence	45,200	30,000	75,200

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Security and emergency operations			
Nuclear safeguards and security	124,409	0	124,409
Security investigations	33,000	0	33,000
Emergency management	93,600	(56,300)	37,300
Program direction	89,367	(2,500)	86,867
Total, Security and emergency operations	340,376	(58,800)	281,576
Independent oversight and performance assurance			
Independent oversight and performance assurance	0	0	0
Program direction	14,937	0	14,937
Total, Independent oversight and performance assurance	14,937	0	14,937
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	86,446	(10,000)	76,446
Program direction	22,604	0	22,604
Total, Environment, safety and health	109,050	(10,000)	99,050
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	21,500	0	21,500
Program direction	3,000	0	3,000
Total, Worker and community transition	24,500	0	24,500

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Russian uranium disposition	0	0	0
Office of hearings and appeals	3,000	0	3,000
Subtotal, Other defense activities	575,122	(38,800)	536,322
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0	(50,000)	(50,000)
Project overrun reserve	0	0	0
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Less proposed supplemental (EH)	0	0	0
Less proposed supplemental (SO)	0	0	0
Total, Adjustments	(20,000)	(50,000)	(70,000)
Total, Other Defense Activities	555,122	(88,800)	466,322
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	0	112,000
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative			
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund	12,800	0	12,800
Energy employees pilot project	2,000	0	2,000
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund	2,200	0	2,200
Total, Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	0	17,000

Title XXXI-XXXII
Atomic Energy Defense Activities
(Dollars in Thousands)

	Request	Change	Recommend
Interim Storage Activities	(85,000)	0	(85,000)
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR ACTIVITIES	12,925,581	(183,600)	12,741,981
Formerly Utilized Site Remediation	140,000	(140,000)	0
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	0	18,500
TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	13,084,081	(323,600)	12,760,481

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $6.2 billion for activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), an increase of $97.3 million to the budget request.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $4.6 billion for weapons activities, an increase of $78.8 million to the budget request. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $842.6 million for directed stockpile work, an increase of $6.0 million; $1.5 billion for campaigns, an increase of $447.1 million; $1.5 billion for readiness in technical base and facilities, a decrease of $405.8 million; $115.7 million for secure transportation assets, the amount of the budget request; $448.2 million for construction, an increase of $34.0 million; and $221.6 million for program direction, a decrease of $2.5 million.

Directed stockpile work

In the directed stockpile work account, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to the budget request for a cooperative research effort with the Department of Defense regarding defeating hard and deeply buried targets.

Campaigns

In the campaigns account, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for the pit manufacturing readiness campaign to begin conceptual design activities for a pit production facility adequate to meet future national security needs; an increase of $477.1 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to reflect the consolidation of all defense computing and modeling activities into a single program line item; a decrease of $20.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to reflect delays in acquisition of the 100–trillion-operations-per-second computer platform; a decrease of $5.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to slow the rate of growth in the Visual Interactive Environment Weapon Simulation (VIEWS) program; and a decrease of $15.0 million to the defense computing and modeling campaign to slow the rate of growth in university partnership activities. The authorized amounts for both the VIEWS and university partnerships programs represents an increase over fiscal year 2000 funding levels.

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) requires that the Nuclear Emergency Search Team remain a program function within the Office of Military Applications under the Office of Defense Programs. The committee further notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 104–65) directed the Secretary of Energy to slow the rate of growth in the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative and Strategic Computing accounts. Finally, the committee is aware that the November 8, 1999, report of the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the U.S. Nuclear Stockpile stated that its "paramount concern"

with the DOE stockpile stewardship program "...is the need to begin work now on an adequate plutonium pit production manufacturing capability." The committee endorses this finding and directs the Secretary of Energy to begin conceptual design activities for a pit production facility with a capacity adequate to meet future national security needs immediately.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

In the budget request for the readiness in technical base and facilities account, the committee recommends: an increase of $56.3 million to reflect the movement of the nuclear emergency search team and accident response group from the other defense activities emergency management account to the weapons activities account; and an increase of $15.0 million for the Kansas City, Pantex, and Y–12 plants to continue advanced manufacturing, modernization, infrastructure improvement, and skills retention efforts.

Construction

In the construction account, the committee recommends an increase of $34.0 million to the budget request for continued preliminary design and engineering development activities in the accelerator production of tritium program.

Program direction

In the program direction account, the committee recommends a decrease of $2.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommends moving the nuclear emergency response programs from the other defense account into the weapons activities account. The amount authorized for program direction reflects an increase of $2.5 million to account for the salaries of those federal employees who will likewise be transferred.

The committee directs that the proposed decrease to the program direction account be achieved through the reorganization and realignment of headquarters and field office roles and responsibilities. The committee believes that the performance of the Office of Defense Programs will be improved by eliminating duplicative efforts and by streamlining management control of DOE weapons activities.

The committee continues to believe that the Office of Defense Programs is overstaffed. The committee notes that several independent assessments of the organizational structure of the Office of Defense Programs, dating back as far as calendar year 1997, have also concluded that the Office of Defense Programs would benefit from a realignment of headquarters and field organization personnel. The committee expects the Department to utilize the authority to make voluntary separation incentive payments authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to fully implement the realignment recommendations described in the calendar year 1997 report by the Institute for Defense Analysis.

Budget Structure for Office of the Assistant Administrator for Defense Programs

The committee commends the Office of Defense Programs for establishing a more detailed and transparent budget structure. The committee continues to believe that this new budget structure will greatly enhance the effectiveness of these programs and instill a higher degree of budgetary discipline in the Office of Defense Programs. The committee further believes that the new budget structure will also assist Congress in assessing the degree of integration among varied experiments, simulation, research, and weapons assessments activities carried out at the Department's weapons laboratories and production plants. The committee directs that future budget requests for weapons activities clearly identify the funding required for each campaign and each program element under the directed stockpile work and readiness in technical base and facilities accounts.

Advanced Simulation and Computing

The committee continues to support the Advanced Simulation and Computing program, including the Advanced Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) and Stockpile Computing program. However, the committee believes that the Department has not fully integrated these programs with the experimental facilities and capabilities that are envisioned for the stockpile stewardship and management program. The committee remains concerned that the rate of growth in this program is not fully justified. The committee notes that the acquisition schedule for the 100–trillion-operations-per- second, ASCI-Blue computer to be located at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory has slipped by as much as two years, yet the budget request reflects no related decrease in funding to account for the delayed delivery of this machine.

The committee is also concerned that the rate of growth in the Advanced Simulation and Computing program is taking resources away from other, equally important, programmatic requirements of the Office of Defense Programs. The committee notes that even at this reduced level of funding, the Advanced Simulation and Computing programs will experience significant growth in the level of funding over fiscal years 1998, 1999, and 2000 funding levels.

The committee continues to support the utilization of the capabilities and facilities of the Pittsburgh Supercomputing Center to better meet the Department's supercomputing needs in lieu of planned acquisitions proposed within the Advanced Simulation and Computing program.

Technology Partnerships and Education

Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for campaigns, the committee recommends $10.0 million for the American Textiles Partnership (AMTEX) project. The committee recommends these funds in order to complete work on this partnership in fiscal year 2001. The committee notes the AMTEX project was projected to conclude in fiscal year 2000, but that the Department of Energy failed to obligate the full amount of funds authorized for the project in that fiscal year.

Tritium Production

Of the funds available in the tritium readiness campaign account, the committee recommends $58.0 million for the Commercial Light Water Reactor program and $53.0 million for the Accelerator Production of Tritium (APT) program.

The committee recommended an increase in the tritium production account to allow DOE to comply with the requirements of section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). The committee notes that the request was insufficient to complete preliminary design and engineering development of critical components of the APT technology, as required by section 3134 and the Secretary of Energy's December 22, 1998, tritium decision.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of Energy failed to request adequate funds to implement the December 1998, tritium decision and meet the requirements set forth in section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). The committee has reduced funding in the defense computing and simulation account to bring the Department into compliance with the Secretary's December 1998, tritium decision and the requirements set forth in section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000.

Nuclear Weapons Emphasis and Effects

Of the funds available for directed stockpile work, the committee recommends $5.0 million for a cooperative program with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to re-establish a vigorous nuclear weapon effects test capability. The program shall emphasize the need to invest in all elements of nuclear weapon effects technologies, including basic phenomenology, analysis and modeling, radiation effects simulation, and hardening technologies.

Defense medical devices prototyping pilot

The committee recommends that, of the funds available for campaigns, up to $6.0 million be made available for the Defense medical devices prototyping pilot program. Such funds are available only for activities that support the national security missions of DOE and established missions of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). No weapons activities funds shall be available for any activity that is not carried out pursuant to a cooperative agreement between DOE and NIH. Any weapons activities funds utilized must be leveraged with at least equal funding from NIH.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The committee recommends $847.0 million for defense nuclear nonproliferation, a decrease of $59.0 million to the budget request of $906.0 million. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $262.9 million for nonproliferation verification research and development, an increase of $30.0 million; $308.1 million for arms control, a decrease of $100.0 million; $224.5 million for fissile materials control and disposition, an increase of $1.1 million; and $51.5 million for program direction, the amount of the budget request.

The committee notes that the Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program was formerly known as the nonproliferation and national security account during fiscal year 2000. Because DOE did not request these funds under separate budget accounts, as required by section 3251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, (Public Law 106- 65), the committee has renamed and consolidated these accounts, including program direction, into a single account titled National Nuclear Security Administration to meet the statutory requirements.

Fissile Materials Control and Disposition

In the fissile materials control and disposition account, the committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million to the budget request to accelerate design activities for the mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility and a decrease of $9.9 million to reflect consolidation of all Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program direction funds into a single account, consistent with the requirements of title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Naval reactors

The committee recommends $695.0 million for naval reactors, an increase of $17.5 million to the budget request for expedited decommissioning and decontamination activities at surplus facilities.

Safeguards and security activities

The committee directs that all funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section be managed exclusively by line programs within the NNSA.

Defense environmental restoration and waste management (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.5 billion for environmental management activities of the Department of Energy (DOE), excluding defense environmental management privatization and including defense facilities closure projects, for a net reduction of $132.0 million. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $1.1 billion for closure projects, the amount of the request; $930.1 million for site and project completion, a reduction of $40.0 million; $3.0 billion for post 2006 completion, a decrease of $80.0 million; $246.0 million for technology development, an increase of $50.0 million; and $191.5 million for program direction, a decrease of $5.0 million. The committee also recommends a decrease of $57.0 million to account for available uncosted, unobligated prior year funds and funds to be deobligated from completed, prior year construction projects.

The committee directs that future year requests for defense environmental restoration and waste management include the request for defense facility closure projects.

Post 2006 Completion

In relation to the budget request for the Post 2006 completion account, the committee recommends: an increase of $10.0 million to

address planning, research, demonstration, and other requirements associated with modification of the Savannah River in-tank precipitation process; an increase of $10.0 million for the Columbia River Corridor Initiative at Hanford to continue reactor decontamination and decommissioning activities; a decrease of $25.0 million in the defense contribution to the uranium decommission and decontamination fund; a decrease of $57.0 million to account for increased contractor efficiencies to be gained through contract management reforms and construction project management improvements; and a decrease of $18.0 million to reflect the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account.

The committee recommends full funding for the F-canyon and H-canyon materials processing facilities.

Site and Project Completion

In relation to the budget request for the site and project completion account, the committee recommends a decrease of $37.0 million to account for increased contractor efficiencies to be gained through contract management reforms and construction project management improvements and a decrease of $3.0 million to reflect the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account.

Science and Technology Development

In relation to the budget request for the science and technology development account, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for applied research and development activities. The amount authorized reflects the movement of the Environmental Systems Research and Analysis program into the Science and Technology Development account from the Post 2006 and Site and Project Completion accounts.

The committee supports the integration of industrial programs and university based programs into the Environmental Management technology focus areas. The committee understands that this approach will better link such research efforts with site needs. The committee believes that the Office of Science and Technology cannot meet its objectives without the active participation of industry and academia. The committee encourages the Office of Science and Technology to continue its inclusion of industry and universities in technology development and deployment activities.

The committee notes that the Department's cleanup and waste management efforts will continue well into the 21st Century with costs anticipated to exceed $150.0 billion and much of the cleanup work scheduled to continue beyond fiscal year 2030. DOE must make meaningful investments in innovative science and technology in order to reduce costs, reduce safety and health risks, and develop solutions to problems for which there are currently no available or effective technologies.

Over the past several years DOE has started to focus the environmental management research and development efforts to the cleanup requirements of the various sites and facilities. This effort

has started to show significant progress in developing new technologies and making them available for cleanup and waste treatment and in substantially reducing the costs of those activities. In the past, DOE has utilized the research capabilities of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs) with great success. The committee is supportive of these efforts and encourages the DOE to expand the research conducted at HBCUs and HSIs.

While in many instances there are no technologies or inadequate technologies to treat accumulated waste or to clean up DOE sites and facilities, in many instances DOE has successfully adapted or incorporated existing technologies into the Environmental Management Program. For example, DOE has been able to adapt several new technologies from the oil industry and has had considerable success with horizontal drilling techniques devised by the oil industry. The committee is aware of several other technologies available to the oil industry such as macro- encapsulation technology that could possibly be used by the DOE Office of Environmental Management. The committee encourages DOE to take advantage of these and other technologies developed by the oil industry that could be helpful to DOE, as well as any other technologies already developed and utilized by industry.

PROGRAM DIRECTION

In relation to the program direction account, the committee recommends $354.9 million, a decrease of $5.0 million.

Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response

The committee recommends $5.9 million for the Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response training facility in Richland, Washington, to be offset by contributions from facility users.

Columbia River Corridor Initiative

The committee supports the Columbia River Corridor Initiative to accelerate cleanup along the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) directed the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to establish a schedule by which the 100 square miles of the Hanford site that adjoin the Columbia River could be cleaned up on an accelerated schedule and proposed for delisting from the Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List. The committee notes that this schedule has not been submitted to Congress. The committee expects that this report will be provided not later than November 1, 2000.

Use of Professional and Performance Insurance at DOE Cleanup Sites

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than February 1 2001, regarding the use of private insurers by contractors to the Department of Energy to underwrite professional and performance liabil-

ity risks related to contracts administered by the Office of Environmental Management (EM). The report shall identify: (1) those contracts that include insurance requirements or accommodate insurance costs; (2) the costs and benefits for such insurance coverage, including the desirability of mandating such coverage in all EM cleanup contracts and an assessment of the prudence value of third party evaluation of contract objectives; (3) the costs to the U.S. Government of failure to require such coverage, including litigation and arbitration expenses and any delays meeting cleanup objectives; and (4) a comparison of the DOE contract requirements to those at commercial cleanup sites with similar coverage. The report shall further assess the desirability of utilizing private insurers or other entities to provide remediation guarantees for EM cleanup contracts, specifically for fixed price remediation projects.

Report on Pilot Program To Use Prior Year Unobligated Balances To Accelerate Cleanup of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

The committee encourages the Secretary to Energy to use the authority provided by section 3176 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 to accelerate closure of the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site (RFETS).

Safeguards and Security Activities

The committee directs that all funds authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section be managed exclusively by the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee authorizes $466.3 billion for other defense activities, a decrease of $88.8 million to the budget request. The reduction reflects a decrease of $50.0 million to account for available uncosted, unobligated prior year funds and funds to be deobligated from completed, prior year construction projects.

Intelligence

The committee recommends $38.1 million for the Office of Intelligence, the amount of the budget request.

Counterintelligence

The committee recommends $75.2 million for the Office of Counterintelligence, an increase of $30.0 million to the budget request.

The committee directs that these funds be utilized to continue implementation of an enhanced computer security program at Department of Energy facilities, including cyber security measures such as intrusion detection, early warning, reporting, and analysis capabilities and a computer vulnerability assessment. The committee directs that priority be given to implementing such added computer security at the three nuclear weapons laboratories.

Security and emergency operations

Nuclear safeguards and security

The committee recommends $124.4 million for safeguards and security, the amount of the budget request.

Security investigations

The committee recommends $33.0 million for security investigations, the amount of the budget request. The committee notes that of these funds, $20.0 million is authorized in line program accounts and is reflected as an offset to the Other Defense Activities account.

Emergency management

The committee recommends $37.3 million for emergency management, a decrease of $56.3 million to the budget request. The reduction reflects movement of the nuclear emergency search team and accident response group programs to the weapons activities account authorized in section 3101(a)(1) of this Act. No emergency management funds are authorized for these activities.

Program Direction

The committee recommends $86.9 million for program direction, a decrease of $2.5 million to the budget request. This reduction reflects the movement of nuclear emergency response programs to the weapons activities account.

Independent oversight and performance assurance

The committee recommends $14.9 million for independent oversight and performance assurance, the amount of the budget request.

Environment, safety and health-defense

The committee recommends $99.1 million for environment, safety and health-defense, a decrease of $10.0 million to the budget request. The reduction would be taken from proposed increases in risk and health studies at Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities that do not directly support the national security missions of the Department and, therefore, are not appropriately funded in this account.

Worker and community transition

The committee recommends $24.5 million for worker and community transition, the amount of the budget request.

The committee endorses the Department of Energy's (DOE) decision to remove the requirement that management and operating contracts at DOE sites include provisions for conducting economic development activities in the communities surrounding such sites. The committee encourages DOE contractors to continue to be good corporate citizens by supporting community-based initiatives. The committee believes, however, that economic development activities

of DOE contractors should not be used as a measure of performance or as a selection criteria for the award of contracts.

Office of Hearings and Appeals

The committee recommends $3.0 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

Defense environmental management privatization (sec. 3104)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $515.0 million for defense environmental management privatization projects, the amount of the budget request. The amount authorized is for the following projects: $450.0 million for the Tank Waste Remediation System Project, phase I (Richland); $65.0 million for the Advanced Mixed Waste Treatment project (Idaho); and $25.1 million for spent nuclear fuel dry storage (Idaho). The amount authorized is reduced by $25.1 million to reflect the use of prior year, uncosted balances in the defense environmental management privatization account.

The committee is deeply concerned with the status of the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) project. The committee understands that cost estimates for the construction portion of this project have increased from $3.2 billion to $6.4 billion, translating into a total estimated project cost increase from $6.9 billion to over $13.0 billion. The committee further understands that these cost estimates are based on a project design that is only 13 to 15 percent complete and, therefore, subject to additional change.

The committee fully supports the TWRS project and believes that the technological approach proposed is viable and realistic. The committee also believes it is vitally important that this project proceed to full scale construction only when the Department of Energy has a high degree of confidence in the overall project cost and other facility requirements. The committee believes that the Secretary of Energy should not enter into a fixed price contract for this project until the contractor has, at a minimum, completed not less than 40 percent of the project design activities.

Energy employees compensation initiative (sec. 3105)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $17.0 million for the establishment of an energy employees compensation fund to compensate Department of Energy (DOE) contractor employees that have proven health or other medical problems that are directly related to their employment at a DOE nuclear facility.

Defense nuclear waste disposal (sec. 3106)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $112.0 million for the Department of Energy fiscal year 2001 defense contribution to the Defense Nuclear Waste Fund.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Reprogramming (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in excess of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of $1.0 million above the amount authorized for the program, until the Secretary of Energy submits a report to the congressional defense committees and a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the report is received.

Limits on general plant projects (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to carry out any construction project authorized under general plant projects if the total estimated cost does not exceed $5.0 million. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the reasons for the cost variation if the cost of the project is revised to exceed $5.0 million.

Limits on construction projects (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit any construction project to be initiated and continued only if the 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. The provision would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from exceeding such limits until 30 legislative days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a detailed report setting forth the reasons for the increase. This provision would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under $5.0 million.

Fund transfer authority (sec. 3124)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit funds authorized by this Act to be transferred to other agencies of the government for performance of work for which the funds were authorized and appropriated. The provision would permit the merger of such transferred funds with the authorizations of the agency to which they are transferred. The provision would also limit, to not more than five percent of the account, the amount of funds authorized by this Act that may be transferred between authorization accounts within the Department of Energy.

Authority for conceptual and construction design (sec. 3125)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to request construction funding until the Secretary has completed a conceptual design. This limitation would apply to construction projects with a total estimated cost greater than $5.0 million. If the estimated cost to prepare the construction design exceeds $600,000, the provision would require the Secretary to obtain a specific authorization to obligate such funds. If the estimated cost to prepare the conceptual design exceeds $3.0 million, the provision would require the Secretary to re-

quest funds for the conceptual design before requesting funds for construction. The provision would also provide an exception to these requirements in the case of an emergency.

The committee directs the Secretary to submit to Congress a report on each conceptual design completed under this provision.

Authority for emergency planning, design, and construction activities (sec. 3126)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design with any funds available to the Department of Energy pursuant to this title, including those funds authorized for advance planning and construction design, whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously to protect the public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

Funds available for all national security programs of the Department of Energy (sec. 3127)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize, subject to section 3121 of this Act, amounts to be appropriated for management and support activities and for general plant projects to be made available for use in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

Availability of funds (sec. 3128)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize amounts to be appropriated for operating expenses or for plant and capital equipment for the Department of Energy to remain available until expended. Program direction funds would remain available until the end of fiscal year 2003.

Transfer of defense environmental management funds (sec. 3129)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with limited authority to transfer up to $5.0 million in fiscal year 2001 defense environmental management funds from one program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project, once in a fiscal year.

SUBTITLE C-NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Term of Office of person first appointed as Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (sec. 3031)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a fixed term of office for the first individual appointed as the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security at the Department of Energy. The individual shall be subject to removal by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

Membership of Under Secretary for Nuclear Security on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy (DOE) to serve as the DOE representative on the Joint Nuclear Weapons Council.

Scope of authority of Secretary of Energy to modify organization of National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3133)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy to reorganize, abolish, alter, consolidate, or discontinue any organizational unit or component of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

Prohibition on pay of personnel engaged in concurrent service or duties inside and outside National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3134)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy (DOE) by this or any other Act to pay the basic pay of an officer or employee of DOE who: (1) serves concurrently in a position in the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and a position outside the NNSA; or (2) performs concurrently the duties of a position in the NNSA and the duties of a position outside the NNSA.

The committee notes that this provision would not apply to detailees who are assigned to serve in position within the NNSA from other federal agencies, other DOE organizations, or private entities under a loaned executive program if such employees do not fulfill any of the duties of their permanent organization during the period of their detail.

The provision prohibits any detailees from serving in enumerated positions specifically defined in title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Organization plan for field offices of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3135)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy to develop an appropriate staffing and organization plan to carry out the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The plan would identify: (1) the roles and responsibilities to be assigned to each NNSA field organizational unit and the NNSA headquarters organization; (2) any modifications, downsizing, eliminations, or consolidations of field offices; (3) any modifications to headquarters and field office staffing levels that the Under Secretary determines are necessary to implement the plan; and (4) a schedule by which the plan could be implemented. The plan would be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2001.

Future-years nuclear security program (sec. 3136)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security to submit a future-years nuclear security program plan that would contain the estimated expenditures necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), including the anticipated workload requirements at each site under the jurisdiction of the NNSA, for fiscal year 2001 and the subsequent five-year period. The provision would require that the Administrator of the NNSA identify how funds authorized under each program element in the weapons activities account support the reliability and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The provision would further require that the first report be submitted to Congress not later than November 1, 2000.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy was required by section 3135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) and section 3253 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) to provide a five-year budget plan, and that the Secretary failed to comply with such requirements. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense provides such future-year budget data to Congress with the President's budget request. The committee believes that such a plan will provide an important planning tool for the Secretary, the Administrator, and the Congress, and would serve as a baseline upon which the congressional defense committees can better evaluate succeeding budget submissions.

Cooperative research and development of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3137)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish cooperative research and development objectives for the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and require that such cooperative research and development be consistent with and support the missions of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The provision would establish a goal of obligating 0.5 percent of NNSA funds available during fiscal years 2001 and 2002 for cooperative research and development agreements, or similar cooperative, cost-shared research partnerships with non-federal organizations. The provision would further require the Administrator of the NNSA to submit a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth a recommendation as to the appropriate percentage goal levels. The provision would require that, beginning in March 2002, and no later than the end of March of each year thereafter, the Administrator report to Congress on whether the goals of this section have been met in the previous fiscal year. If the goals have not been met, the provision would require the Administrator to describe the actions he or she will take to achieve such goals and provide any legislative changes recommended to achieve them.

SUBTITLE D—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Processing, treatment, and disposition of legacy nuclear materials (sec. 3151)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to maintain a high state of readiness at the F-canyon and H-canyon facilities at the Savannah River site. The provision would further prohibit use of funds to begin decommissioning activities at the F-canyon facility, including studies and planning, until the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and the Secretary of Energy submit a report certifying that all materials currently present in the facility are safely stabilized and the requirements for the facility to meet future fissile materials disposition needs can be fully met utilizing the H-canyon facility. The provision would require the Secretary to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a plan describing how all long-term chemical separations activities would be transferred from the F-canyon facility to the H-canyon facility beginning in fiscal year 2002. The report would be submitted not later than February 15, 2001.

Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (sec. 3152)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy by this or any other Act for travel by the Secretary of Energy or any employees of the Office of Secretary of Energy after March 1, 2001, unless or until the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department will not utilize Atomic Energy Defense funding to conduct treatment, storage, or disposal activities at sites designated as Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP).

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) prohibits any Atomic Energy Defense funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1999 from being obligated or expended to conduct treatment, storage, or disposal activities at sites designated as FUSRAP sites. The committee continues to support the cleanup of FUSRAP sites in an expeditious, cost-effective manner. The committee, however, does not support the use of scarce Atomic Energy Defense funds for this purpose.

Department of Energy Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program (sec. 3153)

The budget request included $682.6 million for the Arms Control and Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development programs of the DOE Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program under the National Nuclear Security Administration. While the committee considers the activities included in this account important to U.S. national security, the committee is concerned with the proposed increase of 25 percent in funding over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee believes this level of growth is unjustified. Therefore, the committee recommends $571.1 million

for this account in fiscal year 2001, a decrease of $111.6 million from the budget request, reflecting a net increase of $65.4 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level.

Arms Control Program

The budget request included $408.6 million for the programs contained within the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Program's Arms Control Program account. The committee notes that this account was formerly included in the nonproliferation and national security account during fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends $308.0 million for fiscal year 2001, a reduction of $100.0 million.

The budget request included $272.8 million for the Arms Control Operations Program within the Arms Control Program account. While the committee supports this request, the committee is concerned that DOE has not been funding a number of programs within the Arms Control Operations Program at levels intended by the Congress due to budgetary constraints in some of the other programs within the Arms Control Program. Therefore, the committee directs that the following programs within the Arms Control Operations Program receive no more than the following amount of funding: $144.8 million for the Material Protection, Control, and Accounting Program; $5 million for the International Emergency Cooperation Program; $14.0 million for the Export Control Operations Program; $16.0 million for the Spent Fuel Activities in Kazakhstan Program; $17.5 million for the Nuclear Cities Initiative (NCI); $22.5 million for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program (IPP); $15.2 million for the Transparent and Irreversible Nuclear Reductions Program; and $37.6 million for other arms control program activities.

Material Protection, Control, and Accounting Program

The budget request included $144.8 million for the Material Protection, Control, and Accounting (MPC&A) Program. The committee supports this request, however, the committee is concerned with the findings of a recent General Accounting Office report on this program.

Approximately half of the threat reduction funds spent to date by DOE have been expended by the MPC&A Program. In March 2000, the GAO issued a report entitled "Limited Progress in Improving Nuclear Material Security in Russia and the Newly Independent States." The report found that the MPC&A Program had spent $481.2 million dollars in Russia and the newly independent states since the program's inception in 1994. These funds were spent for a variety of MPC&A activities, including security training, improvements to weapons-usable nuclear materials transport vehicles, and have improved the security of approximately 70 percent of the total weapons-usable material at risk. Just seven percent of the weapons-usable material at risk for theft or diversion, however, has been protected by fully installed security systems.

The committee is concerned that for almost half a billion dollars invested in this threat reduction work, the MPC&A Program has not made significant progress toward reducing the threat posed by unsecured weapons-usable nuclear materials in the former Soviet

Union. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision requiring DOE to provide an annual report to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees on the MPC&A Program that describes the status of securing weapons-usable nuclear material identified by DOE as being at risk for theft and diversion that has received complete and integrated material protection, control, and accounting systems in Russia. The report should specifically describe: (1) the number of buildings and site locations with completed and integrated material protection, control, and accounting upgraded systems; (2) the total amount of highly-enriched uranium and plutonium secured to date in Russia under the auspices of the program; (3) the amount of weapons-usable nuclear material remaining that still requires complete and integrated material protection, control, and accounting systems; (4) the out year budget costs and planning estimated to secure the remaining material; and (5) the total cost to date and by fiscal year of the completed material protection, control, and accounting systems. This report for the previous fiscal year is due no later than January 1, each year during the lifetime of the program. The first report, covering fiscal year 2000 is due January 1, 2001.

According to the March 2000 GAO report, little progress has been made in installing nuclear security systems in Russia's nuclear weapons complex, where over 90 percent of all the nuclear material in the former Soviet Union is located. This is primarily due to the reluctance of Russian officials to grant DOE access to buildings in the nuclear weapons complex. It is the committee's understanding that DOE is negotiating with Russia to gain better access in the nuclear weapons complex, but to date no agreement has been achieved.

The committee believes obtaining an appropriate access policy is necessary to ensure that U.S. funding for this program achieves its intended purpose. Because the MPC&A Program has enjoyed good access at the Russian Navy sites utilizing a model that is acceptable to both parties, the committee recommends that this model be examined as an option for gaining access to the nuclear weapons complex. The committee believes that until such an access policy is agreed to, the MPC&A Program will be unable to adequately address the threat of unsecured weapons-usable nuclear materials in Russia. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision prohibiting the obligation of funds for any MPC&A Program projects in the Russian weapons complex after October 1, 2000, until an access policy is agreed to with the Russians and implemented by the Secretary of Energy. The committee requires the Secretary of Energy to notify the committee in writing that an access policy has been established and implemented prior to obligating funds for an MPC&A Program project in the Russian nuclear weapons complex.

Nuclear Cities Initiative

The budget request included $17.5 million for the NCI, an increase of $10.0 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee supports this request. As part of its efforts to address the threat posed by diversion of former Soviet Union scientific expertise, DOE created the NCI in 1998 to work exclusively in Russia's closed cities to create jobs for displaced Russian work-

ers in the nuclear complex, and to assist the Russian Federation in reducing the size of its nuclear weapons complex.

Last year the committee included a provision prohibiting funds for the NCI from being obligated or expended until the Secretary of Energy certified to Congress that Russia had agreed to close some of its facilities engaged in work on weapons of mass destruction. The committee was disappointed by the certification provided by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to this provision. The evidence provided by the Secretary to support the certification failed to demonstrate that an agreement had been reached between the United States and the Russian Federation stating that Russia would close some of its facilities engaged in work on weapons of mass destruction, as the committee had intended.

The committee continues to believe that a binding agreement should be concluded to ensure the U.S. taxpayer that their investment in this program is facilitating closure of some facilities of the Russian nuclear weapons complex, thereby effectively reducing this threat to U.S. national security. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which reiterates its requirement that of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the NCI Program, no funds may be obligated or expended for purposes of providing assistance under this program to more than three nuclear cities, and more than two serial production facilities in Russia in fiscal year 2001, until 30 days after the Secretary of Energy reports to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, in writing, that a signed agreement has been reached between the U. S. Government and the Government of the Russian Federation that provides that Russia will close some of its facilities engaged in nuclear weapons assembly and disassembly work.

The committee notes the similarity between the projects in the NCI and those of the IPP Program. Last year the committee imposed project review procedures for the IPP Program to improve the program management and effectiveness of IPP projects in Russia. Since those requirements were imposed, the IPP Program has been able to demonstrate to Congress an effective process for evaluating projects to identify those that have the greatest likelihood for success and to ensure that these projects are consistent with U.S. national security interests. Since the IPP and the NCI have similar objectives, the committee believes that a similar project review procedure should be instituted for NCI projects. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision requiring that no more than 50 percent of the funds made available for the NCI for fiscal year 2001 may be obligated until after the Secretary of Energy establishes and implements project review procedures for projects under the NCI. These procedures must ensure that all scientific, technical, and commercial projects proposed under the NCI: will not enhance Russian military or weapons of mass destruction capabilities; are not inadvertently transferred or utilized for military purposes; are commercially viable; and have a commercial, industrial or other nonprofit entity partner. A report on the project review procedures established and implemented for NCI projects shall be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House not later than January 1, 2001.

International Nuclear Safety Program

The budget request included $20 million for the International Nuclear Safety Program. The committee supports this request, however the committee is troubled by the expanding scope of the program. The committee believes the program has inappropriately expanded beyond its mission of working to improve the safety of Soviet-designed reactors and upgrading the nuclear safety infrastructure of the countries where these reactors operate. In particular, the committee is concerned that program funds are being used to fund such items as environmental centers and DOE representative offices in Paris and Tokyo. Since the program has not yet completed its safety and training mission, the committee is concerned that its expanding scope has hampered the program from realizing its intended goal of nuclear safety. The committee believes that the program should refocus its efforts on addressing the most immediate safety concerns, such as providing fire doors for these facilities to prevent fires from spreading from area to area within these reactor facilities, and providing sufficient training to minimize human error, a lead cause of reactor accidents. The committee directs the funding authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2001 for the International Nuclear Safety program shall be available only for purposes of providing basic nuclear safety upgrades and training related to preventing nuclear operator error and improving the operational safety of Soviet designed nuclear reactors.

Long-Term nonproliferation initiative

The budget request included $100.0 million for a new long term nonproliferation initiative proposed by the Secretary of Energy. The committee believes the case for this initiative has not been made by the DOE. Therefore, the committee does not authorize the $100.0 million requested for this initiative.

The committee believes funding this initiative is premature. DOE requested $70.0 million of the initiative for long term nuclear fuel cycle cooperative research and development. The committee is concerned that to date the DOE has been unable to provide clear, fundamental program planning parametes necessary to ensure successful implementation, management, oversight, and accountability for the initiative. The DOE is unable to demonstrate clear program parameters in the initiative, such as how the initiative would be able to expend effectively the $70.0 million requested during fiscal year 2001. In addition, the initiative lacks any government-to-government agreements with the Russians to indicate Russia's commitment to the initiative.

The remaining $30.0 million in the request for the initiative consists of additional funding for ongoing programs within the Nonproliferation and National Security Account. The committee is concerned that requests for these ongoing programs were made not only through the Nonproliferation and National Security Account, but also under this initiative, and that these activities have been described as new initiatives by DOE. These activities are already being funded under existing programs. Therefore, the committee will not fund these activities under this new initiative.

Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development

The budget request included $232.9 million for the Nonproliferation and Verification Research and Development Program. The committee strongly supports the ongoing work in this program and recommends an increase of $30.0 million over the budget request. The committee believes the vital technologies being developed and tested in this program play a critical role in detecting and deterring weapons of mass destruction proliferation, monitoring nuclear explosions, and detecting and responding to chemical and biological weapons attacks.

It is the committee's understanding that the Secretary of Energy is concerned with the high emphasis on nonproliferation programs with Russia, while possible proliferation activities and threats from other countries of concern remain relatively understudied and unanalyzed. The committee concurs with the Secretary of Energy's concerns for the need for broader regional arms control research. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to utilize a portion of the amounts for this program to conduct evaluations of the technical capabilities of other geographic areas of concern to U.S. national security to develop and deliver weapons of mass destruction.

Modification of counterintelligence polygraph program (sec. 3154)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) by authorizing the Secretary of Energy to waive the requirement that certain Department of Energy (DOE) employees and DOE contractor employees successfully pass a counterintelligence polygraph exam before such employees can be granted access to high-risk programs. The provision would allow the Secretary to waive this requirement for any individual for a period not to exceed 120 days, if the Secretary determines that: (1) such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; (2) the covered employee has been granted a security clearance; and (3) the covered employee signs a written acknowledgment that the employment is conditional upon successfully passing a counterintelligence polygraph exam within 120 days of the date of signing such an acknowledgment. The provision would also allow the Secretary to waive this requirement for any individual who the Secretary determines: (1) has completed successfully a full-scope counterintelligence polygraph exam while employed with another federal agency; or (2) should not be examined by reason of treatment for a medical or psychological condition.

Employee incentives for employees at closure project facilities (sec. 3155)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide incentives for retention and separation of federal employees at closure facilities of the Department of Energy (DOE) established pursuant to section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106). Incentives would include

the accumulation of annual leave up to 720 hours, lump sum retention allowances, authority to pay voluntary separation incentive payments (also referred to as buyouts), freeze the cost of and continue health benefits for employees who are either voluntarily or involuntarily separated, and authority to make temporary assignments of certain DOE employees to private sector organizations, on a non-reimbursable basis.

The committee notes that, currently, only the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology and Ohio Field Office sites are designated as defense closure facilities, but that additional facilities may be so designated in the future if such sites meet the requirements established in section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104- 106). The committee believes that incentives are needed to mitigate the anticipated high attrition rate of certain federal employees with critical skills. The committee expects the Department to use this authority to retain such critical skills during potentially disruptive reductions-in-force at those sites designated to close prior to fiscal year 2006.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel (sec. 3171)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend excepted service hiring authority for up to 200 positions, originally authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337). The committee understands that this provision would allow the Department of Energy to continue to compete more effectively for high quality employees with the specialized technical skills needed by the Department.

Updates of report on nuclear test readiness postures (sec. 3172)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to update the nuclear test readiness report established by section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) on a biannual basis. The Secretary would be required to submit the first updated report to the congressional defense committees beginning on February 15, 2001. The reports would include a listing and description of those workforce skills and capabilities that are essential to carry out the missions of the site, a listing and description of the required infrastructure and physical plant that are essential to carry out the missions of the site, and an assessment of the readiness status of the workforce and infrastructure. The report would be submitted in both classified and unclassified form.

Frequency of reports on inadvertent releases of restricted data and formerly restricted data (sec. 3173)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3161 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) by requiring the Secretary of Energy to report inadvertent releases of restricted data

and formerly restricted data on a quarterly basis rather than 30 days after any such release.

Form of certifications regarding the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3174)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the annual certification to the President regarding the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile be submitted in classified form.

The committee notes that, beginning in 1996, the Department of Energy (DOE) weapons laboratory directors, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, and the Nuclear Weapons Council have certified to the President on an annual basis that the U.S. nuclear deterrent is safe, effective, and reliable, and that there is no need to resume underground nuclear testing at this time. To date, these certifications have been submitted in unclassified form. The committee is concerned that should an issue arise in the future that would require a higher classification level, the current process might provide a disincentive to report such issues for fear of advertising a problem with the stockpile. The committee believes that any such disincentive to report fully issues regarding the condition of the U.S. nuclear stockpile should be removed. The committee further notes that the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile recommended in its November 8, 1999, report to Congress that such annual certification reports to the President be submitted in classified form.

Engineering and manufacturing research, development and demonstration by plant managers of certain nuclear weapons production plants (sec. 3175)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a Plant Manager Research, Development and Demonstration (PMRDD) program to support innovative engineering and systems activities at the nuclear weapons production plants. The program would be limited to the Y–12 plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, the Kansas City plant in Kansas City, Missouri, and the Pantex plant in Amarillo, Texas. The program would be authorized at a level not to exceed two percent of the funds available for weapons activities at such plants.

The committee anticipates that the PMRDD program would be used to explore viable tools and techniques for understanding and replacing sunset technologies and for developing more agile manufacturing techniques. The committee believes the creation of this program will support recommendations for addressing workforce problems at the production plants identified by the Commission on Retaining Nuclear Weapons Expertise (also known as the Chiles Commission), by assisting with recruiting and retention of outstanding engineers and craftsmen.

Cooperative research and development agreements for government- owned, government-operated laboratories (sec. 3176)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C.

3710) to streamline the approval process for cooperative research and development agreements (CRADA) at government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) facilities by authorizing federal agencies to substitute an annual strategic plan for individual joint work statements. The provision would further streamline the CRADA process for GOCO facilities by authorizing federal agencies to permit routine CRADAs to be negotiated and signed by GOCO employees, rather than federal employees.

Commendation of Department of Energy and contractor employees for Exemplary Service in Stockpile Stewardship and Security (sec. 3177)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to award a certificate of commendation for meritorious service to current and former Department of Energy (DOE) employees, and current and former DOE contractor employees who worked in programs related to stewardship of the Nation's nuclear weapons stockpile.

The committee notes that the dedication, intellect, and hard work of the scientists and craftsmen employed at DOE laboratories and manufacturing plants are essential to maintaining a credible U.S. nuclear deterrent. The committee further notes that former scientists and craftsmen at DOE laboratories, plants, and materials production sites were instrumental in ensuring that the United States prevailed during the Cold War. The committee recommends this provision in an effort to recognize the contributions of former employees at these facilities and to highlight the Nation's continued reliance on the capabilities of the skilled workers at DOE weapons laboratories and manufacturing plants. The committee commends these individuals for their continued service to the Nation and for the peace that they have helped to preserve.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Department of Energy participation in the Interstate Technology Reciprocity Council

The committee commends the Department of Energy (DOE) and state environmental agencies for their cooperative efforts to accelerate the deployment of innovative technologies at DOE and Department of Defense cleanup sites. The committee notes that over 30 states have joined with the DOE Environmental Management program to form the Interstate Technology Regulatory Cooperation Working Group, which provides guidance documents, training, and other means to accelerate regulatory acceptance and implementation of advanced technologies that are capable of saving both time and money. The committee encourages DOE to continue its participation and support for this cooperative program.

Laboratory directed research and development

The committee notes that the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) funds available to the Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories were reduced by section 308 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000, from the customary six percent to four percent for fiscal year 2000, and

that the LDRD program was removed from the environmental management program. The committee directs the DOE to return the LDRD program to its full scope and to its full normal six percent funding level in fiscal year 2001.

The committee further notes that this funding, in most instances, would be the only available source of basic funding for research and development(R&D)for the DOE laboratories. The January 27, 2000, external review of the LDRD program by the DOE Laboratory Operations Board found that ". . . the LDRD programs are vital in recruiting, retaining, and integrating the best scientific talent into the laboratories and their mission programs' and that the LDRD program at the DOE laboratories has won more R&D 100 awards than any other organization or program in the world.

Report on Post-closure employee benefits at closure project facilities

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit a report, not later than June 1, 2001, to the congressional defense committees detailing any plans for the transfer and post-closure administration of benefits for employees of Department of Energy contractors at closure project facilities established pursuant to section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106). The report shall include the following: (1) strategies to ensure that long-term employee and retiree benefits are consistent; in terms of cost and longevity, with such benefits for employees at other DOE facilities; (2) an analysis of the long-term funding required for the administration of pension and health benefits plans at each closure facility; (3) plans for transfer and post-closure administration of any DOE-funded pension plans at each closure facility; and (4) plans for the transfer and post closure administration of DOE-funded long-term health benefits plans at each closure facility.

The committee notes that, currently, only the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology and Ohio Field Office sites are designated as defense closure facilities, but that additional facilities may be so designated in the future if such sites meet the requirements established in section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–106).

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends $18.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) for fiscal year 2001, the amount of the budget request.

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65), which established the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) within the Department of Energy (DOE), does not repeal or amend the requirements of Chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The committee further notes that the independent oversight authority of the DNFSB related to health and safety matters at DOE and NNSA defense nuclear facilities was not changed by the National Nuclear Security Administration Act.

The committee commends the DNFSB for its continuing efforts to foster positive change in the safety culture at DOE's defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the DNFSB is an independent technical body that continually assesses safety issues at DOE facilities and submits formal safety findings and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy, the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health, and Congress. The committee believes that the external oversight provided by the DNFSB is comparable to or better than the external regulation that could be provided by another Federal agency, such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As such, the committee believes that the DNFSB is the most cost-effective means of ensuring continuous improvement of the safety culture at DOE nuclear facilities.

The committee remains concerned that establishing a new, untested external regulation regime at DOE weapons facilities could have an adverse effect on U.S. national security interests. The committee is equally concerned that such a regime would draw scarce resources away from high priority, compliance-driven clean up actions and critical national security activities. As a result, the committee does not support any further move toward external regulation of DOE defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has likewise concluded that the cost of implementing a new external regulation regime at DOE defense nuclear facilities would not be cost effective.

TITLE XXXIII—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Minimum price of petroleum sold from the naval petroleum reserves (sec. 3301)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the authority for the Secretary of Energy to sell oil from the naval petroleum reserves for less than full market value.

Repeal of authority to contract for cooperative or unit plans affecting Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 (sec. 3302)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 7426 of title 10, United States Code, by deleting language that authorized the Federal Government to contract for cooperative or unit plans in the administration of the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 at Elk Hills. The committee notes that the United States interests to Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1 at Elk Hills was sold to the private sector.

TITLE XXXIV—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

National defense stockpile (secs. 3401–3402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the stockpile manager to obligate $75.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transfer Fund during fiscal year 2001 for the authorized uses of funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The committee further recommends a provision that would increase the amount of revenues that could be achieved through the sale of unneeded materials from the national defense stockpile.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated March 6, 2000, the Acting General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 8129 to the Committee on Armed Services on March 6, 2000. Executive Communication 8129 is available for review at the committee. Senators Warner and Levin introduced this legislative proposal as S. 2481, by request, on April 27, 2000.

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 2001.

Vote: Adopted by a roll call vote of 19–1.

The roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the mark-up have been made public and are available at the committee.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be

included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2001.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

Our armed forces remain the best-trained, best-equipped and most capable fighting force in the world. This bill continues the bipartisan partnership between the Congress and the Administration to improve the quality of life for the men and women of our armed forces and their families, and to transform our military forces to ensure that they are capable of meeting all of the threats to America's security in the 21st Century.

We have additional views on two issues addressed in the bill.

1. Vieques

The Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations and others have testified before the Committee that there is no adequate substitute for live training by the Navy on the island of Vieques. Earlier this year, the President entered into an agreement with the Governor of Puerto Rico, which establishes an orderly process for what we all hope will be the resumption of such training. Under this agreement, we would provide $40 million of economic assistance to the citizens of Vieques and transfer unneeded Department of Defense property on the western end of the island to the government of Puerto Rico with no strings attached. If a referendum on Vieques approves a resumption of live-fire training, an additional $50 million of economic assistance would be provided. If the referendum does not approve a resumption of training, Department of Defense property on the eastern end of the island would be transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal.

As of the conclusion of the Committee mark-up, the government of Puerto Rico had lived up to its obligations under the agreement. The Navy training range on the Vieques has been cleared of protestors with the assistance of the government of Puerto Rico. Navy training exercises have now resumed on the island, with the use of inert ordnance as provided in the agreement.

The Committee considered proposed legislation that would have been inconsistent with this agreement. In our view, these unilateral changes to the terms of the agreement, at a time when the government of Puerto Rico is living up to its obligations under the agreement, could have been perceived by some as a continuation of the kind of behavior that the Navy acknowledges got them into problems in Vieques in the first place. Such changes would have offended many citizens of Vieques and others throughout Puerto Rico, undermining the efforts of the Navy, and this Committee, to ensure the eventual resumption of live-fire training on Vieques. For this reason, we are pleased that the Committee did not adopt this proposal.

Instead, the provision in the bill would authorize $40 million of economic assistance, a referendum on the future of training on Vieques, and an additional $50 million of economic assistance if a

resumption of live-fire training is approved " all of which were requested by the President in accordance with the agreement. With regard to the other element of the agreement " the transfer of various lands to Puerto Rico under certain circumstances " the provision is silent, deferring congressional action until a later date. Finally, the provision in the bill would require a study of future requirements at Fort Buchanan and a moratorium on improvements at the facility until the study can be completed, but would not require the closure of Fort Buchanan or any other facility in Puerto Rico in the event of a negative vote on the referendum.

Our preference is to fully implement the agreement between the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico at this time. However, avoiding unilateral changes to the terms of the agreement is the next best outcome.

2. Department of Energy Organization

Last year, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 contained provisions reorganizing the entire Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex by creating a new, "semi-autonomous" National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) within the Department. These provisions, which were added in conference, were inconsistent with legislation passed in the Senate by a vote of 96–1 and went far beyond anything that was even considered by the House of Representatives.

The Secretary chose to implement this legislation by "dual hatting" a number of key NNSA employees, authorizing them to serve concurrently in both NNSA positions and DOE positions outside NNSA. Although the provisions establishing the NNSA did not contain any provision prohibiting dual-hatting and the Secretary received a legal opinion concluding that such dual- hatting was permissible, a number of Members of our Committee felt that this approach was inconsistent with the legislation. This bill responds to that perceived violation of the statute with provisions that would: (1) prohibit DOE from paying any NNSA officials who are "dual-hatted'; and (2) prohibit the Secretary of Energy from changing the organization of the NNSA in any way.

These are unprecedented restrictions on the ability of a Cabinet Secretary to manage his own Department, and undermine our ability to hold Secretary Richardson and his successors accountable for the activities of the Department of Energy.

Dual-hatting is commonplace throughout the government and has been legally permissible since we repealed the Dual Office Holding Act of 1894 more than 35 years ago. We have required the NNSA to handle 18 separate functions, including program management, safeguards and security, emergency management, environment, safety and health operations, contracting, intelligence, counterintelligence, personnel, legal matters, legislative affairs, and public affairs, among others. We may want all of these positions to be staffed overnight, but that doesn't make it happen. During the transition period, somebody has to fill these positions, and dual-hatting was probably the most economical and effective approach for the Secretary to take.

We are particularly concerned that the enactment of this provision would preclude the Department from creating a single

Counter-Intelligence czar, who serves as both the head of the Department-wide Office of Counterintelligence and the Chief of Defense Nuclear Counterintelligence. We believe that this consolidation of responsibilities could actually clarify responsibilities and eliminate opportunities for buck-passing in a way that makes sense.

In any case, the prohibition on reorganization is completely unnecessary in light of the express prohibition on dual-hatting. This provision would go far beyond its stated purpose of addressing dual-hatting, and prohibit the Secretary of Energy from even establishing, altering or consolidating any organizational unit, component or function of the NNSA.

Last year, the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board reported that the entire organization of the Department of Energy and its nuclear weapons complex had become "dysfunctional". Much of this organization remains unchanged, despite its transfer to the new NNSA. Yet this provision would prohibit the Secretary from addressing the problem by, for example:

reorganizing the NNSA to eliminate superfluous layers of management and make the organization more efficient;

reassigning functions from one component of NNSA to another, to rationalize the structure of the new Administration;

" creating new offices within NNSA to address emerging problems or overarching needs of the new Administration.

In short, this provision not only fails to address the problem identified by its sponsors, it also undermines the ability of the Secretary of Energy to address many of the concerns that led to the enactment of last year's legislation in the first place. We believe that both of the DOE provisions should be deleted from the bill.

CARL LEVIN.
CHUCK ROBB.
TED KENNEDY.
JACK REED.
MARY L. LANDRIEU.
JEFF BINGAMAN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JEFF BINGAMAN

I support the Armed Services Committee markup of this year's National Defense Authorization bill since it provides the necessary resources to meet the nation's increasingly complex military missions while also supporting quality of life improvements for our men and women in uniform. The bill also contains important improvements in health benefits for the nation's veterans, including a comprehensive pharmacy benefit for Medicare-eligible beneficiaries with no enrollment fee or deductible. Although I believe much more needs to be done to honor our commitment to provide adequate health care to veterans, this bill contains an important step toward that goal.

I am particularly pleased that this bill contains important measures honoring the nation's most heroic veterans . The bill contains a provision authorizing an honorarium for the survivors, or surviving spouses, of the Bataan Death March who were made to perform slave labor by the Japanese during World War II. The heroic efforts of those who served in the Phillippines during Bataan and Corregidor are legendary, but have never been fully compensated in the settlement of war claims. In 1952 the Japanese government agreed to provide compensation to American prisoners of war, but never compensated prisoners of war for their forced labor supporting the Japanese war effort. Claims for compensation have been under consideration by the courts for many years, but final settlement has not been reached. In the meantime, veterans of that campaign grow fewer as time passes and remain uncompensated for the sacrifices they made on behalf of the nation. This provision recognizes the importance of honoring those heroic veterans as an expression of the nation's gratitude. I will continue to support efforts to do so until this important gesture is enacted into law.

The bill also looks toward the future as well as recognizing the past. This legislation contains about $8.0 billion in funding for investment in science and technology research. This represents an increase of $446 million over the President's budget request and meets the funding goal for increased investment in future defense technologies that I proposed to the Committee two years ago. I am hopeful that the additional resources will be used to explore new technological concepts that can be used to maintain our edge over potential adversaries not only on the battlefield, but with respect to increasingly urgent requirements to protect the nation's infrastructure from various forms of terrorism including the use of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, increased investment in laser research might provide useful technologies that could meet future military objectives that could also minimize collateral damage.

I remain concerned, however, that the bill does not provide all that could be done to support the most vital national security objec-

tives with respect to non-proliferation and the strategic relationship between the United States and Russia. The President's budget, for example, requested $100 million to expand our efforts to control the threat of "loose nukes" finding their way into unfriendly hands. The "Long-Term Nonproliferation Program for Russia" included a request for funds that would prevent Russia from increasing its stockpile of plutonium separated from spent fuel from nuclear power plants by suspending reprocessing of spent fuel. It included funds to expand DOE's successful Materials, Protection, Control, and Accounting (MPC&A) program that has successfully implemented security regimes at dozens of Russian sites where nuclear materials are stored. The proposal also included funds to close nuclear warhead production facilities at Avangard and Penza–19 and to support displaced nuclear weapons workers to prevent them from seeking employment in unfriendly places.

In addition, the bill reduces funding for the Russian- American Observation Satellite (RAMOS) program, a cooperative technology demonstration project intended to enhance the ability to detect, characterize, and track theater range missiles that could be used against either country. I strongly believe that it is in our national security interest that Russian early warning capabilities be accurate, reliable, and effective. Misunderstandings or misperceptions of either nuclear power when under missile attack could lead to unanticipated and unintended conflict escalation that could decimate both countries. It's in our essential national interest, therefore, to work cooperatively to minimize the risk of such mistakes. In addition, since this program was initially authorized at the highest levels of both governments, it is important as a matter of building confidence and trust to support the original agreement underlying this program. The reduced RAMOS program contained in the bill calls for a restructured program that significantly reduces the benefits to both countries from those originally anticipated when the program was first agree to.

I am also disappointed to note that, although the bill contains substantial funding in support of the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship Program, it does not contain certain key investments needed to ensure the future effectiveness of that program. As a strong supporter of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, I believe that in order to achieve the non- proliferation goals of that international agreement, key investments must be made now in order to optimize our confidence in the nation's nuclear stockpile for the foreseeable future. The President's budget, for example, requested only a modest amount for the Microsystems and Engineering Sciences Application (MESA) project, that would invest in cutting edge nanotechnology research that would incorporate advanced microelectronic technologies into the refurbishment and sustainment of our nuclear stockpile. I believe significantly more funding is needed now in order to ensure that we have that capability in the future so that we will be more confident of the reliability of our nuclear stockpile in the absence of testing nuclear weapons. The bill does contains no additional funding beyond the requested level for this high priority effort needed to support the nation's non-proliferation goals while meeting nuclear stockpile reliability requirements.

I am particularly concerned that the bill includes provisions restricting the authority of the Secretary of Energy to manage his own department by precluding him from directing any reorganization, consolidation, alteration, or other adjustments to components within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The NNSA, although established as a "semi-autonomous agency" within the Department of Energy, is still subject to the Secretary's authority under the legislation approved last year. Legislation contained in this year's bill would set a dangerous precedent that empowers the Congress to restrict cabinet members' authority in ways that could preclude greater efficiency or modernization needed to keep pace with changing political, economic, or technological environments. I urge my colleagues to reconsider this provision during the remaining steps in the legislative cycle.

Finally, I am concerned that the provision in the bill regarding the agreement between the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico over disposition and use of Vieques island might have unintended results that could ultimately further complicate the Navy's need for realistic training. Given the difficulty of arriving at that agreement and the delicacy that pertains, I believe that any Congressional action that substantially alters that carefully crafted arrangement runs the risk of renewed confrontation and significant political consequences both here and in Puerto Rico.

JEFF BINGAMAN.

SENATOR MCCAIN'S MINORITY VIEWS

On most issues, I support the Committee's recommendations in the drafting of the Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Authorization bill. I voted against the bill, mostly because of what it does not do. I spelled out my concerns in a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee on March 23, 2000, but was disappointed that the bill that emerged from the committee failed to address important reform issues.

Last year, I was proud to stand with Senator Lott and Senator Roberts as we led the Senate in the passage of our legislation, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999.

This landmark legislation made great strides in providing significant benefits to the entire Total Force. Specifically, we improved the military by: restoring military retirement benefits to a full 50 percent of base pay for 20–year retirees, directing a 4.8 percent pay raise effective last January, crafting pay table reform, implementing Thrift Savings Plan proposals, as well as other significant quality of life improvements. We can take pride in our efforts to take care of our men and women in uniform. Unfortunately, the final bill was missing a key provision that was stripped by our colleagues in the House of Representatives " food stamp relief for servicemembers and their families.

I was very disappointed that the current year's authorization bill did not include legislation to provide a Special Subsistence Allowance to help the neediest families in the Armed Forces " numbering at least 12,000 " who now require federal food stamp assistance. Earlier this year I again introduced legislation to eliminate the food stamp army. It was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. Despite my repeated urging that this critical issue be addressed, the Committee failed to act on the bill.

We should have acted to eliminate the food stamp army " to do less is an affront to our most needy servicemembers and their families. It is unconscionable that the men and women who are willing to sacrifice their lives for their country have to rely on food stamps to make ends meet, and it is an abrogation of our responsibilities as Senators to let this reality go on without some sort of legislative remedy.

One of the areas of greatest concern among military retirees and their families is the "broken promise" of lifetime medical care, especially for those over-age 65. While the Committee included some key health care provisions, they failed to meet what I think is the most important requirement, the restoration of this broken promise.

Last year I was outspoken regarding reports that the aircraft carrier USS ENTERPRISE (CVN–65) deployed to the Persian Gulf undermanned by some 800 sailors. The Navy reports that it has in-

creasing difficulty filling critical sea-going billets. Despite Congress' efforts, we are losing Air Force and Navy pilots to the commercial airlines faster than we can train them. The Army says that five of its 10 divisions lack enough majors, captains, senior enlisted personnel, tankers, and gunners. These Army reports corroborate the disturbingly low readiness ratings of the 1st Infantry Division and the 10th Mountain Division reported last year.

The Committee, however, did spend a great deal of effort authorizing additional dollars for the many shipbuilding interests. For instance, the Committee added $460 million to build another amphibious assault ship, the LHD–8, which was not in the President's budget and for which the Navy has not even approved a procurement plan. The bill also boosted spending for the DDG–51 destroyer program by $144 million above the Navy's and the President's request.

Finally—not to be outdone by the surface shipyards—the submarine shipbuilders received early authorization to procure the next 5 VIRGINIA class submarines, at a cost of $2.1 billion each, accelerating the authorization for the fifth boat by a full year from the Navy's current plan. In effect, the submarine shipbuilders have been given permission to continue the current non-competitive teaming arrangement, instead of allowing the market to determine whether only one shipyard is needed.

I have noted that there has been a significant effort to fund items that were specifically included on the Service Chiefs' unfunded requirements list. However, every year, certain items are funded that are not on the lists and whose merits are questionable. In all my years serving on the House and the Senate Armed Services Committees, I recall no previous instances of one subcommittee chair transferring money to another subcommittee for the purpose of funding a special interest project. The defense bill transferred $3 million from the shipbuilding budget to the personnel budget to fund a new Navy "Call Center" in Cutler, Maine. I wonder why we can't use this same accounting method to fund improvements in the military retiree health care delivery system? Why not shift the money from the unrequested LHD–8 to pay for additional military health care improvements?

When I put on my web site the lists of pork barrel projects that are added by members of Congress, I try not to include high priority programs and activities that are in the President's budget or are listed on the Service Chief's priority lists. However, I have become increasingly skeptical of these lists. These so-called "wish lists" have proven an effective means of ensuring that such funds are apportioned appropriately in terms of what is best for the national interest. There is, however, growing reason for concern that the process by which the wish lists are drafted is being politicized.

This politicization has resulted in lists'especially this year's list from the Department of the Navy'of increasingly questionable merit. The Navy's fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirements list includes $1.2 billion for an amphibious aircraft carrier assault ship. Last year, the Navy did not even consider placing partial funding for the ship on their list and, furthermore, last year the Navy rejected a $500 million plus-up from the Senate. This is just one example of how Congress' political meddling has seriously impeded

the military's ability to channel resources where they are most needed.

I could continue in this vein, but it is sufficient to say that the military needs less money spent on pork and more money spent wisely to redress the serious problems caused by a decade of declining defense budgets. Those of us who have been criticized for sounding alarm bells about military readiness now have the empty satisfaction of seeing that there is more to maintaining a strong defense than a politician's history of falsely promising to do so.

We must reform the bureaucracy of the Pentagon. With the exception of minor changes, our defense establishment looks just as it did 50 years ago. We must continue to incorporate practices from the private sector'like restructuring, reforming and streamlining'to eliminate duplication and capitalize on cost savings.

More effort must be made to reduce the continuing growth of headquarters staffs and to decentralize the Pentagon's labyrinth of bureaucratic fiefdoms. Although nearly every military analyst shares these views, the Committee took great measures to increase the size of headquarters staffs, eliminating any incentive for the Pentagon to change its way of doing business with its bloated staffs and its outdated practices.

More must be done to eliminate unnecessary and duplicative military contracts and military installations. Every U.S. military leader who has testified over the past decade has testified as to the critical need for further BRAC rounds. We can redirect from $4 to $7 billion per year by eliminating excess defense infrastructure. There is another $2 billion per year we can put to better purposes by privatizing or consolidating support and maintenance functions, and an additional $5.5 billion can be saved per year by eliminating "Buy America" restrictions that only undermines U.S. competitiveness overseas. Despite these compelling facts, the Senate Armed Services Committee did not address any of these issues.

I voted no on the passage of this bill because we can not continue with this "business as usual" mindset. We must reform the Department of Defense and we must not fall prey to the special interest groups that attempt to warp our perspective and misdirect our spending. We owe so much more to our men and women in uniform who defend our country. They are our greatest resource, and I feel they were woefully under represented. We must do better. The lives of our servicemembers and the national security of the United States are at risk.

JOHN MCCAIN.

○