AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS
2nd Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–616

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4205

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 12, 2000.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

106TH CONGRESS
2nd Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–616

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4205

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 12, 2000.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

64–304 WASHINGTON : 2000

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina, *Chairman*

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

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

ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorization in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	3
Rationale for the Committee Bill	10
Hearings	17
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION	19
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	19
OVERVIEW	19
Aircraft Procurement, Army	22
Overview	22
Items of Special Interest	26
AH–64 modifications	26
Airborne reconnaissance low (ARL)	26
Airborne communications	26
Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)	27
Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE) modifications	27
CH–47 Chinook/UH–60 Blackhawk crashworthy fuel tanks	28
Helicopter crashworthy seats	28
TH–67 Creek	28
UH–60 Blackhawk	29
Missile Procurement, Army	29
Overview	29
Items of Special Interest	32
Army tactical missile system (ATACMS) system summary	32
Multipurpose individual munition (MPIM) advance procurement	32
Patriot advanced capability-2 (PAC–2)	32
Patriot anti-cruise missile (PACM)	32
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	33
Overview	33
Items of Special Interest	37
Armored vehicle launch bridge (AVLB) service life extension program (SLEP)	37
Bradley base sustainment	37
Bradley fighting vehicle system (BFVS) series (modifications)	37
Heavy assault bridge (HAB) system	38
Improved recovery vehicle (IRV)	38
Industrial preparedness	38
M1 Abrams tank modifications	39
M113 carrier modifications	39
M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW)	39
MK19–3 grenade launcher	40
Small arms production industrial base	40
Ammunition Procurement, Army	40
Overview	40
Items of Special Interest	44
Army ammunition procurement	44
Other Procurement, Army	44
Overview	44
Items of Special Interest	54
Army data distribution system (ADDS)	54
Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)	54

Page

Army training modernization 54
Combat support medical 55
Combat training centers instrumentation support 55
Communications equipment system upgrades 56
Construction equipment service life extension program (SLEP) 56
Cranes 57
Deployable universal combat earthmovers (DEUCE) 57
Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV) 57
Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV) 58
High mobility multipurpose-wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) 58
Hydraulic excavator (HYEX) 58
Information system security program (ISSP) 59
Integrated family of test equipment (IFTE) 59
Laundries, showers, and latrines 59
Lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME) 60
M56 smoke generator system 60
M915/M916 line haul truck tractor 60
Night vision devices 60
Nonsystem training devices 61
Reserve component automation system (RCAS) 61
Ribbon bridge 62
Single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) family 62
Small tug 63
Standard integrated command post system (SICPS) 63
Standard teleoperating kit 63
Vibratory self-propelled roller 64
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army 64
Overview 64
Items of Special Interest 66
Chemical agents and munitions destruction 66
Aircraft Procurement, Navy 66
Overview 66
Items of Special Interest 71
Advanced helicopter emergency egress lighting system (ADHEELS) ... 71
AN/AVR–2A laser detecting set 71
AV–8B 71
C–40A 72
CH–60S 72
E–2 modifications 72
EA–6B modifications 73
F–18 series modifications 73
F/A–18C/D tactical aircraft moving map capability (TAMMAC) 74
F/A–18E/F 75
HH/UH–1N reclamation and conversion program 75
H–46 modifications 76
H–53 modifications 76
KC–130J 76
T–45 training system (TS) 77
Tactical air reconnaissance pod system (TARPS)-completely digital (CD) 77
UC–35 78
Weapons Procurement, Navy 78
Overview 78
Items of Special Interest 82
Hellfire II missile 82
Improved tactical air-launched decoy (ITALD) 82
Joint standoff weapon (JSOW) 82
Standoff land attack missile-expanded response (SLAM–ER) 82
Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps 83
Overview 83
Items of Special Interest 84
Navy ammunition procurement 84
Marine Corps ammunition procurement 84
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 84
Overview 84
Items of Special Interest 89

Page
LHD–8 amphibious assault ship 89
Auxiliary dry cargo ship 89
Submarine force level 89
Submarine refueling overhauls 90
Other Procurement, Navy 91
Overview 91
Items of Special Interest 101
AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar 101
Aviation life support 101
Education support equipment 101
High-pressure cleaner 101
Joint tactical terminal 102
Mobile remote emitter simulator (MRES) 102
Nuclear attack submarine (SSN) acoustics 102
Operating forces industrial plant equipment 103
Other training equipment 103
Sonobuoys 103
Undersea warfare support equipment 103
WSN–7B ring laser gyro (RLG) 104
Procurement, Marine Corps 104
Overview 104
Items of Special Interest 109
Command post systems 109
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) 109
Improved recovery vehicle (IRV) 109
Material handling equipment 110
Modification kits (intelligence) 110
Radio systems 111
Small unit riverine craft (SURC) 111
Training devices 111
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 112
Overview 112
Items of Special Interest 119
A–10 modifications 119
Aircraft navigational and passenger safety equipment 119
C–130 modifications 120
Compass call block 30/35 mission crew simulator (MCS) 120
C–135 modifications 121
C–17 121
C–17 reverse-affiliate units 122
Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), line 56 122
Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), line 80 124
F–15 modifications 124
F–15E 125
F–16 modifications 125
F–16 improved avionics intermediate shop (IAIS) 126
F–16C 127
E–8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (STARS) 128
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA) 128
Predator 128
T–3A modifications 129
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force 129
Overview 129
Missile Procurement, Air Force 132
Overview 132
Items of Special Interest 136
AGM–65 modifications 136
Medium launch vehicle (MLV) 136
Titan 136
Other Procurement, Air Force 136
Overview 136
Items of Special Interest 142
Automatic data processing equipment (ADPE) 142
AN/FPS–117 radar beacon replacement 142
Eagle vision 142
Rivet joint mission trainer (RJMT) 142
Senior scout 143

Page

Situation awareness data link (SADL) gateway for the theater air control system (TACS) ... 143
Supply asset tracking system (SATS) ... 143
Procurement, Defense-Wide ... 144
Overview ... 144
Items of Special Interest ... 149
Automated document conversion system (ADCS) ... 149
Counternarcotics discreet operations radio (CONDOR) ... 149
Patriot advanced capability 3 (PAC–3) ... 149
Portable intelligence collection and relay capability (PICRC) ... 149
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense ... 150
Overview ... 150
Items of Special Interest ... 152
Chemical agents and munitions destruction ... 152
Chemical stockpile disposal project ... 152
Chemical stockpile emergency preparedness project (CSEPP) ... 153
Alternative technologies and approaches project ... 153
Non-stockpile chemical materiel project ... 153
Chemical agent identification sets ... 154
Assembled chemical weapons assessment (ACWA) ... 154
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 155
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 155
Sections 101–107—Authorization of Appropriations ... 155
Subtitle B—Army Programs ... 155
Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority ... 155
Section 112—Increase in Limitation on Number of Bunker Defeat Munitions that May be Acquired ... 155
Section 113—Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative ... 156
Subtitle C—Navy Programs ... 156
Section 121—Submarine Force Structure ... 156
Section 122—Virginia Class Submarine Program ... 156
Section 123—Retention of Configuration of Certain Naval Reserve Frigates ... 156
Section 124—Extension of Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers ... 156
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs ... 157
Section 131—Annual Report on Operational Status of B–2 Bomber ... 157
Subtitle E—Joint Programs ... 157
Section 141—Study of Production Alternatives for the Joint Strike Fighter Program ... 157
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION ... 158
OVERVIEW ... 158
Army RDT&E ... 161
Overview ... 161
Items of Special Interest ... 170
Advanced artillery systems ... 170
Advanced battery technology ... 170
Aircrew coordination training ... 171
Apache Longbow focused modernization program ... 171
Army tactical unmanned aerial vehicles ... 171
Breacher system ... 171
Chinook helicopter modification and improvement ... 172
Comanche ... 172
Combat identification dismounted soldier (CIDDS) ... 173
Combustion-driven eye-safe self-powered laser ... 173
Common ground station ... 173
Communications and networking technologies ... 174
Defense manufacturing technology ... 174
Emergency preparedness training ... 175
Future combat system ... 175
Future rotorcraft technologies ... 176
Guardrail common sensor ... 177
Helmet mounted infrared sensor development ... 177
High-energy laser test facility ... 177
Hypersonic wind tunnels ... 177
Integrated inertial measurement unit-geo-positioning system ... 178

Page
Land information warfare activity 178
Medical errors reduction research 178
Mobile tactical high energy laser 179
National automotive center-university innovative research 179
Passive millimeter wave camera 179
Real-time heart rate variability 179
Semi-automated imagery processor 180
Starstreak 180
Surveillance control data link (SCDL) 180
Thermal fluid based combat feeding system 181
Trajectory correctable munitions 181
Volumetrically controlled manufacturing technology 181
Navy RDT&E 182
Overview 182
Items of Special Interest 193
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle 193
Advanced anti-radiation guided missile 193
Advanced deployable system 194
Advanced technology demonstrations and fleet battle experiments 194
Advanced waterjet propulsor 195
Aircraft survivability study 195
Aviation depot maintenance technology 196
Aviation modernization plan 196
Battle force tactical trainer (BFTT) 197
Beartrap 197
C–2 eight-blade composite propeller system 198
Common command and decision system 198
Common towed array 199
Composite advanced sail development 199
CVNX aircraft carrier design product modeling 200
Distributed engineering plant 200
Distributed marine environment forecast system 201
DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof-of-concept demonstration 201
Dry chemical fire suppressant 202
E2–C2 rotordome and control surface improvements 202
Extended range guided munition 202
F–18 203
Fielded system obsolescence, technology insertion and technology refreshment 204
Fleet health technology and occupational lung disease 205
Flight worthy transparent armor system 205
High mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS) 206
High performance sigma-delta waveform generator 206
Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communication technology 206
Hybrid light detection and ranging (LIDAR)/radar technology 207
Hyperspectral research 207
Insensitive munitions 207
Integrated aviation life support systems 208
Integrated semiconductor bridge based fuze 208
Intermediate modulus carbon fiber and ultra-high thermal conductivity graphite fibers 208
Joint forces command operational testbed 209
Joint helmet mounted cueing system 209
Joint tactical combat training system 210
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA) 210
Littoral support fast patrol craft 210
Location of global positioning systems (GPS) jammers 211
Malaria deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) vaccine 211
Manned reconnaissance systems 211
Marine Corps dragon warrior UAV 211
Marine mammal research 212
Maritime technology (MARITECH) program 212
Mobile electronic warfare support system 213
Mobile integrated diagnostic and data analysis system (MIDDAS) 213
Multi-function radar/volume search radar and the Navy's radar roadmap 213
Multipurpose processor 214

Page

Naval space surveillance 215
Navy mine countermeasures program 215
Advanced sensors for mine countermeasures and oceanography 215
AN/AQS–20/X mine hunting sonar 216
Synthetic aperture sonar development for long-term mine reconnaissance system 216
Naval modeling and simulation 217
New composite materials for aircraft canopies 217
Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition 218
Optically multiplexed wideband radar beam-forming array 218
P–3 modernization program 218
P–3 special mission squadron sensor upgrade 219
Parametric airborne dipping sonar 219
Power node control centers 220
Project M 220
Radio frequency integration and testing environment 221
Remote precision gun 221
S–3B surveillance system upgrade program 222
Ship service fuel cell program 222
Silicon carbide and gallium nitride semiconductor substrates 222
Single flux quantum electronics 223
SSGN Conversion 223
Submarine sonar dome window 225
Supply chain management and development best practices 225
Surface ship torpedo defense 226
Tactical unmanned aerial vehicles 226
Vacuum electronics 226
Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter demonstration 227
Virtual test bed for advanced electrical ship systems 228
Air Force RDT&E 228
Overview 228
Items of Special Interest 239
21st century affordable aircraft thrust demonstration project 239
Aging landing gear life extension 239
Airborne laser 239
Airborne reconnaissance systems 240
Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) partnership 241
Air Force science and technology 241
Aerospace propulsion 242
Aircrew laser eye protection 242
Ballistic missile technology 243
Combat identification 243
Composite affordability initiative 243
Low cost launch technology 244
Miniature satellite threat reporting system 244
Specialty aerospace metals 244
Upper atmospheric and astronomical research 245
Advanced message-oriented data security module (AMODSM) 245
B–1B link 16 data link 246
B–2 upgrades 246
B–52 modified miniature receive terminals configuration 247
Defense reconnaissance support program 247
Discoverer II 247
Eagle vision 248
Electronic warfare development 248
Extended range cruise missile (ERCM) 249
Global hawk unmanned aerial vehicle 249
Hyperspectral imagery system 250
Integrated broadcast service 250
Joint ejection seat program 251
Joint strike fighter 252
Military strategic and tactical relay (MILSTAR) 253
Mobile approach control system 254
Multi-link antenna system 254
Satellite control network 255
Small smart munitions 255
Space-based infrared system-high (SBIRS-High) 256

Page
Space-based infrared system-low (SBIRS-Low) 256
Spacelift range system 257
U–2 senior year electro-optic system polarimetry 258
Defense Wide RDT&E 259
Overview 259
Items of Special Interest 268
Advanced sensor applications program 268
Ballistic missile defense (BMD) 268
Advanced technology development 269
Liquid surrogate target 269
National missile defense (NMD) 270
Navy theater wide 271
Russian-American cooperative national missile defense 272
Support technology 272
Wide bandwidth information infrastructure 272
Chemical-biological defense program 273
Chemical and biological defense program initiatives 273
Optical computing device materials for chemical sensors 274
Commercial off-the-shelf-receiver development 274
Competitive sustainment demonstration 275
Complex systems design 275
Computational fluid dynamics and finite element analysis 275
Computer network security 276
CV–22 Osprey radar improvements 276
Defense agency science and technology funding 276
Biological warfare defense 277
Computing systems and communications technology 277
Extensible information systems 278
Nuclear sustainment and counter-proliferation technologies 278
Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research 278
Facial recognition technology 278
High definition displays for military applications 278
High energy laser research and development 279
Defense-wide high energy laser development 279
Free electron laser 280
Solid state laser 280
Information technology, superiority and assurance 281
Interference with global positioning system 282
MC–130 autonomous landing guidance system 282
Medical free electron laser 283
Microelectromechanical systems sensor development 283
National imagery and mapping agency 283
Requirement for "designated laboratory" 284
Science and technology affordability initiative 284
Special operations tactical video system 285
Tactical and support aircraft noise reduction 285
Texas regional institute for environmental studies 286
Thermionics for space power systems 286
TRICARE encounter data system 286
Ultra-wideband radar 286
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 287
Overview 287
Items of Special Interest 289
Central test and evaluation investment program 289
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 290
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 290
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 290
Section 202—Amount for Basic and Applied Research 290
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 290
Section 211—High Energy Laser Programs 290
Section 212—Management of Space-Based Infrared System-Low 291
Section 213—Joint Strike Fighter 291
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense 291
Section 231—Funding for Fiscal Year 2001 291
Section 232—Sense of Congress Concerning Commitment to Deploy National Missile Defense 291

Page

Section 233—Reports on Ballistic Missile Threat Posed By North Korea ... 292
Section 234—Plan to Modify Ballistic Missile Defense Architecture to Cover Intermediate-Range Ballistic Missile Threats ... 292
Section 235—Designation of Airborne Laser Program as a Program Element of Ballistic Missile Defense Program ... 293
Subtitle D—Other Matters ... 293
Section 241—Recognition of Those Individuals Instrumental to Naval Research Efforts During the Period from Before World War II Through the End of the Cold War ... 293
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ... 294
OVERVIEW ... 294
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 324
Budget Request Increases ... 324
Critical Readiness Accounts ... 324
Depot maintenance ... 324
Real property maintenance ... 324
Miscellaneous unfunded requirements ... 324
Mobility enhancement funding ... 325
Training accounts ... 325
Army Cold Weather Clothing ... 325
Budget Request Reductions ... 326
Civilian Personnel Reductions ... 326
Excess Foreign Currencies Reductions ... 326
Headquarters Reductions ... 326
Joint Chiefs of Staff Training Exercises ... 327
Other Items of Special Interest ... 327
Accountability of Operation and Maintenance Funding ... 327
Environmental Issues ... 327
Fines and Penalties ... 327
Navy Environmental Leadership Program ... 328
Intelligence Issues ... 328
Cryptologic Skills Training ... 328
Defense Foreign Language Program ... 328
Distributed Common Ground System ... 329
Eagle Vision Commercial Imagery ... 329
Integrated Broadcast Service ... 330
RC–135 and U–2 Operations and Maintenance ... 330
Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Issues ... 330
Armed Forces Recreation Centers ... 330
Lodging Programs ... 331
Nonappropriated Fund Support of Official Activities ... 331
Other Issues ... 332
Army Apprenticeship Program ... 332
Army Workload and Performance System ... 332
Automatic Identification Technology ... 333
Civilian Air Traffic Controllers ... 333
Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities ... 334
Container Freight Station Operations ... 334
Core Logistics Capabilities ... 334
Defense Joint Accounting System ... 335
Defense Personnel Records Imaging System-Electronics Military Personnel Records System ... 336
Department of Defense Civilian Personnel ... 336
Personnel safety ... 336
Recruiting and retention ... 337
Financial Policy ... 337
Local School Renovation and Repair ... 338
Logistics Support Planning ... 338
Military Affiliate Radio System ... 339
National Maintenance Program ... 340
Naval Audit Service ... 341
Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS) ... 341
Spare and Repair Parts ... 341
Urban Warfare Training ... 342
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 342
Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations ... 342

Page
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding 342
Section 302—Working Capital Funds 342
Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home 343
Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund 343
Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions 343
Section 311—Payment of Fines and Penalties Imposed for Environmental Violations 343
Section 312—Necessity of Military Low-Level Flight Training to Protect National Security and Enhance Military Readiness 343
Section 313—Use of Environmental Restoration Accounts to Relocate Activities from Defense Environmental Restoration Sites 343
Subtitle C—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities . 343
Section 321—Use of Appropriated Funds to Cover Operating Expenses of Commissary Stores 343
Section 322—Adjustment of Sales Prices of Commissary Store Goods and Services to Cover Certain Expenses 344
Section 323—Use of Surcharges for Construction and Improvement of Commissary Stores 344
Section 324—Inclusion of Magazines and Other Periodicals as an Authorized Commissary Merchandise Category 344
Section 325—Use of Most Economical Distribution Method for Distilled Spirits 345
Section 326—Report on Effects of Availability of Slot Machines on United States Military Installations Overseas 345
Subtitle D—Performance of Functions by Private-Sector Sources 345
Section 331—Inclusion of Additional Information in Reports to Congress Required before Conversion of Commercial or Industrial Type Functions to Contractor Performance 345
Section 332—Limitation Regarding Navy Marine Corps Intranet Contract 345
Subtitle E—Defense Dependents Education 346
Section 341—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 346
Section 342—Eligibility Requirements for Attendance at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools 346
Subtitle F—Military Readiness Issues 347
Section 351—Additional Capabilities of, and Reporting Requirements for, the Readiness Reporting System 347
Section 352—Reporting Requirements Regarding Transfers from High-Priority Readiness Appropriations 347
Section 353—Department of Defense Strategic Plan to Reduce Backlog in Maintance and Repair of Defense Facilities 347
Subtitle G—Other Matters 348
Section 361—Authority to Ensure Demilitarization of Significant Military Equipment Formerly Owned by the Department of Defense 348
Section 362—Annual Report on Public Sale of Certain Military Equipment Identified on United States Munitions List 348
Section 363—Registration of Certain Information Technology Systems with Chief Information Officer 349
Section 364—Studies and Reports Required as Precondition to Certain Manpower Reductions 349
Section 365—National Guard Assistance for Certain Youth and Chartable Organizations 349
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 352
Subtitle A—Active Forces 352
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 352
Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Minimum Levels 352
Section 403—Adjustment to End Strength Flexibility Authority 353
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 353
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 353
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 353
Section 413—End Strength for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 354

Page

Section 414—Increase in Number of Members in Certain Grades Authorized to Be on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 354
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 355
Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel 355
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 358
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 358
Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Office 358
Department of Defense International Student Program at the Military Colleges 358
Funding for Recruiting and Retention 359
Homosexual Conduct Briefings 360
Incentives for Overseas Assignments 360
National Guard Military Technician Overtime Pay 361
Uniformed Services Former Spouse Protection Act 361
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 361
Subtitle A—General Personnel Management Authorities 361
Section 501—Authority for Secretary of Defense to Suspend Certain Personnel Strength Limitations During War or National Emergency 361
Section 502—Authority to Issue Posthumous Commissions in the Case of Members Dying Before Official Recommendation for Appointment or Promotion is Approved by Secretary Concerned 362
Section 503—Technical Correction to Retired Grade Rule for Army and Air Force Officers 362
Section 504—Extension to End of Calendar Year of Expiration Date for Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities 362
Section 505—Clarification of Requirements for Composition of Active-Duty List Selection Boards When Reserve Officers are Under Consideration 363
Section 506—Voluntary Separation Incentive 363
Section 507—Congressional Review Period for Assignment of Women to Duty on Submarines and for Any Proposed Reconfiguration or Design of Submarines to Accommodate Female Crew Members 363
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Personnel Policy 363
Section 511—Exemption from Active-Duty List for Reserve Officers on Active Duty for a Period of Three Years or Less 363
Section 512—Exemption of Reserve Component Medical and Dental Officers from Counting in Grade Strengths 363
Section 513—Continuation of Officers on the Reserve Active Status List Without Requirement for Application 364
Section 514—Authority to Retain Reserve Component Chaplains and Officers in Medical Specialties Until Specified Age 364
Section 515—Authority for Temporary Increase in Number of Reserve Component Personnel Serving on Active Duty or Full-Time National Guard Duty in Certain Grades 364
Section 516—Authority for Provision of Legal Services to Reserve Component Members Following Release from Active Duty 364
Section 517—Entitlement to Separation Pay for Reserve Officers Released from Active Duty Upon Declining Selective Continuation on Active Duty After Second Failure of Selection for Promotion 364
Section 518—Extension of Involuntary Civil Service Retirement Date for Certain Reserve Technicians 365
Subtitle C—Education and Training 365
Section 521—College Tuition Assistance Program for Pursuit of Degrees by Members of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program 365
Section 522—Review of Allocation of Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps Units Among the Services 365
Section 523—Authority for Naval Postgraduate School to Enroll Certain Defense Industry Civilians in Specified Programs Relating to Defense Product Development 366
Subtitle D—Decorations, Awards, and Commendations 366
Section 531—Authority for Award of the Medal of Honor to Andrew J. Smith for Valor during the Civil War 366
Section 532—Authority for Award of the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman for Valor during the Vietnam Conflict 366

Page

Section 533—Consideration of Proposals for Posthumous or Honorary Promotions or Appointments of Members or Former Members of the Armed Forces and Other Qualified Persons 366
Section 534—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Navy Distinguished Flying Cross to Certain Persons 367
Section 535—Addition of Certain Information to Markers on Graves Containing Remains of Certain Unknowns from the U.S.S. ARIZONA Who Died in the Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 367
Section 536—Sense of Congress Regarding Final Crew of U.S.S. INDIANAPOLIS 367
Section 537—Posthumous Advancement of Rear Admiral (Retired) Husband E. Kimmel and Major General (Retired) Walter C. Short on Retired Lists 367
Section 538—Commendation of Citizens of Remy, France, for World War II Actions 367
Subtitle E—Military Justice Matters 368
Section 541—Recognition by States of Military Testamentary Instruments 368
Section 542—Probable Cause Required for Entry of Names of Subjects into Official Criminal Investigative Reports 368
Section 543—Collection and Use of DNA Identification Information from Violent and Sexual Offenders in the Armed Forces 368
Section 544—Limitation on Secretarial Authority to Grant Clemency for Military Prisoners Serving Sentence of Confinement for Life Without Eligibility for Parole 368
Section 545—Authority for Civilian Special Agents of Military Department Criminal Investigative Organizations to Execute Warrants and Make Arrests 369
Subtitle F—Other Matters 369
Section 551—Funeral Honors Duty Compensation 369
Section 552—Test of Ability of Reserve Component Intelligence Units and Personnel to Meet Current and Emerging Defense Intelligence Needs 369
Section 553—National Guard Challenge Program 369
Section 554—Study of Use of Civilian Contractor Pilots for Operational Support Missions 370
Section 555—Pilot Program to Enhance Military Recruiting by Improving Military Awareness of School Counselors and Educators 370
Section 556—Reimbursement for Expenses Incurred by Members in Connection with Cancellation of Leave on Short Notice 370
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 371
OVERVIEW 371
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 372
Briefings on Benefits of Military Service 372
Extension of Time Limitation on Use of Reserve Education Benefits 373
Improved Basic Allowance for Housing 373
Military Pay Day Every 14 Days 373
Pay Table Reform for Mid-Grade Enlisted Members 374
Reimbursement for Reservists' Travel Expenses 374
Reimbursement of Permanent Change of Station Expenses 374
Retired Pay Following Reduction in Grade 375
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 375
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 375
Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2001 375
Section 602—Revised Method for Calculation of Basic Allowance for Subsistence 375
Section 603—Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance for Low-Income Members of the Armed Forces 375
Section 604—Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing for Inside the United States 376
Section 605—Equitable Treatment of Junior Enlisted Members in Computation of Basic Allowance for Housing 376
Section 606—Basic Allowance for Housing Authorized for Additional Members Without Dependents Who Are on Sea Duty 376
Section 607—Personal Money Allowance for Senior Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces 376

Page

Section 608—Allowance for Officers for Purchase of Required Uniforms and Equipment 377
Section 609—Increase in Monthly Subsistence Allowance for Members of Precommissioning Programs 377
Section 610—Additional Amount Available for Fiscal Year 2001 Increase in Basic Allowance for Housing Inside the United States 377
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 377
Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 377
Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses and Nurse Anesthetists 378
Section 613—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays 378
Section 614—Consistency of Authorities for Special Pay for Reserve Medical and Dental Officers 378
Section 615—Special Pay for Coast Guard Physician Assistants 378
Section 616—Special Duty Assignment Pay for Enlisted Members 378
Section 617—Revision of Career Sea Pay 378
Section 618—Revision of Enlistment Bonus Authority 379
Section 619—Authorization of Retention Bonus for Members of the Armed Forces Qualified in a Critical Military Skill 379
Section 620—Elimination of Required Congressional Notification before Implementation of Certain Special Pay Authority 379
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances 379
Section 631—Advance Payments for Temporary Lodging of Members and Dependents 379
Section 632—Additional Transportation Allowance Regarding Baggage and Household Effects 379
Section 633—Equitable Dislocation Allowances for Junior Enlisted Members 379
Section 634—Authority to Reimburse Military Recruiters, Senior ROTC Cadre, and Military Entrance Processing Personnel for Certain Parking Expenses 379
Section 635—Expansion of Funded Student Travel for Dependents 380
Subtitle D—Retirement and Survivor Benefit Matters 380
Section 641—Increase in Maximum Number of Reserve Retirement Points That May be Credited in Any Year 380
Section 642—Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan Spousal Consent Requirement 380
Subtitle E—Other Matters 380
Section 651—Participation in Thrift Savings Plan 380
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 381
OVERVIEW 381
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 382
Funding for the Defense Health Program 382
Preventive Health Care Services 383
Report on Computer-Based Patient Record and Medical Records Tracking System 383
Report on Mandatory Enrollment Program for TRICARE Beneficaries 384
Subtitle A—Health Care Services 384
Section 701—Two-Year Extension of Authority for Use of Contract Physicians at Military Entrance Processing Stations and Elsewhere Outside Medical Treatment Facilities 384
Section 702—Medical and Dental Care for Medal of Honor Recipients ... 384
Section 703—Provision of Domiciliary and Custodial Care for CHAMPUS Beneficiaries and Certain Former CHAMPUS Beneficiaries 385
Section 704—Demonstration Project for Expanded Access to Mental Health Counselors 385
Section 705—Teleradiology Demonstration Project 385
Subtitle B—TRICARE Program 386
Section 711—Additional Beneficiaries Under TRICARE Prime Remote Program in the Continental United States 386
Section 712—Elimination of Copayments for Immediate Family 386
Section 713—Modernization of TRICARE Business Practices and Increased Use of Military Treatment Facilities 386

Page

Section 714—Claims Processing Improvements 387
Section 715—Prohibition Against Requirement for Prior Authorization for Certain Referrals; Report on Nonavailability-of-Health-Care Statements 388
Section 716—Authority to Establish Special Locality-Based Reimbursement Rates; Reports 388
Section 717—Reimbursement for Certain Travel Expenses 388
Section 718—Reduction of Catastrophic Cap 388
Section 719—Report on Protections Against Health Care Providers Seeking Direct Reimbursement from Members of the Uniformed Services 389
Section 720—Disenrollment Process for TRICARE Retiree Dental Program 389
Subtitle C—Health Care Programs for Medicare-Eligible Department of Defense Beneficiaries 389
Section 721—Implementation of TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program .. 389
Section 722—Study on Health Care Options for Medicare-Eligible Military Retirees 390
Section 723—Extended Coverage Under Federal Employees Health Benefits Program 390
Section 724—Extension of TRICARE Senior Supplement Program 391
Section 725—Extension of TRICARE Senior Prime Demonstration Project 391
Subtitle D—Other Matters 391
Section 731—Training in Health Care Management and Administration 391
Section 732—Study of Accrual Financing for Health Care for Military Retirees 391
Section 733—Tracking Patient Safety in Military Medical Treatment Facilities 391
Section 734—Pharmaceutical Identification Technology 392
Section 735—Management of Vaccine Immunization Program 392
Section 736—Study on Feasibility of Sharing Biomedical Research Facility 392
Section 738—VA/DOD Sharing Agreements for Health Services 393
TITLE VIII—ACQUISTION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 394
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 394
Procurement of Military Clothing and Clothing-Related Items by Military Installations in the United States 394
Compliance with Applicable Labor Laws in Procurement of Military Clothing 394
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 394
Section 801—Extension of Authority for Department of Defense Acquisition Pilot Programs; Reports Required 394
Section 802—Technical Data Rights for Items Developed Exclusively at Private Expense 395
Section 803—Management of Acquisition of Mission-Essential Software for Major Defense Acquisition Programs 395
Section 804—Extension of Waiver Period for Live-Fire Survivability Testing for MH–47E and MH–60K Helicopter Modification Programs 395
Section 805—Three-Year Extension of Authority of Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects . 395
Section 806—Certification of Major Automated Information Systems as to Compliance with Clinger-Cohen Act 396
Section 807—Limitations on Procurement of Certain Items 396
Section 808—Multiyear Services Contracts 396
Section 809—Study on Impact of Foreign Sourcing of Systems on Long-Term Military Readiness and Related Industrial Infrastructure 396
Section 810—Prohibition Against Use of Department of Defense Funds to Give or Withhold a Preference to a Marketer or Vendor of Firearms or Ammunition 397
Section 811—Study and Report on Practice of Contract Bundling in Military Construction Contracts 397
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANGEMENT 398

Page
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 398
Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs 398
Management Headquarters 399
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 399
Section 901—Change of Title of Certain Positions in the Headquarters, Marine Corps 399
Section 902—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition and Support Workforce 399
Section 903—Clarification of Scope of Inspector General Authorities under Military Whistleblower Law 400
Section 904—Report on Number of Personnel Assigned to Legislative Liaison Functions 400
Section 905—Joint Report on Establishment of National Collaborative Information Analysis Capability 400
Section 906—Organization and Management of Civil Air Patrol 401
Section 907—Report on Network Centric Warfare 401
Section 908—Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation 402
Section 909—Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies 403
Section 910—Change in Name of Armed Forces Staff College to Joint Forces Staff College 403
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 404
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 404
Counter-Drug Activities 404
Overview 404
Funding 405
Items of Special Interest 405
Air National Guard fighter operations 405
Coastal Patrol equipment procurement 406
Operation Caper Focus 406
Puerto Rico ROTHR security 406
Southwest border fence 406
OTHER MATTERS 406
Quadrennial Defense Review 406
Department of Defense Personnel Security Investigation Requirements Priorities 407
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 408
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 408
Section 1001—Transfer Authority 408
Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex 408
Section 1003—Authorization of Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000 408
Department of Defense 408
Department of Energy 409
Section 1004—Contingent Repeal of Certain Provisions Shifting Certain Outlays from One Fiscal Year to Another 409
Section 1005—Limitation on Funds for Bosnia and Kosovo Peacekeeping Operations for Fiscal Year 2001 409
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 410
Section 1011—National Defense Features Program 410
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities 410
Section 1021—Report on Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities 410
Section 1022—Report on Tethered Aerostat Radar System 410
Subtitle D—Other Matters 411
Section 1031—Funds for Administrative Expenses Under Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program 411
Section 1032—Technical and Clerical Amendments 411
Section 1033—Transfer of Vietnam Era TA–4 Aircraft to Nonprofit Foundation 411
Section 1034—Transfer of 19th Century Cannon to Museum 411
Section 1035—Expenditures for Declassification Activities 411
Section 1036—Authority to Provide Loan Guarantees to Improve Domestic Preparedness to Combat Cyberterrorism 412
Section 1037—V–22 Cockpit Aircraft Voice and Flight Data Recorders 413
TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL 414
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 414

Page

Section 1101—Employment and Compensation Provisions for Employees of Temporary Organizations Established by Law or Executive Order ... 414
Section 1102—Restructuring the Restriction on Degree Training ... 414
Section 1103—Continuation of Tuition Reimbursement and Training for Certain Acquisition Personnel ... 414
Section 1104—Extension of Authority for Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense to Participate Voluntarily in Reductions in Force ... 414
Section 1105—Expansion of Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Positions ... 415
Section 1106—Pilot Program for Reengineering the Equal Employment Opportunity Complaint Process ... 415

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS ... 416
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 416
Arms Control Implementation ... 416
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 416
Section 1201—Support of United Nations-Sponsored Efforts to Inspect and Monitor Iraqi Weapons Activities ... 416
Section 1202—Annual Report Assessing Effect of Continued Operations in the Balkans Region on Readiness to Execute the National Military Strategy ... 417
Section 1203—Situation in the Balkans ... 417
Section 1204—Limitation on Number of Military Personnel in Colombia ... 419

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION ... 420
OVERVIEW ... 420
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 421
Arms Elimination Projects in Russia ... 421
Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine ... 422
Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia ... 422
Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia ... 424
Defense and Military Contacts ... 426
Elimination of Plutonium Production in Russia ... 426
Fissile Material Processing and Packaging ... 427
Fissile Material Storage Facility ... 427
Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia ... 428
Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security ... 428
Other Assessments and Administrative Support ... 429
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 429
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds ... 429
Section 1302—Funding Allocations ... 430
Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Elimination of Conventional Weapons ... 430
Section 1304—Limitations on Use of Funds for Fissile Material Storage Facility ... 430
Section 1305—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Submission of Multiyear Plan ... 430
Section 1306—Russian Nonstrategic Nuclear Arms ... 430
Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds to Support Warhead Dismantlement Processing ... 430
Section 1308—Agreement on Nuclear Weapons Storage Sites ... 430
Section 1309—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Construction of Fossil Fuel Energy Plants ... 430
Section 1310—Audits of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs ... 430
Section 1311—Limitation on Use of Funds for Prevention of Biological Weapons Proliferation in Russia ... 431

TITLE XIV—COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES FROM ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE (EMP) ATTACK ... 432
OVERVIEW ... 432
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 433
Section 1401—Establishment of Commission ... 433
Section 1402—Duties of Commission ... 433
Section 1403—Report ... 433

Page

Section 1404—Powers 433
Section 1405—Commission Procedures 433
Section 1406—Personnel Members 433
Section 1407—Miscellaneous Administrative Provisions 433
Section 1408—Funding 433
Section 1409—Termination of the Commission 433

TITLE XV—PROVISIONS REGARDING VIEQUES ISLAND, PUERTO RICO 434
OVERVIEW 434
Section 1501—Conditions on Disposal of Naval Ammunition Support Detachment, Vieques Island 435
Section 1502—Retention of Eastern Portion of Vieques Island 436
Section 1503—Limitations on Military Use of Vieques Island 436
Section 1504—Economic Assistance for Residents of Vieques Island 436

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 437
PURPOSE 437
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW 437

TITLE XXI—ARMY 455
SUMMARY 455
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 455
Condition of Barracks to Support Basic Training 455
Improvements to Military Family Housing 455
Planning and Design 456
Unspecified Minor Construction 456
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 456
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 456
Section 2102—Family Housing 456
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 456
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 456
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 1999 Project 456

TITLE XXII—NAVY 457
SUMMARY 457
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 457
Acquisition of Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance Facilities, Blount Island, Jacksonville, Florida 457
Improvements to Military Family Housing 457
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 457
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 457
Section 2202—Family Housing 458
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 458
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 458
Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Fiscal Year 1997 Project at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia 458

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE 459
SUMMARY 459
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 459
Rome Research Site, New York 459
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 459
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 459
Section 2302—Family Housing 459
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 460
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 460

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES 461
SUMMARY 461
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 461
Forward Operating Locations in Support of Counter-Drug and Drug Interdiction Activities 461
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 461
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 461

Page

Section 2402—Authorization Of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 461
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE 462
SUMMARY 462
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 462
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 462
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 462
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 463
SUMMARY 463
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 463
Planning and Design, Army National Guard 463
Planning and Design, Army Reserve 463
Unspecified Minor Construction, Army Reserve 463
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 463
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 463
TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS 464
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 464
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law 464
Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1998 Projects 464
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects 464
Section 2704—Effective Date 464
TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS 465
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 465
Military Housing Privatization Initiative 465
Water Quality Issues Affecting Military Installations in the Area of ..... Kaiserslautern, Germany 465
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 465
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 465
Section 2801—Revision of Limitations on Space by Pay Grade 465
Section 2802—Leasing of Military Family Housing, United States Southern Command, Miami, Florida 466
Section 2803—Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing 466
Section 2804—Expansion of Definition of Armory to Include Readiness Centers 466
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 466
Section 2811—Increase in Threshold for Notice and Wait Requirements for Real Property Transactions 466
Section 2812—Enhancement of Authority of Military Departments to Lease Non-Excess Property 466
Section 2813—Conveyance Authority Regarding Utility Systems of Military Departments 466
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances Generally 467
Part I—Army Conveyances 467
Section 2831—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois 467
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Galesburg, Illinois 467
Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Winona, Minnesota 467
Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Fort Polk, Louisiana 467
Section 2835—Land Conveyance, Fort Pickett, Virginia 467
Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Fort Dix, New Jersey 467
Section 2837—Land Conveyance, Nike Site 43, Elrama, Pennsylvania .. 468
Section 2838—Land Exchange, Fort Hood, Texas 468
Section 2839—Land Conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois 468
Section 2840—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Local Training Center, Chattanooga, Tennessee 468
Part II—Navy Conveyances 468

Page

Section 2851—Modification of Authority for Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, California, to Use Certain Navy Property 468
Section 2852—Modification of Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California 469
Section 2853—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California 469
Section 2854—Lease of Property, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California 469
Section 2855—Lease of Property, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida 469
Section 2856—Land Exchange, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California 470
Section 2857—Land Exchange, Naval Air Reserve Center, Columbus, Ohio 470
Section 2858—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Tampa, Florida 470
Part III—Air Force Conveyances 470
Section 2861—Land Conveyance, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio 470
Section 2862—Land Conveyance, Point Arena Air Force Station, California 471
Section 2863—Land Conveyance, Los Angeles Air Force Base, California 471
Part IV—Other Conveyances 471
Section 2871—Conveyance of Army and Air Force Exchange Service Property, Farmers Branch, Texas 471
Subtitle D—Other Matters 471
Section 2881—Retention of Easement Authority to Leased Parkland, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California 471
Section 2882—Extension of Demonstration Project for Purchase of Fire, Security, Police, Public Works, and Utility Services from Local Government Agencies 472
Section 2883—Establishment of World War II Memorial on Guam 472
Section 2884—Naming of the Army Missile Testing Range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll 472
Section 2885—Designation of Building at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, in Honor of Andrew T. McNamara 472
Section 2886—Redesignation of the Balboa Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, in Honor of Bob Wilson, a Former Member of the House of Representatives 472
Section 2887—Sense of Congress Regarding Importance of Expansion of National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California 472

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 473

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 473
OVERVIEW 473
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 492
Overview 492
Items of Special Interest 492
Acceleration of the 94–1 program and restoration of infrastructure at the Savannah River Site 492
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative 492
Hanford tank waste remediation system privatization, phase I 494
Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility 494
Nonproliferation and national security 495
Worker and community transition 495
National Nuclear Security Administration 496
Items of Special Interest 496
Budget Structure of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Campaigns 496
Advanced Design and Production Technology (ADAPT) 497
Advanced radiography 497
Defense computing and modeling 498
Laser development 500
Pit manufacturing readiness 501

Page

Tritium readiness 502
Construction projects 502
Defense programs requirements process 502
Department of Energy Reorganization Issues 503
Directed stockpile work 505
Stockpile evaluation 505
Stockpile maintenance 505
Program direction for defense programs 506
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF) 506
Operations of facilities 507
Special projects 507
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 508
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 508
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 508
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management 508
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 508
Section 3104—Defense Facilities Closure Projects 508
Section 3105—Defense Environmental Management Privatization 508
Section 3106—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 508
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions 508
Section 3121—Reprogramming 508
Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects 508
Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects 508
Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority 509
Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design 509
Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities 509
Section 3127—Availability of Funds 509
Section 3128—Authority Relating to Transfer of Defense Environmental Management Funds 509
Section 3131—Funding for Termination Costs for Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Project, Richland, Washington 509
Section 3132—Enhanced Cooperation Between National Nuclear Security Administration and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization 510
Section 3133—Required Contents of Future-Years Nuclear Security Program to be Submitted with Fiscal Year 2002 Budget and Limitation on Obligation of Certain Funds Pending Submission of that Program 510
Section 3134—Limitation on Obligation of Certain Funds 510
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 511
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 511
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 511
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 511
Section 3201—Authorization 511
TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE 512
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 512
Section 3301—Authorized Uses of Stockpile Funds 512
Section 3302—Use of Excess Titanium Sponge in the National Defense Stockpile to Manufacture Department of Defense Equipment 512
TITLE XXXIV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 513
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 513
Merchant Marine Academy 513
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 513
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001 513
Section 3402—Extension of Period For Disposal of Obsolete Vessels From the National Reserve Fleet 513
Section 3403—Authority to Convey National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessel, GLACIER 513
Departmental Data 514
Department of Defense Authorization Request 514
Military Construction Authorization Request 515
Committee Position 515
Communications From Other Committees 515
Fiscal Data 521
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 521

Page

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 521
Committee Cost Estimate 542
Oversight Findings 542
Constitutional Authority Statement 542
Statement of Federal Mandates 542
Roll Call Votes 542
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 551
Additional Views 690
Additional views of John M. Spratt, Jr 690
Additional views of Steven T. Kuykendall 694
Additional views of Baron P. Hill 695
Additional views of Joseph R. Pitts, John M. Spratt, Jr 697
Additional views of Robert A. Underwood, Neil Abercrombie, Solomon P. Ortiz, Thomas H. Allen, Silvestre Reyes 698
Additional views of Loretta Sanchez, Lane Evans, Neil Abercrombie, Patrick J. Kennedy, Thomas H. Allen, Adam Smith, Ellen O. Tauscher, Robert E. Andrews, Mike Thompson 700
Additional views of Loretta Sanchez, Neil Abercrombie, Ike Skelton, Robert A. Underwood, Patrick J. Kennedy, Robert A. Brady 701

106TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–616

FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

MAY 12, 2000.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4205]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4205) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 4205. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2001: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (7) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of $305.3 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 2001. Of this amount, the President requested $291.0 billion for the Department of Defense (including $8.0 billion for military construction and family housing) and $13.1 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of $309.9 billion in budget authority. This amount is consistent with the discretionary defense spending limitations imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and it represents an increase of approximately $21.1 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). Overall, the committee's recommendation is consistent with the amounts established in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 for the national defense budget function.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,323,262	1,323,262	219,500	1,542,762	1,542,762
Missile Procurement, Army	1,295,728	1,295,728	71,953	1,367,681	1,367,681
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,874,638	1,874,638	293,300	2,167,938	2,167,938
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,131,323	1,131,323	68,000	1,199,323	1,199,323
Other Procurement, Army	3,795,870	3,795,870	299,400	4,095,270	4,095,270
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army					
Operation & Maintenance	607,200	607,200	(607,200)	-	-
Procurement	121,900	121,900	(121,900)	-	-
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	274,400	274,400	(274,400)	-	-
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,963,858	7,963,858	241,900	8,205,758	8,205,758
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,434,250	1,434,250	128,000	1,562,250	1,562,250
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,649	429,649	51,700	481,349	481,349
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	12,296,919	12,296,919	(314,951)	11,981,968	11,981,968
Other Procurement, Navy	3,334,611	3,334,611	97,400	3,432,011	3,432,011
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,171,935	1,171,935	82,800	1,254,735	1,254,735
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	9,539,602	9,539,602	727,551	10,267,153	10,267,153
Missile Procurement, Air Force	3,061,715	3,061,715	(15,000)	3,046,715	3,046,715
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	638,808	638,808	-	638,808	638,808
Other Procurement, Air Force	7,699,127	7,699,127	170,776	7,869,903	7,869,903
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,275,308	2,275,308	33,766	2,309,074	2,309,074
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense	-	-	-		
Operation & Maintenance	-	-	607,200	607,200	607,200
Procurement	-	-	105,700	105,700	105,700
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	-	-	164,200	164,200	164,200
Procurement, Defense Health Program	290,006	-	-	290,006	-
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	3,300	-	-	3,300	-
Total Procurement	**60,563,409**	**60,270,103**	**2,029,695**	**62,593,104**	**62,299,798**
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	5,260,346	5,260,346	239,900	5,500,246	5,500,246
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,476,677	8,476,677	357,800	8,834,477	8,834,477

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,685,576	13,685,576	(8,468)	13,677,108	13,677,108
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	10,238,242	10,238,242	839,521	11,077,763	11,077,763
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	-	-	-	-	-
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	201,560	201,560	18,000	219,560	219,560
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	**37,862,401**	**37,862,401**	**1,446,753**	**39,309,154**	**39,309,154**
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	19,123,731	19,123,731	368,886	19,492,617	19,492,617
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	23,300,154	23,300,154	21,655	23,321,809	23,321,809
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,705,658	2,705,658	146,020	2,851,678	2,851,678
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	22,346,977	22,346,977	4,187	22,351,164	22,351,164
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	11,920,069	11,920,069	(246,217)	11,673,852	11,673,852
Office of the Inspector General	144,245	147,545	-	144,245	147,545
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,521,418	1,521,418	44,500	1,565,918	1,565,918
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	960,946	960,946	6,700	967,646	967,646
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	133,959	133,959	16,510	150,469	150,469
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,885,859	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859	1,890,859
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,182,335	3,182,335	54,500	3,236,835	3,236,835
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,446,375	3,446,375	15,500	3,461,875	3,461,875
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	8,574	8,574	-	8,574	8,574
Environmental Restoration, Army	389,932	389,932	-	389,932	389,932
Environmental Restoration, Navy	294,038	294,038	-	294,038	294,038
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	376,300	376,300	-	376,300	376,300
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	23,412	23,412	-	23,412	23,412
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	186,499	186,499	-	186,499	186,499
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	836,300	836,300	5,200	841,500	841,500
Defense Health Program	11,310,423	11,600,429	261,100	11,571,523	11,861,529
Cooperative Threat Reduction	458,400	458,400	(25,000)	433,400	433,400
Overseas Military Investment Recovery	-	3,300	-		3,300
Disposal of DoD Real Property	-	8,968	-		8,968
Lease of DoD Real Property	-	15,400	-		15,400

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	25,000	25,000	-	25,000	25,000
Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance Fund	-	25,000	-		25,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	64,900	64,900	(9,100)	55,800	55,800
Korean War Memorial Account, DoD	-	30	-		30
National Science Center, Army	-	90	-		90
Burdensharing	-	215,000	-		215,000
Rocky Mountain Arsenal	-	6,000	-		6,000
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	4,100,577	4,100,577	-	4,100,577	4,100,577
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	**108,746,081**	**109,313,175**	**669,441**	**109,415,522**	**109,982,616**
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Funds (DECA)	916,276	916,276	-	**916,276**	916,276
Army Working Capital Fund	-	-			-
Navy Working Capital Fund	-	-			-
Air Force Working Capital Fund	-	-			-
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	388,158	348,951	**737,109**	737,109
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	-	(150,000)	(150,000)	**(150,000)**	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Excess Sales)	-	(219,000)		-	(219,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Transfer to WCF Cash)	-	-	-	-	-
Armed Forces Retirement Home		-		-	-
Subtotal Revolving and Management Funds	**1,304,434**	**935,434**	**198,951**	**1,503,385**	**1,284,385**
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	**110,050,515**	**110,248,609**	**868,392**	**110,918,907**	**111,267,001**
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel		**75,801,666**	-	-	**75,801,666**
Total Military Personnel	-	**75,801,666**			**75,801,666**
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	897,938	897,938	(225,547)	**672,391**	672,391
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	753,422	134,388	**887,810**	887,810

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	530,969	172,904	**703,873**	703,873
Military Construction, Defense-wide	784,753	784,753	30,751	**815,504**	815,504
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	59,130	70,009	**129,139**	129,139
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	50,179	60,706	**110,885**	110,885
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	81,713	23,141	**104,854**	104,854
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	16,103	16,103	40,471	**56,574**	56,574
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	14,851	26,897	**41,748**	41,748
Base Realignment and Closure IV	1,174,369	1,170,305	-	**1,174,369**	1,170,305
NATO Security Investment Program	190,000	190,000	(12,500)	**177,500**	177,500
Unaccompanied Housing Fund	-	-			
Total Military Construction	**4,553,427**	**4,549,363**	**321,220**	**4,874,647**	**4,870,583**
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	162,106	36,399	**198,505**	198,505
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	978,275	(24,531)	**953,744**	953,744
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	362,822	362,822	54,403	**417,225**	417,225
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	882,638	882,638	-	**882,638**	882,638
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	223,483	17,901	**241,384**	241,384
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	826,271	(5,392)	**820,879**	820,879
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	-	-	-	-	-
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	44,886	44,886	-	**44,886**	44,886
Homeowners Assistance Fund	-	4,064	-	-	4,064
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	-	-	-	-	-
Total Family Housing	**3,480,481**	**3,484,545**	**78,780**	**3,559,261**	**3,563,325**
OTHER DoD MILITARY					
Other Legislation (travel cards)		5,000	-	-	-
Defense Wide Contingencies		-			-
General Transfer Authority [non-additive]		[2,000,000]			[2,000,000]
National Security Education Trust Fund		7,950			7,950
Other Trust Funds		123,681			123,681

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Interfund Transfers		(55,300)			(55,300)
Defense Vessel Transfer Program Account		-			-
Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance Fund		-			-
Offsetting Receipts and Other		(1,298,788)			(1,298,788)
Appropriations Rescissions		-			-
Total Other DoD Military		**(1,217,457)**	**-**	**-**	**(1,222,457)**
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	**216,510,233**	**290,999,230**	**4,744,840**	**221,255,073**	**295,889,070**
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)					
Weapons Activities	4,594,000	4,594,000	83,800	4,677,800	4,677,800
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,551,527	4,551,527	40,000	4,591,527	4,591,527
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	515,000	515,000	(256,000)	259,000	259,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	112,000	-	112,000	112,000
Other Defense Actitivities	555,122	555,122	2,000	557,122	557,122
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,082,297	1,082,297	-	1,082,297	1,082,297
Other Nuclear Security Activities	1,583,635	1,583,635	(669,600)	914,035	914,035
Naval Reactors			677,600	677,600	677,600
Interim Storage Activities		(85,000)	-	-	(85,000)
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	17,000	17,000	(17,000)	-	-
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,000	140,000	(140,000)	-	-
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	18,500	18,500	(1,500)	17,000	17,000
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	**13,169,081**	**13,084,081**	**(280,700)**	**12,888,381**	**12,803,381**
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)					
Department of Justice - Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund					
Payments to Individuals		13,727	-		13,727
Administrative Expenses		2,000	-		2,000
Department of Justice - Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Program		300,473	-		300,473
Department of Justice - National Drug Intelligence Center		27,000			27,000
Department of Transportation - Coast Guard Operations		341,000	-		341,000

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 2001

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	FY 2001 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program		98,700	-		98,700
Department of Transportation - xfer from National Defense Sealift Fund		-	-		-
Department of Commerce - Export Administration		5,138	-		5,138
Federal Emergency Management Agency			-		
Salaries and Expenses	28,000	28,000	(28,000)	-	-
Planning and Assistance	20,000	20,000	(20,000)	-	-
CIA Retirement and Disability System	-	216,000	-		216,000
National Science Foundation - Antarctic research activities	-	62,600	-		62,600
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses	-	24,480	-		24,480
Intelligence Community Management Account	-	110,631	-		110,631
Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund	-	-	-		-
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	**48,000**	**1,249,749**	**(48,000)**	**-**	**1,201,749**
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	**229,727,314**	**305,333,060**	**4,416,140**	**234,143,454**	**309,894,200**

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 is the first defense authorization bill prepared for the new millennium. It reflects the committee's view of, and commitment to, the policies, programs, and priorities required to maintain U.S. military preeminence in the 21st century.

The committee bill authorizes $309.9 billion for defense during fiscal year 2001—an addition of $4.5 billion to the Administration's defense budget request. Although this bill continues the trend of adding to the Administration's defense budget request, the committee remains troubled by the mismatch between requirements, forces, and resources that continues to exist and will remain, even with the increases contained in this bill.

In the committee's view, the public debate over the adequacy of U.S. defense funding has turned an important corner. In recent years, efforts to increase defense have encountered skepticism and outright opposition by an Administration that came into office believing that defense could be reduced substantially without risk to the national security. The end of the Cold War was accompanied by annual real decreases in defense spending, as the "peace dividend" was applied to other priorities. There now appears to be a general consensus that U.S. defense spending has fallen too far too fast. These real decreases have resulted in significant problems in readiness, equipment modernization, and quality of life for U.S. service personnel, and a significant overall decline in U.S. military capability. This year, the committee has again sought to address the most critical shortfalls in these areas by increasing funding above the Administration's budget request.

U.S. Strategy for the New Millennium

U.S. military strategy continues to be guided by the tenets outlined in the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The QDR, building upon its predecessor, the 1993 Bottom-Up Review, postulated that the sizing and composition of U.S. military forces should be based on the requirement to fight two nearly simultaneous major theater wars. While the committee believes that the two major theater war standard has been a realistic and useful planning tool, the QDR was a budget-driven exercise, rather than a strategy-driven one. Even so, the defense resources historically requested by the Administration have never been adequate to execute the strategy without accepting a greater than prudent level of risk.

Testifying before the committee on October 21, 1999, the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps service chiefs each stated that they lacked the capabilities required of a true "two major theater war" military force. Army Chief of Staff General Eric Shinseki declared that the Army could execute the two major theater war strategy only with "high risk." In subsequent testimony on February 10, 2000, General Shinseki stated, "You measure that risk in national treasure, lives, and expended dollars." Former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger told the committee on February 8, 2000, "The simple reality today is that we cannot fight two MRCs [major regional contingencies] more or less simultaneously." Even former

Secretary of Defense William Perry, who oversaw the Clinton Administration's early defense efforts, testified before the committee, "We do not have a capability of fighting two [major theater wars] at the same time. For one thing, we do not have enough airlift and sealift to go to two places at once."

The next Administration will have an ability, through the QDR process, to place its imprint on the strategy that will guide the level and composition of U.S. military forces in the new millennium. The committee expects that the next QDR, due out in September 2001, will be strategy-based and not budget constrained. The committee has long believed that the level of resources necessary for defense must flow from an assessment of U.S. strategy, existing and emerging threats, and the force levels required to deal with those threats. Under this Administration, the reverse has been true. Anticipated budget levels have driven the sizing and composition of U.S. forces and the strategy that can be implemented with those force levels. This approach stands sound national security planning on its head.

The committee's approach again this year has been guided by an effort to develop a defense budget that is more responsive to the post-Cold War threats faced by the United States and commensurate with America's global responsibilities—and, in so doing, to ensure that U.S. forces can successfully execute their missions at the lowest possible level of risk.

Maintaining America's Military Preeminence

In its Phase I report last fall on the emerging global security environment, the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century reported that the United States can expect to confront a variety of new and asymmetric threats in the next several decades that will pose significant challenges to U.S. security. These threats include the spread of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction, information warfare, terrorism, and the use by other states of space for military purposes. According to the commission, "threats to American security will be more diffuse, harder to anticipate, and more difficult to neutralize than ever before. Deterrence will not work as it once did; in many cases it may not work at all."

In its Phase II report, issued in April 2000, the commission concluded, "The maintenance of America's strength is a long-term commitment and cannot be assured without conscious, dedicated effort." This places a premium on ensuring that America's armed forces are sufficiently resourced, manned, and equipped, to successfully confront emerging threats. This fundamental principle has guided the committee's approach to the defense budget for the past six years. The committee agrees with the commission's conclusion that without a sustained defense effort, the United States "will find its power reduced, its interests challenged even more than they are today, and its influence eroded." Secretary Schlesinger echoed this point in testimony before the committee on February 8, 2000, when he stated, "The United States simply cannot continue to play the global leadership role envisioned by the current national security strategy without a substantial increase in defense spending. . . . We are resting on our laurels as the sole superpower," he stated,

and warned that without sustained increases in defense, "we are likely to see a train wreck."

Unfortunately, in the past year, additional strains have been imposed on the U.S. military, as the armed forces continue to be asked to do more with less. This reality has again called into question the armed forces' ability to carry out the national military strategy postulated in the QDR. One year ago, U.S. forces led NATO's Operation Allied Force campaign against Yugoslavia. For the Air Force, this operation was the equivalent of a major theater war. The 78-day military campaign exposed serious strains within the U.S. military, illuminating problems that have resulted from underfunding and over-extending the military. It also led to the second major peacekeeping operation involving U.S. forces in the Balkans in five years. Like the peacekeeping mission in Bosnia, the NATO-led Kosovo peacekeeping operation is of indefinite duration and threatens to involve the United States in an ever-deepening quagmire. The requirements of peacekeeping pose significant burdens on U.S. forces that detract from their primary warfighting mission. As a result, readiness has declined, equipment has been severely strained, and quality of life has suffered.

The committee recognizes that the United States has global interests and responsibilities. However, the increasing use of the armed forces for humanitarian and civil support missions abroad diminishes the military's capacity to respond to a significant conflict or crisis. The U.S. armed forces were employed overseas more times in the past decade than in the previous 45 years. Since 1989, the Army has participated in 35 major deployments, including a significant number of peacekeeping missions. During the same period, the Army, including its Reserve Components, reduced its force structure by more than 34 percent. Continued high operating tempos risk bending the force to the breaking point. The employment of U.S. military forces should be selective and based on a pragmatic calculation of the risks and benefits to U.S. national security. In establishing the funding priorities in this year's bill, the committee is again guided by this fundamental principle.

The Administration's Defense Budget Request

The President's defense budget request for fiscal year 2001 reflects the first significant real increase in defense funding in a decade and, unlike in previous years, does not appear to be premised on questionable economic assumptions, assumed savings, and outlay gimmicks. In submitting its proposed budget, the Administration appears to recognize that quality of life, readiness, and modernization shortfalls are real, that they have real-world implications, and that increased defense spending is necessary. However, as Secretary of Defense William Cohen testified before the committee on February 9, 2000, "One budgetary year, one submission or two submissions of real growth increase does not a military make. It's going to take sustained commitment over the years."

Unfortunately, despite the increases proposed by the President this year, serious mismatches between strategy, forces, and resources continue to exist. Over the past eight years, the Administration's cumulative defense budget requests have fallen more than $300 billion short of even covering the costs of inflation relative to

the fiscal year 1993 defense spending levels it inherited—spending levels that already reflected significant cutbacks resulting from President Bush's post-Cold War downsizing of the U.S. military.

Although U.S. military strategy remains essentially unchanged from that articulated in the QDR, the committee believes that the Administration's current and planned levels of defense funding are insufficient to carry out that strategy. The committee believes that the United States will need to invest significantly more resources in order to maintain even current military capabilities. As Secretary Schlesinger testified before the committee on February 8, 2000, "We cannot maintain the present force structure and reequip the forces on the present budget levels or the prospective budget levels. . . . The simple reality is that we cannot sustain those forces. This is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of simple arithmetic. . . ." The committee has sought repeatedly to provide additional resources for defense that would address the most serious deficiencies that exist.

Despite significant congressional increases to the defense budget last year, the service chiefs testified before the committee in October 1999 to having at least $9 billion in critical unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2000, excluding the unbudgeted costs of Kosovo operations. Few, if any, of these shortfalls were addressed in the fiscal year 2000 supplemental submitted with the budget request. This led the House to support a significant increase to the Administration's supplemental request. In testimony before the committee earlier this year, the service chiefs identified nearly $16 billion in unfunded military requirements. Since last year, their five-year estimate of shortfalls has increased from $38 billion to $84 billion. As General Eric Shinseki, Army Chief of Staff, testified, "there is still a mismatch between the resources we have and the requirements we may face."

In a recent report, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) concluded, "A substantial defense strategy-resources mismatch . . . already exists. It is profound. It has been ongoing for some time and will take years to overcome. It is reaching crisis proportions and requires immediate attention." With this in mind, the committee has sought to address in this year's budget the most serious aspects of this mismatch as they relate to readiness, modernization, and quality of life.

Restoring Readiness

Restoring military readiness is a key priority for the committee, as U.S. military readiness is essential to securing America's future as the world's sole superpower. In recent years, readiness has suffered as a result of high operations tempo resulting from the high pace of unscheduled contingency deployments around the world.

Historically, the Administration has sought to pay for these deployments by raiding critical readiness accounts. In addition, near-term readiness has been purchased at the expense of future modernization. Admiral Jay Johnson, Chief of Navy Operations, told the committee in October 1999 that "fiscal constraints force us too often to choose between near-term readiness and future modernization and recapitalization." General James Jones, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated, "We have sacrificed our procurement ac-

counts to assist in meeting the growing costs of keeping our aging equipment and weapons 'ready.'"

Unfortunately, the Administration's fiscal year 2001 defense budget request contains few if any increases to readiness accounts and falls well short of addressing the serious readiness problems that exist. Moreover, current budget projections indicate that funding for critical readiness needs will decline next year. Existing readiness problems include a shortage of spare parts, aging equipment, decaying infrastructure, growing equipment and facilities' backlogs, insufficient training, and personnel shortages. According to Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan, the overall combat readiness of the Air Force has declined by 26 percent since 1996.

The committee finds this situation troubling, particularly in light of the fact that the Administration has at long last acknowledged that serious readiness shortfalls exist. In testifying on the fiscal year 2001 budget request on February 9, 2000, General Henry Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, acknowledged that even recent funding increases "will not guarantee the levels of readiness needed to significantly reduce risk in executing the National Military Strategy."

Over the past five years, the Congress has added more than $7 billion to the Administration's budget requests to fund day-to-day operations, training, equipment and facility maintenance, and spare parts. The committee bill continues this trend by adding significant additional resources for critical readiness priorities.

Equipping the Force

For the United States to remain the world's preeminent military power, additional investment in the development and procurement of modern technology and equipment is essential. Our men and women in uniform cannot be expected to fight and win the nation's wars in the 21st century solely with equipment developed and acquired in the 20th century.

Although this year's budget request increases funding for research, development, testing, and evaluation for the first time in five years, important shortfalls remain in these critical accounts. In particular, additional efforts are required in the area of national and theater missile defenses. The committee budget reflects the committee's historically strong support for the development of technologies that could be deployed to protect the American homeland from the real and growing threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles and the weapons of mass destruction they carry.

The Administration's budget request for fiscal year 2001 meets, for the first time, the Administration's own target of providing $60 billion for the procurement of equipment essential to a modern military. However, this goal was attained through the use of innovative accounting, such as including submarine overhaul funds in the procurement accounts for the first time.

Despite meeting this milestone, the committee is troubled by the fact that the $60.3 billion request is $1.5 billion below what the Administration projected the request would be one year ago. This is difficult to comprehend in an overall defense budget characterized by real spending growth.

The committee notes that the military of 2000 is continuing to live off the equipment investment decisions made almost two decades earlier. The defense build-up that occurred under President Reagan has served the nation well. However, the force that resulted from this build-up is precisely the one being worn out as a result of extensive operational deployments and inadequate resourcing. As Secretary Schlesinger told the committee, the U.S. military continues to live off and wear out the "capital" of the late Cold War.

During its examination of the Administration's budget request, the committee heard testimony from a variety of witnesses, including former Department of Defense officials, who testified that the Administration's procurement budget was insufficient to modernize and equip the current QDR force well into the 21st century. The CSIS report estimated that "DOD procurement budgets will need to average $164 billion annually" over the next 10 years "to provide for steady and continued modernization and replacement of the QDR force. . . ." Other estimates have suggested that the current procurement budget is underfunded by $25 billion to $50 billion. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre, in Senate testimony, stated, "Even though we got to $60 billion in our modernization budget, we're still not really making up for the hole that we dug for ourselves during . . . the second half of the '80s and the '90s." Even Secretary Perry testified before the committee that procurement is underfunded. "My own judgment is it probably needs to be perhaps $70 to $80 billion," he declared.

Over the past five years, the committee has added nearly $18 billion to the Administration's procurement budget requests and this bill adds another $2.0 billion to the procurement accounts largely to meet the most critical unfunded modernization requirements identified by the service chiefs.

Keeping Faith With Our Military Personnel

Ensuring a decent quality of life for military personnel and their families remains central to the committee's efforts to revitalize the all-volunteer U.S. armed forces. America's military is only as good as the people who serve in it. Recruiting and retaining top-notch personnel remains a key committee priority in this year's bill.

In recent years, each of the military services has encountered difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel. With this in mind, the committee bill makes a series of improvements to the pay, allowances, benefits, and living conditions of American military personnel that significantly enhance the quality of life for them and their families. The committee's actions follow up on last year's initiatives taken by the Congress with respect to pay raises, pay table reform, military retirement benefits, basic allowance for housing, special pay and retention bonuses, and the military Thrift Savings Plan.

In particular, the committee bill removes the barriers to an effective military healthcare system by restoring access to prescription drug benefits for Medicare-eligible retirees, reduces out-of-pocket costs for service personnel participating in the TRICARE Prime and TRICARE Prime Remote programs, and expands the coverage provided under this program to family members. Moreover, the bill

allows TRICARE reimbursements to be tailored to local area costs and allows reimbursement for travel expenses incurred resulting from long-distance referrals for medical care. The committee bill also makes a number of management initiatives that are expected to save the Defense Health Program over $500 million, which can be reinvested in benefits, instead of being squandered on administration. The committee's actions will result in improved access, portability of benefit, and increased savings to U.S. service personnel for medical care.

In short, the committee bill fulfills the promise to make continued improvements in compensation and health care programs begun in last year's National Defense Authorization Act. In addition, the committee bill includes a provision to eliminate the statutory requirement that service members pay for 15 percent of housing costs from their own pockets, and to authorize the Secretary of Defense to increase the basic allowance for housing rates while reducing out-of-pocket housing expenses for military members to zero by fiscal year 2005.

Military healthcare, morale, welfare, and recreation programs, as well as the quality of facilities in which military personnel live and work, also have a tangible effect on service members, their families, and career decisions. Unfortunately, the Administration's budget request significantly underfunds military construction and healthcare improvements. The committee bill goes a long way toward improving the quality of life for U.S. military personnel and their families.

The Committee Bill: Investing for the 21st Century

Over the past five years, the Congress has added nearly $50 billion to the Administration's proposed defense budgets. These increases were necessary, but not sufficient. They have helped stop the hemorrhaging of America's defenses, but restoring U.S. military capability to that required by U.S. commitments and national interests requires more. While the committee recognizes that additional defense investments are required, there is no question that U.S. national security would be worse off had the committee and the Congress not acted in a responsible manner to address the military's most pressing problems.

Modernizing and maintaining today's military forces, following on the heels of a decade of real decline in defense budgets, will require the kind of sustained commitment and investment in the years ahead that took place in the early 1980s. Some may argue that the nation cannot afford such an investment. In the committee's view, what the nation cannot afford is another decade, like the last, of declining defense budgets and shrinking military forces if the United States is to remain a superpower able to promote and protect its global interests.

It is with this reality in mind that the committee has crafted a defense budget designed to provide our service personnel with the best tools our country can produce to enable them to defend our nation's people, interests, and values. The committee bill represents the minimum funding necessary to accomplish that goal. Although a greater level of investment in America's security will be necessary over the coming years if the nation is to be secure from the

range of threats it will likely confront, this bill is a necessary first step toward ensuring that America's military can meet the challenges that lie ahead, and ensure the safety and security of all Americans, well into the new millennium.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 results from extensive hearings that began on February 9, 2000 and that were completed on March 23, 2000. The full committee conducted 6 sessions. In addition, a total of 27 sessions were conducted by five different subcommittees and two panels of the committee on various titles of the bill.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

In October 1995, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff first advised the Secretary of Defense that in order to recapitalize the U.S. armed forces after a decade of ever-decreasing defense procurement budgets, $60 billion would be required annually and should be achieved by fiscal year 1998. Over four years after this pronouncement and three years after its subsequent endorsement by the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the fiscal year 2001 budget request finally reached that level, although it is $1.5 billion below what was forecast at the time the fiscal year 2000 budget was submitted to the Congress one year ago—the sixth consecutive year in which this situation has occurred. Consequently, it is not surprising that the service chiefs continue to lament that many of their modernization needs are going unmet. What is surprising is the fact that, notwithstanding these unmet needs, the future years defense program similarly forecasts reductions to the procurement budgets in fiscal years 2004 and 2005 from those made a year ago while, at the same time, prominent former Department of Defense (DOD) leaders in the current Administration advocate large increases to these budgets.

For example, former Secretary of Defense, William Perry, testified before the committee earlier this year that, "Procurement proposed to you in this budget is $60 billion in round figures. My own judgment is it probably needs to be perhaps $70 to $80 billion . . ." Also, in testimony before the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee just prior to his resignation in March, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, John Hamre, noted, "Even though we got to $60 billion in our modernization budget, we're still not really making up for the hole that we dug for ourselves during the '90s. . . . actually the second half of the '80s and the '90s. And we're going to have to do a better job later on. This is where people said, 'Well what will it cost to do that?' I don't believe it's $100 billion a year to do that, but I think it's in the $10 billion to $15 billion more a year for procurement in order to start getting out of that hole."

Having added nearly $18 billion to the procurement budget requests of the past five years, the committee obviously shares the views of the two former senior DOD officials. However, during most of this period the committee has found itself to be seriously hampered in advocating a dramatically larger modernization budget by a lack of support from the DOD civilian leadership—including

those individuals who now have testified that, indeed, increased procurement funding is required. Consequently, it has been unable to sustain the healthy $5 to $6 billion adds to the procurement accounts that it made in fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Nevertheless, fiscal year 2001 marks the sixth consecutive year the committee has increased the President's procurement budget, and the $2.6 billion added has again been largely devoted to funding equipment for which, according to the service chiefs, requirements have not been met.

The committee continues to strongly believe that the resources provided to the Department to carry out its national security strategy of preparing to win two nearly simultaneous major theater wars is inadequate. If this strategy remains intact following the fiscal year 2001 QDR, then it is imperative that the next Administration provide adequate resources to modernize our armed forces from the outset and sustain these resources for as long as required. As stated by former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger in his testimony to the committee this year, "The United States simply cannot continue to play the global leadership role envisioned by the current national security strategy without a substantial increase in defense spending. . . . We cannot maintain the present force structure and reequip the forces on the present budget levels or the prospective budget levels."

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,323,262	219,500	1,542,762
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,295,728	71,953	1,367,681
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,874,638	293,300	2,167,938
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,131,323	68,000	1,199,323
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	3,795,870	299,400	4,095,270
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY	1,003,500	(1,003,500)	-
TOTAL ARMY	**10,424,321**	**(51,347)**	**10,372,974**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	7,963,858	241,900	8,205,758
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	1,434,250	128,000	1,562,250
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	429,649	51,700	481,349
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	12,296,919	(314,951)	11,981,968
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,334,611	97,400	3,432,011
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,171,935	82,800	1,254,735
TOTAL NAVY	**26,631,222**	**286,849**	**26,918,071**
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	9,539,602	727,551	10,267,153
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	638,808	-	638,808
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,061,715	(15,000)	3,046,715
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	7,699,127	170,776	7,869,903
TOTAL AIR FORCE	**20,939,252**	**883,327**	**21,822,579**
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,275,308	33,766	2,309,074
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF	-	877,100	877,100
TOTAL DEFENSE-WIDE	**2,275,308**	**910,866**	**3,186,174**
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	290,006	-	290,006
PROCUREMENT, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	3,300	-	3,300
GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	**60,563,409**	**2,029,695**	**62,593,104**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,323.3 million for Aircraft Procurement, Army for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $1,542.8 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
001	ARL (TIARA)	-	-	1	31,000	1	31,000
002	UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	-	-	1	7,600	1	7,600
003	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR/ACS (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
	ROTARY						
004	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	6	81,205	6	71,100	12	152,305
	UH-60L			[+3]	[+27,900]	[+3]	[+27,900]
	UH-60Q			[+3]	[+40,200]	[+3]	[+40,200]
	Firehawk Modifications				[+3,000]		[+3,000]
004	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(16,554)			-	(16,554)
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,127			-	22,127
005A	TH-67 CREEK	-	-	19	24,000	19	24,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT		**86,778**		**133,700**		**220,478**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
006	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	22,626			-	22,626
007	ARL MODS	-	6,553			-	6,553
008	AH1F MODS	-	423			-	423
009	AH-64 MODS	-	18,516		12,000	-	30,516
	ODDS				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
	VMEP				[+7,000]		[+7,000]
010	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	117,083		5,000	-	122,083
	Crashworthy Fuel Tanks				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
011	CH-47 ICH	-	57,630			-	57,630
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	26,200			-	26,200
013	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	11,903			-	11,903
014	OH-58 MODS	-	462			-	462
015	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	-	752			-	752

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
016	LONGBOW	-	744,846			-	744,846
016	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,392)			-	(35,392)
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	35,000			-	35,000
018	UH-1 MODS	-	4,297			-	4,297
019	UH-60 MODS	-	3,021		9,000	-	12,021
	Crashworthy Fuel Tanks				[+9,000]		[+9,000]
020	KIOWA WARRIOR	-	41,816			-	41,816
021	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	-	-			-	-
022	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	-	60,042			-	60,042
023	ASE MODS (SIRFC)	-	4,487		20,000	-	24,487
	Laser Detecting Sets				[+20,000]		[+20,000]
024	ASE MODS (ATIRCM)	-	-			-	-
025	GATM	-	10,073			-	10,073
026	MODIFICATIONS < $5.0M	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**1,130,338**		**46,000**		**1,176,338**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
027	SPARE PARTS (AIR)	-	15,167				15,167
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**15,167**		**-**		**15,167**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
028	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	-	-		8,000	-	8,000
	ASET IV				[+8,000]		[+8,000]
	OTHER SUPPORT					-	-
029	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
030	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	11,926			-	11,926
031	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	3,490			-	3,490
032	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	74,144			-	74,144

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
033	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,419			-	1,419
034	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS ARC-220	-	-		31,800 [+31,800]	-	31,800 [+31,800]
035	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**90,979**		**39,800**		**130,779**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,323,262**		**219,500**		**1,542,762**

Items of Special Interest

AH–64 modifications

The budget request contained $18.5 million for AH–64 modifications but included no funds to continue procurement of the oil debris detection system (ODDS) or the vibration management enhancement program (VMEP).

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

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

Since the ODDS, which has been successfully integrated into other Department of Defense aircraft, both reduces aircraft maintenance costs and enhances aircrew safety, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to incorporate the ODDS on AH–64 Apaches. The committee also recommends an increase of $7.0 million to continue procurement of VMEP systems for the ARNG Apache fleet and to transition this technology to the Blackhawk.

In total, the committee recommends $30.5 million for AH–64 modifications, an increase of $12.0 million.

Airborne reconnaissance low (ARL)

The budget request contained no funds to procure ARL aircraft. The ARL supports intelligence collection requirements for forward-deployed force projection, operations other-than-war, and mid-intensity conflicts.

The committee understands that the final ARL aircraft validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council remains unfunded and is required to replace the less capable ARL-imagery intelligence (I) aircraft lost in South America in 1999. The ARL–M possesses integrated imagery intelligence, communications intelligence, a moving target indicator and synthetic aperture radar; consequently, it offers a broader intelligence collection capability than the ARL–I aircraft.

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $31.0 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for this replacement aircraft. In support of this requirement, the committee recommends $31.0 million for one ARL–M replacement aircraft.

Airborne communications

The budget request contained no funds to continue procurement of the AN/ARC–220 aviation high frequency radios, which provide secure voice and data communications capability between Army

helicopters flying nap-of-the-earth missions and beyond-line-of-sight aviation tactical operations centers.

The committee notes that the Task Force Hawk after action report identified the lack of such capability in AH–64 Apache attack helicopters as a major deficiency for conducting long-range strike missions. The committee understands that the budget request will result in a break in the production line. The committee further notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $31.8 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for AH–64 Apache and OH–58D Kiowa Warrior helicopter radios.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $31.8 million to ensure the fielding of radios for both AH–64 Apache attack helicopters and OH–58D Kiowa Warriors and to prevent a production line break.

Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of ASE.

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

Congress added $7.4 million in fiscal year 1998, $6.4 million in fiscal year 1999, and $12.5 million in fiscal year 2000 for ASET IV upgrades and notes that the necessity of this training device was a subject of discussion in the Task Force Hawk After Action Report. However, additional validated requirements exist and several systems in their present configuration still lack the capability to simulate the most current infrared (IR) and SAM threats, thereby limiting aircrew training. The committee believes this situation is inconsistent with the Army's "train as you fight" concept.

Consistent with its past actions, and based on the Army's requirement for forces to train in realistic threat environments, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for upgrading ASET IV systems with current IR SAM threat simulators.

Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE) modifications

The budget request contained $4.5 million to procure ASE modifications but included no funds for AN/AVR–2A laser detecting sets (LDS). The LDS is the only device in the Army capable of providing warning to helicopter crews when they have been illuminated by a laser-targeted weapon. It detects, identifies, and characterizes threats 360-degrees-around and plus-or-minus 45 degrees above-and-below an aircraft.

The committee continues to be concerned with the growing laser threat to helicopter aircrews and notes the limited fielding of this system to force package one aircraft only. The committee also notes the identification by the Army Chief of Staff of an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to complete LDS "A" kit installation

on AH–64A Apaches, AH–64D Apache Longbows, and MH–47D/E and MH–60K/L Special Operations Aircraft as well as to prevent a production line break.

Based on a growing laser threat to Army attack and special operations aircraft and its desire to extend fielding of this system beyond force package one units, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for procurement of AN/AVR–2A LDS A kits.

CH–47 Chinook/UH–60 Blackhawk crashworthy fuel tanks

The budget request contained $117.1 million for modifications to CH–47 Chinooks and $3.0 million for modifications to UH–60 Blackhawks but included no funds for the procurement of CH–47 internal crashworthy fuel tanks or UH–60 external crashworthy fuel tanks for Army National Guard (ARNG) units.

The committee understands that both the UH–60's external fuel tanks and the CH–47's internal fuel tanks are subject to rupture in the event of a crash, posing a safety risk to flight crews and passengers. Since current battlefield flight scenarios require these helicopters to fly long-range missions into hostile environments, the committee believes that extended range, crashworthy fuel tanks are critical to the safety and survivability of these aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to continue upgrading ARNG CH–47s with internal crashworthy fuel tanks and $9.0 million to begin procurement of external crashworthy fuel tanks for ARNG UH–60s.

Helicopter crashworthy seats

The committee is concerned about improving the safety performance of Army helicopter seats. While existing pilot and the co-pilot seats offer some protection in the event of a hard impact in a crash, passenger and troop seats offer minimal or no protection from the acceleration forces created by such a crash, resulting in fatalities and serious injury of soldiers.

Accordingly, the committee strongly encourages the Department of the Army to include funds in its fiscal year 2002 budget request for the UH–60 Blackhawk and CH–47 Chinook helicopters to begin procurement of passenger and troop compartment crashworthy seats, which can provide protection for a majority of expected survivable crashes.

TH–67 Creek

The budget request contained no funds to procure TH–67 Creek training helicopters.

The committee notes that a shortfall in visual flight, instrument flight, and basic combat skills training helicopters will occur with the anticipated retirement of Vietnam-era UH–1 and OH–58 A/C aircraft as outlined in the draft fiscal year 2000 Army Aviation Modernization Plan. The committee understands that the Army does not intend to replace these retiring aircraft due to affordability concerns. However, the committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $35.0 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for 27 TH–67s.

Based on the need to replace the aging Huey and OH–58 A/C fleet as soon as possible and the need to provide quality training

for Army aviators, the committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million for 19 TH–67 helicopters.

UH–60 Blackhawk

The budget request contained $64.7 million for the procurement of six UH–60L Blackhawk utility helicopters for the Army National Guard (ARNG) but included no funds for UH–60Q enhanced medical evacuation (MEDEVAC) helicopters or Firehawk conversion kits for the ARNG. The Blackhawk is the Army's primary utility helicopter for air assault, general support and aero medical evacuation missions.

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $196.0 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for the procurement of 20 additional Blackhawks for the ARNG in recognition of a shortfall that has persisted for a number of years in ARNG units. The committee also notes that the UH–60Q MEDEVAC helicopter is the number one near-term medical modernization program for the Army and provides enhanced medical evacuation and treatment of six litter or seven ambulatory patients in a state-of-the-art medical treatment cabin interior. Finally, the committee notes that the Firehawk conversion kit, which enables a UH–60 to carry up to 1000 gallons of water in the under fuselage tank and fully refill via a snorkel system in approximately one minute after dropping its payload on a fire, greatly enhances the ARNG's ability to support forest firefighting requirements.

Consistent with its actions in prior fiscal years, the committee recommends an increase of $27.9 million to procure three additional UH–60L Blackhawks and $40.2 million to procure three UH–60Q MEDEVAC variants. The committee also recommends $3.0 million to procure two Firehawk conversion kits for the ARNG.

In total, the committee recommends $135.8 million for the UH–60 helicopter, an increase of $71.1 million.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,295.7 million for Missile Procurement, Army for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $1,367.7 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	7	29,801			7	29,801
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM					-	-
002	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY (MYP)	2,200	296,962			2,200	296,962
002	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(11,599)			-	(11,599)
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM					-	-
004	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	3,754	387,959			3,754	387,959
004	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(15,711)			-	(15,711)
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
006	MLRS ROCKET	-	9,413			-	9,413
007	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	66	188,689			66	188,689
008	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	-	15,044	51	10,000	51	25,044
	ATACMS BLOCK IV				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
009	ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY	55	230,334			55	230,334
010	MPIM ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	3,547		(3,547)	-	-
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**1,134,439**		**6,453**		**1,140,892**
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
011	PATRIOT MODS	-	22,929		65,500	-	88,429
	PAC-2				[65,500]		[65,500]
012	STINGER MODS	-	21,838			-	21,838
013	AVENGER MODS	-	6,828			-	6,828
014	ITAS/TOW MODS (MYP)	-	64,562			-	64,562
015	MLRS MODS	-	16,499			-	16,499
	TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES		**132,656**		**65,500**		**198,156**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
016	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	20,785			-	20,785
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**20,785**		**-**		**20,785**
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
017	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	-	2,394			-	2,394
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	-	969			-	969
019	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	-	1,341			-	1,341
020	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	-	3,144			-	3,144
021	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**7,848**		**-**		**7,848**
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**1,295,728**		**71,953**		**1,367,681**

Items of Special Interest

Army tactical missile system (ATACMS) system summary

The budget request contained $15.0 million for ATAMCS Block IA missile production support costs, but included no funds to procure ATACMS Block IV missiles. The ATACMS is a surface-to-surface, global positioning system-guided missile for deep-strike attacks against tactical surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missile sites, logistics elements, and command, control, communications complexes.

The committee is aware of the ATACMS Block IV upgrade that will incorporate Standoff Land Attack Missile-Expanded Response warheads into 51 ATACMS Block IA missiles. This warhead upgrade is designed to limit collateral damage when used against targets in urban environments and is a direct outgrowth of the Army's inability to conduct deep strike missions against such targets with its existing ATACMS missile inventory during Operation Allied Force.

The committee believes that the Army should have the capability to provide joint force commanders with a surface-to-surface deep strike option, which produces limited collateral damage in urban environments. Therefore, the committee recommends $10.0 million to upgrade 51 ATACMS Block IA missiles to Block IV configuration.

Multipurpose individual munition (MPIM) advance procurement

The budget request contained $3.5 million for advance procurement of the MPIM. Subsequent to the submission of the budget request to Congress, Army program officials identified additional alternate warhead research, development, test and evaluation work required to develop further the lethality of the MPIM and reduce its weight. Accordingly, the committee recommends a transfer of the $3.5 million requested for MPIM advance procurement to PE 64802A for this purpose.

Patriot advanced capability-2 (PAC–2)

The budget request contained $22.9 million for Patriot missile modifications.

The committee is aware that certain variants of the PAC–2 missile have recently experienced unexpectedly high rates of failure in certain components. Although reductions in unit readiness have not yet occured, the committee believes that repair and upgrade of these missiles is needed to assure that PAC–2 inventories remain sufficiently robust to meet validated requirements. The committee understands that acceleration of this process by one year will help meet this objective, provide for earlier fielding of a guidance-enhanced missile with improved ballistic and cruise missile defense capabilities, and generate significant cost savings.

Therefore, the committee recommends $88.4 million for Patriot modifications, and increase of $65.5 million.

Patriot anti-cruise missile (PACM)

The budget request contained no funds for PACM procurement.

The PACM program has developed a new seeker that would provide older Patriot missiles with anti-cruise missile capabilities. The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept.106-162) required the Secretary of Defense to use the Defense Science Board (DSB) to assess PACM capabilities and the opportunity costs of PACM acquisition. The committee notes that the final DSB report indicates that between $100 and $125 million of research and development funding are needed to complete PACM design, resolve parts obsolescence, prepare facilities for production, integrate PACM with Patriot ground elements, and complete ground and flight testing. The DSB also indicated that the cost to upgrade PAC–2 airframes to the PACM configuration is about $1.0 million per missile. The committee believes that, even if ground- and flight-testing needed to make an informed judgment on the technical merits of the missile were complete, the costs identified by the DSB would still be prohibitive. For these reasons, the committee recommends no funds for PACM procurement, as requested.

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,874.6 million for procurement of Army weapons and tracked combat vehicles for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $2,167.9 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	-	5,331			-	5,331
002	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	-	359,389	65	81,300	65	440,689
	A20DS				[+81,300]		[+81,300]
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,006			-	20,006
004	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	-	12,098			-	12,098
005	HAB TRAINING DEVICES	-	-			-	-
006	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	-	14,038			-	14,038
007	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	-	10,504			-	10,504
008	MEDIUM ARMORED VEHICLE FAMILY: MAVF	-	537,077			-	537,077
009	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	-	-			-	-
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					-	-
010	CARRIER, MOD	-	45,111		50,000	-	95,111
	M113A3				[+50,000]		[+50,000]
011	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	-	31,898			-	31,898
012	BFVS SERIES (MOD)	-	37,142		20,000	-	57,142
	Laser Warning Receivers				[+20,000]		[+20,000]
013	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	-	8,060			-	8,060
014	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	-	5			-	5
015	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	-	68,385		8,300	-	76,685
016	BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	-	-		20,000	-	20,000
017	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	-	12	59,200	12	59,200
017A	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				13,100		13,100
018	ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	1,692			-	1,692
019	AVLB SLEP	-	15,252		(10,300)	-	4,952
020	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	36,098		18,900	-	54,998
	UAAPU				[+18,900]		[+18,900]
021	M1A1D RETROFIT	-	891			-	891
022	SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	16	36,149			16	36,149
023	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	551,828			-	551,828

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
023	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(213,406)			-	(213,406)
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	174,445			-	174,445
025	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	-			-	-
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					-	-
026	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	135			-	135
027	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	9,250			-	9,250
	TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		**1,761,378**		**260,500**		**2,021,878**
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
028	ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,196	12,449			1,196	12,449
029	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	-	-		18,300	-	18,300
030	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	581	11,835		2,500	581	14,335
031	M16 RIFLE	10,314	4,793			10,314	4,793
032	XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	230	3,085			230	3,085
033	5.56 CARBINE M4	8,309	5,190			8,309	5,190
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					-	-
034	MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,813			-	1,813
035	M4 CARBINE MODS	-	2,504			-	2,504
036	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	-	9,956			-	9,956
037	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)	-	495			-	495
038	HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	-	3,507			-	3,507
039	M119 MODIFICATIONS	-	4,705			-	4,705
040	M16 RIFLE MODS	-	9,592			-	9,592
041	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	787			-	787
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					-	-
042	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	1,182			-	1,182
043	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	5,152			-	5,152

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
044	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	3,604		12,000	-	15,604
	Arsenal Initiative				[12,000]		[12,000]
045	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	3,506			-	3,506
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		**84,155**		**32,800**		**116,955**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES						
046	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	29,105			-	29,105
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**29,105**		**-**		**29,105**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**1,874,638**		**293,300**		**2,167,938**

Items of Special Interest

Armored vehicle launch bridge (AVLB) service life extension program (SLEP)

The budget request contained $15.3 million to conduct a SLEP of AVLB vehicles. As a result of the cancellation of the Wolverine Heavy Assault Bridge (HAB), a SLEP for the 36-year old, 60-ton military load class (MLC) AVLB is now a priority for the Army. The SLEP will upgrade the AVLB to a 70-ton MLC bridge, which will enable both the Abrams tank and Hercules Improved Recovery Vehicles to safely cross expanses at full span.

The committee notes the importance of this system and recognizes that a number of these vehicles will remain in the Army inventory after the fielding of the Wolverine HAB. The committee further notes its continued support for the Wolverine HAB, which is discussed elsewhere in this report. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.3 million for the AVLB SLEP.

Bradley base sustainment

The budget request contained $359.4 million for the procurement of Bradley A3 fighting vehicle upgrades, of which $6.1 million was included for fielding Army National Guard (ARNG) A2 Operation Desert Storm (ODS) variants.

The Bradley A2ODS is derived from upgrading the first-generation Bradley A0's lethality, survivability, and mobility, as well as the situational awareness of its crew. Modifications include installation of a laser range finder, Global Positioning System navigation capability, a combat identification system, a driver's thermal viewer, and a missile countermeasure device.

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

Because ARNG enhanced brigades will comprise an increasing percentage of the Army's warfighting capability as a result of active force reductions, the committee recommends $440.7 million, an increase of $81.3 million, for upgrading an additional 65 Bradley A0 vehicles to the A2ODS variant for the ARNG.

Bradley fighting vehicle system (BFVS) series (modifications)

The budget request contained $37.1 million to procure modification kits for the BFVS but included no funds to procure AN/VVR–1 laser warning receivers (LWR). The AN/VVR–1 LWR provides warning to armored vehicle crews when a threat laser used to direct a laser-guided weapon to its target has illuminated them.

Because the committee is aware of the proliferation of laser-guided weapons and the increasing threat they pose to armored vehicles, it recommends an increase of $20.0 million to procure addi-

tional AN/VVR-1 LWRs for the protection of high value warfighting assets.

Heavy assault bridge (HAB) system

The budget request contained no funds to continue procurement of the HAB.

The HAB is a 70-ton military load-class bridge transported on a modified M1A2 Abrams system enhancement program (SEP) tank chassis. The system is capable of spanning gaps up to 79 feet, can be deployed in 5 minutes, and can be retrieved from either end in less than 10 minutes.

The committee is concerned by the Secretary of the Army's termination of this program, especially after having provided a $14.0 million increase for HAB advance procurement in fiscal year 2000, as well as having authorized a combined M1A2 SEP/HAB multiyear procurement contract. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified the HAB as the Army's top unfunded modernization requirement in fiscal year 2001.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $59.2 million for 12 vehicles and $13.1 million in advance procurement for fiscal year 2002 to maintain HAB production.

Improved recovery vehicle (IRV)

The budget request contained $68.4 million to procure IRVs but included no funds for the procurement of IRVs for the Army Reserve.

The 56-ton M88A1 is capable of towing only vehicles weighing less than 60 tons. Consequently, two M88A1s are required to safely tow an Abrams tank if it is rendered immobile due to combat damage or mechanical failure. The M88A2 IRV upgrade includes increased engine horsepower, as well as braking, steering, winch, lift, and suspension capabilities required to safely recover Abrams tanks and other heavy combat systems.

The committee understands that the Army Reserve has a shortfall of three companies of IRVs in force package one reserve units. Accordingly, the committee recommends $76.7 million, an increase of $8.3 million, for additional M88A2 IRV upgrades for the Army Reserve.

Industrial preparedness

The budget request contained $3.6 million for storage and maintenance of laid away equipment and facilities at Hawthorne Army Depot and Rock Island and Watervliet Arsenals, but included no funds for expanding the Armament Retooling and Support (ARMS) Initiative to include the manufacturing arsenals.

The committee recommends a provision (sec. 113) that would expand the ARMS Initiative to attract commercial tenants to these arsenals. The committee believes that collocating such tenants with existing ammunition plants has helped maintain both facilities and perishable industrial skills of the ammunition production workforce with minimal expenditure of public funds and that a similar effort to offset the underutilization of the manufacturing arsenals would be equally beneficial.

Therefore, the committee recommends $15.6 million, an increase of $12.0 million to expand the ARMS initiative to include the manufacturing arsenals.

M1 Abrams tank modifications

The budget request contained $36.1 million for M1 Abrams tank modifications but included no funds for the procurement of M1A2 Abrams System Enhancement Program (SEP) tank under armor auxiliary power units (UAAPU).

The UAAPU is designed to power tank weapon systems in lieu of an idling M1A2 Abrams SEP tank's gas turbine engine, which will reduce engine wear, fuel consumption, fuel storage and transportation requirements while increasing the operating life of the tank's batteries. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified an $18.9 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for 80 UAAPUs for M1A2 SEP tanks.

The committee believes that the savings realized by using an UAAPU will be considerable and, therefore, recommends $55.0 million, an increase of $18.9 million, for 80 UAAPUs.

M113 carrier modifications

The budget request contained $45.1 million for M113 carrier modifications, of which $43.2 million was for M113 "A3" upgrades. The M113A3 upgrade program, which is expected to add an additional 20 years of service life to the vehicle, includes installation of a new engine, transmission, external armored fuel tanks, driver controls, and internal Kevlar spall liners.

The committee notes that M113A3 upgrades are among the highest unfunded requirements identified by the Army Chief of Staff in fiscal year 2001. The committee further notes that additional funds would accelerate the fielding of A3 upgrades for force package two from fiscal year 2004 into fiscal year 2002.

Therefore, consistent with its actions taken in prior fiscal years, the committee recommends $95.1 million, an increase of $50.0 million for additional M113A3 upgrade kits.

M249 squad automatic weapon (SAW)

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

The M249 SAW is a lightweight machine gun capable of delivering a sustained volume of automatic, accurate, and highly lethal fire up to ranges of 800 meters. It is fielded throughout the Army in airborne, light and mechanized infantry, and air cavalry units. The committee is concerned that the Army has eliminated funds for this weapon in the future years defense program but notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified an $18.3 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for the 4,280 remaining SAWs to complete the Army's procurement objective of these weapons. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $18.3 million for this purpose to complete the procurement objective of M249 SAWs.

MK19-3 grenade launcher

The budget request contained $11.8 million to procure MK19–3 grenade launchers. The MK19–3 40 millimeter automatic grenade launcher can engage point targets up to 1,500 meters in range and provide suppressive fire up to 2,200 meters. The MK19–3 can also be used as a crew-served weapon mounted on armored vehicles and High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles.

The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified an $8.1 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for MK19–3s for Army National Guard (ARNG) units. The committee also notes this weapon's increased importance in military operations in urban terrain and the increasing deployment of ARNG units into contingency operations of this type.

Based on these factors, and consistent with prior year actions to add funds for MK19s, the committee recommends $14.3 million, an increase of $2.5 million to procure additional MK19–3 grenade launchers.

Small arms production industrial base

The committee understands that there is reluctance within the Department of the Army to forward requests for waivers to expand the competition on particular small arms critical repair parts contracts to the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the authority provided in section 2473 of title 10, United States Code. The committee is concerned that such waivers requested by the Army from the Secretary of Defense have been denied. To ensure that competition is available, when necessary, the committee reiterates that waivers on small arms critical repair parts contracts should be forwarded to, and granted by, the Secretary of Defense when he believes it is not necessary to preserve the small arms production industrial base.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,131.3 million for Ammunition Procurement, Army for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $1,199.3 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	-	97,758			-	97,758
002	CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	873	1,337			873	1,337
003	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	-	8,990			-	8,990
004	CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM993	-	-			-	-
005	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,487			-	2,487
006	CTG, .45 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	-			-	-
007	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	-	10,646		6,000	-	16,646
008	CTG CAL .50 API MK211 MOD 0	254	1,987		2,000	254	3,987
009	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,004			-	2,004
010	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	57,780			-	57,780
011	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	-	9,517			-	9,517
012	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	-	60,788			-	60,788
013	NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	5	8,397			5	8,397
	MORTAR AMMUNITION					-	-
014	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	-	28,673		8,000	-	36,673
	M767				[8,000]		[8,000]
015	CTG 81MM INFRARED (IR) ILLUM XM816	-	-			-	-
016	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	24	930			24	930
017	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE M931	-	-			-	-
018	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/MO FUZE	62	45,031		5,400	62	50,431
019	CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	-	-		6,600	-	6,600
020	CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE M929 W/MO FUZE	-	-			-	-
021	CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	26	24,969			26	24,969
	TANK AMMUNITION					-	-
022	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	-	-			-	-
023	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	-	-			-	-
024	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	87	48,477			87	48,477
025	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	199	101,512			199	101,512
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
026	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	40	1,807			40	1,807
027	CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	-	-			-	-
028	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	-	-			-	-
029	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	-	-			-	-
030	CTG ARTY 105MM M927	-	-			-	-
031	CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	-	130			-	130
032	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	-	14,682			-	14,682
033	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	-	-			-	-
034	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	-	14,907			-	14,907
035	REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADA	117	47,674			117	47,674
036	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	175	35,178			175	35,178
037	MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	164	27,432		20,000	164	47,432
	ARTILLERY FUZES					-	-
038	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	-	67,005			-	67,005
	MINES					-	-
039	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	-	3,892			-	3,892
040	MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	-			-	-
041	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	58	7,284			58	7,284
	ROCKETS					-	-
042	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
043	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	-	152,767			-	152,767
	OTHER AMMUNITION					-	-
044	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	16,603		2,000	-	18,603
	APOBS				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
045	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	20,260			-	20,260
046	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	13,067			-	13,067
047	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	3,053			-	3,053
	MISCELLANEOUS					-	-
048	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	6,750			-	6,750
049	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	-	4,298			-	4,298
050	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	10,145			-	10,145
051	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	9,476			-	9,476

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
052	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	5,118			-	5,118
053	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	-	5,764			-	5,764
	TOTAL AMMUNITION		**978,575**		**60,000**		**1,038,575**
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
054	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	47,748			-	47,748
055	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,215			-	3,215
056	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	12,267			-	12,267
057	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	84,799			-	84,799
058	ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,719		8,000	-	12,719
	TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		**152,748**		**8,000**		**160,748**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,131,323**		**68,000**		**1,199,323**

Items of Special Interest

Army ammunition procurement

The budget request contained $1,131.3 million for procurement of ammunition and production base support. The committee recommends $1,199.3 million, an increase of $68.0 million for the following types of ammunition programs, which include top unfunded requirements identified by the Chief of Staff of the Army in fiscal year 2001:

[Dollars in millions]

Small/Medium Cal Ammunition:	
CTG .50 cal, SLAPT M 903 (M 962)	$6.0
CTG .50 cal, Mk 211	2.0
Mortar Ammunition:	
CTG mortar 60mm Illum M721/M767	8.0
CTG 120mm HE M934 w/MO Fuze	5.4
CTG 120mm Illum XM930 w/MTSQ Fuze	6.6
Artillery Ammunition:	
Modular Artillery Charge System	20.0
Rockets:	
Bunker Defeating Munition	10.0
Demolition Munitions:	
APOBS	2.0
Production Base Support:	
ARMS Initiative	8.0

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $3,795.9 million for Other Procurement, Army for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $4,095.3 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	-	-			-	-
002	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	374	12,135			374	12,135
003	SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,912			24	1,912
004	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	-	30,213			-	30,213
005	SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	376	20,010			376	20,010
006	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	67	6,147			67	6,147
007	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	1,002	110,746	100	5,000	1,102	115,746
	HMMWV				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
008	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	19	5,208			19	5,208
009	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	-	438,256		35,000	-	473,256
010	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPM	-	14,830			-	14,830
011	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	-	166,119		5,000	-	171,119
	HEMTT/HEMAT				[+3,800]		[+3,800]
	HEMTT Firetrucks				[+1,200]		[+1,200]
012	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	20	13,453			20	13,453
013	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	-	42,989		1,600	-	44,589
	M915A3				[+1,600]		[+1,600]
014	TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	-	-			-	-
015	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	94	17,233			94	17,233
016	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SL	-	-			-	-
017	LINE HAUL ESP	362	27,054			362	27,054
018	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	28,910			-	28,910
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	-	1,853			-	1,853
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES					-	-
020	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	12	2,263			12	2,263
021	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	35	834			35	834
022	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	989			-	989
023	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,021			-	1,021
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
024	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	-			-	-
025	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
026	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		**942,175**		**46,600**		**988,775**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
027	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	13,096			-	13,096
028	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	5,553			-	5,553
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS					-	-
029	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SP	-	72,034			-	72,034
030	SHF TERM	-	38,307			-	38,307
031	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	3,475			-	3,475
032	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	21,439			-	21,439
033	SMART-T (SPACE)	-	48,594			-	48,594
034	SCAMP (SPACE)	-	4,261			-	4,261
035	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	-	9,286			-	9,286
036	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	1,489			-	1,489
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM					-	-
037	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	10,355			-	10,355
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					-	-
038	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	-	32,675		18,500	-	51,175
	ADDS				[+18,500]		[+18,500]
039	SINCGARS FAMILY	-	18,340		30,700	-	49,040
040	JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	-	972			-	972
041	ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	-	113,951			-	113,951
042	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	-	3,348			-	3,348
043	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONIC	-	4,374			-	4,374
044	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	-	2,459			-	2,459
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM					-	-
045	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	1,744			-	1,744

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
046	TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	11,051			-	11,051
047	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	-	54,374		4,000	-	58,374
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
048	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	2,025			-	2,025
049	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	3,945			-	3,945
050	ARMY DISN ROUTER	-	4,339			-	4,339
051	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	431			-	431
052	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	-	2,865			-	2,865
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
053	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	57,779			-	57,779
054	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	18,836			-	18,836
055	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	65,975			-	65,975
056	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	-	65,412			-	65,412
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
057	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	869			-	869
058	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	19,604			-	19,604
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
059	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	66,671			-	66,671
060	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	183	26,753			183	26,753
061	PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	-	9,571			-	9,571
062	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	4	37,789			4	37,789
063	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	-	66,415			-	66,415
064	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
065	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	44	20,030			44	20,030
066	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	-			-	-
067	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILIT	-	12,853			-	12,853
068	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS	-	2,833			-	2,833
069	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS (JTAGS)	-	-			-	-
070	TROJAN (TIARA)	-	4,264			-	4,264
071	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	224			-	224
072	CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA	404	1,939			404	1,939

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
073	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TIARA)	-	484			-	484
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)					-	-
074	SHORTSTOP	-	-			-	-
075	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURE	-	2,311			-	2,311
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)					-	-
076	FAAD GBS	2	24,188			2	24,188
077	TARGET LOCATION OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	-			-	-
078	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	-	34,146		20,400	-	54,546
	AN/PVS-7				[+12,000]		[+12,000]
	25mm Tubes				[+8,400]		[+8,400]
079	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYST	77	46,156			77	46,156
080	LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	-	1,199			-	1,199
081	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	1,664	35,348			1,664	35,348
082	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	-	8,040			-	8,040
083	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-	14,405			-	14,405
084	PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (P	-	-			-	-
085	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-	18,530			-	18,530
086	DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	1,660	60,802			1,660	60,802
087	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (L	29	7,093			29	7,093
088	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	73	1,652			73	1,652
089	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	36	7,341			36	7,341
090	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	7	7,018			7	7,018
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS					-	-
091	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-	17,260			-	17,260
092	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	54,452			456	54,452
093	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-	972			-	972
094	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	333	27,411			333	27,411
095	FAAD C2	2	17,868			2	17,868
096	FAADC2I MODIFICATIONS	-	-			-	-
097	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (A	-	4,859			-	4,859
098	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	-	17,153			-	17,153
099	STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33	19,084			33	19,084

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
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		5,000	-	40,971
	MCPS				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION					-	-
108	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	-	35,960		8,000	-	43,960
	Distance Learning Initiative				[+8,000]		[+8,000]
109	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	172,051		6,000	-	178,051
	AIT				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
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
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**1,847,767**		**92,600**		**1,940,367**
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
114	GEN SMK MECH:MTRZD DUAL PURP M56	48	11,369	48	11,400	96	22,769
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		27,000	-	42,669

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
120	FLOAT BRIDGE PROPULSION	5	1,942			5	1,942
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					-	-
121	KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	2	688		10,000	2	10,688
	SRS KITS				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
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		9,000	-	21,580
	LADS				[+9,000]		[+9,000]
129	FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS	-	-			-	-
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	-	3,984			-	3,984
131	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	160	1,999		4,600	160	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
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)	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT					-	-
146	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	-	31,567		14,000	-	45,567
	Rapid IV Pumps				[+8000]		[+8000]
	LSTAT				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
	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	96	7,000	166	11,671
153	COMPACTOR, HIGH SPEED	-	-			-	-
154	LOADERS	5	1,444			5	1,444
155	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	35	8,282	13	2,300	48	10,582
156	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	34	14,146		10,200	34	24,346
157	CRANES	-	6,089		10,000	-	16,089
	ATEC				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
158	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	-	-			-	-
159	CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	-	89			-	89
160	CONST EQUIP SLEP	-	1,986		10,000	-	11,986
	D7 SLEP				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
	Scraper SLEP				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
161	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	-	2,635			-	2,635
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT					-	-
162	SMALL TUG	-	-	3	9,000	3	9,000
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	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
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
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					-	-
175	CTC INSTRUMENTATION SUPPORT	-	81,845		13,700	-	95,545
	DFIRST				[+10,500]		[+10,500]
	MPRC-H				[+3,200]		[+3,200]
176	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	-	91,937		17,000	-	108,937
	EST 2000				[+8,000]		[+8,000]
	A-FIST XXI				[+9,000]		[+9,000]
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		5,000	-	70,381
	CTS-SPORT				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
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	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
191	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	-	24,344			-	24,344
192	MA8975	-	2,332			-	2,332
193	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**962,888**		**160,200**		**1,123,088**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA1						
194	INITIAL SPARES - TSV	-	-			-	-
	OPA2						
195	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	-	42,401			-	42,401
	OPA3						
196	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	-	639			-	639
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**43,040**		**-**		**43,040**
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		**3,795,870**		**299,400**		**4,095,270**

Items of Special Interest

Army data distribution system (ADDS)

The budget request contained $32.7 million to procure Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS) radios but included no funds to procure EPLRS for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

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

The committee notes that procurement and fielding of additional EPLRS is a high priority for the ARNG since many of its units are in deployment rotations to the Balkans and, as a result, must have the necessary data communications capabilities to operate alongside active Army units.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $51.2 million for ADDS, an increase of $18.5 million to procure EPLRS for an ARNG enhanced brigade.

Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)

The budget request contained $172.1 million for procurement of ADPE, of which $485,000 was included for automatic identification technology (AIT).

AIT devices, which consist of various radio frequency, bar code scanning, and data carrier devices, are components of automated logistics systems that expedite receiving, storage, distribution, and inventory management of new and repairable items. These devices are also used to automate manufacturing process controls for aircraft repair parts and to track ground support equipment at various military depots.

The committee believes that substantial savings can continue to be achieved from further implementation of these devices in automated inventory and repair processes. Therefore, the committee recommends $178.1 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for maintenance AIT implementation.

Army training modernization

The budget request contained $36.0 million to procure digital training facilities and supporting infrastructure for The Army Distance Learning Program (TADLP), of which $10.9 million was included for Army National Guard (ARNG) distributed training technology.

TADLP provides automation and supporting infrastructure to improve the training of service members and civilian workers in both the active and reserve components to a single standard, particularly in military occupational skill qualifications. Additionally, it provides a highly effective means of delivering training and education to deployed troops while reducing training delivery time and support costs.

The committee is aware of prior year increases in ARNG funding for online courseware and training to enhance its role in support of "first responders" to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) inci-

dents. The committee understands that the ARNG has identified over 120 training courses as essential for online WMD-related training and believes it is important to support the ARNG's WMD first-response training requirement.

Therefore, the committee recommends $44.0 million for TADLP, an increase of $8.0 million, for ARNG distributive training technology to continue online courseware development and procure commercial-off-the-shelf management system hardware and software for WMD first-response training requirements.

Combat support medical

The budget request contained $31.6 million to procure deployable medical systems and field medical equipment but included no funds for rapid intravenous (IV) infusion pumps or for Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT) units. The budget request also contained $6.3 million in PE 64807A, but included funds for LSTAT.

The Rapid IV infusion pump is a miniature, portable, lightweight pump specifically designed for life-saving intravenous fluid resuscitation by a medic in the field to restore blood pressure and prevent shock and death of victims with severe blood loss or dehydration. This system was developed in conjunction with the Walter Reed Army Medical Institute of Research and has received Food and Drug Administration approval. The committee understands that it is estimated that up to 15 percent of the soldiers that died in Vietnam who were not immediate battlefield casualties would have survived their wounds if rapid infusion of fluids had been a possibility during that conflict.

The LSTAT integrates a set of commercially available, Food and Drug Administration-approved medical devices in a self-contained mini-intensive care, medical evacuation platform, which provides advanced life-support, on-board ventilation, suction, environmental control, oxygen generation, and patient monitoring to stabilize wounded soldiers near the battlefront as they are evacuated. LSTAT is configured on a NATO-standard litter, is broadly interoperable with other medical systems and compatible with most evacuation platforms including UH–60s, UH–1s, C–130s, and High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicles.

The committee is impressed with the potential life saving capability that these devices offer, and, therefore, recommends $45.6 million, an increase of $8.0 million to procure rapid IV infusion pumps and $6.0 million to begin procurement of LSTAT units. The committee also recommends $10.3 million in PE64807A, an increase of $4.0 million for development of expanded LSTAT capabilities.

Combat training centers instrumentation support

The budget request contained $81.8 million for combat training centers support but included no funds for either the Army National Guard (ARNG) deployable force-on-force instrumented range system (DFIRST) or the multi-purpose range complex-heavy (MPRC–H).

Encouraged by the fact that the DFIRST system was chosen over all current force-on-force instrumentation systems by the All Serv-

ice Combat Identification Evaluation Team (ASCIET) as the instrumentation system for the fiscal year 1999 Joint Exercise, in the committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee recommended a pilot program at two ARNG training sites to explore the capabilities and benefits of DFIRST systems to increase readiness of ARNG units through more effective training and at a lower cost with greater safety. To continue this concept of force-on-force, simulation-based training at regional training centers, the committee recommends an increase of $10.5 million for the three additional DFIRSTs.

The committee understands that targeting electronic upgrades are needed for the MPRC–H authorized by the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65). The committee believes that such upgrades are absolutely paramount for effectively training ARNG units for their growing worldwide deployments.

Therefore, the committee recommends $3.2 million for MPRC–H targetry electronic upgrades. In total, the committee recommends $95.5 million for combat training centers, an increase of $13.7 million.

Communications equipment system upgrades

The committee believes that currently fielded military radios and communication systems still require upgrades to improve operational capability and dependability, as well as reduce operations and support costs and is aware that Military Standard 188–141A includes an approved miniaturized, multi-function, digital communications technology, based on compressor and expander techniques, that dramatically improves quality of voice and data communications over both wired and wireless networks. Accordingly, the committee expects the Department of Defense to continue to use this technology, when cost effective, to upgrade and improve current communications systems such as, but not limited to, the Single Channel Ground and Airborne Radio System, the Joint Tactical Radio System, and the ARC–190 and PRC–104 radios.

Construction equipment service life extension program (SLEP)

The budget request contained $2.0 million for service life extensions to various types of construction equipment but included no funds to conduct an Army National Guard (ARNG) D–7 dozer and Army Reserve heavy grader and scraper SLEP.

The committee understands that the majority of the currently fielded ARNG D–7 dozers have an average age of 27 years, well beyond their intended 15 year service lives and that there are no plans to replace them. Additionally, the committee notes that the average age of Army Reserve graders and scrapers is 15 years. Both of these types of equipment continue to have greater demands placed on them by the increased "operations-other-than-war" deployments being fulfilled by the reserve component have been called upon to fulfill.

Therefore, the committee recommends $12.0 million for construction equipment SLEPs, an increase of $5.0 million for an ARNG D–7 dozer SLEP and $5.0 million for an Army Reserve heavy scraper and grader SLEP.

Cranes

The budget request contained $6.1 million to procure cranes, of which $3.0 million was included for the procurement of three replacement wheel-mounted, 25-ton all-terrain cranes (ATECs). However, no ATECs were requested for the Army Reserve (AR).

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

The committee notes the importance of ATECs in fulfilling Army Reserve combat support and combat service support mission requirements and recommends $16.1 million, an increase of $10.0 million, to procure ATECs for the Army Reserve.

Deployable universal combat earthmovers (DEUCE)

The budget request contained $14.1 million to procure DEUCEs. The DEUCE is a military-unique, high speed, earthmoving tractor capable of clearing, leveling, and excavating operations for light and airborne divisions.

The committee understands that the DUECE will be a critical piece of equipment for the Army's interim medium brigades. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $14.0 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to procure 36 DEUCEs for the Army's initial and interim brigades as part of the service's transformation.

Therefore, the committee recommends $24.3 million, an increase of $10.2 million, to begin fielding DEUCEs to the interim brigades.

Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV)

The budget request contained $166.1 million for the procurement of the FHTV. Although the budget request included $121.8 million for Army National Guard (ARNG) FHTV and $6.2 million for Army Reserve FHTV, no funds were included for the procurement of Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Trucks (HEMTT) or Heavy Expanded Mobility Trailers (HEMAT) for ARNG Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) battalion conversions. The HEMTT is a diesel powered, 10-ton, 8-wheel drive, tactical vehicle that transports ammunition, and petroleum. The vehicle is also produced in wrecker, tanker, and tractor variants and is the prime mover in support of certain missile systems, including the MLRS.

The committee notes the Army Chief of Staff has identified an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for additional HEMMTs and HEMATs for ARNG MLRS battalion conversion. The committee is also aware of a HEMTT fire truck shortfall in two Army Reserve combat service support companies that are designated as force package one units. These vehicles would replace obsolete fire trucks that were commercially adapted for military purposes.

The committee recommends $171.1 million for the FHTV, an increase of $3.8 million to procure both HEMTTs and HEMATs for ARNG MLRS battalion conversion and $1.2 million to procure three HEMTT fire trucks for the Army Reserve.

Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV)

The budget request contained $438.3 million for procurement of, and identified improvements to the FMTV, of which $84.0 million was included for two and one-half-ton variants for the Army National Guard (ARNG) and $33.8 million was included for these variants for the Army Reserve. The FMTV comprise the Army's two and one-half-ton and five-ton, common chassis cargo and utility trucks. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $118.9 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for reserve component FMTV due to the increasing reliance upon the reserves for combat support and combat service support missions.

The committee strongly supports upgrading the reserve component's aging fleet of trucks and, therefore, recommends $473.3 million, an increase of $35.0 million for additional Army Reserve two and one-half-ton and five-ton FMTVs.

High mobility multipurpose-wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)

The budget request contained $110.7 million for 1,002 HMMWVA2s, which incorporate upgraded electrical, braking, engine and transmission improvements as well as a 15-year corrosion prevention program, but included no funds for HMMWVs to fill critical shortages in Army Reserve combat support and combat service support units.

The HMMWV is a multi-service, four-wheel drive utility and logistics vehicle. The Army fleet is used for personnel and weapons transport, medical evacuation, and as an air defense weapon-mount platform. While recognizing that the HMMWVs requested in the budget will replace older vehicles in high priority active component units, the committee is concerned that certain Army Reserve units do not have enough HMMWVs to meet their growing mission and deployment requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends $115.7 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for 100 Army Reserve HMMWVA2s.

Hydraulic excavator (HYEX)

The budget request contained $8.3 million for procurement of HYEXs, of which $2.6 million was included for 11 Army Reserve HYEXs. The HYEX is a diesel driven, self-propelled, tracked vehicle with a wide variety of excavation attachments used for general excavation; digging; trenching and lifting for lines of communication; logistics-over-the-shore, and other construction activities primarily in support of Corps and Echelons Above Corps levels.

The committee understands that a HYEX shortfall exists in high priority Army Reserve construction units and that these units will continue to operate existing obsolete equipment for the foreseeable future until it is replaced.

Based upon increased reliance on the reserve component to provide engineer equipment for operations-other-than-war, and disaster/humanitarian relief operations, the committee recommends $10.6 million, an increase of $2.3 million, for 13 additional Type I HYEXs for the Army Reserve.

Information system security program (ISSP)

The budget request contained $54.4 million, $46.6 million, and $15.7 million to procure secure voice and data equipment for the Army, Navy, and Air Force respectively.

The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) recommended an increase of $9.0 million in fiscal year 2000 to support the services' efforts to replace older secure voice and data systems with modern multi-media secure digital communications equipment. The committee continues to strongly support upgrading critical telecommunications equipment to safeguard classified or sensitive information in the face of growing information security threats.

Therefore, in order to accelerate the replacement of obsolete secure voice and data terminals, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to procure additional secure terminal equipment: $4.0 million for the Army ISSP, $4.0 million for the Navy and Marine Corps ISSP, and $4.0 million for the Air Force ISSP.

Integrated family of test equipment (IFTE)

The budget request contained $65.4 million to procure IFTE, of which $37.1 million was included for Contact Test Sets (CTS) Soldier Portable On-System Repair Tool (SPORT).

The CTS SPORT is the Army's standard lightweight, ruggedized, portable tester used at all levels of maintenance to automatically diagnose faulty electronic components for immediate replacement.

The committee has strongly supported the IFTE program over the years and continues to believe in the productivity improvements resulting from automatic test equipment usage. Therefore, the committee recommends $70.4 million for IFTE, an increase of $5.0 million, to procure additional CTS SPORTs.

However, the committee is aware that the current CTS SPORT indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) contract will expire in June 2001. Based on the importance of the CTS SPORT to numerous weapons systems and to avoid possible fielding interruptions for this equipment, the committee expects the Secretary of the Army to extend the current ID/IQ contract for CTS SPORT and understands that this extension would require no government costs.

Laundries, showers, and latrines

The budget request contained $12.6 million to procure the Laundry Advanced System (LADS). The LADS is a mobile field laundry designed to launder clothing at four times the capacity of the current, but obsolete M–85 field laundry system and recycle 99 percent of the water used by the M–85 system.

The committee believes the logistical benefit to field combat service support units from reduced water usage combined with the enhancement to deployed soldiers' quality of life provided by LADS are impressive. Consequently, the committee strongly supports the Army's efforts to replace the obsolete and unserviceable M–85 system and recommends $21.6 million, an increase of 9.0 million, to accelerate procurement of LADS.

Lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME)

The budget request contained $2.0 million to procure LMEs. The LME is a lightweight, frame-supported tent designed to provide forward deployed maintenance units a quick setup-and-takedown enclosed shelter in which to perform field maintenance operations across the battlefield in all climatic conditions.

The committee notes that mobility will be the hallmark of the Army's future medium brigades and that they must therefore be capable of rapidly repairing and maintaining equipment while deployed. The committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $4.6 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for LMEs to maintain production at minimum sustaining rate.

Therefore, the committee recommends $6.6 million, an increase of $4.6 million, for the procurement of additional LMEs and to maintain a minimum production rate.

M56 smoke generator system

The budget request contained $11.4 million for the procurement of M56 smoke generator systems.

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

The committee understands that the M56 has been designated as an essential item of equipment for early entry forces yet is not being produced at an economic production rate. Therefore, to address this problem, the committee recommends $22.8 million, an increase of $11.4 million, to reach an economic production rate of this system.

M915/M916 line haul truck tractor

The budget request contained $43.0 million for 915A3 line haul tractors, of which $3.4 million was included for M915A3s for the Army Reserve. The M915A3 line haul tractor is a six-by-four wheel drive vehicle fielded primarily in medium transportation companies and used to haul containers and petroleum over both primary and secondary roads.

The committee notes that currently fielded M915 tractors are experiencing reduced mission capable rates and are both difficult and expensive to operate due to old age. To correct this deficiency and to fill critical shortages in Army Reserve line haul companies, the committee recommends $44.6 million for M915/M916 line haul truck tractors, an increase of $1.6 million to procure 12 additional upgraded M915A3 tractors.

Night vision devices

The budget request contained $34.1 million to procure night vision devices, of which $29.5 million was included for AN/PVS–7 night vision goggles. However, no funds were included for third generation, 25 millimeter (mm) image intensification tube upgrades.

The AN/PVS–7 night vision goggle is a state-of-the-art image-intensifying system, which can be head- or helmet-mounted to enhance the dismounted soldier's nighttime operations. The 25mm image intensification tube upgrade program, which replaces less capable tubes with the third generation variant in fielded AN/PVS–4 night vision goggles and AN/TVS–5 night vision sights, provides a minimum 25 percent resolution increase in these systems.

The committee has consistently supported additional funds for night vision devices the past five years, and notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified $14.8 million unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001 to procure AN/PVS–7 night vision goggles and $8.4 million for third generation, 25mm image intensification tube upgrades.

Consistent with prior year actions, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for AN/PVS–7 night vision goggles and $8.4 million for third generation, 25mm image intensification tube upgrades. The committee expects $400,000 of the AN/PVS–7 increase to be used to procure these goggles for Army Reserve combat support units.

Nonsystem training devices

The budget request contained $91.9 million for procurement of various training devices and range modernization but no funds were included for continued procurement of engagement skills trainer (EST) 2000 or Abrams Full-crew Interactive Skills Trainers (A–FIST) XXI upgrades for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The EST 2000 simulates three-dimensional targets in several realistic terrain environments, providing marksmanship, squad-tactical, and close-range shoot-no-shoot training. This system also provides both shooter and instructor with real-time and post-exercise weapon handling technique feedback. The committee understands that the ARNG has a requirement for 100 EST 2000 systems.

The ARNG A–FISTs do not meet current Army tank gunnery training standards and require software upgrades to enhance training on the tank commander's weapon station and to provide identical gunnery matrices to the Conduct Of Fire Trainer, the Army's standard for stand-alone precision gunnery training devices. The committee understands that these upgrades will offer significant training advantages for tank crews as well as reduced maintenance costs. The committee also understands that the ARNG has developed a three-year, A–FIST XXI conversion program to incorporate these upgrades.

The committee believes that these training systems are critical for ARNG forces' marksmanship and gunnery simulation training in light of their increased worldwide deployments. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for procurement of 30 EST 2000 systems and an increase of $9.0 million for the first increment of a three-year A–FIST XXI conversion program, both for the ARNG. In total, the committee recommends $108.9 million for nonsystem training devices, an increase of $17.0 million.

Reserve component automation system (RCAS)

The budget request contained $91.5 million to procure and field RCAS equipment and software.

The RCAS is critical to the day-to-day operation and mobilization capability of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. If continued support for, and improvements to, this program are not made, the reserve components will experience a significant deterioration in their ability to mobilize in support of national security missions in a timely manner.

The committee understands that there is a limitation of Army funds allocated for the RCAS beyond fiscal year 2002.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to budget sufficient funds in the future years defense program to ensure that the RCAS will be able to effectively fulfill the administrative support and mobilization requirements of the reserve components. The committee also expects the Secretary to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the yearly allocation of funds required annually maintain and improve the RCAS program by March 1, 2001.

Ribbon bridge

The budget request contained $15.7 million for ribbon bridge equipment but included no funds to procure this equipment for Army National Guard (ARNG) multi-role bridge companies (MRBC). Ribbon bridge equipment consists of 10-ton, 8-wheel drive M1977 Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck Common Bridge Transporters, M15 Bridge Adaptor Pallets, and M14 Improved Boat Cradles.

The committee understands that seven ARNG MRBC will be established in fiscal year 2001 using existing engineer bridging equipment and older, lower-capacity, five-ton trucks. The committee also understands that without additional funds, these new MRBC units will not begin conversion to the new equipment required for their mission until fiscal year 2004.

Therefore, the committee recommends $42.7 million for ribbon bridging equipment, an increase of $27.0 million to accelerate the fielding of two ARNG MRBC.

Single channel ground and airborne radio systems (SINCGARS) family

The budget request contained $18.3 million for the procurement and the fielding of airborne SINCGARS, but included no funds to procure SINCGARS advanced system improvement program (ASIP) radios for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The SINCGARS ASIP radio upgrades early version voice-only radios and includes a tactical Internet controller and integrated communications security enhancements, which provide commanders a highly reliable, easily maintained, secure voice and data handling command and control capability.

The committee understands that two ARNG divisions still require improved SINCGARS; and, without these upgraded radios, these forces will be unable to transmit and receive data from their active Army components when participating together in joint and combined operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends $49.0 million for SINCGARS, an increase of $30.7 million, to procure SINCGARS ASIP radios for one ARNG division.

Small tug

The budget request contained no funds to procure small tugs.

The small tug is a 60-foot, steel hull, twin propeller vessel designed to tow general cargo barges in harbors, inland waterways, and along coastlines. It is also capable of assisting larger tugs in mooring ships of all sizes at piers and in restricted navigation waterways, moving of floating cranes and machine shops, and performing line-handling duties.

The committee is aware of the Army's intent to replace its unreliable 40-year old small tugs that were used in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm and understands that it has increased its requirement to fifteen tugs to replace these older vessels. The committee included an increase of $4.7 million in fiscal year 1999 to procure two additional tugs and $9.0 million in fiscal year 2000 to complete the earlier requirement of eight tugs. However, the committee notes that the Army has not budgeted for the additional seven new tugs in its future years defense program.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million to accelerate procurement of 3 additional vessels towards completion of the requirement for 15 small tugs.

Standard integrated command post system (SICPS)

The budget request contained $36.0 million to procure SICPS components, of which $1.3 million was included for modular command post system (MCPS) tents.

The MCPS tent consists of a lightweight aluminum frame, interchangeable fabric wall sections, fabric roof, floors and liners, worktables, map boards, and light sets. Multiple MCPS tents can be interconnected to create a large complex. The committee notes the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $40.1 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to accelerate the procurement of SICPS components for force packages one and two.

The committee is aware of the vital role MCPS tents play in growing worldwide deployments and, therefore, recommends $41.0 million, an increase of $2.0 million and $3.0 million respectively, to procure MCPS for active and Army National Guard units.

Standard teleoperating kit

The budget request contained $700,000 to procure Standardized Robotic System (SRS) vehicle teleoperating kits.

The SRS kit can be installed on existing tracked or wheeled vehicles to enable them to be operated by remote control, if circumstances dictate, to clear mines. The committee understands that SRS contingency sets have been responsible for detonating hundreds of mines while deployed in Bosnia. The committee also notes that redesigned combat engineer force structure requires SRS equipment at all force levels, including the new interim medium brigades.

Based on the successful employment of this technology and the critical life saving mission that it performs, the committee recommends $10.7 million for standard teleoperating equipment, an increase of $10.0 million for additional SRS kits.

Vibratory self-propelled roller

The budget request contained $4.7 million to procure vibratory self-propelled rollers. The vibratory self-propelled roller is a commercial compacting vehicle used to support construction of airfields, logistic areas, and roads required to deploy and sustain Army forces.

The committee notes that the last major procurement of this equipment occurred in the early 1980s and that its 22-year average age, combined with the effects of increased deployments, has reduced its readiness ratings to unsatisfactory levels. The committee also notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a $10.0 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to replace vibratory self-propelled rollers for both the active and reserve components as a fiscal year 2001 unfunded requirement.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $11.7 million, an increase of $7.0 million to procure 96 additional vibratory self-propelled rollers, including $3.0 million for active Army units and $4.0 million for Army Reserve units.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,003.5 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends no funds for fiscal year 2001.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
001	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	274,400		(274,400)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC					-	-
	PROCUREMENT					-	-
002	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	121,900		(121,900)	-	-
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M					-	-
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					-	-
003	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	607,200		(607,200)	-	-
	TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY		**1,003,500**		**(1,003,500)**		**-**

Items of Special Interest

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION

The budget request contained $1,003.5 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army.

The committee notes that section 1412 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (Public Law 99–145), as amended, requires that funds for the destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions, including funds for military construction projects necessary to carry out the demilitarization program shall only be authorized and appropriated in the budget of the Department of Defense (DOD) as a separate program and shall not be included in the budget accounts for any military department. The committee notes that for the second year in a row, the Department's budget request contained funds for the chemical demilitarization program in a budget account of the Department of the Army in direct violation of the law.

The committee believes that the original legislation, which mandated that funds for the chemical demilitarization program be authorized and appropriated in a defense-wide budget account in order to emphasize that destruction of the chemical weapons stockpile was a national issue affecting all of the Department and not just a single military service, was sound in 1986, when the estimated cost of the chemical stockpile demilitarization program was approximately $1.5 billion, and is even more valid today, when the estimated cost of the program has grown almost ten-fold.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, a decrease of $1,003.5 million. The committee recommends an increase of $877.1 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $7,963.9 million for Aircraft Procurement, Navy for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $8,205.8 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
001	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	10	282,132			10	282,132
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(55,486)			-	(55,486)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
003	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	42	2,923,960	(3)	(205,800)	39	2,718,160
003	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(105,407)			-	(105,407)
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	101,068			-	101,068
005	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	16	1,199,181			16	1,199,181
005	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(70,589)			-	(70,589)
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	79,858			-	79,858
007	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	-	2,452			-	2,452
008	SH-60R	4	162,327			4	162,327
009	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	5	364,882			5	364,882
009	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(112,092)			-	(112,092)
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	68,082			-	68,082
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**4,840,368**		**(205,800)**		**4,634,568**
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
011	CH-60S (MYP)	15	238,457	2	41,900	17	280,357
011	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(73,386)			-	(73,386)
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	80,411			-	80,411
013	UC-35	-	-	2	15,200	2	15,200
	NAVY			[1]		[1]	
	USMC			[1]		[1]	
014	C-40A	-	-	1	54,000	1	54,000
015	VP-3 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT	1	50,276			1	50,276
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**295,758**		**111,100**		**406,858**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
016	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	278,070	2	32,800	14	310,870
016	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,491)			-	(9,491)
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	5,142			-	5,142
018	JPATS	21	74,372			21	74,372
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**348,093**		**32,800**		**380,893**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
019	KC-130J	2	154,818	1	76,300	3	231,118
019A	HH/UH-1N RECLAMATION AND CONVERSION				17,500		17,500
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**154,818**		**93,800**		**248,618**
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
020	EA-6 SERIES	-	203,102		23,000	-	226,102
	AFCS				[+21,000]		[+21,000]
	ARC-164				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
021	AV-8 SERIES	-	40,639			-	40,639
022	F-14 SERIES	-	30,481			-	30,481
023	ADVERSARY	-	6,947			-	6,947
024	F-18 SERIES	-	212,614		103,700	-	316,314
	ECP-583				[+86,900]		[+86,900]
	ECP-560				[+31,000]		[+31,000]
	AT FLIR				[+9,600]		[+9,600]
	ATARS				[-23,800]		[-23,800]
025	H-46 SERIES	-	16,556		5,000	-	21,556
	ERIP				[+5,000]		[+5,000]

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
026	AH-1W SERIES	-	9,758			-	9,758
027	H-53 SERIES	-	19,919			-	34,919
	Active CH-53E FLIR				15,000		
	USMCR CH-53E FLIR				[+12,400]		[+12,400]
028	SH-60 SERIES				[+2,600]		[+2,600]
	ADHEELS	-	21,088		8,000	-	29,088
029	H-1 SERIES				[+8,000]		[+8,000]
030	H-3 SERIES	-	2,642			-	2,642
031	EP-3 SERIES	-	61			-	61
032	P-3 SERIES	-	25,833			-	25,833
033	S-3 SERIES	-	60,710			-	60,710
034	E-2 SERIES	-	79,050			-	79,050
	Hawkeye 2000	-	18,485		39,000	-	57,485
035	TRAINER A/C SERIES				[+39,000]		[+39,000]
036	C-2A	-	19,422			-	19,422
037	C-130 SERIES	-	2,596			-	2,596
038	FEWSG	-	7,921			-	7,921
039	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	-	605			-	605
040	E-6 SERIES	-	7,936			-	7,936
041	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	-	60,687			-	60,687
042	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	-	7,632			-	7,632
043	T-45 SERIES	-	4,134			-	4,134
044	POWER PLANT CHANGES	-	9,057			-	9,057
045	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	17,062			-	17,062
046	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	-	41,889			-	41,889
	TAMMAC	-	71,620		9,300	-	80,920
					[+9,300]		[+9,300]
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		**998,446**		**203,000**		**1,201,446**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
047	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	941,553			-	941,553
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**941,553**		**-**		**941,553**
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
048	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	312,411			-	312,411
049	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	8,642			-	8,642
050	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	13,015			-	13,015
051	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	37,088		7,000	-	44,088
	TARPS-CD				[+7,000]		[+7,000]
052	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,158			-	12,158
053	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,508			-	1,508
054	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**384,822**		**7,000**		**391,822**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**7,963,858**		**241,900**		**8,205,758**

Items of Special Interest

Advanced helicopter emergency egress lighting system (ADHEELS)

The budget request contained $21.1 million for SH–60 series modifications but included no funds for the ADHEELS. The ADHEELS provides crew escape lighting for H–60 series helicopters in the event of water impact.

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy has selected ADHEELS as its future helicopter escape lighting system due to its superior performance, significantly increased operational reliability, and lower life-cycle costs.

The committee strongly supports this choice and recommends $29.1 million, an increase of $8.0 million for accelerated ADHEELS procurement and installation in both new production and existing H–60 series helicopters.

AN/AVR–2A laser detecting set

The budget request contained $41.9 million for common electronic countermeasures modifications, of which $13.5 million was included for an AN/AAR–47 sensor upgrade.

The AN/AVR–2A laser detecting set alerts pilots to the presence of impending laser beamriding missile attack in sufficient time to take evasive action. The committee notes that the Department of the Navy plans a laser warning capability upgrade to the AN/AAR–47 missile approach warning system, which would eliminate the need for a stand-alone AN/AVR–2A, but is concerned that the AN/AAR–47 upgrade might not be as capable as the existing AN/AVR–2A.

Therefore, the committee expects that procurement and installation of the AN/AAR–47 sensor upgrade should not occur until the Commander of Navy Operational Test and Evaluation Forces ensures that adequate testing is undertaken, including side-by-side, on-aircraft testing comparing it with the AN/AVR–2A.

AV–8B

The budget request contained $226.6 million to procure 10 remanufactured AV–8B aircraft. The AV–8B remanufacture program combines a new fuselage, a power plant, and radar with other mission systems upgrades to produce a significantly more capable aircraft at 70 percent of the cost of a new aircraft. The committee notes that the Department of the Navy plans for fiscal year 2001 to be the last year for procurement of remanufactured AV–8Bs.

The committee recognizes that the AV–8B performs the close air support (CAS) mission, which is critical to the successful employment of Marine forces. Additionally, the committee believes that the short take-off, vertical land (STOVL), radar-equipped AV–8B will remain an important component of CAS capability until its replacement by the Marine Corps' joint strike fighter (JSF) STOVL variant, currently in the demonstration and validation phase of its development.

Since the committee understands that the Marine Corps' JSF variant is currently planned for its initial operational capability in fiscal year 2008, it expects the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that

the Marine Corps has procured sufficient STOVL, radar-equipped AV–8Bs prior to discontinuing the AV–8B remanufacture program.

C–40A

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of C–40A aircraft.

The C–40A, a long-range commercial-derivative airlift aircraft used to transport high priority passengers and cargo, will replace the Navy's 27-year-old C–9 fleet which is reaching the end of its service life.

The committee understands that the Navy's aging C–9 fleet is not compliant with either future global navigation requirements or noise abatement standards, that will restrict future flights into European airfields. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified additional C–40A aircraft for the Naval Reserve among his top unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $54.0 million to procure an additional C–40A aircraft for the Naval Reserve.

CH–60S

The budget request contained $165.1 million for 15 CH–60S helicopters and $80.4 million for advance procurement of 16 CH–60Ss in fiscal year 2002.

The CH–60S replaces the H–46D for the Navy's helicopter combat support missions including vertical replenishment, cargo and personnel transfer, and search and rescue.

The committee understands that the aging H–46D is increasingly expensive to operate and that its replacement with a fleet of H–60 series helicopters will avoid an estimated $22.0 billion of support costs over the next 20 years. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified additional CH–60S helicopters among his top unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

The committee believes that the aging H–46D fleet should be retired as soon as practical and, therefore, recommends $207.0 million, an increase of $41.9 million for two additional CH–60S helicopters.

E–2 modifications

The budget request contained $18.5 million for E–2 modifications but included no funds to upgrade ready-storage Group I-configured E–2C aircraft to the Hawkeye 2000 configuration.

Group I-configured E–2C aircraft are no longer usable for the Navy's fleet operations due to their outdated computer and communications capabilities but could be modified to the Hawkeye 2000 configuration which would upgrade this aircraft with satellite communications; a commercial-off-the-shelf, high-capacity mission computer and associated workstations; and the cooperative engagement capability. The committee understands that this modification will provide the E–2C fleet with a quantum leap in situational awareness and fleet-wide connectivity.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $57.5 million, an increase of $39.0 million, to upgrade one ready-storage Group I E–2Cs to the Hawkeye 2000 configuration.

EA–6B modifications

The budget request contained $203.1 million for EA–6B modifications but included no funds for the AN/ASW–41 automatic flight control system (AFCS), which provides the EA–6B pilot with automatic speed, attitude and altitude control capabilities. The budget request also contained no funds for HAVE QUICK ARC–164 radios which employ a rapid frequency-hopping technique to provide an anti-jam radio capability.

The committee understands that replacement of the current flight control system with the AN/ASW–41 AFCS will significantly increase this aircraft's mission capable rates through improved reliability and reduced maintenance man-hours. The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified the AN/ASW–41 AFCS among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001 and, therefore, recommends an increase of $21.0 million for this purpose.

The committee understands that only 41 of the Department of the Navy's 123 EA–6Bs are equipped with either an ARC–164, ARC–182, or ARC–210 HAVE QUICK anti-jam radio and that during the recent Operation Allied Force engagement many EA–6Bs were not capable of jam-free ultra-high frequency (UHF) communications with other Allied aircraft in composite-force strike packages. As a result of the EA–6B's HAVE QUICK radio deficiency, the committee also understands that entire Operation Allied Force strike packages were forced to use single UHF frequencies which were vulnerable to communications jamming and could be easily monitored by our adversaries with a potential to compromise operational mission execution plans.

While the committee is aware of the Department's plans to equip the EA–6B fleet with ARC-210 radios as part of the block 89A upgrade, it believes that an interim anti-jam radio capability is critical for any future EA–6B combat operations until the block 89A upgrade is complete in fiscal year 2005. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to equip 40 additional EA–6B aircraft with ARC–164 anti-jam radios.

In total, the committee recommends $226.1 million for EA–6B modifications, an increase of $23.0 million.

F–18 series modifications

The budget request contained $212.6 million for F–18 series modifications, of which $22.7 million was included for engineering change proposal (ECP)–583 kits to modify six Marine Corps F/A–18A aircraft, $3.0 million was included for installation of ECP–560 modification kits for seven Naval Reserve F/A–18A aircraft, $5.3 million was included for two advanced targeting forward-looking infrared (ATFLIR) pods for both Navy and Marine Corps F/A–18C/D aircraft, and $23.8 million was included for the advanced tactical airborne reconnaissance system (ATARS).

The ECP–583 modification kit upgrades the radar, avionics and weapons delivery capability of the Marine Corps' F/A–18A model aircraft to the same capability as later-model F/A–18Cs. Without this capability, the F/A–18A cannot autonomously deliver precision-guided munitions (PGMs) or employ the Air Intercept Missile (AIM)–120 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM).

The committee notes that the Navy's long-range attack aircraft plans include the employment of the F/A–18A until at least 2015. Despite the fact that the Marine Corps has a requirement to upgrade 76 of its F/A–18As with this modification, the Department of the Navy has thus far only planned to upgrade 34 aircraft. However, the committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) and the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) have identified ECP–583 among their top unfunded aviation requirements in fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $86.9 million to procure twenty additional ECP–583 upgrade kits for the Marine Corps' F/A–18A aircraft fleet—10 for the active component and 10 for the Marine Corps Reserve.

The ECP–560 modification kit upgrades only the avionics and weapons delivery capability of the Naval Reserve's F/A–18A aircraft to employ PGMs and the AIM–120 AMRAAM, improving both the Naval Reserve's F/A–18A capability and its commonality with the Navy's F/A–18C aircraft fleet. The committee notes that only 13 of the Naval Reserve's 52 F/A–18As have undergone ECP–560 modification upgrades, but understands that the Navy plans to retain its Naval Reserve F/A–18As in the inventory until at least 2012. The committee further notes that the CNO has identified the ECP–560 among his unfunded requirements for the Naval Reserve in fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $31.0 million for this purpose.

The ATFLIR pod detects, classifies and tracks ground targets for engagement with precision-guided munitions. The ATFLIR pod replaces the existing tactical forward-looking infrared pod that, the committee understands, has inadequate resolution, loses target track during high-G maneuvering, and does not maintain automatic track at required ranges. The committee notes that both the CNO and CMC have also included the ATFLIR among their unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $9.6 million for an additional three ATFLIR pods for the Marine Corps Reserve F/A–18 aircraft.

The ATARS is an image acquisition, data storage, and data link sensor suite planned for use on the Marine Corps' F/A–18D aircraft. The committee notes that the recently completed ATARS operational evaluation concluded that the system was not operationally suitable due to reliability and availability problems with its ground station component. As a result, the committee believes that the Department of the Navy's $23.8 million ATARS procurement request exceeds requirements and, consequently, recommends a decrease of that amount.

In total, the committee recommends $316.3 million, an increase of $103.7 million, for F–18 series modifications.

F/A–18C/D tactical aircraft moving map capability (TAMMAC)

The budget request contained $71.6 million for common avionics changes but included no funds for procurement of TAMMAC units for F/A–18C/D aircraft.

The TAMMAC, which replaces obsolete data storage and digital video units, is a modular hardware and software system with significant memory, information processing, and video output capabilities. It provides aircrews with a graphic presentation of the air-

craft's present position as well as relative positions of targets, threats, terrain features, no-fly zones, and safe bases. The committee understands that the TAMMAC also includes a ground proximity warning system to improve flight safety and will be less expensive to operate and support than the existing units.

The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has included procurement of the TAMMAC for the F/A–18C/D aircraft among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001. Accordingly, the committee recommends $80.9 million, an increase of $9.3 million to procure 80 TAMMAC units for F/A–18C/D aircraft.

F/A–18E/F

The budget request contained $2,818.6 million for 42 F/A–18E/F aircraft, and $101.1 million for advance procurement of 45 aircraft in fiscal year 2002.

In its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee supported the Navy's requirement to replace its aging fighter/attack aircraft fleet by authorizing a multiyear procurement of 222 aircraft. However, the committee notes that the Department of the Navy now plans to procure three less aircraft in fiscal year 2002 than projected in fiscal year 2000, which results in 219 F/A–18E/F aircraft planned for the multiyear procurement period between fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Consistent with the planned program of the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2002, the committee recommends $2,612.8 million, a decrease of $205.8 million and three aircraft. The committee understands that this reduction will maintain the F/A–18E/F fiscal year 2001 procurement quantity within a range that will not affect the multiyear procurement contract.

HH/UH–1N reclamation and conversion program

The budget request contained no funds for the HH/UH–1N reclamation and conversion program.

The HH/UH–1N reclamation and conversion program would restore old HH/UH–1N helicopters, currently in long-term storage facilities, for entry into a remanufacture production line that rebuilds the aircraft's avionics, propulsion, and other systems.

The committee understands that current H–1 remanufacture plans would remove UH–1N helicopters from the Marine Corps' operating fleet for entry into the H–1 remanufacture production line, decreasing the number of UH–1Ns in some of the Marine Corps' UH–1N helicopter squadrons below their authorized strength. In order to avoid this situation, the committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have identified the HH/UH–1N reclamation and conversion program among their unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

The committee believes that UH–1N fleet readiness will suffer if operational aircraft are removed from the fleet to be upgraded. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $17.5 million for the HH–UH–1N reclamation and conversion program and believes that this increase will provide for induction of fourteen helicopters into the remanufacture production line.

H–46 modifications

The budget request contained $16.6 million for H–46 modifications but included no funds for the CH–46E engine reliability improvement program (ERIP) to rebuild the CH–46E's key engine components, providing improved performance, safety, and reliability.

Subsequent to the submission of the budget request, the committee learned that the mean time between engine removals (MTBR) of the CH–46E's engine has rapidly declined to 363 hours, and that the CH–46E's engine performance has degraded 10 percent from original specifications. To address this problem, the committee understands that an ERIP would restore the engine's MTBR to the planned interval of 900 hours, greatly reducing operation and support costs in the process.

The committee notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have identified the ERIP as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001. Since the CH–46E is scheduled to remain in service until 2012, the committee recommends $21.6 million, an increase of $5.0 million to begin an ERIP for the CH–46E engine and encourages the Department of the Navy to budget to complete the ERIP within the fiscal year 2002 future years defense program.

H–53 modifications

The budget request contained $19.9 million for H–53 helicopter modifications but included no funds for AN/AAQ–29 forward looking infrared (FLIR) system kits that would provide an improved capability for the Marine Corps' CH–53E helicopters to operate at night and in poor weather conditions.

The AN/AAQ–29 FLIR, which replaces the out-of-production AN/AAQ–16 FLIR, provides aircrews and embarked ground force commanders with infrared video displays, flight information, and navigational data. The committee understands that only 42 of the Marine Corps' 165 CH–53E helicopters are equipped with a FLIR system and notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have included 23 AN/AAQ–29 FLIR system kits among their unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $34.9 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for 23 AN/AAQ–29 FLIR system kits: $12.4 million for 19 system kits for active component CH–53Es, and $2.6 million for 4 system kits for the Marine Corps Reserve CH–53Es.

KC–130J

The budget request contained $154.8 million for two KC–130J aircraft.

The KC–130J is a tactical airlift aircraft that also serves as a tanker for both helicopters and tactical fighters. The KC–130J replaces existing KC–130F, R, and T models, providing increased speed and range, a higher cruise ceiling, and a shorter take-off distance compared to the older models.

The Marine Corps currently has an inventory of 35 KC–130Fs, 14 KC–130Rs, and 28 KC–130Ts. The KC–130F, which was procured between 1960 and 1962, is the oldest aircraft in the inven-

tory and is approaching the end of its service life. The committee understands that a recent service life assessment of the KC–130F fleet revealed that unless procurement of KC–130Js is accelerated or a comprehensive and costly service life extension program is undertaken, an inventory shortfall of 15 aircraft may occur as early as 2001.

In its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee recommended an increase of four KC–130Js and notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified additional KC–130J aircraft among his highest unfunded aviation procurement requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, consistent with its prior actions, the committee recommends $231.1 million, an increase of $76.3 million for one additional KC–130J aircraft.

T–45 training system (TS)

The budget request contained $268.6 million to procure 12 T–45C aircraft and associated ground-based training equipment and $5.1 million for advance procurement of 4 T–45C aircraft in fiscal year 2002. The T–45TS is an integrated training system that combines the T–45 aircraft, simulators, and computer-based training for the Navy's intermediate-level undergraduate pilot training.

The committee notes that the T–45 aircraft procurement objective has decreased from 234 in the Department of the Navy's budget request for fiscal year 2000 to 169 in its request for fiscal year 2001. The committee further notes that the Navy plans to close its T–45 production line in fiscal year 2002 although the requirement for the T–45 remains at 234. Since the Navy has experienced a recent shortage of pilots and the Chief of Naval Operations has identified additional T–45 aircraft among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001, the committee is puzzled by both the decrease in its T–45 procurement objective and its proposed shutdown of the T–45 production line in fiscal year 2002.

Consequently, the committee recommends $301.4 million, an increase of $32.8 million for two additional aircraft. Further, the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to restore funding in its future years defense program to continue T–45 production.

Tactical air reconnaissance pod system (TARPS)-completely digital (CD)

The budget request contained $37.1 million for other production charges but included no funds for the TARPS–CD system, an electro-optic sensor upgrade designed to validate clear-weather digital imaging technologies and to mitigate development risks for the shared reconnaissance pod (SHARP) system.

The committee notes the recent, successful at-sea deployment of the TARPS–CD system and believes that the progress of the Navy's digital imaging technology risk-mitigation efforts thus far provides sufficient confidence to build on these efforts through the integration of a non-developmental, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) synthetic aperture radar (SAR) sensor which will provide day/night imagery in all-weather conditions. Since the committee understands that an all-weather reconnaissance capability is a requirement for

the SHARP system, it fully supports further risk-mitigation activities integrating a SAR sensor on the TARPS–CD system.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $44.1 million, an increase of $7.0 million, to integrate a COTS SAR sensor into the TARPS CD.

UC–35

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of UC–35 aircraft for the Army, Navy or the Marine Corps.

The UC–35 is a medium-range, medium-lift operational support aircraft. The committee understands that the Army, Navy, and the Marine Corps conduct the operational support airlift mission with the short-range C–12 aircraft, which is increasingly expensive to operate, and does not meet payload, range, or avionics requirements. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have each identified the procurement of UC–35s among their unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $22.8 million for three UC–35 aircraft: $7.6 million for one Army aircraft and $15.2 million for one aircraft each for the Navy and Marine Corps.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $1,434.3 million for Weapons Procurement, Navy for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $1,562.3 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II	12	472,859			12	472,859
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(38,927)			-	(38,927)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	28,801			-	28,801
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					-	-
003	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,232			-	1,232
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**463,965**		**-**		**463,965**
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
004	TOMAHAWK	-	-			-	-
005	ESSM	36	40,001			36	40,001
	TACTICAL MISSILES					-	-
006	AMRAAM	75	38,943			75	38,943
007	JSOW	636	171,624	175	35,000	811	206,624
008	SLAM-ER	30	27,859	60	30,000	90	57,859
009	STANDARD MISSILE	86	170,365			86	170,365
010	RAM	-	23,067			-	23,067
011	HELLFIRE	-	-		55,000	-	55,000
012	PENGUIN	-	-			-	-
013	AERIAL TARGETS	-	58,891		10,000	-	68,891
	ITALD				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
014	DRONES AND DECOYS	-	-			-	-
015	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	-	14,902			-	14,902
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					-	-
016	SIDEWINDER MODS	63	27,532			63	27,532
017	HARM MODS	-	-			-	-
018	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	-	50,690			-	50,690
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
019	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	21,269		(1,000)	-	20,269
020	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	-	180,291			-	180,291
020	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(9,754)			-	(9,754)
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
022	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,723			-	2,723
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**818,403**		**129,000**		**947,403**
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
023	ASW TARGETS	-	3,180			-	3,180
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP					-	-
024	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	-	7,141			-	7,141
025	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	-	38,926		(1,000)	-	37,926
026	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	-	1,960			-	1,960
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
027	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	23,740			-	23,740
028	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	-	14,955			-	14,955
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION					-	-
029	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,842			-	1,842
	TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		**91,744**		**(1,000)**		**90,744**
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
030	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	-	909			-	909
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS					-	-
031	CIWS MODS	-	964			-	964
032	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-			-	-
033	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	-			-	-
034	GUN MOUNT MODS	-	4,779			-	4,779

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
035	MODS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
	OTHER					-	-
036	PIONEER	-	-			-	-
037	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS		**6,652**		**-**		**6,652**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
038	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	53,486			-	53,486
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**53,486**		**-**		**53,486**
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**1,434,250**		**128,000**		**1,562,250**

Items of Special Interest

Hellfire II missile

The budget request contained no funds for Hellfire II missiles.

The Hellfire II missile is a laser-guided, anti-armor and anti-ship weapon used by the Marine Corps on the AH–1W helicopter and by the Navy on the SH–60B helicopter. The committee notes that, despite increased funding provided by Congress in fiscal years 1998 and 2000, the Department of the Navy has not met its inventory requirement for these missiles. The committee further notes that, as a result of this situation, the Chief of Naval Operations has identified procurement of Hellfire II missiles among his top unfunded readiness requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, consistent with its prior actions, the committee recommends an increase of $55.0 million to procure additional Hellfire II missiles.

Improved tactical air-launched decoy (ITALD)

The budget request contained $58.9 million for aerial targets but included no funds for the ITALD.

The ITALD, launched from Navy strike aircraft, is used to deceive and saturate hostile air defense systems, thereby enhancing strike aircraft survivability. The committee understands that only 260 ITALDs have been funded to date against a Navy requirement for 1500 to 1750 systems. Because the committee believes that the use of tactical decoys significantly improves both aircrew survival and mission success, the committee recommends $68.9 million, an increase of $10.0 million, to procure additional ITALDs.

Joint standoff weapon (JSOW)

The budget request contained $171.6 million for the JSOW, a standoff air-to-ground glide weapon that uses global positioning system satellites and an inertial navigation system for precision guidance.

The committee understands that the JSOW has performed flawlessly in over 60 combat deliveries and notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified the procurement of additional JSOWs among his top two unfunded weapons requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $206.6 million, an increase of $35.0 million, to accelerate procurement of additional JSOWs.

Standoff land attack missile-expanded response (SLAM–ER)

The budget request contained $27.9 million to convert 30 standoff land attack missiles (SLAMs) to the SLAM–ER configuration. The SLAM–ER is a long-range, air-to-ground, precision-guided missile that improves the SLAM's range, accuracy and lethality.

The committee notes that the SLAM–ER has recently completed its operational test and evaluation with both operationally effective and suitable ratings. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has included the conversion of 60 SLAMs to the SLAM–ER configuration among his unfunded requirements in fis-

cal year 2001 in order to reduce the risk of future missile shortages for a major theater war or contingency operation.

Therefore, the committee recommends $57.9 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for the conversion of an additional 60 SLAMs to the SLAM–ER configuration.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY/MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained $429.6 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $481.3 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	63,157		15,000	-	78,157
	Laser Guided Bombs/Kits				[+15,000]		[+15,000]
002	JDAM	672	24,390			672	24,390
003	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	-			-	-
004	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	11,508			-	11,508
005	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,230			-	5,230
006	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	50,600			-	50,600
007	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	26,461			-	26,461
008	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,635			-	10,635
009	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	39,293		6,500	-	45,793
	MJU-52/B IR Chaff				[+6,500]		[+6,500]
010	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	-			-	-
011	JATOS	-	4,995			-	4,995
012	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	-	14,948			-	14,948
013	EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	5,723			-	5,723
014	CIWS AMMUNITION	-	-			-	-
015	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	8,733			-	8,733
016	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	5,176			-	5,176
017	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	8,745			-	8,745
018	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	6,378			-	6,378
019	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	7,317			-	7,317
020	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (87)	-	-			-	-
021	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	1,343			-	1,343
022	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300			-	1,300
	TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY		**295,932**		**21,500**		**317,432**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
023	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	23,456		3,000	-	26,456
024	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,039		1,000	-	3,039
025	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	40,945		2,000	-	42,945
	APOBS				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
026	.50 CALIBER	-	7,637		1,000	-	8,637
027	40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	2,034			-	2,034
028	60MM, ALL TYPES	-	688			-	688
029	81MM, ALL TYPES	-	4,981			-	4,981
030	120MM, ALL TYPES	-	7,633			-	7,633
031	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	3,931			-	3,931
032	9 MM ALL TYPES	-	2,657			-	2,657
033	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	8,358			-	8,358
034	STINGER SLEP	-	3,925			-	3,925
035	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	1,592		15,300	-	16,892
	83mm HEDP				[+10,700]		[+10,700]
	83mm Common Practice				[+ 4,600]		[+ 4,600]
036	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	-	322		7,900	-	8,222
	M795 155mm				[+7,900]		[+7,900]
037	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	9,638			-	9,638
038	FUZE, ALL TYPES	-	249			-	249
039	NON LETHALS	-	4,480			-	4,480
040	AMMO MODERNIZATION	-	6,900			-	6,900
041	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	952			-	952
042	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-			-	-
043	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,300			-	1,300
	TOTAL PROC. AMMO, MC		**133,717**		**30,200**		**163,917**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		**429,649**		**51,700**		**481,349**

Items of Special Interest

Navy ammunition procurement

The budget request contained $295.9 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $317.4 million, an increase of $21.5 million for the following types of ammunition, which are among the top unfunded requirements identified by the Chief of Naval Operations in fiscal year 2001:

[Dollars in millions]

GBU–10/12/16 laser guided bombs/kits	$15.0
MJU–52/B IR expendables	6.5

Marine corps ammunition procurement

The budget request contained $133.7 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends $163.9 million, an increase of $30.2 million for the following types of ammunition, which are among the top unfunded requirements identified by the Commandant of the Marine Corps in fiscal year 2001:

[Dollars in millions]

5.56mm, all types	$3.0
7.62mm, all types	1.0
APOBS	2.0
.50 caliber	1.0
Rocket, 83mm HEDP	10.7
Rocket, 83mm HE Common Practice	4.6
155mm Projectile Extended Range M795	7.9

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $12,296.9 million for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $11,982.0 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	1	4,974,888			1	4,974,888
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(921,235)			-	(921,235)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	21,869			-	21,869
003	NEW SSN	1	2,019,503			1	2,019,503
003	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(816,491)			-	(816,491)
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	508,222			-	508,222
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	705,228			-	705,228
005	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(1,787)			-	(1,787)
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,000			-	25,000
007	SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	210,414			1	210,414
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	72,277		14,000	-	86,277
	SSBN/SSGN Refueling Advance Procurement				[+14,000]		[+14,000]
009	DDG-51 (MYP)	3	2,795,581			3	2,795,581
009	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(82,022)			-	(82,022)
010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	356,843			-	356,843
	TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS		**9,868,290**		**14,000**		**9,882,290**
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
011	LHD ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-		10,000	-	10,000
012	LPD-17	2	1,489,286			2	1,489,286
012	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-			-	-
013	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	20,700			-	20,700
	TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		**1,509,986**		**10,000**		**1,519,986**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COS						
014	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	-	-			-	-
014	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-			-	-
015	ADC(X)	1	338,951	(1)	(338,951)	-	-
016	LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	-			-	-
016	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-			-	-
017	OUTFITTING	-	301,077			-	301,077
018	POST DELIVERY	-	-			-	-
019	LCAC SLEP	1	15,615			1	15,615
020	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	-	263,000			-	263,000
021	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAMS		**918,643**		**(338,951)**		**579,692**
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION		**12,296,919**		**(314,951)**		**11,981,968**

Items of Special Interest

LHD–8 amphibious assault ship

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

The committee understands that the Navy intends to procure the LHD–8 amphibious assault ship in fiscal year 2005 due to funding constraints, but notes that both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have identified the LHD–8 as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001. The committee further notes that procurement of the LHD–8 before fiscal year 2005 could result in significant savings and result in more stable funding for the Navy's shipbuilding plan.

Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $10.0 million for advance procurement and long lead materials for the construction of LHD–8.

Auxiliary dry cargo ship

The budget request contained $339.0 million for the procurement of an auxiliary dry cargo ship (ADC(X)).

The committee is satisfied that the Navy has programmed sufficient resources to provide for engineering and other one-time costs of the lead shipyard in the ADC(X) program. However, since the program calls for the ADC(X) class ships to be built by two shipyards, the committee is concerned that the Navy has not also provided sufficient resources to fund engineering and other non-recurring activities unique to the second shipyard. The committee understands that if these activities are not adequately funded, the award of the prime contract for the ADC(X) may be delayed.

The committee is concerned that procurement of ADC(X) ships in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) account does not adequately reflect the unique logistics and sealift mission of these vessels. The committee understands that the ADC(X) will be used to move cargo and other supplies to forward-deployed fleet units and believes that a vessel performing this mission would be more appropriately funded in the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF). The committee has therefore transferred the funds requested for the ADC(X) in the SCN account to the NDSF and directs the Secretary of the Navy to fund ADC(X) procurement in the NDSF in future budget requests.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $339.0 million to the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy request and an increase of $349.0 million to the National Defense Sealift Fund, including $339.0 million to procure an ADC(X) and $10.0 million to fund engineering and other non-recurring activities necessary to support construction of this ship class at two shipyards.

Submarine force level

The 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) established a force of 50 nuclear powered attack submarines (SSNs) as adequate to support the national military strategy and subsequent budget requests have supported this force level. However, the 1999 Attack Submarine Study conducted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff found that the QDR force level is insufficient to meet near- and long-term

operational requirements. Due to the low rate of attack submarine procurement during the 1990s any force structure increase above the QFR level over the long-term would require a sustained increase in VIRGINIA class SSN procurement.

Although sustained procurement of sufficient numbers of new submarines is the only long-term solution to the SSN force structure shortfall, the committee is aware of near-term cost-effective opportunities to increase the number of submarines in the fleet. The committee understands that the budget request contains sufficient funds through fiscal year 2005 to refuel four LOS ANGELES class SSNs that would otherwise be retired well before the end of their useful service lives and strongly supports this effort as well as a longer-term opportunity to refuel, in lieu of retirement, an additional three LOS ANGELES class SSNs.

The committee is also aware of the opportunity to refuel and convert four OHIO class nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) to nuclear powered cruise missile submarines (SSGNs) in lieu of retirement. Although its final configuration would be dictated by arms control considerations, the SSGN would provide a stealthy conventional strike platform to support theater Commanders-in-Chief (CINC) requirements for precision cruise missiles.

The committee supports the use of all reasonable means to increase the submarine force level through increased procurement of new submarines as well as refueling and conversion, in lieu of early retirement, of existing submarines. The committee believes that this combination of efforts would provide the most cost-effective way of maintaining an adequate submarine force that is capable of meeting current and future challenges to U.S. national security interests.

Submarine refueling overhauls

The budget request contained $72.3 million for advance procurement for submarine refueling overhauls but included no funds for advance procurement for refueling overhauls associated with the conversion of ballistic missile submarines to cruise missile submarines.

The committee is aware of the Navy's proposal to convert four OHIO class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) to nuclear powered cruise missile submarines (SSGNs) as a means of providing theater Commanders-in-Chief (CINCs) with increased numbers of cruise missiles for conventional precision strike missions. The committee notes that a requirement of any conversion program would be the refueling of the nuclear reactors of the candidate SSBNs. The committee understands that the Navy has no experience with refueling OHIO class SSBNs and that the submarines converted to SSGNs would also be the first of the class to require refueling.

Therefore, in order to reduce risk in any potential SSGN conversion program, the committee recommends $86.3 million for submarine refueling overhauls, an increase of $14.0 million, for advance planning and procurement for OHIO class submarine refueling overhauls.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $3,334.6 million for Other Procurement, Navy for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $3,432.0 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	6,995			-	6,995
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	6,257			-	6,257
003	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	-	-			-	-
004	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	GENERATORS					-	-
005	OTHER GENERATORS	-	-			-	-
	PUMPS					-	-
006	OTHER PUMPS	-	-			-	-
	PROPELLERS					-	-
007	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	3,757			-	3,757
008	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	-	-			-	-
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT					-	-
009	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	33,425		12,000	-	45,425
	WSN-7B RLG				[+12,000]	-	[+12,000]
010	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	9,120			-	9,120
	PERISCOPES					-	-
011	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	18,998			-	18,998
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT					-	-
012	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	16,837			-	16,837
013	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	10,486			-	10,486
014	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	47,805			-	47,805
015	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
016	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,419			-	11,419
017	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	12,387			-	12,387
018	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
019	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	6,206			-	6,206
020	DSSP EQUIPMENT	-	5,356			-	5,356
021	LCAC	-	3,559			-	3,559
022	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	16,589			-	16,589

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
023	HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
024	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	58,851		2,000	-	60,851
	MINI-MAX				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
025	SURFACE IMA	-	2,010			-	2,010
026	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	-			-	-
027	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	4,852			-	4,852
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT					-	-
028	REACTOR POWER UNITS	-	-			-	-
029	REACTOR COMPONENTS	-	203,365			-	203,365
	OCEAN ENGINEERING					-	-
030	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	-	5,649			-	5,649
031	EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	SMALL BOATS					-	-
032	STANDARD BOATS	-	2,696			-	2,696
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					-	-
033	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	3,302			-	3,302
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT					-	-
034	OPERATING FORCES IPE	-	2,689		5,000	-	7,689
	EMF				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT					-	-
035	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	-	80,870			-	80,870
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT					-	-
036	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**573,480**		**19,000**		**592,480**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
037	AN/SPS-49	-	-			-	-
038	RADAR SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
039	TISS	-	-			-	-
	SHIP SONARS					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
040	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	14,291			-	14,291
041	SSN ACOUSTICS	-	106,647		8,000	-	114,647
	TB-23 Refurb				[+8,000]		[+8,000]
042	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	847		5,000	-	5,847
	Sonar Dome				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
043	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
044	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	10,726			-	10,726
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
045	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	10,697			-	10,697
046	SSTD	-	-			-	-
047	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	-			-	-
048	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	29,869			-	29,869
049	SURTASS	-	5,516			-	5,516
050	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	6,213			-	6,213
051	CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	-			-	-
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT					-	-
052	AN/SLQ-32	-	-			-	-
053	AN/WLR-1	-	-			-	-
054	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	3,901			-	3,901
055	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	-			-	-
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT					-	-
056	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	-	61,524			-	61,524
057	COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	-	-			-	-
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT					-	-
058	AN/WLQ-4	-	-			-	-
059	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	17,316			-	17,316
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
060	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
061	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	15,853			-	15,853
062	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	-	37,427			-	37,427
063	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCS)	-	46,692			-	46,692
064	ATDLS	-	19,153			-	19,153

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
065	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	8,989			-	8,989
066	SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	16,863			-	16,863
067	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	9,607			-	9,607
068	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	9,046			-	9,046
069	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	15,356			-	15,356
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					-	-
070	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,341			-	1,341
071	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	21,390		4,000	-	25,390
	BFTT-ATC				[+4,000]		[+4,000]
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
072	MATCALS	-	4,294			-	4,294
073	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	7,945			-	7,945
074	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	18,510			-	18,510
075	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	30,549			-	30,549
076	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,705			-	6,705
077	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,124			-	5,124
078	FACSFAC	-	4,315			-	4,315
079	ID SYSTEMS	-	14,280			-	14,280
080	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	-			-	-
081	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	-	11,980			-	11,980
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
082	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	-	-			-	-
083	OSIS EVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT (OED)	-	-			-	-
084	TADIX-B	-	32		6,000	-	6,032
	Joint Tactical Terminal				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
085	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	2,735			-	2,735
086	GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	-			-	-
087	COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	-	47,022			-	47,022
088	RADIAC	-	8,308			-	8,308
089	GPETE	-	7,356			-	7,356
090	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,421			-	4,421
091	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
092	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	5,378			-	5,378
093	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	-	-			-	-
094	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,889		14,000	-	18,889
	AN/SPS-73				[+14,000]		[14,000]
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS					-	-
095	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	-	-			-	-
096	PORTABLE RADIOS	-	-			-	-
097	SINCGARS	-	-			-	-
098	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	-	185,143			-	185,143
099	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
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	-	-			-	-
111	GCCS EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
112	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	-	176,132			-	176,132
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
113	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	-	46,563		4,000	-	50,563
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT					-	-
114	SPECIAL DCP	-	14,964			-	14,964
115	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	-	17,188			-	17,188
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
116	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**1,490,336**		**41,000**		**1,531,336**
	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)	-	-			-	-
121	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	-	-			-	-
122	AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	-	-			-	-
123	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	-	-			-	-
124	SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	-	49,466		18,000	-	67,466
	AN/SSQ-53E				[+3,000]		[+3,000]
	AN/SSQ-62E				[+5,000]		[+5,000]
	AN/SSQ-77				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
125	MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN $5 MILLIO	-	-			-	-
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
126	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,125		7,500	-	22,625
	MRES				[+7,500]		[+7,500]
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
	AN/AVS-9				[+9,900]		[+9,900]
133	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	-	32,084			-	32,084

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
134	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
135	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,928			-	4,928
	TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**204,932**		**35,400**		**240,332**
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
136	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	18,287			-	18,287
	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
141	RAM GMLS	-	37,309			-	37,309
142	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	9,352			-	9,352
143	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	36,848			-	36,848
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			-	33,814
	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 EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
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
161	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	31,557			-	31,557
	TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**497,956**		**-**		**497,956**
	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			-	10,458
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
	TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**97,670**		**-**		**97,670**
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
175	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	7,646			-	7,646
176	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	5,196			-	5,196

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
177	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	4,081			-	4,081
178	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	-	144,885			-	144,885
	TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**161,808**		**-**		**161,808**
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
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		2,000	-	4,076
	Recruiting Kiosks				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
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	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		**99,488**		**2,000**		**101,488**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
188	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	208,941			-	208,941
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**208,941**		**-**		**208,941**
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**3,334,611**		**97,400**		**3,432,011**

Items of Special Interest

AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar

The budget request contained $4.9 million for items less than $5.0 million but contained no funds for the AN/SPS–73 (V) surface search radar.

The Navy currently operates several different surface search radars on its ships but has begun the replacement of these various systems with the AN/SPS–73 (V) radar. The AN/SPS–73 (V) is a commercial-off-the-shelf system that has improved performance over current radars and reduced support costs through standardized logistics and maintenance requirements. The committee continues to support the accelerated standardization of surface search radars and recommends an increase of $14.0 million for the procurement of additional AN/SPS–73 (V) radars for this purpose.

Aviation life support

The budget request contained $20.4 million for aviation life support equipment for Navy and Marine Corps aircrews.

The Marine Corps currently uses a mix of aircrew night vision systems procured during the 1980s and 1990s, some of which are incompatible with the latest glass cockpit displays in new fleet aircraft. The Marine Corps is moving toward a standardized configuration for aircrew night vision equipment, but currently has an inadequate supply of modern systems. The committee notes that this shortfall was identified by both the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of the Marine Corps as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001.

The committee notes that Congress has previously added funds to this program to facilitate the upgrading of fixed and rotary wing aircrews with state-of-the-art night vision systems. The committee supports the continuation of this effort and recommends an increase of $9.9 million to procure additional AN/AVS–9 night vision goggles for Marine Corps aircrews.

Education support equipment

The budget request contained $2.1 million for the virtual recruiting program, which utilizes computer-based recruiting kiosks.

The committee understands that the Navy is facing serious challenges in meeting recruiting goals and has established a pilot program to use computer-based kiosks to provide potential recruits with access to information about the Navy in an interactive format. The committee further understands that the preliminary results of the pilot project have been very successful but that the budget request fails to fully fund this promising program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $4.1 million for education support equipment, an increase of $2.0 million, to procure an additional 150 armed forces recruiting kiosks in order to fully fund the virtual recruiting program.

High-pressure cleaner

The budget request contained $58.9 million for ship support equipment items less than $5.0 million but included no funds for high-pressure non-hazardous dry steam solvent-based cleaners.

The committee is aware that the Navy and the Marine Corps are each using high-pressure dry steam solvent-based cleaners facilities to clean turbine engine parts, avionics, printed circuit boards, and a wide variety of other military equipment in an environmentally responsible manner. The committee also understands that the Navy has estimated substantial maintenance cost savings associated with the use of these cleaners and recognizes the value of their widespread use.

The committee agrees with the Navy's findings and, therefore, recommends $60.9 million for ship support equipment items less than $5.0 million, an increase of $2.0 million, for the procurement of high-pressure dry steam solvent-based cleaners.

Joint tactical terminal

The budget request contained $32,000 for the Joint Tactical Terminal (JTT).

The committee is fully supportive of the Navy's efforts to field the JTT but is aware that the Navy has a shortfall in purchasing the required number of terminals.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $6.0 million, and increase of $6.0 million, to correct this deficiency.

Mobile remote emitter simulator (MRES)

The budget request contained $15.1 million for weapons range support but included no funds to procure MRES systems.

The MRES is a high power electronic warfare threat simulator that is capable of illuminating aircraft, ships and other signal collection platforms.

The committee notes that Congress provided additional funding to procure an MRES system each year since fiscal year 1998 in order to upgrade the Navy's electronic warfare testing and training facilities. The committee supports the continuation of this modernization effort and recommends an increase of $7.5 million for the procurement and installation of one MRES system.

Nuclear attack submarine (SSN) acoustics

The budget request contained $106.6 million for SSN acoustics but included no funds for the refurbishment and upgrade of TB–23 submarine towed arrays.

The committee understands that the Navy intends to upgrade all submarine towed acoustic arrays with the TB–29A array beginning in 2002 but at a rate that will require the TB–23 array to remain in service for at least the next decade. The committee further understands that the TB–23 array must be refurbished and upgraded periodically to maintain the reliability and effectiveness of this critical acoustic sensor. Therefore, in order to ensure that the submarine force retains modern and reliable acoustic sensors until completely outfitted with the TB–29A array, the committee recommends $114.6 million for SSN acoustics, an increase of $8.0 million, to sustain the TB–23 array refurbishment and upgrade program.

Operating forces industrial plant equipment

The budget request contained $2.7 million for operating forces industrial plant equipment but included no funds for expeditionary maintenance facilities (EMF).

The committee is aware that the Navy is decommissioning its repair tenders, thereby limiting its ability to rapidly deploy a ship and equipment repair capability to support forward deployed forces. However, the committee is also aware that EMF, surface and air transportable, self-contained repair and maintenance facilities that can be operational within 72 hours of deployment, can meet the Navy's needs for a rapidly deployable repair and maintenance capability.

The committee fully supports the EMF concept and, therefore, recommends $7.7 million for industrial plant equipment, an increase of $5.0 million, to procure seven of the facilities.

Other training equipment

The budget request included $21.4 million for other training equipment, of which $16.4 million for the procurement of equipment to support the Battle Force Tactical Training (BFTT) program.

The BFTT system allows surface combatants and aircraft carriers to conduct realistic coordinated training scenarios using ownship equipment instead of shore-based training simulators. In fiscal year 2000, Congress provided funds for upgrades to the BFTT system in order to provide an Air Traffic Control (ATC) training capability for aircraft carrier crews. In order to complete this upgrade, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million.

Sonobuoys

The budget request contained $49.5 million for the procurement of sonobuoys, including AN/SSQ–36, AN/SSQ–53E, AN/SSQ–57, AN/SSQ–62E, AN/SSQ–77, AN/SSQ–101, and Signal Underwater Sound (SUS) buoys.

The committee notes that the Navy's peacetime annual requirement for sonobuoys is approximately 100,000 units of all types, but the budget request would fund about 63,000. The Navy's low sonobuoy procurement rate continues to fall far short of annual peacetime anti-submarine warfare (ASW) training requirements.

The committee is concerned that the supply of sonobuoys could be quickly exhausted in the event of a major theater contingency involving airborne ASW operations. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $18.0 million to address the sonobuoy shortfall, distributed as follows: $3.0 million for AN/SSQ–53E, $5.0 million for AN/SSQ–62E, and $10.0 million for AN/SSQ–77.

Undersea warfare support equipment

The budget request contained $847,000 for undersea warfare support equipment but included no funds for surface sonar windows and domes.

The committee understands that the Navy has developed a new material and production process for surface ship sonar dome windows because reliable sources for the material previously used are no longer available. The committee also understands that it is crit-

ical that the Navy validate the new sonar dome material fabrication process to support orders for spare sonar dome windows.

Therefore the committee recommends $5.8 million for undersea warfare support equipment, an increase of $5.0 million, to complete development of production tooling and fabrication of the first production sonar dome with the new material system.

WSN–7B ring laser gyro (RLG)

The budget request contained $33.4 million for other navigation equipment, including $7.4 million for the procurement of 11 WSN–7 RLGs.

The WSN–7 RLG is the common RLG ship navigation system for surface ships and submarines.

The committee has recommended a total increase of $52.0 million for the procurement and installation of WSN–7 RLGs over the four preceding fiscal years. Consistent with its actions in prior fiscal years, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the procurement and installation of additional WSN–7B RLGs, associated system field change kits, and simulators. This increase will allow the Navy to accelerate significantly the replacement of maintenance-intensive WSN–2 conventional gyro navigation systems in surface ships with the WSN–7B RLG.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained $1,171.9 million for Procurement, Marine Corps for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $1,254.7 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	AAV7A1 PIP	170	83,372			170	83,372
002	RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM	-	4,930			-	4,930
003	LAV PIP	-	1,709			-	1,709
004	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	16	42,623	5	14,500	21	57,123
005	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	20,815			-	20,815
006	ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH)	-	-			-	-
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS					-	-
007	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	3,891			-	3,891
008	ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER)	-	-			-	-
009	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	6,413			-	6,413
010	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLIO	-	415			-	415
	WEAPONS					-	-
011	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	11,105			-	11,105
	OTHER SUPPORT					-	-
012	OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	-	1,347			-	1,347
	TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		**176,620**		**14,500**		**191,120**
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
013	EADS MOD	-	-			-	-
014	JAVELIN (MYP)	293	29,119			293	29,119
014	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-			-	-
015	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS)	-	10,550			-	10,550
016	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	-	949			-	949
017	PREDATOR (SRAW)	698	43,355			698	43,355

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	OTHER SUPPORT					-	-
018	MODIFICATION KITS	-	3,598			-	3,598
	TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		**87,571**		**-**		**87,571**
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
019	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	4,714			-	4,714
020	GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	8,241			-	8,241
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					-	-
021	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	-			-	-
022	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11,960			-	11,960
023	MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	5,041		8,500	-	13,541
	JSTARS CGS/JSWS				[+8,500]		[+8,500]
024	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	-	402			-	402
025	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL)	-	-			-	-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					-	-
026	GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,676			-	4,676
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)					-	-
027	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	14,351			-	14,351
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)					-	-
028	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	-	8,320			-	8,320
029	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	-	80,656			-	80,656
030	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	-	9,507		2,000	-	11,507
	Common In-User Equipment				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
031	MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	-	-			-	-
032	RADIO SYSTEMS	-	3,097		12,000	-	15,097
	THHR				[+12,000]		[+12,000]
033	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	3,152			-	3,152
034	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	-	80,564			-	80,564
035	MOD KITS MAGTF C41	-	7,484			-	7,484
036	ITEMS < $2M MAGTF C41	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
037	ITEMS < $2M (OTHER)	-	-			-	-
038	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	-	3,152			-	3,152
039	INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	-	14,666			-	14,666
040	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	12,343			-	12,343
	TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		**272,326**		**22,500**		**294,826**
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
041	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	33	1,397			33	1,397
042	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	-	23,368			-	23,368
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					-	-
043	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	1,859	124,448		23,000	1,859	147,448
044	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (MYP)	2,027	325,582			2,027	325,582
045	LT TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT(LTVR)	-	-			-	-
046	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	-			-	-
	OTHER SUPPORT					-	-
047	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-			-	-
048	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	12,684			-	12,684
	TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES		**487,479**		**23,000**		**510,479**
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
049	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,809			-	3,809
050	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	2,704			-	2,704
051	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	-	7,651			-	7,651
052	DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	-	655			-	655
053	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	9,325			-	9,325
054	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	-			-	-
055	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-			-	-
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
056	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
057	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
058	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	5,317			-	5,317
059	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	5,741			-	5,741
060	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	-			-	-
061	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	36,311		12,100	-	48,411
	D7 SLEP				[+7,000]		[+7,000]
	Scraper SLEP				[+5,100]		[+5,100]
062	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	5,846			-	5,846
	GENERAL PROPERTY					-	-
063	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	1,914			-	1,914
064	TRAINING DEVICES	-	30,791		8,700	-	39,491
	ISMT-E				[+8,700]		[+8,700]
065	CONTAINER FAMILY	-	6,902			-	6,902
	OTHER SUPPORT					-	-
066	MODIFICATION KITS	-	-			-	-
067	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	-	-			-	-
068	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	5,591		2,000	-	7,591
	Riverine Craft				[+2,000]		[+2,000]
069	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		**122,557**		**22,800**		**145,357**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
070	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	25,382			-	25,382
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**25,382**		**-**		**25,382**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**1,171,935**		**82,800**		**1,254,735**

Items of Special Interest

Command post systems

The budget request contained $9.5 million to procure equipment for command post systems but included no funds for additional common end user computer equipment for the Marine Forces Reserve (MARFORRES).

The MARFORRES is currently implementing state-of-the-art information system networks to enable greater management of and communications with remote units. These information systems have enabled the migration from paper and manual-based business processes to the network-based flow of information in support of growing personnel management requirements for pay, medical entitlements, retention and separation. The committee understands that additional computer hardware and software, high speed printers, scanners, and multi-functional phones are required to expand the employment of these networks and notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified a $2.0 million unfunded requirement for this equipment in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends $11.5 million, and increase of $2.0 million, for additional common end user computer equipment for the MARFORRES.

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)

The budget request contained $124.4 million for HMMWVA2s, which incorporate upgraded electrical, braking, engine, and transmission improvements as well as a 15-year corrosion prevention program.

The HMMWV is a multi-service, four-wheel drive utility and logistics vehicle. The Marine Corps fleet is used for personnel and weapons transport, medical evacuation, and as an air defense weapon-mount platform.

The committee understands that a 1997 corrosion study concluded that of the more than 17,800 HMMWVs procured by the Marine Corps from 1985 to 1995, 27 percent of the fleet was unserviceable due to severely corroded frames that no longer complied with manufacturer specifications. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified the accelerated procurement of additional HMMWVA2s to replace these unserviceable vehicles as his number one ground unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001.

The committee strongly supports this effort and, therefore, recommends $147.4 million, an increase of $23.0 million, for additional HMMWVA2s.

Improved recovery vehicle (IRV)

The budget request contained $42.6 million to procure IRVs.

The 56-ton M88A1 is capable of towing only vehicles weighing less than 60 tons. Consequently, two M88A1s are required to safely tow an Abrams tank if it is rendered immobile due to combat damage or mechanical failure. The M88A2 IRV upgrade includes increased engine horsepower, as well as braking, steering, winch, lift, and suspension capabilities required to safely recover Abrams tanks and other heavy combat systems.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified a $14.5 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for 5 additional IRVs, which would accelerate the buyout of the program by one year. Accordingly, the committee recommends $57.1 million, an increase of $14.5 million, for 5 additional M88A2 IRV upgrades to support future expeditionary operations.

Material handling equipment

The budget request contained $36.3 million for the procurement of various types of material handling equipment but included no funds for the remanufacture or product improvement of D–7G bulldozers and scrapers.

The D–7G bulldozer/scraper fleet is used throughout Marine Corps combat engineer and support units for airfield construction, as well as for combat clearing and debris excavation.

The committee notes that the service's bulldozer and scraper fleet is over 15 years old and rapidly deteriorating. The committee also notes that the D–7G remanufacturing/product improve program will extend the life of these bulldozers and scrapers for an additional 10 years.

Consistent with its actions in prior years, the committee recommends $48.4 million, an increase of $7.0 million, to remanufacture/product improve 62 D–7G bulldozers and $5.1 million to remanufacture/product improve 45 scrapers.

Modification kits (intelligence)

The budget request contained $5.0 million for modifications to various tactical intelligence systems, but no funds were included to procure Joint Surveillance Target and Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) Common Ground Stations (CGS) or Joint Service Workstations (JSWS).

The Joint STARS CGS will provide the Marine Air-Ground Task Force (MAGTF) commander with near-real-time battle space surveillance and command and control capability by integrating into a single station the processing of signals, imagery, and other intelligence received through a data link from the Air Force's E–8 Joint STARS aircraft radar. The system detects, locates, tracks, and classifies both moving and stationary targets beyond the forward line of troops. The JSWS, a principal component of the Joint STARS CGS, was developed for fixed-site locations that do not require all of the communications assets and deployability provided by a CGS. The committee notes the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified an $8.5 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to procure 1 CGS and 3 JSWS, which would accelerate the approved acquisition objective by one year to fiscal year 2001.

The committee is aware of the proven success of the CGS and understands the additional CGS and three JSWSs will provide the necessary assets for MAGTFs throughout the Fleet Marine Force, while greatly enhancing the MAGTF commanders' situational awareness. Therefore, the committee recommends $13.5 million, an increase of $8.5 million, for 1 Joint STARS CGS and 3 JSWSs.

Radio systems

The budget request contained $3.1 million for procurement of radio systems but no funds were included to procure Tactical Hand Held Radios (THHR).

The THHR is a military-ready, multi-band, secure voice and data radio that will provide Marine reconnaissance teams, and squad-/platoon-size units with a lightweight, standardized, maintainable communications capability that is interoperable with numerous Department of Defense legacy communications radios.

The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified THHRs as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001, which would meet the entire acquisition objective for replacing existing obsolete radios. Because the committee believes that the services must have interoperable communications in support of the growing number of joint operation deployments and supports the need for greater communications capability within small units, the committee recommends $15.1 million for radio systems, an increase $12.0 million to procure THHRs.

Small unit riverine craft (SURC)

The budget request contained no funds to procure a SURC.

The committee understands that there is a requirement for a SURC to support Marine Corps operations for a fast, shallow draft, high capacity craft that is C–130 deployable and that such a craft would provide Marine units with the capability to insert combat troops into a riverside environment.

The committee is supportive of this requirement and, therefore, recommends an increase of $2.0 million to procure a SURC for the Marine Corps.

Training devices

The budget request contained $30.8 million to procure of numerous training and simulation systems, but no funds were included for upgrades to fielded indoor simulated marksmanship trainers (ISMT).

The ISMT-enhanced (E) will be a deployable, interactive, three-dimensional simulation-based indoor training system for individual and small tactical unit marksmanship training. System enhancements will allow Marines to receive marksmanship training on all infantry weapons and replicate known-distance range qualification courses, offensive and defensive combat situations, and shoot-no-shoot decision-making exercises, all of which would normally be performed on an outdoor range using live ammunition. The committee notes that 97 of the Marine Corps' 603 ISMTs will receive the enhanced upgrade in fiscal year 2000 and that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified an $8.7 million unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 to upgrade the remaining 506 ISMTs.

The committee believes that it is critical for Marines to maintain high marksmanship standards and that the ISMT–E will provide the training designed to compliment live-fire requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $39.5 million, an increase of $8.7 million, to complete ISMT–E upgrades.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $9,539.6 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $10,267.2 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F-22 RAPTOR	10	2,428,637			10	2,428,637
001	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(278,755)			-	(278,755)
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	396,222			-	396,222
003	F-15A	-	24,290	2	149,800	2	174,090
003	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(24,290)			-	(24,290)
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
005	F-16 C/D (MYP)	-	23,317	3	51,700	3	75,017
005	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(23,317)			-	(23,317)
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-			-	-
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT					-	-
	TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		**2,546,104**		**201,500**		**2,747,604**
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
007	C-17 (MYP)	12	2,555,223		25,900	12	2,581,123
	C-17 WST				[+14,900]		[+14,900]
	C-17 MTS				[+11,000]		[+11,000]
007	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(343,300)			-	(343,300)
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	266,800			-	266,800
009	C-17 ICS	-	412,200			-	412,200
	OTHER AIRLIFT					-	-
010	WC-130	-	-			-	-
011	EC-130J	-	-			-	-
012	C-130H	-	-			-	-
013	C-130J	2	208,051			2	208,051
	TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		**3,098,974**		**25,900**		**3,124,874**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
014	JPATS	27	113,825			27	113,825
	TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		**113,825**		**-**		**113,825**
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
015	V-22 OSPREY	4	355,681			4	355,681
015	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(19,915)			-	(19,915)
016	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	27,209			-	27,209
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT					-	-
017	SMALL VCX	-	-			-	-
018	C-32A	-	-			-	-
019	C-32B FEST/DEST AIRCRAFT	-	-			-	-
020	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,548			27	2,548
021	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	-	-			-	-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					-	-
022	TARGET DRONES	-	32,915			-	32,915
023	E-8C	1	296,342			1	296,342
023	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(35,732)			-	(35,732)
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-		40,000	-	40,000
025	E-8C ICS	-	-			-	-
026	HAEUAV	-	22,388			-	22,388
027	PREDATOR UAV	7	22,078		12,000	7	34,078
	TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		**703,514**		**52,000**		**755,514**
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
028	B-2A	-	21,723			-	21,723
029	B-1B	-	48,793			-	48,793

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
030	B-52	-	8,425			-	8,425
031	F-117	-	32,005			-	32,005
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT					-	-
032	A-10	-	33,891		15,400	-	49,291
	IFFCC				[+6,800]		[+6,800]
	SADL				[+8,600]		[+8,600]
033	F-15	-	258,247		100,000	-	358,247
	E-Kits				[+70,000]		[+70,000]
	BOL Countermeasures				[+30,000]		[+30,000]
034	F-16	-	248,830		49,300	-	298,130
	PATS				[+25,000]		[+25,000]
	ALE-50 Pylon				[+12,300]		[+12,300]
	AVSR				[+12,000]		[+12,000]
035	T/AT-37	-	83			-	83
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT					-	-
036	C-5	-	95,401			-	95,401
037	C-9	-	3,271			-	3,271
038	C-17A	-	97,124			-	97,124
039	C-21	-	1,883			-	1,883
040	C-22	-	-			-	-
041	C-32A	-	23,568			-	23,568
042	C-37A	-	376			-	376
043	C-141	-	737			-	737
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT					-	-
044	T-1	-	-			-	-
045	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	1,949		(1,949)	-	-
046	T-38	-	120,520			-	120,520
047	T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	89			-	89
048	T-43	-	4,929			-	4,929
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					-	-
049	KC-10A (ATCA)	-	55,370			-	55,370
050	C-12	-	1,521			-	1,521

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
051	C-18	-	345			-	345
052	C-20 MODS	-	5,235			-	5,235
053	VC-25A MOD	-	98			-	98
054	C-130	-	91,524		16,000	-	107,524
	SADL				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
	AN/APN-242				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
055	C-135	-	328,232		58,000	-	386,232
	Re-engine Kits				[+52,000]		[+52,000]
	SADL				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
056	DARP	-	165,540		78,200	-	243,740
	RC-135 Training Aircraft				[+44,000]		[+44,000]
	OFT II				[+9,000]		[+9,000]
	TAWS				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
	RC-135 GATM				[+28,400]		[+28,400]
	Mods Transfer				[-13,200]		[-13,200]
057	E-3	-	88,654			-	88,654
058	E-4	-	31,559		(1,700)	-	29,859
059	E-8	-	33,389			-	33,389
060	H-1	-	3,535			-	3,535
061	H-60	-	23,648			-	23,648
062	OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	28,214		7,000	-	35,214
	LESPA				[+7,000]		[+7,000]
063	PREDATOR MODS	-	-			-	-
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS					-	-
064	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	16,729			-	16,729
064A	AIRCRAFT NAVIGATIONAL AND PASSENGER SAFETY EQUIPMENT				20,000		20,000
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		**1,875,437**		**340,251**		**2,215,688**

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
065	AIRCRAFT SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	-	356,856			-	356,856
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**356,856**		**-**		**356,856**
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
066	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQ & FACILITIES	-	177,943		(2,000)	-	175,943
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT					-	-
067	A-10	-	-			-	-
068	B-2A	-	18,603			-	18,603
069	B-2B	-	42,700			-	42,700
070	C-5	-	-			-	-
071	C-130	-	1,365		23,700	-	25,065
	EC-130H Block 30/35 Simulator				[+23,700]		[+23,700]
072	E-4	-	1,463			-	1,463
073	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,267			-	7,267
074	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	25,464		24,000	-	49,464
	IAIS				[+24,000]		[+24,000]
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS					-	-
075	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	25,352		(1,000)	-	24,352
	WAR CONSUMABLES					-	-
076	WAR CONSUMABLES	-	43,015			-	43,015
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES					-	-
077	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	398,474		33,000	-	431,474
	AMODSM				[+1,000]		[+1,000]
	Classified				[+32,000]		[+32,000]
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT					-	-
078	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,836			-	4,836
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF					-	-
079	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	DARP					-	-
080	DARP	-	98,410		30,200	-	128,610
	U-2ST				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
	JSAF				[+4,000]		[+4,000]
	SYERS				[+3,000]		[+3,000]
	Mods Transfer				[+13,200]		[13,200]
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		**844,892**		**107,900**		**952,792**
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**9,539,602**		**727,551**		**10,267,153**

Items of Special Interest

A–10 modifications

The budget request contained $33.9 million for A–10 aircraft modifications but included no funds for the integrated flight and fire control computer (IFFCC) or for the situation awareness data link (SADL) for the Air National Guard's (ANG) A–10 fleet.

The IFFCC is a replacement for the A–10's existing weapons delivery computer, which has no additional processing power for future growth. The committee understands that the Air Force plans to conduct a multi-stage improvement program for the A–10 that will significantly enhance its communications, threat warning and precision-guided munitions capabilities but will be unable to proceed with this program without the IFFCC. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified the IFFCC among his top 20 unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001 in recognition of its importance to future A–10 modernization and recommends an increase of $6.8 million for this purpose.

The SADL provides the ANG A–10 fleet with an all-weather, secure, jam-resistant, low-cost data link using commercial-off-the-shelf enhanced position location reporting system radios. The committee understands that the A–10 SADL would prevent battlefield fratricide, integrate with the Army and Marine Corps digitized battlefield, and has growth capability for future data link upgrades. The committee notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has identified the A–10 SADL among his unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $8.6 million for this cost effective modification.

In total, the committee recommends $49.3 million, an increase of $15.4 million, for A–10 aircraft modifications.

Aircraft navigational and passenger safety equipment

The budget request contained various amounts in several aircraft modification budget lines for the procurement and installation of aircraft navigational and passenger safety equipment.

The committee has recommended increases for passenger and navigational safety for several years, supporting the Secretary of Defense's directive to improve aircraft flight and passenger safety subsequent to the crash of a cabinet secretary's CT–43 aircraft in 1996. These increases have funded both terrain avoidance warning systems (TAWS), which project an aircraft's position relative to the ground and improves pilot situational awareness by warning of potential ground impact, and traffic collision and avoidance systems (TCAS), which provide predictive collision avoidance information regarding an aircraft's position relative to another aircraft. The committee notes that other safety upgrades are also planned in the future years defense program (FYDP) such as cockpit voice recorders, flight data recorders, and predictive windshear radars.

While the Department of Defense continues to fund these upgrades in both the fiscal year 2001 budget and the FYDP, the committee believes that such navigational and passenger safety improvements should be expedited. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to accelerate upgrades of the TAWS, TCAS, cockpit voice recorders, flight data recorders, and

predictive windshear radars on passenger-carrying aircraft. Additionally, the committee expects the secretaries of the military departments to report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2001, on the passenger and navigation safety upgrade status and plans for each of its passenger-carrying aircraft. This report should identify which aircraft need to be equipped with TAWS, TCAS, cockpit voice recorders, flight data recorders, and predictive wind shear radars.

C–130 modifications

The budget request contained $91.5 million for C–130 modifications but included no funds for the carry-on situation awareness data link (SADL) or the AN/APN–242 for the Air National Guard's (ANG) C–130 fleet.

The carry-on SADL provides the ANG's C–130 aircraft fleet with an all-weather, secure, jam-resistant, and low-cost data link using commercial-off-the-shelf enhanced position location reporting system radios. The committee understands that, without the carry-on SADL, the ANG's C–130 transport and rescue aircraft will be incompatible with the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Force packages, and notes that the Chief of the ANG has identified the C–130 carry-on SADL among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to procure carry-on SADLs for the ANG's C–, EC–, HC–, and MC–130 aircraft fleets.

The AN/APN–242 is a weather and navigation radar that replaces the 1950's-era AN/APN–59 radar currently installed on the ANG's C–130 aircraft fleet. The committee understands that the AN/APN–59, in addition to being obsolete, has a mean-time-between-failure (MTBF) rate of 40 to 100 hours and is costly to maintain. The committee also understands that the AN/APN–242 radar has significantly improved performance capabilities, a projected MTBF rate of 1800 hours, and that maintenance cost savings associated with the AN/APN–59's replacement will pay for the AN/APN–242's acquisition within five years. To improve C–130 mission capability and reduce maintenance costs, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for AN/APN–242 radars for the ANG's C–130 fleet.

In total, the committee recommends $107.5 million, an increase of $16.0 million, for C–130 modifications.

Compass call block 30/35 mission crew simulator (MCS)

The budget request contained $1.4 million for C–130 post-production support, but included no funds for a Compass Call block 30/35 MCS. The EC–130H Compass Call is used to disrupt enemy command and control communications, and the block 30/35 MCS would provide aircrew training for the current block 30 and planned block 35 aircraft configurations.

The committee understands that the current EC–130H mission simulator is an obsolete, block 20 configuration which limits training effectiveness for block 30- and 35-configured Compass Call aircraft due to its inability to generate sensitive mission scenarios typical of actual flying missions. The committee notes that training in actual block 30-configured EC–130H aircraft is expensive and for

this reason the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified the Compass Call block 30/35 MCS among his top unfunded readiness requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Because the committee believes that a state-of-the-art simulator is required for this high-demand, low-density aircraft, it recommends $25.1 million, an increase of $23.7 million, to procure a Compass Call block 30/35 MCS.

C–135 modifications

The budget request contained $328.2 million for C–135 modifications but included no funds for reengining KC–135E aerial refueling aircraft or for the KC–135 carry-on situation awareness data link (SADL) for the Air National Guard (ANG).

The committee remains a strong supporter of the KC–135 reengining program and understands that reengined KC–135s are capable of shorter take-offs, operating with higher gross weights, meeting or exceeding all noise and pollution standards, and off-loading more fuel. The committee notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has identified reengining of the KC–135E among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $52.0 million for two KC–135E reengining kits.

The KC–135 carry-on SADL provides the ANG's KC–135 tanker aircraft fleet with an all-weather, secure, jam-resistant, and low-cost data link using commercial-off-the-shelf enhanced position location reporting system radios. The committee understands that without the KC–135 carry-on SADL, ANG tanker aircraft will be incompatible with the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Force packages. The committee notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has identified the KC–135 carry-on SADL among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to procure additional SADLs for the ANG's tanker fleet.

In total, the committee recommends $386.2 million, an increase of $58.0 million, for C–135 modifications.

C–17

The budget request contained $2,211.9 million to procure 12 C–17 aircraft and $266.8 million for advance procurement of 15 aircraft in fiscal year 2002 but included no funds for an additional weapon system trainer (WST) at the C–17 training base or for a maintenance training system (MTS) for the Air National Guard (ANG).

The committee understands that the C–17 training base currently has three WSTs, but it needs a fourth system to accommodate the increased pilot production anticipated in fiscal year 2004 when additional aircraft and pilots are projected to arrive. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified an additional C–17 WST among his top unfunded readiness requirements in fiscal year 2001. In order to ensure that the C–17 training base will have sufficient capacity to meet required pilot production levels, the committee recommends an increase of $14.9 million for procurement of an additional WST.

The C–17 MTS is designed to qualify personnel to maintain the C–17 aircraft. In its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee recommended an increase of $3.5 million for advance procurement of long-lead items for the MTS. The committee understands that the ANG unit that will receive C–17 aircraft in fiscal year 2003 requires an MTS for initial qualification of its maintenance personnel prior to the arrival of the aircraft but notes that the Department of the Air Force has still not budgeted for this system. Therefore, consistent with its prior actions and to deliver a maintenance training capability on schedule, the committee recommends an increase of $11.0 million for the MTS.

In total, the committee recommends $2,237.8 million for the C–17, an increase of $25.9 million.

C–17 reverse-affiliate units

The committee notes that the Air Force is retiring its aging C–141 aircraft fleet and replacing it with the C–17, which was recently combat proven in Operation Allied Force, to meet the Department of Defense's airlift mobility requirements. The committee also notes the Air Force's increasing reliance on, and importance of, Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) units to accomplish the airlift mission and that several reserve units are scheduled to begin retiring their C–141 aircraft in fiscal year 2003 without a designated follow-on mission identified. In light of the current AFRC pilot and technician recruiting and retention shortfalls, the committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has yet to make a time-sensitive determination of a follow-on mission for those AFRC units with retiring C–141 aircraft.

Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to designate a mission for the AFRC units affected by the retirement of the C–141, especially those units with a joint-service requirement, and requests the Secretary to strongly consider the designation of a reverse-affiliate C–17 unit at bases where one of these units is located. A C–17 reverse-affiliate unit would permit the AFRC to continue to utilize existing aircrew and maintenance personnel expertise in its operations and maintenance responsibilities for AFRC-assigned C–17 aircraft, while also providing mission-ready aircraft that could be flown by active duty Air Force aircrews.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), line 56

The budget request contained $165.5 million for various RC–135 and U–2 aircraft modifications but included no funds for RC–135 training aircraft, an updated C–135 operational flight trainer (OFT II), RC–135 global air traffic management (GATM) upgrades, or the theater airborne warning system (TAWS) for the RC–135 Rivet Joint (RJ).

The committee notes that the theater and functional commanders-in-chief (CINCs) have repeatedly testified that their intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) requirements, particularly those supported by ISR aircraft such as the RC–135 and U–2, are not currently satisfied due to the limited number of these platforms. The committee understands that the Air Force does not have a dedicated RC–135 aircrew training aircraft and that this de-

ficiency contributes to the limited number of aircraft available to meet CINC requirements. To increase the availability of RC–135 mission aircraft to the CINCs, the committee recommends an increase of $44.0 million to modify two C–135 aircraft into an RC–135 training aircraft configuration.

The C–135 operational flight trainer (OFT I) is the aircraft simulation training device for the RC–, OC–, WC–, and TC–135 pilots. The committee understands that OFT I is obsolete due to its outdated engine and aircraft avionics configurations and that OFT II would train aircrews to operate the re-engined and updated-avionics-configured C–135 model aircraft. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the procurement of OFT II among his top five unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $9.0 million, of which $6.5 million is for an OFT II and $2.5 million is to equip this OFT II with motion simulation.

RC–135 GATM upgrades include: interference resistant navigational receivers, global positioning system upgrades, a traffic collision and avoidance system, radios to permit reduced vertical separation between aircraft during Atlantic Ocean transit, cockpit voice recorders, and flight management system upgrades. The committee understands that, without these upgrades, RC–135 aircraft will be restricted from flying the most direct and fuel-efficient ocean routes and altitudes, will be subject to critical landing-phase navigational radio interference, and will not be equipped with the Secretary of Defense-directed safety modifications until after fiscal year 2005. To meet these vital needs, the committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included RC–135 GATM upgrades among his unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001, and consequently, recommends an increase of $28.4 million for this purpose.

The TAWS significantly improves the accuracy of ballistic missile warning on RC–135 RJ, a tactical reconnaissance aircraft. In its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee recommended an increase of $17.3 million for the RC–135 RJ TAWS and believes that continued integration of these suites is critical to tactical missile defense warning. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for continued procurement and installation of TAWS suites on the RC–135 RJ aircraft.

To consolidate RC–135 modifications in DARP, line 56, and U–2 modifications in DARP, line 80, the committee recommends a transfer of the $5.1 million budgeted for RC–135 aircraft modifications in DARP, line 80 into this budget line; and a transfer of the $18.3 million budgeted for U–2 aircraft modifications in this line into DARP, line 80. This transfer results in a $13.2 million decrease to this line and an increase of $13.2 million in DARP, line 80.

In total, the committee recommends $243.7 million for DARP, line 56, an increase of $78.2 million for RC–135 modifications.

Finally, the committee is concerned about the Department of the Air Force's budget plan for the RC–135's joint signals intelligence avionics family (JSAF) upgrades and notes that the request would budget for a single JSAF suite for the RC–135 but additional suites are not planned until fiscal year 2005. Without full and continuous funding for this upgrade, the committee understands the first sys-

tem, if installed onto the RC–135, would result in a unique RC–135 aircraft configuration which would increase unit support costs for that aircraft. Accordingly, the committee believes the new JSAF system should continue development and testing in the RC–135 systems integration laboratory and on the U–2 aircraft until the Department of the Air Force budgets to upgrade all 16 RC–135 aircraft.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP), line 80

The budget request contained $98.4 million in DARP, line 80, for various U–2 and RC–135 aircraft modifications, of which $1.8 million was included for senior year electro-optic reconnaissance system (SYERS) sensor spares and $17.0 million was included for a joint signals intelligence avionics family (JSAF) suite for the U–2. However, the budget request did not include any funds for additional U–2ST aircraft, a two-seat trainer version of the single-seat U–2S reconnaissance aircraft.

SYERS is an electro-optic camera system that provides real-time imagery to national decision makers and tactical forces. The committee understands that the budget request underfunds initial deployment spares for the SYERS upgrade by $3.0 million and, accordingly, recommends an increase of this amount.

The JSAF provides an upgraded information collection capability for the U–2S. The committee understands that the budget request is insufficient to procure an entire JSAF suite and required spares and cabling. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million for this purpose.

The committee understands that there are only four U–2STs and that without an additional U–2ST, the U–2S pilot production rate does not meet requirements to resolve an existing pilot shortage. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included an additional U–2ST among his top five unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001 and, accordingly, recommends an increase of $10.0 million to convert a U–2S into a U–2ST aircraft.

Including transfers between DARP lines 56 and 80 discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends $128.6 million, an increase of $30.2 million, for U–2 modifications.

F–15 modifications

The budget request contained $258.2 million for F–15 modifications, of which $37.3 million was included for modification kits that convert the F100 engine to the F100–220E configuration. However, the budget request included no funds for F–15 Bofers launchers (BOL) countermeasure dispenser systems for the Air National Guard's (ANG) F–15A and B aircraft, which would significantly improve its survivability.

Conversion kits for the F–15's F100 engine, also known as "E-kits," provide increased thrust, greater reliability, better fuel efficiency, and reduced operations and maintenance costs. The committee understands that, without the E-kit modification, ANG's F–15A/B fleet will be increasingly costly to operate and maintain, less safe, and have diminished availability to respond to the Air Force's Air Expeditionary Force contingency operations. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $70.0 million for E-kits to

accelerate the conversion of the ANG's F–15A/B aircraft engines to the F100–220E configuration.

The committee understands that the Air Force's test of a BOL countermeasures dispenser system on the F–15 aircraft revealed that this system provided a dramatic increase in the aircraft's chaff and flare capacity and a new preemptive expendable capability. The committee also understands that the Air Combat Command has identified an urgent requirement for a preemptive chaff and flare capability on the F–15, and notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has included integration of such capability on F–15A and B aircraft among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million to integrate the BOL countermeasure dispenser system on the ANG's F–15A and B aircraft. The committee also recommends $68.9 million, an increase of $7.6 million, in PE 27134F for F–15 operational systems development to complete foreign comparative test activities for integration of this system on all F–15 aircraft, as reflected in Title II of this report.

In total, the committee recommends $358.2 million, an increase of $100.0 million for F–15 modifications.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Air Force modifies its F–15 fleet with a series of individual modifications rather than through a comprehensive block upgrade approach, such as the B–2 block modification upgrade program, in which several modifications are accomplished at one time. Since the committee believes that an F–15 block upgrade program would be more efficient, reduce cost, increase aircraft availability, and increase readiness through a reduction in the number of different F–15 configurations, it strongly encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to implement an F–15 block upgrade program beginning with the Air Force's fiscal year 2002 budget request, and expects the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees his plan to implement such a block upgrade program.

F–15E

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of F–15E aircraft. The F–15E is a two-seat, missionized-cockpit, dual-role fighter that retains an air-to-air capability and adds the systems necessary to meet the requirement for an all-weather, deep penetration, day/night air-to-surface attack aircraft.

The committee notes that the Air Force plans to operate its inventory of 218 F–15Es until 2030, and further notes that the F–15E fleet has recently experienced very high operational tempos. The committee believes, therefore, that additional attrition reserve aircraft should be procured.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $149.8 million for two F–15E aircraft.

F–16 modifications

The budget request contained $248.8 million for various F–16 modifications, of which $6.0 million was included to procure 29 ALE–50 towed decoy launcher pylons. However, the request included no funds for the LITENING II precision attack targeting

system (PATS) or for airborne video solid-state recorder systems (AVSRs).

The committee understands that Air National Guard (ANG) F–16 units equipped with the F–16C block 25 and 30 aircraft have an immediate shortfall in precision strike capability. The committee notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has identified procurement of additional LITENING II PATS as his number one unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001. This system, which consists of a third-generation forward-looking infrared and a laser spot tracker, will allow ANG block 25 and 30 F–16s to participate in future Air Expeditionary Force contingency operations. The committee notes that the ANG has a requirement for 160 LITENING II PATSs, but only 56 have been funded.

The committee believes the integration of ANG F–16s into precision strike operations is essential to the Total Force concept and, therefore, recommends an increase of $25.0 million to procure 17 additional systems.

The ALE–50 towed decoy pylon enables F–16C aircraft to carry the ALE–50, a radio-frequency repeater which is used to decoy an incoming threat missile away from the aircraft. The committee understands that the ALE–50 was one of the most effective countermeasure devices used during Operation Allied Force and that it is credited with saving several aircraft. Also, the committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified procurement of the ALE–50 towed decoy pylon among his unfunded modernization requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $18.3 million, an increase of $12.3 million, to accelerate the production of 111 additional ALE–50 towed decoy pylons.

The AVSR is a commercial off-the-shelf replacement for the F–16's existing mechanical airborne video tape recorders which, the committee understands, are difficult to maintain and have low reliability. The committee also understands that the AVSR will provide a dramatic improvement in mean time between failure, has no moving parts which can break or wear out, requires no scheduled maintenance and will save an estimated $80 million in life-cycle costs compared to the F–16's current system.

Therefore, to improve reliability and reduce F–16 airborne video tape recorder ownership costs, the committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for the AVSR.

In total, the committee recommends $298.1 million for F–16 modifications, an increase of $49.3 million.

F–16 improved avionics intermediate shop (IAIS)

The budget request contained $25.5 million for F–16 post production support, of which $5.0 million was included for one IAIS system.

The F–16 IAIS system is a mobile test station used to diagnose and repair F–16 avionics problems at deployed locations. Because the F–16 IAIS uses fewer people and requires less cargo space for transit than the existing avionics intermediate shop, deployments of F–16 units which have the IAIS require less airlift support.

The committee understands that 63 F–16 IAISs are required but notes that only 48 have been—or are planned to be—procured in

the future years defense program. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified additional IAISs among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends $49.5 million, an increase of $24.0 million for five additional F–16 IAIS systems, including two for active, two for Air National Guard, and one for Air Force Reserve units.

F–16C

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of F–16C aircraft, the primary multi-mission fighter aircraft of the Air Force.

The committee notes its continuing strong support for the F–16C program and that Congress provided an increase of $24.0 million in fiscal year 2000 for advance procurement of additional aircraft in fiscal year 2001. Finally, the committee notes that the Department of the Air Force planned to procure 20 additional aircraft (10 each in fiscal years 2002 and 2003) but has subsequently revised its plan and now intends to procure six aircraft in fiscal year 2003 and seven in each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

Therefore, consistent with its previous actions, and noting that both the Air Force Chief of Staff and the Chief of the Air National Guard have identified additional F–16C aircraft among their top unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001, the committee recommends an increase of $51.7 million and expects that the Department will combine these funds with the $24.0 million appropriated for advance procurement in fiscal year 2000 for to procure three F–16C block 50/52 aircraft.

The committee observes that the Senate Committee on Appropriations report on H.R. 2521 (S. Rept. 102–154) stated, "the Committee directs that F–16 aircraft scheduled to be delivered to the Air Force during fiscal year 1992 be turned over to those Air National Guard F–16's units which served in Operation Desert Storm." The committee further observes that the statement of the managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 2521 (H. Rept. 102–328) stated, "The Committee of Conference directs the Air Force to initiate, immediately in the first quarter of fiscal year 1992, the modernization process for those Air National Guard F–16 units that deployed to Operation Desert Storm, in priority over any nondeploying unit, leading to equipping these deploying units with updated F–16 aircraft. Units with the Close Air Support (CAS) mission will be equipped with Block 30 aircraft." The committee notes that the Air Force complied with the aforementioned directives but subsequently reversed that action when it removed the block 30 aircraft of the 174th Fighter Wing and replaced them with less capable block 25 aircraft.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to assign F–16 block 40, or later model F–16 aircraft, to Air National Guard units whose capabilities have been downgraded as a result of the substitution of older block aircraft when F–16C block 50/52 aircraft procured in fiscal year 2001 are delivered to the Air Force.

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

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement to continue E–8C Joint STARS aircraft production.

The E–8C Joint STARS aircraft provides near real-time surveillance and targeting information on moving and stationary ground targets, enabling battlefield commanders to quickly make and execute engagement decisions. Although its situational awareness value to commanders has prompted the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) to validate a requirement for 19 aircraft, the Department of the Air Force has budgeted only for 15.

While the committee is encouraged that the Department has funded the 15th Joint STARS aircraft in its budget request, it remains concerned that, despite the JROC-validated requirement for 19 aircraft, the Department plans to shut down the E–8C production line after this aircraft is produced. These "low-density, high demand" aircraft are among the most sought-after assets by the regional commanders-in-chief for a range of reconnaissance and surveillance operations and have been combat proven in the recent Operation Allied Force.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for advance procurement of a 16th E–8C Joint STARS aircraft.

Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA)

The budget request contained $28.2 million for other aircraft modifications but included no funds for the LESPA.

Due to its longer repack cycle and extended service life, the committee continues to believe that the Department of the Air Force will realize substantial life cycle cost savings with LESPA, compared to existing parachutes, and has previously recommended procurement of LESPAs for the Navy's P–3 and E–2 aircraft.

Consistent with its previous actions to reduce ownership costs, the committee recommends $35.2 million for other aircraft modifications, an increase of $7.0 million for LESPAs to replace existing parachutes in C–130, C–141, C–5 and KC–135 aircraft.

Predator

The budget request contained $22.1 million for procurement of the Predator unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) system.

The committee understands that the Air Force is experiencing vanishing vendor problems with some of the current hardware in the Predator ground station and that there is a requirement to control multiple Predator aircraft simultaneously from a single ground station. The committee is also aware that there are required air vehicle reliability and maintainability upgrades that have not been funded.

Consequently, the committee recommends $34.1 million for the Predator, an increase of $12.0 million for upgrading the current ground stations with commercial hardware, for integrating the capability to control multiple UAVs simultaneously and for improving air vehicle reliability and maintainability.

Finally, the committee is aware that a jointly funded effort between the contractor and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has developed a turbo-prop variant of the Predator to be followed by a jet-powered variant. Both of these Predator-B

variants use the current Predator ground station, avionics, datalink, and control software but provide major performance improvements over the current aircraft, including a maximum speed in excess of 200 knots and a service ceiling to 45,000 feet. While the current Predator has clearly proven its military worth, given these performance improvements, a Predator-B would appear to satisfy many niche missions for which the current vehicle is not well-suited. The committee believes that a Predator-B would be a valuable addition to the Predator fleet and that a mix of Predator-A and -B aircraft would cost effectively satisfy all Predator mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee requests the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct an assessment of the utility of a Predator-B aircraft, including the benefits or problems operating a mixed Predator fleet. The committee further requests the Secretary report his findings to the congressional defense and intelligence committees concurrent with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

T–3A modifications

The budget request contained $1.9 million for T–3A aircraft modifications.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has removed the T–3A from service for screening prospective pilot candidates prior to entry into undergraduate pilot training. Consequently, the committee recommends no funding for T–3A modifications, a decrease of $1.9 million.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $638.8 million for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $638.8 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS	-	11,466			-	11,466
002	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	-	-			-	-
003	2.75 IN ROCKET, FLARE IR	-	-			-	-
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	CARTRIDGES					-	-
005	CARTRIDGES	-	70,090			-	70,090
006	5.56 MM	-	-			-	-
007	30 MM TRAINING	-	-			-	-
008	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	-	-			-	-
009	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	-	-			-	-
010	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	-	-			-	-
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	BOMBS					-	-
012	PRACTICE BOMBS	-	32,731			-	32,731
013	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	30,745			-	30,745
014	CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	-	1,400			-	1,400
015	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	-	-			-	-
016	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	-	-			-	-
017	GBU - 37	-	-			-	-
018	GBU-15	-	-			-	-
019	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	-	-			-	-
020	2000 LB HE BOMB MK-84	-	-			-	-
021	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	-	-			-	-
022	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	300	107,201			300	107,201
023	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	9,098	219,848			9,098	219,848
024	WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	6,308	104,046			6,308	104,046
025	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	-			-	-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B					-	-
026	ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
027	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-			-	-
028	MJU-10B	-	-			-	-
029	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	-	-			-	-
030	CAD/PAD	-	-			-	-
031	LUU-19 FLARE	-	-			-	-
032	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	2,431			-	2,431
033	MODIFICATIONS <5M	-	196			-	196
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,806			-	7,806
	FUZES					-	-
035	FLARES	-	37,432			-	37,432
036	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	-	9,342			-	9,342
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		**634,734**		**-**		**634,734**
	WEAPONS						
	SMALL ARMS						
037	SMALL ARMS	-	4,074			-	4,074
038	M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	-			-	-
039	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	-	-			-	-
040	M-9 PISTOL	-	-			-	-
041	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL WEAPONS		**4,074**		**-**		**4,074**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		**638,808**		**-**		**638,808**

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $3,061.7 million for Missile Procurement, Air Force for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $3,046.7 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	-	42,308			-	42,308
	TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		**42,308**		**-**		**42,308**
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
002	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	2,006			-	2,006
	TACTICAL					-	-
003	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	174	90,828			174	90,828
004	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	-	96			-	96
005	AMRAAM	204	98,687			204	98,687
	TARGET DRONES					-	-
006	TARGET DRONES	-	-			-	-
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES					-	-
007	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,017			-	3,017
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER					-	-
008	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	-	2,623			-	2,623
	TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		**197,257**		**-**		**197,257**
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
009	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	-	-			-	-
010	CONVENTIONAL ALCM	-	-			-	-
011	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	-	28,428			-	28,428
012	MM III MODIFICATIONS	-	375,129			-	375,129
013	AGM-65D MAVERICK	-	2,042		5,000	-	7,042
014	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	-	4,066			-	4,066

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
015	PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	-	99			-	99
016	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $5.0M	-	99			-	99
	TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		**409,863**		**5,000**		**414,863**
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
017	MISSILE SPARES - REPAIR PARTS	-	44,026			-	44,026
	TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		**44,026**		**-**		**44,026**
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
018	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	25,736			-	25,736
019	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,765			-	9,765
020	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	-	196,937			-	196,937
021	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	13,404			-	13,404
022	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	1,478			-	1,478
023	INERTIAL UPPER STAGES(SPACE)	-	-			-	-
024	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	-	68,582			-	68,582
025	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	-	106,356			-	106,356
026	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	-	22,770			-	22,770
027	TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)	-	469,720		(10,000)	-	459,720
028	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	287,996			3	287,996
029	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	-	55,939		(10,000)	-	45,939
029	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-			-	-
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS					-	-
030	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	-	-			-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
031	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	968,498			-	968,498
032	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	141,080			-	141,080
	TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT		**2,368,261**		**(20,000)**		**2,348,261**
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**3,061,715**		**(15,000)**		**3,046,715**

Items of Special Interest

AGM–65 modifications

The budget request contained $2.0 million to convert 200 AGM–65G missiles to the AGM–65K configuration.

The AGM–65 is a precision guided tactical missile employed on the F–16 and A–10 aircraft. The "G" configuration has an infrared target seeker that can be upgraded to the "K" configuration, which uses an updated electro-optical (EO) seeker. The "B" configuration has an obsolete EO target seeker that can be upgraded to the "H" configuration, which also uses an updated EO seeker. Since the committee understands that over 5300 AGM–65s were fired in Operation Desert Storm and over 800 in Operation Allied Force, it believes that the current upgrade rate can neither meet future operational requirements nor provide sufficient missiles for training.

Consistent with its prior year actions in adding funds for these upgrades, the committee recommends $7.0 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for conversion to both the AGM–65H and K configurations, of which some missiles should be procured for Air National Guard pilot training.

Medium launch vehicle (MLV)

The budget request contained $55.9 million for MLV launch operations.

The committee notes that the MLV is used for Global Positioning System (GPS) satellite launch operations and that, due to the restructuring of the GPS program, GPS launches have been delayed. Consequently, the committee believes that the budget request contains funds in excess of MLV program requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $45.9 million for MLV, a reduction of $10.0 million.

Titan

The budget request contained $469.7 million for the Titan launch vehicle and launch operations.

The committee notes that the management contingency funding request for the Titan program is substantially larger than that of other programs of comparable maturity and believes that the budget request contains funds in excess of requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $459.7 million, a reduction of $10.0 million.

Other Procurement, Air Force

Overview

The budget request contained $7,699.1 million for Other Procurement, Air Force for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $7,869.9 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	16	254			16	254
002	STATION WAGON, 4X2	-	-			-	-
003	BUSES	66	4,101			66	4,101
004	AMBULANCES	8	646			8	646
005	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	83	1,706			83	1,706
006	ARMORED SEDAN	1	200			1	200
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES					-	-
007	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	-	-			-	-
008	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-			-	-
009	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	-	-			-	-
010	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	-	-			-	-
011	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	-	17,593		(1,200)	-	16,393
012	TRUCK CARRYALL	-	-			-	-
013	FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	5,869			-	5,869
014	HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	-	13,435			-	13,435
015	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	-	-			-	-
016	TRUCK, UTILITY	-	-			-	-
017	CAP VEHICLES	-	768			-	768
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	29,235			-	29,235
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES					-	-
019	HMMWV, ARMORED	-	5,586			-	5,586
020	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	-	5,042			-	5,042
021	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	18,373			-	18,373
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT					-	-
022	TRUCK CRASH P-19	-	8,761		(1,300)	-	7,461
023	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	3,700			-	3,700
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					-	-
024	TRUCK, F/L 6000 LB	-	-			-	-
025	TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	-	4,857			-	4,857

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
026	60K A/C LOADER	48	96,948			48	96,948
027	NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	34	24,144			34	24,144
028	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	4,530			-	4,530
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT					-	-
029	TRUCK, DUMP	-	1,763			-	1,763
030	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQUIP	-	5,852			-	5,852
031	MODIFICATIONS	-	387			-	387
032	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	8,616			-	8,616
033	VEHICLE LEASES	-	-			-	-
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM					-	-
034	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-			-	-
	TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		**262,366**		**(2,500)**		**259,866**
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
035	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	-	23,346			-	23,346
036	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	491			-	491
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS					-	-
037	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	-			-	-
038	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,572			-	1,572
039	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,530		8,200	-	13,730
	Senior Scout				[+8,200]		[+8,200]
039A	EAGLE VISION				5,000		5,000
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS					-	-
040	AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	-	-			-	-
041	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	58,663			-	58,663
042	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	15,431		4,400	-	19,831
	SADL Gateway				[+4,400]		[+4,400]
043	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST	-	33,515			-	33,515
044	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	20,858			-	20,858
045	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	602			-	602

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
046	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,447			-	1,447
047	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-			-	-
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS					-	-
048	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	74,771		10,000	-	84,771
	SPARES				[+10,000]		[+10,000]
049	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	14,753			-	14,753
050	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	8,495			-	8,495
051	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	34,519			-	34,519
052	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	26,003		1,000	-	27,003
	AMODSM				[+1,000]		[+1,000]
053	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	1,584			-	1,584
054	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	15,681		4,000	-	19,681
	ISSP				[+4,000]		[+4,000]
055	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
056	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	23,788			-	23,788
057	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	56,820			-	56,820
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS					-	-
058	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	-			-	-
059	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	177,283			-	177,283
060	USCENTCOM	-	7,335			-	7,335
061	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	17,947			-	17,947
	DISA PROGRAMS					-	-
062	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	9,112			-	9,112
063	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPAC	-	-			-	-
064	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	2,674			-	2,674
065	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	39,094			-	39,094
066	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	-	92,714			-	92,714
067	MILSATCOM SPACE	-	53,027			-	53,027
068	SPACE MODS SPACE	-	25,959			-	25,959
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE					-	-
069	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	-	101,222			-	101,222
070	COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	-	3,104			-	3,104

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
071	RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	16,630			-	16,630
072	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	2,005			-	2,005
073	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	3,227			-	3,227
074	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	74,301			-	74,301
075	CAP COM & ELECT	-	386			-	386
076	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,204			-	7,204
	MODIFICATIONS					-	-
077	COMM ELECT MODS	-	54,372		15,000	-	69,372
	AN/FPS-117 Beacons				[+15,000]		[+15,000]
	TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		**1,105,465**		**47,600**		**1,153,065**
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
078	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	10,106			-	10,106
079	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	1,105			-	1,105
080	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,541			-	9,541
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP					-	-
081	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	2,833			-	2,833
082	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	6,744			-	6,744
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ					-	-
083	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	15,118		12,000	-	27,118
	SATS				[+12,000]		[+12,000]
084	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	9,241			-	9,241
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT					-	-
085	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	-			-	-
086	FLOODLIGHTS	-	10,718			-	10,718
087	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000	-	7,187			-	7,187
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					-	-
088	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	15,171			-	15,171
089	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	17,025			-	17,025
090	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	941			-	941

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
091	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	1,838			-	1,838
092	BLADDERS FUEL	-	-			-	-
093	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	-			-	-
094	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	6,037			-	6,037
095	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	-	8,259			-	8,259
096	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	-	50,021			-	50,021
097	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	-	-			-	-
098	AIR CONDITIONERS	-	6,217			-	6,217
099	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		15,500	-	28,285
	RJMT EFETS				[+15,500]		[+15,500]
103	DARP, MRIGS	-	89,049			-	89,049
104	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-	5,794,849		93,176	-	5,888,025
105	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	-	136,317		5,000	-	141,317
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
	TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		**6,299,660**		**125,676**		**6,425,336**
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
110	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	31,636			-	31,636
	TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		**31,636**		**-**		**31,636**
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**7,699,127**		**170,776**		**7,869,903**

Items of Special Interest

Automatic data processing equipment (ADPE)

The budget request contained $74.8 million for ADPE but included no funds for the spare parts production and re-procurement system (SPARES), a web-based, industry-standard electronic storage and management system.

The committee understands that SPARES has enabled parts procurement times to be reduced from 90 to 15 days and field maintenance response times to be reduced from 14 days to only a few hours. The committee continues to consider these figures impressive as it did when recommending increased funding for SPARES in its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) for fiscal year 2000.

Therefore, consistent with its prior actions, the committee recommends $84.8 million, an increase of $10.0 million, to continue procurement of the SPARES.

AN/FPS–117 radar beacon replacement

The budget request contained $54.4 million for communications electronics modifications but included no funds for replacement of beacons on AN/FPS–117 radars. The AN/FPS–117 is a minimally attended, long-range radar system used to provide air defense and air traffic control in the Arctic regions of Canada and Alaska.

The committee understands that the AN/FPS–117's beacons, which provide identification friend or foe information to military air defense controllers as well as altitude and aircraft identification to civilian air traffic controllers, are increasingly unsupportable due to out-of-production parts and do not meet Federal Aviation Administration regulations for air traffic control.

The committee believes these radars should not be allowed to deteriorate and, therefore recommends $69.4 million, an increase of $15.0 million, to begin a program for integration, testing and replacement of AN/FPS–117 radar beacons.

Eagle vision

The budget request included no funds for procuring the processing hardware necessary to complete the Eagle Vision 4 imagery system.

Eagle Vision is a ground station that receives and processes imagery from commercial remote sensing satellites. The committee fully supports the Eagle Vision commercial imagery initiative, which has provided unique, unclassified imagery support to meet theater and service requirements that, due to higher priorities, cannot be met by other technical means. The committee believes that this initiative needs to be fully funded to continue such support.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for completing the Eagle Vision 4 processor installation.

Rivet joint mission trainer (RJMT)

The budget request contained $12.8 million for RC–135 Defense Aerial Reconnaissance Program procurement but included no funds to provide a forward-deployed training capability for the RJMT, the primary RC–135 Rivet Joint (RJ) ground training simulator.

The RC–135 RJ is a tactical reconnaissance aircraft that provides real-time intelligence to combat forces. The committee understands that the procurement of an enhanced field exportable training system (EFETS) would improve training and readiness by allowing deployed RC–135 RJ crewmembers to use existing post-mission ground data processing equipment to function as an RJMT. Since procurement of an additional RJMT for deployed locations would not be required, the committee further understands that the EFETS would save the Air Force $27.4 million and notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included $15.5 million for the EFETS among his top five unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $28.3 million, an increase of $15.5 million for this purpose.

Senior scout

The budget request contained $5.5 million for procurement of intelligence communications equipment, including $2.0 million for procurement of spares and replacement equipment for the Senior Scout tactical reconnaissance aircraft.

The committee is pleased that the Air Force has decided to retain the Senior Scout reconnaissance capability to augment the high demand/low density airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) fleets in the reserve component. However, the committee is disturbed that the Air Force has not added funding to upgrade the Senior Scout to more effectively interoperate with other ISR aircraft and, more importantly, the combat aircraft it supports.

Therefore, the committee recommends $13.7 million for intelligence communications equipment, an increase of $8.2 million for Senior Scout collection and dissemination upgrades and for the addition of a deployable ground data reduction system.

Situation awareness data link (SADL) gateway for the theater air control system (TACS)

The budget request contained $15.4 million for TACS improvement but included no funds to initiate a program for the SADL gateway for the Air National Guard's (ANG) TACS.

The SADL gateway for the ANG's TACS would use commercial-off-the-shelf enhanced position location reporting system radios, a laptop-sized computer, and an integrated software package to provide datalink-equipped ground assets with friend or foe track identification when an aircraft's transponder is not operating. This capability would enable ANG TACS participants on the ground to view the entire air battle picture. The committee understands that this system would help prevent battlefield fratricide and notes that the Chief of the Air National Guard has identified the SADL gateway for the ANG's TACS among his unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $19.8 million, an increase of $4.4 million, to initiate a SADL gateway program for the ANG's TACS.

Supply asset tracking system (SATS)

The budget request contained $15.1 million for mechanized material handling equipment but included no funds for SATS.

SATS provides the capability to quickly and accurately identify and locate personnel, equipment and supplies through the use of commercial automated information technology. The committee understands that this system enhances productivity, shortens inventory cycles, and allows real-time inventory updates.

The committee notes that Congress has provided additional funds for SATS installation over the past two years and accordingly, recommends $27.1 million, an increase of $12.0 million, to continue the installation of this system at Air Force bases worldwide.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request contained $2,275.3 million for Procurement, Defense-Wide for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $2,309.1 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
001	MOTOR VEHICLES	-	321			-	321
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	-	64,872			-	64,872
003	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	-	23,191			-	23,191
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				6,000	-	6,000
005	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	11,535			-	11,535
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA					-	-
006	MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECH	-	-			-	-
007	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	-	26,655			-	26,655
008	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	-	3,233			-	3,233
009	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	-	19,399			-	19,399
010	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	-	3,671			-	3,671
011	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	-	5,136			-	5,136
012	STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	-	2,469			-	2,469
013	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	14,429			-	14,429
014	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA					-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA					-	-
016	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-	82,863			-	82,863
016A	AUTOMATED DOCUMENT CONVERSION SYSTEM				40,000		40,000
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS					-	-
017	VEHICLES	-	-			-	-
018	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA					-	-
019	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	-	4,714			-	4,714
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO					-	-
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-			-	-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS					-	-
021	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	28,171			-	28,171
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION					-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
022	PATRIOT PAC-3	40	365,457	8	65,200	48	430,657
	PAC-3 Missiles				[+35,200]		[+35,200]
	Production Line Facilitization				[+30,000]		[+30,000]
023	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	-	74,530			-	74,530
024	C4I	-	3,975			-	3,975
025	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	-	-			-	-
	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY					-	-
	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY					-	-
027	VEHICLES	-	145			-	145
028	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	44,034			-	44,034
	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY					-	-
029	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	656			-	656
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS					-	-
030	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS	-	4,695			-	4,695
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE					-	-
031	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE	-	1,546			-	1,546
	TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT		**785,697**		**111,200**		**896,897**
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
032	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	68,480			-	68,480
033	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	2,364			-	2,364
034	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	10,403			-	10,403
035	CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	4	8,533			4	8,533
036	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	13,871			-	13,871
037	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	26,237			-	26,237
038	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	2,186			-	2,186
	SHIPBUILDING					-	-
039	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	-	33,477			-	33,477
039	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(7,977)			-	(7,977)
040	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	22,472			-	22,472

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
041	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	-	-			-	-
042	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	1,559			-	1,559
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					-	-
043	SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	36,632			-	36,632
044	SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	25,978			-	25,978
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					-	-
045	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	74,444			-	74,444
046	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	32,309		6,000	-	38,309
	PICRC				[+6,000]		[+6,000]
047	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	11,829			-	11,829
048	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	-	909			-	909
049	NAVAL SPC WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	-			-	-
050	SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	-	14,511			-	14,511
051	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	11,780			-	11,780
052	SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	5,801			-	5,801
053	DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-			-	-
054	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	14,376			-	14,376
055	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	2,021			-	2,021
056	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	105,547			-	105,547
057	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	-	7,575			-	7,575
	TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		**525,317**		**6,000**		**531,317**
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
058	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	108,725			-	108,725
059	DECONTAMINATION	-	12,195			-	12,195
060	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	-	141,781			-	141,781

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
061	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	-	36,179			-	36,179
062	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	-	175,056			-	175,056
	TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		**473,936**		**-**		**473,936**
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9	490,358		(83,434)	9	406,924
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**2,275,308**		**33,766**		**2,309,074**

Items of Special Interest

Automated document conversion system (ADCS)

The budget request contained no funds for ADCS.

The committee recognizes that the ADCS program continues to perform a critical role in the attainment of the Department's goal for achieving a digitally integrated, paperless environment by 2002. Although the ADCS is the Department's single most productive program in converting the vast remaining inventories of legacy engineering drawings into more useful computerized formats, the committee understands that, a significant conversion backlog remains in each service.

Therefore, in order to reduce this backlog, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million to continue the ADCS program.

Counternarcotics discreet operations radio (CONDOR)

The budget request contained no funds for the CONDOR, a mobile communications system that allows encrypted as well as non-encrypted transmissions in a single device and includes a net broadcast capability for one-to-many communications similar to handheld radios. CONDOR addresses the Department of Defense's requirement to have secure and net-mode mobile communications in a device that resembles a normal cellular telephone while reducing the Department's need to maintain unique expensive wireless networks.

The committee understands that NSA has procured a small number of these devices; however, additional devices are required. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for additional CONDOR procurement.

Patriot advanced capability 3 (PAC–3)

The budget request contained $365.5 million for acquisition of the PAC–3 system and 40 PAC–3 missiles. The PAC–3 system is the only theater missile defense (TMD) system nearing operational deployment that is capable of defeating current sophisticated ballistic missile threats.

The committee notes that the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization has identified facilitization of the PAC–3 production line and additional procurement of PAC–3 missiles as unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001. The committee believes that additional funds would provide both manufacturing efficiencies prior to full rate production of the PAC–3 as well as inventory growth to meet emerging threats.

Because of the near-term importance of the PAC–3 for TMD, the committee recommends $430.7 million, an increase of $35.2 million for procurement of eight additional PAC–3 missiles and $30.0 million for additional facilitization of the PAC–3 production line.

Portable intelligence collection and relay capability (PICRC)

The budget request contained $32.3 million for special operations forces (SOF) intelligence systems but included no funds for the PICRC.

The PICRC integrates commercial-off-the-shelf mapping and display software, desktop computers, hand-held computing devices, and wireless communications to enable SOF operators to employ high-resolution imagery for precision navigation, annotate real-time visual observations, and relay information to command elements.

The committee understands that this system would significantly enhance SOF capabilities to accurately collect, quickly report, and promptly act upon real-time intelligence data. Consequently, the committee recommends $38.3 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for procurement of PICRC systems.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained no funds for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $877.1 million for fiscal year 2001.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
		QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE						
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
001	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	-		164,200	-	164,200
	Alternative Technologies and Approaches Project				[+135,200]		[+135,200]
	Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Program				[+29,000]		[+29,000]
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC					-	-
	PROCUREMENT					-	-
002	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	-		105,700	-	105,700
	Chemical Stockpile Disposal Project				[+105,100]		[+105,100]
	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Project				[+600]		[+600]
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M					-	-
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					-	-
003	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	-	-		607,200	-	607,200
	Program Manager for Chemical Demilitarization				[+9,400]		[+9,400]
	Chemical Stockpile Disposal Project				[+483,600]		[+483,600]
	Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Project				[+66,700]		[+66,700]
	Non-Stockpile Chemical Materiel Project				[+47,500]		[+47,500]
	TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE		**-**		**877,100**		**877,100**

Items of Special Interest

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

As described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends transferring the budget request of $1,003.5 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army (CAMD, A) to Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (CAMD, D), and recommends a total of $877.1 million for the program.

The committee notes the progress during the last fiscal year in the continuing effort to dispose of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions and of chemical warfare related materiel, while ensuring maximum protection of the public, personnel involved in the destruction and the environment. Nearly 20 percent of the original stockpile of 31,495 tons of chemical agents has been destroyed and 90 percent of the stockpile is under contract for destruction.

The committee continues to be concerned about total cost of the chemical agents and munitions destruction program (currently estimated at $14.9 billion). Section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) included several measures to increase the flexibility of the program with respect to the disposition of chemical stockpile destruction facilities and the destruction of non-stockpile chemical agents, munitions or related materials in these facilities. The provision required the Secretary of Defense to assess the program and report to the Congress by March 1, 2000, the measures taken, or planned to be taken, under existing law and recommendations for additional legislation to reduce significantly program costs and to meet U.S. obligations under the CWC. The section further provided for a review and assessment by the Comptroller General of the United States of program execution and financial management for each element of the program. The committee intends to use these reports as the basis for further review of the program later this year.

The committee continues to believe that, in order to ensure the maximum protection of the public, personnel involved in the destruction of the stockpile, and the environment, the Department should proceed with destruction of the stockpile as rapidly as is technically and programmatically feasible. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense carry out the chemical agents and munitions destruction program in accordance with the following priorities:

Execution of the baseline chemical stockpile disposal project and the alternative technologies project at those sites selected and approved for use of those technologies; and

Preparation for pilot testing of those ACWA technologies which have the greatest likelihood of implementation and, if implemented, of meeting the destruction goals established by the CWC.

Chemical stockpile disposal project

The budget request for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program included $105.1 million in procurement and $483.6 million in operations and maintenance funding for the chemical stockpile disposal project. The committee recommends the budget request for the chemical stockpile disposal project.

Chemical stockpile emergency preparedness project (CSEPP)

The budget request for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program included $600,000 in procurement funds for minor replacement equipment and $66.7 million for CSEPP operations and maintenance.

The committee notes that funds provided for CSEPP in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 were subject to reductions of approximately 9 percent and 8 percent, respectively, as a pro-rata share of reductions to the CAMD, A account. Because of the potential impact of such reductions on the safety of those living and working near or on the chemical stockpile storage and destruction sites, the committee directs that funding for CSEPP shall be at the requested level unless otherwise specifically noted.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a total of $600,000 in CAMD, D–Procurement, and $66.7 million in CAMD, D–Operations and Maintenance, for CSEPP, as a Congressional special interest item.

Alternative technologies and approaches project

The budget request for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program included $135.2 million for development of alternative technologies and approaches for the disposal of bulk chemical agents stored at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and Newport, Indiana. The committee recommends the budget request for the alternative technologies and approaches project.

Non-stockpile chemical materiel project

The budget request for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program included $60.2 million in research and development, $16.2 million in procurement, and $47.5 million in operations and maintenance funds for the non-stockpile chemical materiel project.

The committee notes that the Army has destroyed a large portion of its existing non-stockpile chemical warfare materiel and that approximately 1,400 non-stockpile chemical munitions are currently in storage awaiting destruction. However, because of technical issues, cost increases, and delays in obtaining state permits, program officials are considering alternate disposal methods, including the use of chemical stockpile disposal facilities.

The committee is aware that an independent assessment of the non-stockpile project recommends seeking appropriate environmental permit language to allow destruction of non-stockpile materiel at the chemical stockpile disposal facilities. The assessment also recommends examination of the schedule and cost risks of the non-stockpile project to quantify the potential program risks, ultimate costs, and time to complete the project. The committee believes that these issues must be addressed and serious consideration given to destruction of non-stockpile chemical materiel in stockpile disposal facilities before proceeding further with development and acquisition of integrated transportable treatment systems for non-stockpile chemical materiel.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a total of $47.5 million for the non-stockpile chemical materiel project, a decrease of $60.2 million for non-stockpile chemical materiel project research and de-

velopment and a decrease of $16.2 million for non-stockpile chemical materiel project procurement.

Chemical agent identification sets

The committee notes that approximately 10,000 chemical agent identification sets (CAIS) and components, which were used to train soldiers in defensive responses to a chemical attack, are in storage awaiting destruction, and that the Army's baseline approach for treating and disposing of CAIS has been to develop a mobile treatment system in the non-stockpile chemical materiel project. The committee has reviewed the National Research Council (NRC)'s report "Disposal of Chemical Agent Identification Sets," which evaluates the Army's 1998 report to Congress on alternative approaches for the treatment and disposal of CAIS. The NRC recommends that the Army reconsider its interpretation of CAIS as chemical warfare materiel under section 1512 of Title 50, United States Code, evaluate the technical feasibility of non-incineration technologies for CAIS disposal, insure the active involvement of public and other stakeholder groups CAIS project decision, and consider the potential use of chemical stockpile destruction facilities for CAIS disposal.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Army to address the Council's recommendations in the next annual status report on the disposal of chemical weapons and materiel.

Assembled chemical weapons assessment (ACWA)

The budget request for chemical agents and munitions destruction contains $79.0 million for ACWA research and development, including $50.0 million for engineering design studies for three additional alternative technologies to be demonstrated in accordance with the statement of managers that accompanied the conference report on H.R. 2561 (H. Rept. 106–371).

The committee has reviewed the progress in the ACWA program to identify and demonstrate not less than two alternatives to the baseline incineration process in accordance with Title VIII, section 8065 of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208) and to conduct evaluations of three additional alternative technologies.

The committee notes the NRC's "Review and Evaluation of Alternative Technologies for Demilitarization of Assembled Chemical Weapons" dated August 1999, which concluded that the primary alternative technologies can decompose the chemical agents of concern with the required destruction efficiencies; however, testing, verification, and integration beyond the 1999 demonstration phase would be necessary. The NRC also concluded that an extraordinary commitment of resources would be required to complete destruction of the assembled chemical weapons stockpile (using any of the ACWA technology packages) in time to meet the current deadline established by the CWC.

The committee notes that the NRC's "Supplemental Review," dated March 2000, of the three technologies from the 1999 demonstration concluded that, while the two hydrolysis-based technologies showed promise, none of the technology packages was ready for integrated pilot programming, and the tests were not con-

ducted for a sufficient period of time to demonstrate reliability and long-term operations. The committee notes that the two hydrolysis-based technologies are currently in the engineering design studies phase and that a site-specific Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which includes both the baseline incineration and hydrolysis options, is being submitted for the Pueblo, Colorado, chemical stockpile destruction facility in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). A NEPA record of decision is expected in May 2001, approximately 15 months from the date the EIS was filed.

The committee notes that contract awards for demonstration of the three additional alternative technologies were made in February 2000 and a report to Congress of the results of the demonstration is planned for March 2001. Based on this schedule and noting the concerns raised by the NRC regarding the need for testing, verification, and integration beyond the demonstration phase, the committee believes there is no requirement to begin preliminary engineering design studies for the three additional alternatives during fiscal year 2001.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $29.0 million for ACWA program research and development, a decrease of $50.0 million.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–107—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 2001 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into multiyear procurement (MYP) contracts for the M2A3 Bradley Fighting Vehicle in fiscal year 2001 and the UH–60 Blackhawk and Navy CH–60 Knighthawk utility helicopters, as the Department of the Navy's executive agent, in fiscal year 2002. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of the Army from executing a M2A3 Bradley MYP contract until a successful completion of the vehicle's initial operational test and evaluation and certification by the Secretary to the congressional defense committees that the vehicle met all of its required test parameters.

Section 112—Increase in Limitation on Number of Bunker Defeat Munitions that May be Acquired

This section would amend section 116 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337) to increase the number of bunker defeat munitions that may be acquired by the Army from 6,000 contingency rounds to 8,500 contingency rounds.

Section 113—Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative

This section would modify section 193 of the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–484) by extending the initiative through fiscal year 2002. The provision would also expand the purposes of the ARMS Act beyond the current facilities identified in Section 193 to include the Army manufacturing arsenals. Finally, the provision would modify Section 194 of the ARMS Act to allow the Secretary of the Army to enter into long term facilities use contracts and accept non-monetary consideration in lieu of rental payments for use of facilities. The provision would require that the Secretary of the Army provide a report to the Congressional defense committees by July 1, 2001, on the implementation of the arsenal contracts provided by the ARMS Act authority.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Submarine Force Structure

This section would prohibit the retirement of any Los Angeles class nuclear powered attack submarine with less than 30 years of active commissioned service. This section would also require the President to report to Congress on the submarine force structure required to support the national military strategy and the acquisition and overhaul requirements necessary to achieve and maintain such a force.

Section 122—Virginia Class Submarine Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the procurement of five Virginia class submarines during fiscal years 2003 through 2006.

Section 123—Retention of Configuration of Certain Naval Reserve Frigates

This provision would require the Secretary of the Navy to configure and equip the Naval Reserve FFG–7 Flight I and II frigates remaining in active service with the complete organic weapon system for these vessels as specified in the Navy's Operational Requirements Document and retain these frigates in their current locations.

Section 124—Extension of Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers

This section would authorize an extension of the existing multiyear procurement contract for the DDG–51 destroyer program through fiscal year 2005. The section would authorize the procurement of three ships per year through fiscal year 2001 and the procurement of up to three ships per year from fiscal year 2002 through 2005.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Annual Report on Operational Status of B–2 Bomber

This section would repeal section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–89). This section would further require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on the B–2 bomber that would include assessments related to B–2 capabilities; technologies needed to enhance B–2 capabilities and the adequacy of technology investments to enhance these capabilities; and the consistency of such technology investments with the Air Force bomber roadmap and the report of the 1998 Long Range Airpower panel submitted pursuant to the requirements of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–56).

SUBTITLE E—JOINT PROGRAMS

Section 141—Study of Production Alternatives for the Joint Strike Fighter Program

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress providing the results of a study of production alternatives for the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program and the effects on the tactical fighter aircraft industrial base of each alternative considered.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $37,862.4 million for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), representing a decrease of $426.7 million to the amount provided for fiscal year 2000. The committee recommends $39,309.2 million, an increase of $1,446.8 million from the budget request.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2001 request for RDT&E funding represents the first increase in the budget request for RDT&E funding by the Administration in five years. Although this request approaches the level of funding provided by Congress in recent years, a number of important priorities are identified by the services as unfunded or underfunded. The committee has placed its emphasis on recommending increases to the request, where appropriate, to address the highest unfunded priorities identified by each of the military service chiefs, the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, the Special Operations Command, and other defense agencies prevented by funding constraints from investing in needed advanced technology.

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense continues to place higher priority on the allocation of budgetary resources to research and development activities of some defense agencies than on those of the military services. The committee believes that the Department has not provided sufficient justification to support imbalances in funding levels between the defense agencies and the military services, and, therefore, recommends correcting these imbalances by maintaining funding of several defense agencies at the levels originally projected by the Department for fiscal year 2001 in the budget estimates provided to Congress one year ago.

The budget request contained $7,543.2 million for defense science and technology, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced development. The committee notes that this amount represents a decrease of $853.3 million from the amount provided in fiscal year 2000. As outlined elsewhere in this report, the committee continues to be disturbed by the growing number of military service research and development programs that have been reduced or eliminated as a result of insufficient research and development funding, and is particularly concerned with the low level of science and technology funding. The committee views defense science and technology investment as critical to maintaining U.S. military technological superiority in the face of growing and changing threats to national security interests around the world.

While the budget request for RDT&E activities represents a significant reversal in the five-year trend of decline experienced by the services, the committee believes that many important programs have already experienced unnecessary cost and schedule growth as a direct result of unjustified funding constraints. The committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of Defense thoroughly review the Department's modernization investment strategy to ensure proper balance between the services and defense-wide agencies, and between legacy systems and the technological advances critical to the future superiority of the nation's military forces.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	**5,260,346**	**239,900**	**5,500,246**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,198,200	155,700	4,353,900
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,062,146	84,200	1,146,346
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	**8,476,677**	**357,800**	**8,834,477**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,192,324	232,900	6,425,224
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,284,353	124,900	2,409,253
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	**13,685,576**	**(8,468)**	**13,677,108**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,401,999	(261,368)	10,140,631
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,283,577	252,900	3,536,477
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSEWIDE	**10,238,242**	**839,521**	**11,077,763**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,189,744	839,521	10,029,265
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,048,498	0	1,048,498
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVALUATION DEFENSE	**0**	**0**	**0**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	**201,560**	**18,000**	**219,560**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	201,560	18,000	219,560
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	0	0	0
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVALUATION	**37,862,401**	**1,446,753**	**39,309,154**
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	**30,183,827**	**984,753**	**31,168,580**
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	**7,678,574**	**462,000**	**8,140,574**

ARMY RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $5,260.3 million for Army RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $5,500.2 million, an increase of $239.9 million.

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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,459		14,459
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	132,164		132,164
0601104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	54,365		54,365
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	200,988	-	200,988
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	200,988	-	200,988
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE	-		-
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	11,557		11,557
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	20,722	4,000	24,722
		Passive Millimeter Wave Camera			[+4,000]
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	7,226		7,226
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	31,080	2,000	33,080
		Future Rotorcraft Technology			[+2,000]
0602270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	17,310		17,310
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	47,183	5,000	52,183
		Hypersonic Wind Tunnel			[+1,000]
		IMU-GPS			[+4,000]
0602307A	11	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	993	10,000	10,993
		Solid State Laser Development			[+10,000]
0602308A	12	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	30,479		30,479
0602601A	13	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	63,589		63,589
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		23,869
		Bi-polar Wafer Cell Nickel-Metal Hydride Technology			[1,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602709A	19	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,465	5,000	25,465
		Combustion-Driven Eye Safe Self Powered Laser			[+5,000]
0602712A	20	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	12,386		12,386
0602716A	21	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	15,786	3,700	19,486
		Medical Errors Reduction Research			[+3,700]
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		42,344
0602785A	26	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	11,869		11,869
0602786A	27	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	24,659		24,659
0602787A	28	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,729	10,000	85,729
		Real Time Heart Rate Variability			[+5,000]
		Volumetrically Controlled Manufacturing Technology			[+5,000]
0602789A	29	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,338		1,338
0602805A	30	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,154		10,154
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	602,489	39,700	642,189
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	602,489	39,700	642,189
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603001A	31	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,469		15,469
0603002A	32	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,512		16512
0603003A	33	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,810		28,810
0603004A	34	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,738	7,500	37,238
		Trajectory Correctable Munitions			[+7,500]
0603005A	35	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	148,114	49,000	197,114
		Future Combat System			[+46,000]
		National Automotive Center - University Innovative Research			[+3,000]
0603006A	36	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,505		21,505
0603007A	37	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,072	3,000	6,072
		Aircrew Coordination Training			[+3,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603009A	38	TRACTOR HIKE	12,217		12,217
0603013A	39	TRACTOR DIRT	-		-
0603017A	40	TRACTOR RED	984		984
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 DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHNOLOGY DEMONST	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	3,800	37,141
		Helmet Mounted Infrared Sensor			[+3,800]
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 AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	15,613		15,613
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	490,905	63,300	554,205
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	490,905	63,300	554,205
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603308A	56	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,573	5,000	17,573
		Mobile Tactical High Energy Laser			[+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	1,500	15,074
		Thermal Fluid Based Combat Feeding System			[+1,500]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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 SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	13,753		13,753
0603807A	69	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	15,259		15,259
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	-		-
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	661,451	6,500	667,951
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	661,451	6,500	667,951
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
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		61,056
0604280A	78	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	62,218		62,218
0604321A	79	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	44,084		44,084
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	-	59,600	59,600
		Breacher			[+59,600]
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) - ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	20,689		20,689
0604766A	102	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	57,419	3,000	60,419
		Semi-Automated Imagery Processor			[+3,000]
0604768A	103	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	96,102		96,102
0604770A	104	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	17,898	(3,900)	13,998
		Common Ground Station			[-7,900]
		Surveillance Control Data Link (SCDL)			[+4,000]
0604778A	105	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	2,420		2,420
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	3,500	26,005
		Multi Purpose Individual Munition			[+3,500]
0604804A	109	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,457		20,457
0604805A	110	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	49,316	13,000	62,316
		Communications and Networking Technologies			[+13,000]
0604807A	111	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	6,318	4,000	10,318
		Life Support for Trauma and Transport			[+4,000]
0604808A	112	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	69,584		69,584
0604814A	113	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	52,848		52,848

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604817A	114	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	5,362	5,000	10,362
		Combat Identification Dismounted Solider			[+5,000]
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
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,770,357	84,200	1,854,557
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	708,211	-	708,211
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,062,146	84,200	1,146,346
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256A	122	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,901		13,901
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
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	5,000	19,521
		High-Energy Laser Test Facility			[+5,000]
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	-		0
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	-		-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	696,943	5,000	701,943
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	696,943	5,000	701,943
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0603778A	152	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,523		59,523
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,996		24,996
0203610A	154	DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION	-	3,000	3,000
		Emergency Preparedness Training			[+3,000]
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	20,400	116,229
		Apache Longbow Focused Modernization Program			[+18,400]
		Guardrail Common Sensor			[+2,000]
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 PROGRAM	6,021		6,021

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	3,800	11,940
		Land Information Warfare Activity			[+3,800]
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	4,000	33,427
		Army Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles PIP			[+4,000]
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	10,000	67,906
		ManTech			[+10,000]
1001018A	179	NATO JOINT STARS	-		-
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	837,213	41,200	878,413
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	837,213	41,200	878,413
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, ARMY	5,260,346	239,900	5,500,246
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,198,200	155,700	4,353,900
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,062,146	84,200	1,146,346

Items of Special Interest

Advanced artillery systems

The budget request contained $355.3 million in PE 63854A for artillery systems, and $23.2 million in PE 63635M for ground combat support systems, including $12.1 million for the lightweight 155mm towed howitzer.

The committee notes that the Army and Marine Corps have identified a need for lighter, more lethal, more mobile, and strategically more deployable artillery systems to support their complementary forces. The committee further notes the joint Army-Marine Corps program with the United Kingdom to develop a new lightweight 155mm towed howitzer as a replacement for the aging and operationally deficient M198 towed howitzer for both the Marine Corps and the Army. The committee is aware that the lightweight 155mm towed howitzer has already been successfully transported by the MV–22 Osprey to demonstrate its ability to be rapidly transported on the battlefield. The committee notes that the lightweight 155mm howitzer will incorporate a modern fire-control system, not available in the M198, which will allow the howitzer to be emplaced within two minutes, and immediately fired with greatly increased accuracy.

The committee also notes the Army's highest priority effort, the procurement of a medium weight brigade force and supports this effort to develop a capability to rapidly and appropriately respond to global threats. The Army has confirmed a requirement for a highly capable fire support for this new force but must rely initially on the towed M198 howitzer until the lightweight 155mm development is complete.

The committee supports the rapid fielding of the lightweight 155mm towed howitzer for both the new Army medium weight brigades and for the Marine Corps, and is aware that the Marine Corps has stated a need to conduct additional testing with the United Kingdom and the Army to address at-sea environment concerns. The committee recommends an increase of $3.2 million in PE 63635M for the lightweight 155mm howitzer.

The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army expedite development of the fire control system for the lightweight 155mm towed howitzer, within available funds, so that it will be incorporated from the beginning of lightweight 155mm production.

Advanced battery technology

The budget request contained $23.9 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices.

The committee notes that the Army and other services have identified a steady growth in requirements for affordable higher performance energy storage devices. The committee also notes that industrial development efforts are maturing a wide array of new battery technologies, including bi-polar wafer cell nickel-metal hydride technology. This emerging power supply technology offers significant improvements in storage/weight and discharge characteristics that are needed to meet emerging defense needs.

The committee notes that the Army is the designated executive agent for development of power supply technologies and rec-

ommends $23.9 million in PE 62705A for electronics and electronic devices, of which $1.0 million shall be available for development of bi-polar wafer cell nickel-metal hydride technology.

Aircrew coordination training

The budget request contained $3.1 million in PE 63007A for manpower, personnel, and training, but included no funding for aircrew coordination training (ACT).

The committee notes with concern the adverse trend in the Army aviation safety record and strongly supports efforts such as the ACT program to enhance flight safety. The committee recommends $6.1 million in PE 63007A, an increase of $3.0 million for aircrew coordination training.

Apache Longbow focused modernization program

The budget request contained $95.8 million in PE 23744A for aircraft modification and product improvement, but included no funds for a focused Apache Longbow modernization program.

The committee is aware that despite the significant capability of the Apache Longbow, some component systems within the Apache fleet have not been modernized as part of the Longbow program. Several of these systems, based on older technology, are responsible for escalating operation and maintenance costs, and reduced overall aircraft performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $18.4 million in PE 23744A for a focused Apache Longbow modernization effort as part of the Army's aviation modernization program.

Army tactical unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $29.4 million in PE 35204A for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAV).

The committee notes that the Army just completed a successful competitive selection for an off-the-shelf TUAV. The committee notes that the Army will place increasing reliance on its TUAV and needs to field the best possible system including sensors.

The committee recommends $33.4 million in PE 35204A, an increase of $4.0 million for preplanned product improvements and sensor development.

Breacher system

The budget request contained no funds in PE 64649A or for the procurement of the Breacher system.

The Breacher, an M–1 Abrams tank chassis-based vehicle, will be used by combat engineers to clear minefields and complex obstacles on the forward edge of the battlefield. This vehicle is designed to replace several other existing breaching systems and provides increased capability to maneuver with the armor forces it supports.

Although the committee understands that the Breacher was terminated to fund Army transformation priorities, the committee notes that this system is the second highest unfunded modernization requirement identified by the Army Chief of Staff in fiscal year 2001.

The committee believes that termination of the Breacher was shortsighted, and therefore recommends an increase of $59.6 mil-

lion in PE 64649A to complete engineering and manufacturing development and $20.0 million in procurement to begin production line facilitization.

Chinook helicopter modification and improvement

The budget request contained $95.8 million in PE 23744A for aircraft modification and product improvement programs, including $37.2 million for other CH–47F Chinook improved cargo helicopter (ICH), but included no funds for the CH–47D Chinook helicopter product improvements.

The committee notes that the CH–47F Chinook improved cargo helicopter program will upgrade engines, airframe and avionics of approximately 300 CH–47D Chinook helicopters. The committee is aware that the Army plans to protect helicopters, including the ICH, from the serious threat posed by infrared guided missiles by acquiring the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures/Common Missile Warning System (ATIRCM/CMWS) that includes portions of the existing joint service ALE–47 programmable countermeasure dispenser. However, the committee is aware that the ATIRCM/CMWS development is delayed and the system may not be available for several years. The committee believes it is unsatisfactory for the Army to delay procurement of the proven ALE–47 countermeasure system while awaiting ATIRCM/CMWS.

Therefore, the committee directs the Army to include the ALE–47 programmable countermeasure dispensers as part of the ICH program. The committee supports the ICH program; however, the committee also notes that many CH–47D models require additional product improvement to address aging and part obsolescence issues that threaten near-term flight worthiness. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to assess the need to establish a funded Chinook product improvement program and report the results of the assessment including levels of funding required to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Comanche

The budget request contained $614.0 million in PE 64223A for Comanche.

The committee notes that the Comanche remains the Army's highest aviation modernization priority, and that the Secretary of the Army has requested an additional $48.2 million over last year's forecast in order to accelerate Comanche development. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has recently reviewed the Comanche program and determined that the program has successfully achieved all program exit criteria required before entry into engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). The committee is aware, however, that final approval for EMD is pending while the Army assesses out-year acquisition funding for Comanche.

The committee supports Comanche and strongly endorses the commitment made by the Army to accelerate this program. While total out-year procurement for major programs is an important issue, the committee believes the Army has made every effort to accelerate this program within the inadequate modernization funding

allowed by the Department of Defense, and strongly recommends that the Secretary of Defense grant immediate approval for Comanche's entry into EMD. This program represents the only viable solution to meet the requirement for a stealthy, rapidly deployable, and highly capable armed reconnaissance aircraft to support the Army's recently approved aviation modernization plan. The committee believes the requirement and the urgency for the Comanche has been more than adequately justified and entry into the EMD phase of the program should not be delayed pending discussions of the total planned procurement or annual rate.

The committee recommends the budget request, and supports earliest possible entry into EMD.

Combat identification dismounted soldier (CIDDS)

The budget request contained $5.4 million in PE 64817A for CIDDS.

The committee is aware that CIDDS will allow an individual soldier to identify quickly friendly forces and thus reduce the incidence of fratricide.

The committee continues to support strongly all efforts to reduce fratricide and, therefore, to enhance the capability of the dismounted soldier to positively identify a target as friend or foe, recommends $10.4 million in PE 64817A, an increase of $5.0 million.

Combustion-driven eye-safe self-powered laser

The budget request contained $20.5 million in PE 62709A for night vision technology, but included no funds for the combustion-driven eye-safe self-powered laser.

The committee notes that the combustion-driven eye-safe self-powered laser offers the potential to field a three-dimensional identification friend or foe system capable of identifying aircraft and vehicle threat systems in real-time.

The committee recommends $25.5 million in PE 62709A, an increase of $5.0 million for the combustion-driven eye-safe self-powered laser.

Common ground station

The budget request contained $17.9 million in PE 64770A for continued development of the Army's Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) Common Ground Station, including $2.0 million to develop the Army's Distributed Common Ground Station (DCGS-A). The budget request also contained $5.9 million for development of a wide-band data link to provide connectivity to the Joint STARS next generation capability.

The committee notes that the DCGS–A effort duplicates that being conducted within the Army's Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities program. Further, the committee notes that the Air Force has not determined the next generation Joint STARS data link and will not do so until at least fiscal year 2002. Therefore, the committee believes it premature for the Army to begin design or development work for such communications connectivity.

For these reasons, the committee recommends a decrease of $7.9 million in this PE 64770A to the DCGS–A program.

Communications and networking technologies

The budget request contained $49.3 million in PE 64805A for communications, command and control engineering and manufacturing development.

The committee notes that communications and networking technologies are critical to command and control, precision strike, intelligence dissemination, logistics and day-to-day business operations throughout the joint commands, military services and supporting defense agencies. The committee recognizes that the most advanced technological developments in these areas are emerging from commercial industry and are driven by the rapid evolution of the commercial markets. The committee believes that the Department must capitalize on the rapid progress being made in the commercial sector and identify, assess, adapt and integrate state-of-the-art commercial communications and networking technologies to achieve the goal of Information Superiority established by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Joint Vision 2010. The committee also believes that there are significant gains to be made by leveraging information technology developments from the commercial sector for the benefit of government users, through cooperative research and development of technologies that promise significant gains in both civil and military capabilities, and through training government personnel in these rapidly evolving technologies.

Therefore, the committee recommends $62.3 million in PE 64805A, an increase of $13.0 million to accelerate on-going programs for the development and application of commercial information technologies for defense purposes and to foster cooperative and complementary information technology research and development programs. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Army work with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence) to insure the applicability of the increased program to the overall Defense communications architecture.

Defense manufacturing technology

The budget request contained a total of $149.1 million for the manufacturing technology (ManTech) program, including $29.3 million in PE 78045A, $59.6 million in PE 78011N, $53.1 million in PE 78011F, and $7.1 million in PE 78011S.

The committee notes the progress by the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel (JDMTP) in developing an overarching strategy for the ManTech program that focuses on defense-essential requirements, involves prospective users of the technology, ensures prioritization of projects, and plans for transition of ManTech projects to the ultimate user of the technology. The committee also notes the progress toward achieving congressional guidelines on program funding levels, particularly in the Army. The total budget request for Department of Defense ManTech represents an increase of $16.0 million above the previous year, and the five-year ManTech plan projects an 11 percent increase through fiscal year 2005, with the Army program increasing $71.2 million and stable budget projections for the Navy, Air Force, and Defense Logistics

Agency. The positive funding trend will permit the establishment of new ManTech initiatives in critical defense technologies.

The committee notes the increasing use of thick composite structures in rotary wing aircraft and other applications by all the military departments and encourages increased emphasis on the development of advanced manufacturing technologies for such composite structures.

The committee supports a continuing program in munitions manufacturing technology and expects that munitions manufacturing technology projects will compete for funding on an equal basis with other manufacturing technologies.

The committee also notes that the Army, Navy, and Air Force are developing methods to accelerate insertion of emerging microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) technology into tactical systems to meet precision navigation and guidance requirements. The objective of the initiative is to develop and demonstrate low cost manufacturing processes for emerging MEMS technologies that will enable the production of affordable MEMS-based inertial sensors, accelerometers and gyroscopes for tactical weapons. The committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to establish a Tri-Service initiative for the development of affordable MEMS manufacturing technology, and recommends that the funding for the program be provided in the Army's ManTech program.

The committee recommends $39.3 million in PE 78045A for the Army's manufacturing technology program, an increase of $ 10.0 million. The committee recommends $69.6 million in PE 78011N, an increase of $10.0 million for the Navy's ManTech program. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee has recommended an increase of $4.5 million in PE 78011F for the development of manufacturing technology for specialty aerospace metals.

Emergency preparedness training

The budget request contained no funds for emergency preparedness training research and development.

The committee notes the progress in development of advanced distributed learning programs for chemical and biological preparedness and consequence management response training for the Army's designated Civil Support Teams and other elements of the Reserve Components.

The committee recommends a $3.0 million in PE 23610A to continue the development for selected Reserve Component forces of training programs for response to and management of the consequences of potential terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction.

Future combat system

The budget request contained $148.1 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology, including funding for efforts supporting the future combat system (FCS).

The committee is aware that the Army has begun the process, through the FCS initiative, to transform the Army into a more strategically responsive force that is dominant at every point across the full spectrum of operations. The committee notes that the cornerstone of this aggressive transformation effort would begin in fis-

cal year 2001 with the partnership between the Army and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to incorporate the most promising, new, reaching technologies into a family of future combat systems.

The committee notes that, while DARPA has ongoing work in many technology areas, these efforts have not been focused on solving Army identified problems or advancing technologies applicable to the future combat system. The committee believes that DARPA should dedicate more funding to the Army FCS program and other high priority requirements identified by the services.

The committee strongly supports the future combat system development and notes that there is an urgent requirement to provide additional funding at the program onset to allow a more inclusive and robust concept definition phase that will enable as many participants as possible to explore innovative solutions for the future combat system. The committee is also aware that additional efforts focused on technology development in the areas such as robotics, precision weapons, active protection and signature control are needed.

Therefore the committee recommends an increase of $46.0 million in PE 63005A for the future combat system.

The committee notes that the joint United States-United Kingdom Future Scout and Cavalry System (FSCS) program is developing leap-ahead technology for future ground systems. Both nations are contributing funding and technology to a program regarded as an excellent example of cooperation between allies and the Army has indicated that it needs the technology from FSCS to support development of the Future Combat System.

The committee is disturbed by the Army's elimination of funding for the FSCS engineering manufacturing development phase. The committee believes that the FSCS is an essential collaborative program that should continue in order to develop and demonstrate key technologies on which to build the family of future combat vehicles. The committee believes that industry should be encouraged to continue its significant private venture funding and that will only occur if the FSCS consortia can identify a firm connection between FSCS and FCS. The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Army to report to the congressional defense committees on how the Army will sustain the joint FSCS program to develop and demonstrate key technologies applicable to the future family of combat systems, no later than December 31, 2000.

Future rotorcraft technologies

The budget request contained $31.1 million in PE 62211A for aviation advanced technology, but included no funds to support the initiative to focus technology for the future generation of rotorcraft.

The committee notes that despite a clear need for modern, efficient, capable rotorcraft, no focused program exists to develop the enabling technologies for more efficient, affordable rotorcraft in the future.

The committee recommends $33.1 million in PE 62211A, an increase of $2.0 million for future rotorcraft technologies and directs the Secretary of the Army to establish a focused program to develop technologies critical for the future rotorcraft.

Guardrail common sensor

The budget request contained $95.8 million in PE 23744A for aircraft modifications and product improvement programs, including $11.3 million for continued development and modification of the Army's Guardrail Common Sensor aircraft and ground stations.

The committee notes that the Guardrail System 2 was recently delivered to the Army after nearly ten years of modification. Unfortunately, this system was returned without upgrades to permit the dissemination of tactical intelligence information via the Tactical Information Broadcast Service (TIBS). TIBS is the baseline for the Integrated Broadcast Service that is the DOD-mandated worldwide tactical intelligence dissemination service.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 23744A to install the TIBS capability in the final Guardrail system.

Helmet mounted infrared sensor development

The budget request contained $33.3 million in PE 63710A for night vision technology.

The committee is aware that the Army has initiated development of a prototype helmet mounted infrared sensor system to support the warfighter that has been demonstrated to significantly improve situational awareness in all weather/environmental conditions. This technology has direct applicability to Department of Defense and civilian firefighting personnel and increases safety and effectiveness for firefighting in smoke filled environments as well as for search and rescue.

The committee recommends $37.1 million in PE 63710A, an increase of $3.8 million for helmet mounted infrared sensor development.

High-energy laser test facility

The budget request contained $14.5 million in PE 65605A for the Department of Defense (DOD) high-energy laser system test facility (HELSTF).

The committee notes the recent release of the congressionally directed DOD high-energy laser master plan and identification of a need for increased investment in solid-state laser technology. The committee is aware that HELSTF has contributed significantly to the development of high-power lasers, and will continue to provide unique capabilities for research, development, test and evaluation of high-power laser systems.

The committee supports the DOD high-energy laser master plan and the selection of the Army as lead in solid-state laser development and recommends $19.5 million in PE 65605A, an increase of $5.0 million for HELSTF.

Hypersonic wind tunnels

The budget request contained $47.2 million in PE 62303A for missile technology, but included no funds for modernization of the hypersonic wind tunnels at the Aero-optics Evaluation Center (AOEC)

The committee notes that upgrading the hypersonic wind tunnel diagnostics and instrumentation will provide enhanced testing ca-

pabilities for key ballistic missile defense programs, including Navy Area Defense, the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology project, and the Army's scramjet technology program.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62303A to upgrade hypersonic wind tunnels.

Integrated inertial measurement unit-geo-positioning system

The budget request contained $47.2 million in PE 62303A for missile technology, including funds for integrated guidance systems.

The committee notes that the development of a highly integrated, jam-proof, micro-electromechanical systems (MEMS) based inertial measuring unit-geo positioning system (IMU–GPS) is critical to achieving the goal of affordable precision fire and forget weapons. The most demanding application for this capability is the 155mm projectile for Army and Navy applications. The committee is aware that: (1) recent Army flight tests have demonstrated significant progress and shown that the goal is achievable and (2) a development plan has been established to produce a suitable system in approximately three years. The committee further notes that this program also offers potentially significant cost growth and technical problem solutions to Navy fire support programs, and the use of IMU–GPS systems by both the Army and Navy could result in billions of dollars of savings for the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62303A for continued development of an integrated IMU-GPS.

Land information warfare activity

The budget request contained $8.1 million in PE 33140A for the information systems security program.

The committee notes that the Army's land information warfare activity (LIWA) continues to develop a state-of-the-art capability for information security and analysis, and that the Department of Defense (DOD) has recently acknowledged the importance of this new capability to DOD information assurance efforts.

The committee supports the Department of Defense efforts to establish such capability, and supports completion of the LIWA, including tests of that capability for Army and other entities to ensure that this potential capability is thoroughly evaluated.

Therefore, the committee recommends $11.9 million, an increase of $3.8 million in PE 33140A for continued development and enhancement of the Army's land information warfare activity.

Medical errors reduction research

The budget request contained $15.8 million in PE 62716A for human factors engineering technology, but included no funds for the medical errors reduction research program (MERRP).

The committee notes that MEERP is an extension of the previous emergency teams coordination (MEDTEAMS) program to reduce medical errors in operating rooms, intensive care units and other hospital activities and will expand that effort from the emergency department to advanced life support protocols.

The committee recommends $19.5 million in PE 62716A, an increase of $3.7 million for MERRP.

Mobile tactical high energy laser

The budget request contained $12.6 million in PE 63308A for Army missile defense systems, but included no funds for mobile tactical high energy laser development.

The committee is aware that the Army has determined a need for a mobile directed energy air defense system. The committee understands that one alternate being explored is the evolution of the stationary tactical high energy laser (THEL) being developed for Israel. A mobile THEL for the U.S. Army would require further development of key elements such as solid-state laser development, compact power sources, and a lightweight acquisition, tracking and beam direction system.

The committee recommends $17.6 million in PE 63308A, an increase of $5.0 million for mobile tactical high energy laser development.

National automotive center-university innovative research

The budget request contained $148.1 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advanced technology.

The committee is aware that the national automotive center (NAC) has supported efforts by various universities to perform research in a number of innovative technologies to solve current ground vehicle problems and pioneer a new generation of lighter, more efficient ground vehicles. Areas of innovation include propulsion and power sources, ultra lightweight structures and advanced materials, supported by innovative modeling and simulation.

The committee supports efforts of the NAC to take advantage of university expertise and recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63005A for NAC-university innovative research.

Passive millimeter wave camera

The budget request contained $20.7 million in PE 62120A for sensors and electronic survivability, but included no funds for the passive millimeter wave camera.

The committee is aware that passive millimeter wave camera technology offers a weather-penetrating alternative to shorter wavelength infrared thermal imaging cameras.

The committee recommends $24.7 million in PE 62120A, an increase of $4.0 million for passive millimeter wave camera development.

Real-time heart rate variability

The budget request contained $75.7 million in PE 62787A for medical technology, but included no funds for real-time heart rate variability.

The committee notes that heart rate variability technology offers the potential for enhancing assessment of disease and trauma. This technology provides the capability for emergency response personnel in trauma environments to detect injury severity, physiological stress and potential for survival.

The committee supports development of real-time heart rate variability technology to enhance trauma victim survivability, and recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62787A for real-time heart rate variability technology.

Semi-automated imagery processor

The budget request contained $57.4 million in PE 64766A for Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities, including development of the semi-automated imagery processor (SAIP).

The SAIP will provide the Department's limited number of imagery analysts with an automated target recognition assistance capability, which will greatly improve their productivity. Accordingly, the committee recommends $60.4 million in PE 64766A, an increase of $3.0 million, for continued development and fielding of the SAIP.

Starstreak

The budget request contained $28.8 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology, but included no funds to complete flight test of the Starstreak missile.

The committee continues to support the requirement for Starstreak testing mandated by in the Defense Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–262) that required an Apache Longbow side-by-side test between the Starstreak missile and the Stinger missile. The committee notes the Army has announced its intention to begin the tests and that the Ministry of Defense of the United Kingdom is providing the Starstreak missiles for testing.

The committee recommends $28.8 million in PE 63003A, the budget request, and recommends initiation of the planned side-by-side testing.

Surveillance control data link (SCDL)

The budget request contained $17.9 million in PE 64770A for improvements to the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) ground stations, but no funds were included for the Joint STARS SCDL System Improvement Program (SIP).

The committee notes the proven success of the Joint STARS system in both Operations Desert Storm and Joint Endeavor. A key feature of Joint STARS is the secure, encrypted, anti-jam SCDL. The SCDL links the Air Force's E–8 Joint STARS aircraft to the Army's Joint STARS common ground stations (CGS), enabling real-time data transfer of radar imagery intelligence data and command and control information between the aircraft and ground stations.

The committee has provided increases for phases one and two of the three-phrase SIP in prior years. These phases eliminated CGS common data terminal (CDT) obsolete parts and updated older circuit boards with state-of-the-art, software-based array boards, resulting in an increased data transfer rate while reducing component cost, size, weight, and power requirements. The committee understands that the Army requires funds to complete phase three of the SCDL SIP, which would further improve interoperability through performance testing of the CDT.

Based on the increased reliability and improved performance of earlier SIP upgrades, the committee recommends an increase of

$4.0 million in PE 64770A to complete the SCDL SIP phase three engineering effort.

Thermal fluid based combat feeding system

The budget request contained $13.6 million in PE 63747A for soldier support and survivability, and included $3.4 million for food and food systems.

The committee notes that a modern central heat unit co-generation kitchen has been developed to replace the existing field kitchen. The committee is aware that this kitchen uses diesel type fuel rather than the more flammable gasoline that has been the primary source of the longstanding fire hazards in existing field kitchens.

The committee supports rapid introduction of this modern, safer kitchen, and recommends $15.1 million in PE 63747A, an increase of $1.5 million for fabrication and field testing of the thermal fluid based combat feeding system.

Trajectory correctable munitions

The budget request contained $29.7 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology.

The committee notes that the United States and Sweden have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to demonstrate a 155mm trajectory correctable munition (TCM), which employs a new technology to achieve precision indirect fire support. The committee also notes that development of this munition is on schedule and recent firing tests have successfully demonstrated achievement of key milestones.

The committee recommends $37.2 million in PE 63004A, an increase of $7.5 million, and urges the Department of Defense to complete testing of the TCM round.

Volumetrically controlled manufacturing technology

The budget request contained $75.7 million in PE 62787A for medical technology applied research.

The committee recalls that the Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 105–56) provided $2.5 million in PE 62787A for the development of a prototype artificial hip using multidimensional, volumetrically controlled manufacturing of synthetic materials. The appropriation supported the first phase of a two-year, two-phase project to develop an optimized hip stem for orthopedic implants that would address the structural failure of implants in current use.

In the statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on S. 1059 (H. Rept. 106–301), the conferees stated that they were encouraged by the progress made in the program at the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command and the establishment of a mathematical foundation for advancing synthetic material development from two-dimensional processes to real-time, three-dimensional manufacturing. The process has the potential to eliminate the current mode of failure of conventional composite materials, namely delamination and polymer-fiber interface breakdown, and has potential applications in aerospace and other manufacturing.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62787A to continue the program for development of multi-dimensional volumetrically controlled manufacturing technology at the U.S. Army Medical Research and Material Command.

NAVY RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $8,476.7 million for Navy RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $8,834.5 million, an increase of $357.8 million.

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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601152N	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,343		16,343
0601153N	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	381,139	750	381,889
		Marine Mammal Research			[+750]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	397,482	750	398,232
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	397,482	750	398,232
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602111N	3	AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,966	10,500	48,466
		Free Electron Laser			[+5,000]
		Integrated Semiconductor Bridge Based Fuze			[+1,500]
		Propulsion Development			[+4,000]
0602121N	4	SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	44,563		44,563
0602122N	5	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	21,057	2,000	23,057
		New Composite Materials for Aircraft Canopies			[+2,000]
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	9,793		9,793
0602228N	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)	-		-
0602232N	8	COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELLIGENCE, SURVEIL.	79,905	10,500	90,405
		Hybrid Fiberoptic/Wireless Communications Technology			[+2,500]
		Hyperspectral Research			[+5,000]
		Optically Multiplexed Wideband Radar Beam-Forming Array			[+3,000]
0602233N	9	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,939		30,939
0602234N	10	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	68,076	10,000	78,076
		Intermediate Modulus Carbon Fiber			[+2,000]
		Silicon Carbide and Gallium Nitride Semiconductor Substrates			[+5,000]
		Single Flux Quantum Electronics			[+3,000]
		Vacuum Electronics			[10,000]
0602270N	11	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,043	3,000	29,043
		High Performance Sigma-Delta Waveform Generator			[+3,000]
0602314N	12	UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	52,488		52,488

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602315N	13	MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	50,864		50,864
0602435N	14	OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,320	8,000	68,320
		Advanced Sensors for Mine Countermeasures and Oceanography			[+6,000]
		Distributed Marine Environment Forecast System			[+2,000]
0602633N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	35,028		35,028
0602805N	16	DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,067		10,067
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	527,109	44,000	571,109
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	527,109	44,000	571,109
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,667	9,500	49,167
		DP-2 Thrust Vectoring System Proof of Concept Demonstration			[+9,500]
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	11,800	49,232
		Power Node Control Centers			[+3,000]
		Project M			[+3,000]
		Ship Service Fuel Cell Program			[+2,800]
		Virtual Testbed for Advanced Electrical Ship Systems			[+3,000]
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	54,749	1,000	55,749
		Remote Precision Gun			[+1,000]
0603706N	22	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	10,110	3,000	13,110
		Increase			[+3,000]
		Malaria DNA Vaccine			[1,500]
		Occupational Lung Disease			[500]
0603707N	23	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	26,988		26,988
0603712N	24	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,002		24,002
0603727N	25	NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	49,506		49,506
0603747N	26	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	58,296		58,296
0603782N	27	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,618		45,618

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603792N	28	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	76,333	25,000	101,333
		Littoral Support Fast Patrol Craft			[+22,000]
		Hybrid Light Detection and Ranging LIDAR			[+3,000]
		Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller			[11,300]
0603794N	29	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,673		29,673
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	538,512	50,300	588,812
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	538,512	50,300	588,812
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603207N	30	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,337		30,337
0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	7,536	4,500	12,036
		Aircraft Survivability Study			[+500]
		Flight Worthy Transparent Armor System			[+2,000]
		Lightweight Environmentally Sealed Parachute Assembly (LESPA)			[+2,000]
0603254N	32	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,680	5,000	24,680
		Beartrap			[+5,000]
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	5,500	103,429
		Synthetic Aperture Sonar Development			[+5,500]
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	-	8,400	8,400
		Surface Ship Torpedo Defense			[+8,400]
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	148,952		148,952
		CVNX Aircraft Carrier Design Product Model			[5,000]
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	244,437	(6,000)	238,437
		Decrease			[-3,000]
		Decrease			[-3,000]
0603525N	40	PILOT FISH	107,598		107,598
0603526N	41	ADVANCED SOFTWARE AND COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603527N	42	RETRACT LARCH	11,895		11,895

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603536N	43	RETRACT JUNIPER	-		-
0603542N	44	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	572		572
0603553N	45	SURFACE ASW	6,752		6,752
0603559N	46	SSGN CONVERSION	34,762		34,762
0603561N	47	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	113,269	10,200	123,469
		Common Towed Array			[+10,200]
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	(3,000)	43,896
		Decrease			[-3,000]
0603570N	51	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	168,483		168,483
0603573N	52	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,635		5,635
0603576N	53	CHALK EAGLE	64,770		64,770
0603582N	54	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,966		32,966
0603609N	55	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	28,619	5,000	33,619
		Optical Correlation Technology for Automatic Target Recognition			[+5,000]
0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	137,981	27,500	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	20,500	43,716
		High Mobility Artillery Rocket System			[+17,300]
		Lightweight 155			[+3,200]
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	1,750	63,944
		Aviation Depot Maintenance Technology			[+1,750]
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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		143,044
		ERGM			[39,100]
0603800N	75	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	131,566		131,566
0603851M	76	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,580		23,580
0603857N	77	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCIET)	13,110		13,110
0603889N	78	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	-		-
0604327N	79	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	-		-
0604707N	80	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPOR	34,100		34,100
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	2,229,666	79,350	2,309,016
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,068,469	31,350	2,099,819
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	161,197	48,000	209,197
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	-		-
0604212N	82	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	24,393		24,393
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		69,946
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	455	12,000	12,455
		Surveillance System Upgrade			[+12,000]
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,051		6,051
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,906	4,900	7,806
		Advanced Concept Systems Development			[+3,000]
		New Electrical System			[+1,900]
0604231N	89	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	57,817		57,817
0604245N	90	H-1 UPGRADES	139,680		139,680

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	8,000	25,466
		Integrated Aviation Life Support Systems			[+8,000]
0604270N	94	EW DEVELOPMENT	97,281	6,000	103,281
		Location of Global Positioning Jammers			[+6,000]
0604300N	95	SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	305,274		305,274
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	17,000	64,312
		AN/AQS-20/X Mine Hunting Sonar			[+17,000]
0604503N	101	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	34,801	15,000	49,801
		Multi Purpose Processor			[+15,000]
0604504N	102	AIR CONTROL	13,538		13,538
0604507N	103	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	875		875
0604512N	104	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,833		9833
0604518N	105	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	3,720		3,720
0604524N	106	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	3,642		3,642
0604528N	107	SWATH (SMALL WATERPLANE AREA TWIN HULL) OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIP	-		-
0604558N	108	NEW DESIGN SSN	207,091	2,000	209,091
		Submarine Sonar Dome Window			[+2,000]
0604561N	109	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	6,617		6,617
0604562N	110	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	20,492		20,492
0604567N	111	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,204		62,204
0604574N	112	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,291		3,291
0604601N	113	MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,968		1,968
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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		85,049
0604771N	124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	5,273	2,000	7,273
		Mobile Integrated Diagnostic and Data Analysis System			[+2,000]
0604777N	125	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	18,487		18,487
0604784N	126	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,710	10,000	30,710
		Advanced Deployable System			[+10,000]
0604800N	127	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	295,962		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		15,259
0508713N	132	NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	5,917		5,917
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,152,405	76,900	2,229,305
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	29,249	-	29,249
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,123,156	76,900	2,200,056
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
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
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	4,000	4,949
		Supply Chain Management and Development Best Practices			[+4,000]
0605853N	141	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	17,644		17,644

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605856N	142	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,403		2403
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		8,091
0305885N	151	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	4,666		4,666
0909999N	152	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	631,515	4,000	635,515
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	631,515	4,000	635,515
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
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		42,687
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	26,000	274,093
		Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System			[+8,000]
		SHARP			[+18,000]
0204152N	161	E-2 SQUADRONS	18,698	2,000	20,698
		E2-C2 Rotordome and Control Surface Improvements			[+2,000]
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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0204571N	166	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,059	13,000	40,059
		Battle Force Tactical Trainer			[+5,000]
		Joint Tactical Combat Training System			[+8,000]
0204575N	167	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,924		9,924
0205601N	168	HARM IMPROVEMENT	21,355	5,000	26,355
		Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile			[+5,000]
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	6,000	57,018
		C-2 Eight-Blade Composite Propeller System			[+6,000]
0205667N	173	F-14 UPGRADE	1,228		1,228
0205675N	174	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,435		53,435
0206313M	175	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	96,153	8,500	104,653
		Mobile Electronic Warfare Support System			[+8,500]
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		37778
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		7,795
0305192N	188	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	7,000		7,000
0305204M	189	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	-	5,000	5,000
		Dragon Warrior Unmanned Aerial Vehicle			[+5,000]
0305204N	190	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	113,052	8,000	121,052
		Joint Forces Command Operational Testbed			[+1,000]
		TUAV MSAG Technology			[+7,000]
0305206N	191	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,759		4,759

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305207N	192	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	27,479	10,600	38,079
		Long-Range Optical Sensor Technology			[+5,000]
		P-3 Squadron Sensor Upgrade			[+2,600]
		Solid-State Shutter Mechanism			[+3,000]
0305208N	193	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,482		4,482
0305927N	194	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	2,038	(600)	1,438
		Naval Space Surveillance			[-600]
0305972N	195	SPACE ACTIVITIES	-		-
0308601N	196	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,106	3,000	12,106
		C4ISR Modeling and Simulation			[+3,000]
0702207N	197	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	34,166		34,166
0708011N	198	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,626	10,000	69,626
		ManTech			[+10,000]
0708730N	199	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	9,366	6,000	15,366
		MARITECH			[+6,000]
XXXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	531,940		531,940
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,468,048	102,500	1,570,548
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,468,048	102,500	1,570,548
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, NAVY	8,476,677	357,800	8,834,477
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,192,324	232,900	6,425,224
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,284,353	124,900	2,409,253

Items of Special Interest

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request contained $138.0 million in PE 63611M for the Marine Corps Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicles (AAAV).

The AAAV is one of the highest priority Marine Corps modernization programs and is essential to the Marine Corps' ability to implement its operational maneuver from the sea doctrine.

The committee believes that an additional engineering manufacturing development AAAV test vehicle would significantly enhance reliability testing, software maturation and other efforts designed to reduce life-cycle costs. Therefore, the committee recommends $165.5 million, an increase of $27.5 million in PE 63611M for this purpose.

Advanced anti-radiation guided missile

The budget request contained $21.4 million in PE25601N for operational systems development of improvements to the High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) system, including $9.0 million to continue the Advanced Anti-Radiation Guided Missile (AARGM) project.

The AARGM project is a Phase III Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program to develop and demonstrate a dual-mode guidance section on a HARM airframe. Program objectives are to demonstrate an effective, affordable, and lethal suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD) capability against mobile, relocatable, or fixed air defense threats in the presence of potential air defense radar emitter shutdown or other anti-radiation missile countermeasures.

The AARGM technology demonstration program is an outgrowth of a Phase I and Phase II competitive SBIR program, which successfully demonstrated the feasibility of a dual-mode seeker to address anti-radiation missile countermeasures. The dual-mode technology under development in the AARGM program has demonstrated high potential to solve the problem of target radar "shutdown" not only for HARM, the primary SEAD weapon, but also for application in other missile airframes. The committee notes the progress made in the program and the delivery of advanced ARRGM seeker hardware for development test and evaluation at the Naval Air Weapons Center, China Lake, California. The committee also notes the application of AARGM technology being considered in the Quick Bolt advanced concept technology demonstration.

The committee recommends a $26.4 million in PE 25601N, an increase of $5.0 million to continue risk reduction, test, and other field activities to prepare for a potential Milestone II decision to enter engineering and manufacturing development. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the results of the developmental testing of the ARRGM seeker and the Navy's plans for further development of the AARGM with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Advanced deployable system

The budget request contained $20.7 million in PE 64784N for the advanced deployable system (ADS). The ADS is a surveillance system for use in littoral waters and restricted waterways that can be rapidly deployed in time of crisis to provide a submarine detection and tracking capability to U.S. Naval forces.

The committee notes the ADS program is transitioning to the engineering and manufacturing development phase and has consistently met or exceeded schedule and cost milestones. The committee supports leveraging the early success of the ADS program by accelerating the development of enhanced capabilities for the system.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $30.7 million in PE 64784N, an increase of $10.0 million, for the ADS to accelerate the development of advanced, long-life sensors for trip-wire arrays, increased mine detection capabilities, and enhanced automation.

Advanced technology demonstrations and fleet battle experiments

The budget request contained $76.3 million in PE 63792N for the Navy's advanced technology transition program to demonstrate technologies that could significantly improve the warfighting capabilities of the fleet and joint forces and provide the opportunity to identify and move emerging technologies quickly and efficiently from the laboratory to the fleet.

The committee notes the role of the Navy Warfare Development Command in developing Navy operational concepts and doctrine, identifying required operational capabilities, focusing research and development issues, maturing innovative concepts in naval, joint, and coalition warfare for evaluation in fleet battle experiments, and designing, planning, and evaluating the experiments. The committee is aware that fleet battle experiments have provided a test bed for validation of Navy doctrine and operational concepts, assessment of innovative technologies and concepts, and identification of some of the operational, tactical, and technical challenges that will be faced by the fleet in the future.

The committee also notes the role that the Navy's science and technology program performs by focusing on the long-term objective of enabling future naval capabilities, science and technology developments that are critical to ensuring naval superiority, and the demonstration of affordable technology for transition to the fleet. The committee encourages the Office of Naval Research, the Navy Secretariat, and the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations to facilitate this strategy by ensuring a close working relationship between the Office of Naval Research, the Navy Warfare Development Command, and the numbered fleets.

Elsewhere in this report the committee notes the Navy's progress in concept evaluation of a littoral warfare fast patrol craft and the significant advances in logistics support, surveillance, communications and fire support that such a craft could provide for naval forces in littoral environments, and recommends increased funding for prototype craft that would permit demonstration of the operational concept in fleet battle experiments and other exercises.

The committee notes recommendations from the Defense Science Board for improvements in tactical mobility and intratheater lift and recommendations for demonstration of high speed, fast shuttle

sealift and advanced amphibious capabilities for movement of forces and logistical support within the theater and of other capabilities in future fleet battle experiments. The committee encourages the Navy to support such activities from available funds.

Advanced waterjet propulsor

The budget request contained $244.4 million for in PE 63513N for shipboard systems component development, but included no funds for advanced water jet technology.

The committee report on H. R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) noted proposals for a quarter-scale at-sea demonstration and cavitation tunnel testing of an advanced waterjet propulsor (AWJ–21) to validate critical performance criteria and potential application of the propulsor to the DD–21 land attack destroyer or other naval ships. The report urged the Secretary of the Navy to assess the requirement for further development, demonstration, and evaluation of advanced waterjet propulsor technology and to provide recommendations regarding the demonstration, a program execution plan, and Navy funding for the program.

On December 1, 1999, the Secretary reported that the Navy's AWJ–21 technology demonstration plan had developed hydrodynamic performance prediction and critical performance measurement capabilities for advanced waterjet concepts, and that the knowledge and capability generated will be provided to both DD–21 industry teams determining the suitability of the AWJ–21 for use on DD–21. The report stated that a separate Navy-funded advanced waterjet development and large-scale demonstration program would be inappropriate because it could be viewed as Government endorsement of a specific propulsor solution and subverting the DD–21 acquisition strategy (in which the industry team is given full responsibility for recommending a total ship design for the DD–21). The report stated further that development of the AWJ–21 system by the DD–21 program is dependent upon a decision by the winning DD–21 industry team to include the AWJ–21 propulsion concept in their design. The report concluded that there is currently no Navy operational requirement that requires the use of an advanced waterjet propulsor and recommended no further development of advanced waterjet technology at this time.

Accordingly, the committee encourages the Navy to ensure that advanced water jet technology is given all appropriate consideration.

Aircraft survivability study

The budget request contained $7.5 million in PE 63216N for aircraft survivability demonstration and validation.

The committee is aware that the population of aircrew and passengers permitted on board military aircraft includes both female and male personnel, and is concerned about the ability of crash protective seating systems to provide adequate protection to occupants of lighter weight and smaller stature.

The committee recommends an increase of $500,000 in PE 63216N to determine and assess the potential for increased injury risk to female operators and passengers in the Navy's helicopter fleet.

Aviation depot maintenance technology

The budget request contained $62.2 million in PE 63721N for environmental protection.

The committee notes that new environmentally friendly repair processes are being developed that offer significant productivity improvements and potential cost savings. To this end, Congress provided increased funding in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 for the development and demonstration of aviation depot maintenance technologies that will significantly reduce maintenance and repair costs and reduce or eliminate hazardous waste and pollution products.

The committees recommends $63.9 million in PE 63721N, an increase of $1.75 million to continue the program for demonstration of advanced maintenance technologies for application of tungsten carbide coatings to aircraft landing gear and hydraulic components.

Aviation modernization plan

The committee notes recent reports that the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations is considering a major revision of naval aviation plans which would remove aircraft from inventory, cancel future aircraft systems concepts, and reconfigure the carrier air wing in order to develop an affordable modernization plan for naval aviation. The reports indicate that the recommendations contained in the "Common Vision for Naval Aviation" would be implemented beginning with the Navy's budget request for fiscal year 2002. The committee understands that the following alternatives are being considered:

(1) Replacement of the EA–6B Prowler electronic warfare aircraft by 2010 with an electronic warfare aircraft follow-on;

(2) Retirement of the F–14 Tomcat strike-fighter aircraft by 2008;

(3) Service life extension of the C–2 Grayhound Tracker carrier onboard delivery aircraft;

(4) Retirement of the S–3B Viking antisubmarine warfare aircraft by 2008 and its mission replacement by a combination of P–3C Orion maritime patrol aircraft and SH–60R Seahawk multi-mission helicopter;

(5) Replacement of the S–3B Viking in its tanker role by F/A–18E/F fighter aircraft with a aircraft refueling capability;

(6) Service life extension of the P–3C Orion maritime patrol aircraft;

(7) Service life extension of the EP–3E Aries electronic surveillance aircraft;

(8) Cancellation of the concept of a common support aircraft that would combine the mission of the E–2C Hawkeye airborne early warning aircraft with the missions of the S–3 Viking and C–2 Greyhound aircraft;

(9) Delay introduction of a multi-mission maritime aircraft to replace the P–3C Orion and EP–3E Aries to no later than 2015; and

(10) Reduction of the number of strike aircraft in a carrier air wing from 56 to 50.

The committee commends the Navy for its initiative in developing a long-term plan for naval aviation that attempts to meet the challenges of affordability and effectiveness in a budget constrained

environment. The committee recognizes the issues of current and future operational requirements, current force capabilities, personnel, training, research and development, procurement, logistics, and estimated funding available that must be considered in developing such a plan. The committee notes that the Navy's plan is not complete and was not available during the committee's review of the budget request.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to provide information on the Navy's revised aviation modernization plan to the congressional defense committees at the earliest opportunity to ensure adequate opportunity for oversight review of this important initiative prior to receipt of the budget request for fiscal year 2002.

Battle force tactical trainer (BFTT)

The budget request contained $27.1 million in PE 24571N for consolidated training systems development, including $4.1 million for development of the surface tactical team trainer (Battle Force Tactical Training program).

The committee notes that the BFTT system provides the Navy with an effective embedded training capability on many of the Navy's surface ships, permitting realistic unit level team training and coordinated training among ships in port, and providing commanders the ability to conduct coordinated realistic, high stress, combat system training when afloat. The Navy is converting BFTT to a Windows NT™ personal computer (PC)-based environment that will extend the BFTT simulation to shore-based facilities at the training commands to provide more realistic combat system team and individual training at these facilities, as well as providing the opportunity for expansion and upgrade of the capabilities of the BFTT system.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 24571N to accelerate the conversion and upgrade of the BFTT system to a Windows NT™/PC-based environment.

Beartrap

The budget request contained $19.7 million in PE 63254N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems development, including $5.3 million for Project Beartrap.

The budget request for Beartrap supports hardware and software development for the rapid prototyping of advanced capability acoustic and non-acoustic ASW sensors, as well as data collection and analysis for threat assessment and environmental characterization. The committee notes the progress being made in the evaluation and development of the phenomena of nonlinear dynamics and stochastic resonance (NDSR) for acoustic, magnetic, and other ASW sensor and signal processing applications. The committee also notes the Navy's progress in developing a comprehensive and focused strategy for acoustic, and non-acoustic environmental data collection, analysis and dissemination, and plans for continued implementation of the strategy to meet the Navy's needs in environmental data bases, modeling for new systems research and development, and environmental inputs to tactical decision aids.

The committee recommends $24.7 million in PE 63254N, an increase of $5.0 million for Project Beartrap to continue the develop-

ment, demonstration, and evaluation of NDSR technology for ASW applications and to continue the Beartrap environmental characterization program.

C–2 eight-blade composite propeller system

The budget request contained $51.0 million in PE 25633N for improvements in operational Navy aviation and aviation support systems.

The committee notes that the Navy is seeking solutions to operational limitations encountered with the propeller system used on E–2C and C–2A aircraft. The current propeller system incorporates technology developed in the 1950s and the 1960s, is difficult and expensive to maintain, and is no longer in production. The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105–132) directed the initiation of development and demonstration of an eight-blade composite propeller for E–2C and C–2A aircraft. The Navy subsequently began a program for design, development, test, and production of the propeller system. The committee notes that the program includes flight and ground test of the new propeller system for the E–2 aircraft, but includes only ground tests for the new propeller on the C–2 aircraft.

The committee recommends $57.0 million in PE 25633N, an increase of $6.0 million to flight test the new propeller system on the C–2 aircraft sequentially with the E–2 flight test program.

Common command and decision system

The budget request contained $119.3 million in PE 63658N for continued development of the Navy's cooperative engagement capability (CEC), and $33.0 million in PE 63582N for combat systems integration demonstration and validation, including $8.7 million for common command and decision systems development.

The committee notes the Navy's progress in resolving interoperability issues between CEC and Navy ship self-defense (SSD) combat systems and preparations for the CEC operational evaluation in May 2001. The committee anticipates that successful completion of the evaluation will provide the basis for widespread deployment of CEC to the fleet and for joint purposes as well.

The committee also notes that the Navy initiated engineering studies in fiscal year 1999 for a common command and decision (CC&D) system that would be a preplanned product improvement (P3I) to the Aegis weapons systems and the Mark 2 ship self defense system and would replace the command and decision capability presently in these systems with a common computer architecture. Such an architecture would reduce future combat systems life-cycle costs, enable the fielding of new or modified combat systems capabilities more quickly and at a lower cost, enhance system interoperability, and eliminate the redundant, conflicting processing that is inherent in these systems. The Navy has stated that the CC&D is a critical step toward resolving long-term interoperability problems. Congress provided an increase of $30.0 million for the program in fiscal year 2000. The Navy's program plan includes $91.2 million in addition to this year's request through fiscal year 2005. The Navy has projected a notional program schedule that would begin engineering and manufacturing development in March

2002 and achieve initial operational capability for the CC&D system in September 2008. The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified a $43 million unfunded requirement to accelerate the ability to begin engineering and manufacturing development by one year.

The committee supports the CC&D system program objectives that have been identified by the Navy. The committee notes that the CC&D development program is at an early stage, the program schedule is notional, and operational requirements are being refined. The committee also notes Navy plans to evaluate a proposed new approach to cooperative engagement capability data processing and transmission (the Tactical Component Network (TCN)), which could conserve CEC communications bandwidth and provide for a wider, more efficient CEC network.

The committee encourages the Navy to seek technology insertion opportunities that will improve the interoperability of Navy combat systems and CEC's capabilities for naval and joint forces and to provide the required funding as a part of the Navy's core budget program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the Navy's program plan and funding for the CC&D P3I program and for insertion of advanced technology in the CEC/SSD integrated combat system with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee recommends $119.3 million in PE 63658N for continued development of the Navy's CEC and $33.0 million in PE 63582N to continue combat systems integration demonstration and validation.

Common towed array

The budget request contained $113.3 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, including $4.5 million for the development of advanced towed array technology for submarines and surface ships.

The committee notes the Navy's operational requirement for improvements in critical undersea warfare combat systems technologies needed in the littoral regions of the world. The committee also notes that the Navy's advanced towed array technology program is making considerable progress in developing multiple-line and fiber optic affordable towed array technology that could result in high gain, volumetric towed arrays with significantly improved performance for submarine and surface ship sonar systems

The committee recommends $123.5 million in PE 63561N, an increase of $10.2 million to accelerate the development and demonstration of advanced towed array systems for surface ship and submarine anti-submarine warfare tactical and strategic surveillance.

Composite advanced sail development

The budget request contained $113.3 million in PE 63561N for advanced submarine systems development, including $5.7 million for hydrodynamics/hydroacoustics and completion of the advanced submarine sail development project.

The committee notes that the Navy's technology insertion plan for the Virginia class submarine includes installation of an ad-

vanced sail made of steel on the seventh Virginia class ship. The committee also notes the development of a quarter-scale advanced submarine sail made of composite materials for the Navy's large scale vehicle and the conduct of submersion tests at the Navy's Idaho test range in which the composite sail exceeded the Navy's performance expectations.

The committee supports the advanced submarine technology insertion program for the Virginia class submarine and directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the Navy's plan for further development of a composite advanced sail for the submarine with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

CVNX aircraft carrier design product modeling

The budget request contained $149.0 million in PE 63512N for carrier systems development.

The committee notes that all new classes of Navy ships, such as the Virginia-class submarine, the DD–22 land attack destroyer, and the LPD–17 amphibious transport dock, are being designed using electronic three dimensional product models to take advantage of the inherent design, production and life cycle maintenance cost savings offered by these modern design tools.

The committee also notes that design data for the Nimitz-class nuclear aircraft carriers, upon which design work began in the 1950's, remains largely in non-electronic form. Conversion of aircraft carrier design data into an electronic format was difficult to justify when Navy plans previously called for a complete change in designs following completion of CVN–77.

The committee notes, however, that the Navy has adopted an evolutionary design approach for future carriers, beginning with the CVN–77 as a transition ship and retains the Nimitz-class hull form largely unchanged through at least CVNX–2. Therefore, the committee believes that it now may be cost-effective to convert Nimitz-class design data and to develop future nuclear aircraft design data utilizing electronic, three-dimensional product models to reap the design, production, and life cycle maintenance cost savings offered by this approach. The committee is aware that development of a nuclear aircraft carrier design product model may take several years and could be undertaken as part of the planned design efforts for CVN–77, CVNX–1, and CVNX–2.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an assessment of the cost-effectiveness of developing an aircraft carrier design product model for the CVNX and report the results of the assessment, together with plans and funding requirements for development of such a model to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee recommends $149.0 million in PE 63512N, including $5.0 million to begin development of an aircraft carrier design product model for the CVNX.

Distributed engineering plant

The committee supports continued integration of high performance computers for Navy Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA)'s multi-functional test control center and distributed engineering

plant (DEP) operations with the Joint Forces Command's Joint Interoperability Training Center and other military organizations and activities, academia, and industry in the Hampton Roads region. The committee notes that cooperation and sharing of computer resources among joint forces and the military services, academia, and industry in the region could result in lower costs and improved capabilities for analysis, design, modeling and simulation, which would be reflected in major combat systems developments, such as the cooperative engagement capability and the CVN–77 and CVN–X aircraft carriers.

The committee is aware of the multi-functional test control center at NAVSEA Dam Neck and its interface with major Atlantic test and training ranges used for joint operations and training. The committee also notes that the Hampton Roads network access point at NAVSEA Dam Neck provides transcontinental connectivity to other development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and training activities and an improved analytical and information exchange capability.

The committee encourages the Navy to continue to capitalize on government-sponsored high performance computing and high speed network programs, such as the National Science Foundation's Partnership for Advanced Computing Infrastructure, the East Coast Communication's Network, and the Department of Defense high performance computing modernization program, in developing improved capabilities for analysis, design, modeling and simulation, combat systems integration, training, test and evaluation.

Distributed marine environment forecast system

The budget request contained $60.3 million in PE 62435N for applied research in oceanographic and atmospheric technology, including $12.0 million for ocean and atmospheric prediction.

The committee notes the long established need for a distributed forecast system in the marine environment, which combines ocean and atmospheric models with common database access and common tools to provide the capability for prediction of local and future weather and sea conditions and their potential effects on fleet and other operations. The committee also notes the potential for building upon oceanographic and atmospheric models and data from the Department of Defense, National Air and Space Administration, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, and Environmental Protection Agency to integrate these resources into a distributed marine environment forecast system.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62435N to establish an applied research program for development and demonstration of a distributed marine environment forecast system.

DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof-of-concept demonstration

The budget request contained $39.7 million in PE 63217N for air systems and weapons advanced technology development, but included no funds for continuation of the DP–2 thrust vectoring system proof of concept demonstration.

DP–2 is a proof-of-concept program to demonstrate the use of thrust vector control to achieve vertical takeoff and conventional

takeoff capabilities in a one-half scale flight test vehicle. The technology offers the potential for a low cost, medium range aircraft of advanced composite construction.

The committee notes the progress being made in the DP–2 program in the design and fabrication of large, precise composite structures and in the potential for the use of small models to demonstrate and confirm complex aeronautical guidance and control laws for the DP–2 system prior to entering the flight test phase. The committee also notes that technical issues regarding strength of materials, engineering design, the development and test of an automated control system, and other safety of flight issues must be resolved before the program can proceed to the flight test phase.

The committee recommends $49.2 million in PE 63217N, an increase of $9.5 million to continue the DP–2 development program leading to a proof-of-concept demonstration of a one-half scale flight test vehicle. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide an assessment of the program progress and plans and funding requirements for completion of the flight-test demonstration to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Dry chemical fire suppressant

The committee notes that the Navy's initial tests of a gelled, dry chemical fire suppressant agent in a self-contained fire extinguishing system, which is reportedly non-toxic and has a long shelf life, have successfully demonstrated the effectiveness of the material for fire fighting. The Naval Research Laboratory report of its test of alternative fire suppressant technologies, dated July 1999, indicated the agent's high level of effectiveness and its potential for performing better than clean agent fire suppressant systems in current use aboard Navy ships, and encouraged further research on the agent. The committee encourages the Navy to conduct comprehensive field tests of the suppressant and, if the tests are successful, to consider deployment of the fire suppressant system to the fleet.

E2–C2 rotordome and control surface improvements

The budget request contained $18.7 million in PE 24152N for E–2 squadron operational systems development.

The committee notes that the rotordome and control surfaces on the Navy's E2–C2 Hawkeye aircraft have been experiencing problems due to structural damage from water absorption and excessive wear and that the Navy's plans to extend the service life of these aircraft require a new retrofit design to eliminate costly maintenance and downtime.

The committee recommends $20.7 million in PE 24152N, an increase of $2.0 million to develop composite retrofit options to improve the serviceability and performance of the E2–C2 Hawkeye.

Extended range guided munition

The budget request contained $143.0 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology, including $39.1 million for development of the extended range guided munition (ERGM).

The committee notes that the Navy's core program for near-term improvements in naval surface fire support (NSFS) includes upgrading the existing 5-inch 54-caliber Mk 45 gun on its cruisers and destroyers to fire a new extended-range guided munition (ERGM) with nearly five times the range of current 5-inch projectile. Both the 5-inch 62-caliber Mk 45 Mod 4 gun and the ERGM projectile were to have achieved initial operational capability in fiscal year 2001. The first Mk 45 Mod 4 gun was installed in the USS Winston Church (DDG–81) on schedule in 1999. However, technical challenges and the contractor's relocation of the ERGM development activity have delayed the ERGM development program an estimated three years to 2004 and doubled the program cost.

The committee notes ERGM's key role in the NSFS program and the need for a long-range (63 nautical mile) guided, gun-fired projectile to achieve the approved operational requirements for support of ground forces ashore. The committee also notes that the global positioning system/inertial measuring unit (GPS/IMU) guidance and control technology being developed for ERGM will establish a baseline for future advanced guided projectiles for the DD–21 land attack destroyer and for other weapons systems.

The committee has closely monitored the ERGM program since its inception and has supported the baseline development program and accelerated development and integration of microelectromechanical system (MEMS)-based GPS/INS into ERGM. The committee has encouraged close cooperation between the Navy and Army guided munitions research and development communities in order to achieve risk reduction in their respective guided projectile development programs and maximum commonality and economies of scale in production.

The committee notes the detailed reviews of the ERGM program by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition) and the contractor; program management changes and risk reduction measures taken; and program rebaseline and other measures under consideration that might encourage program competition. The committee believes that the technical goals of the program are challenging, but achievable.

The committee recommends $39.1 million in PE 63795N, the budget request, to continue the ERGM development program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the revised program baseline, risk reduction measures, and measures to foster competition in the ERGM program no later than November 1, 2000.

F–18

The budget request contained $248.1 million in PE 24136N for continued development of capabilities for the F/A–18 aircraft.

The committee has supported the Shared Airborne Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP) efforts to provide the F/A–18 aircraft with an enhanced tactical reconnaissance capability that will also be applicable to other combat aircraft. The committee notes the recent successful demonstration of the SHARP risk-mitigation project for the F–14 Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance Podded System that was employed by the battle group U.S.S. John F. Kennedy. This demonstration clearly indicated the force multiplying capability pro-

vided by a real-time imagery system supports continuation of this effort.

The committee is concerned, however, that the funding requested for SHARP is insufficient to support completion of sensors for an initial operational capability (IOC) in fiscal year 2003. The committee notes that this shortfall in funding results in an increase in cost of tactical reconnaissance support by extending use of the less capable F–14 Tactical Air Reconnaissance Pod (TARPS). The committee is also aware that emerging technology is being developed to replace existing mechanical focal plane shutters with a solid-state shutter to further increase SHARP camera performance and reliability. However, the committee is concerned that the current program is insufficiently funded to ensure a fiscal year 2003 SHARP fleet deployment.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $18.0 million in PE 24136N for the development of the SHARP F–18 tactical reconnaissance capability to maintain the SHARP IOC.

Fielded system obsolescence, technology insertion and technology refreshment

The committee notes the increasing reliance upon commercial-off-the-shelf in Department of Defense systems and the rapid obsolescence of technology and exponential increases in capability in subsequent generations that are common characteristics of the commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) industry. The committee believes that management of COTS in Defense systems is a major effort that must be recognized, quantified and separately addressed as an integral part of the procurement process. To this end, the committee recommends that all programs within DOD with high COTS content should include a management plan that addresses the costs associated with sustaining the military capability of the systems in a COTS environment. The plan should clearly distinguish the costs associated with sustaining current performance requirements through technology refreshment and meeting increased performance requirements through the technology insertion process.

The committee believes that institution of such a planning process in the Department would provide Congress with the information necessary to evaluate the merits of COTS products in DOD applications based on a true and accurate representation of operational requirements and total ownership costs. Based on ongoing work in technology refreshment and technology insertion by the Department of the Navy as represented by the Acoustic Rapid COTS Insertion (A–RCI) program, the committee believes that a pilot program to address these issues should be established within the Navy.

The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy provide a report on the Navy's plan for such a program that would address the issues of technology refresh and technology insertion in legacy and developmental programs with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Fleet health technology and occupational lung disease

The budget request contained $10.1 million in PE 63706N for medical development, including $4.8 million for the fleet health technology program.

The Navy's medical development program supports advanced medical care and health protection from hazardous occupational and operational exposure to Navy and Marine Corps personnel in operational theaters. The committee notes that the budget request would reduce funding for the fleet health technology program approximately $5.7 million less than the fiscal year 2001 estimate that was provided in the fiscal year 2000 request. The committee is disturbed with this reduction in the priority given to the medical care and occupational health and safety of Navy and Marine Corps personnel.

The committee also notes that concerns have been raised that naval personnel diagnosed with sarcoidosis, may have suffered from other lung diseases related to exposure to occupational hazards during their military service. A study by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has provided an assessment of the incidence of sarcoidosis among Navy enlisted personnel and suggests a relationship of sarcoidosis with assignment aboard aircraft carriers. The Navy Surgeon General has indicated that correlation of the results of the NIOSH study with a pathologic review of tissue samples at the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology taken from naval personnel during the 1960s and 1970s, would be relevant to resolving the concerns regarding sarcoidosis and other lung diseases. The Navy Surgeon General also indicated that collaboration with the multi-center study of sarcoidosis etiology, natural history, and treatment currently being considered by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, should be considered.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, to establish an occupational lung disease assessment program to determine if naval personnel with lung disease due to other causes may have been misdiagnosed with sarcoidosis and if the incidence of sarcoidosis or other lung disease could be attributable to service aboard Navy ships. The program should also consider collaboration with the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute's sarcoidosis etiology study. The Secretary of the Navy shall report the plan for the study and any initial study results to the congressional defense committees no later than March 21, 2001.

The committee recommends $13.1 million in PE 63706N, an increase of $3.0 million, including $500,000 for the conduct of the occupational lung disease assessment discussed above. To offset the recommended increase, the committee recommends a reduction of $3.0 million in PE 63513N.

Flight worthy transparent armor system

The budget request contained $7.5 million in PE 63216N for aircraft survivability demonstration and validation.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63216N for the development of a flight worthy transparent armor

system for the AH–1Z light attack helicopter and V–22 tilt-rotor aircraft that could be migrated to other platforms as well.

High mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS)

The budget request contained no funds for the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS). The HIMARS is an Army-developed, Family of Medium Tactical Vehicle (FMTV)-mounted multiple launch rocket system. The committee understands that the Marine Corps currently lacks an all-weather, continuously available, long-range fire support system capable of prosecuting a Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) and Marine Ground Combat Element's (CGE) deep strike mission and counter fire battle. The committee also understands that the existing prototype HIMARS has the potential to fulfill the MEF and CGE mission requirements. The committee notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified a $17.3 million unfunded requirement for the procurement of two HIMARS systems for evaluation and a system design study to address integrating the HIMARS launcher onto the Marine Corps' Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement truck in fiscal year 2001.

The committee believes that evaluation of this weapon system as a deep strike alternative capability for Marine expeditionary forces is important, and, therefore, recommends $17.3 million in PE 63635M to procure two HIMARS systems for this purpose.

High performance sigma-delta waveform generator

The budget request contained $26.0 million in PE 62270N for applied research in electronic warfare technology.

The committee notes that the Office of Naval Research has been developing semi-conductor and super-conducting technology for the implementation of a Sigma-Delta Waveform Generator. This activity has included development of high speed gallium arsenide and/or Josephson Junction circuits to implement a highly linear, flexible, digital waveform generator for next generation Navy systems. The advanced semi-conductor and super-conducting circuits being developed will enable higher levels of performance required to detect small targets in clutter and to perform multiple radio frequency functions.

The committee recommends an $29.0 million in PE 62270N, an increase of $3.0 million to continue the program for development of super-conducting wave form generator technology.

Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communication technology

The budget request contained $79.9 million in PE 62232N for applied research in communications, command and control, intelligence, and surveillance.

The committee notes the progress made in development and demonstration of the technology for hybrid fiber optic wireless communications systems, and believes that the application of this technology to shipboard communications will provide increased mobility and security while reducing the effects of frequency interference.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.5 million in PE 62232N to continue the development of hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communication system technology. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to assess the progress in the program and the

potential for incorporation of the technology in the Navy's core science and technology program and to report the results of that assessment to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Hybrid light detection and ranging (LIDAR)/radar technology

The budget request contained $76.3 million in PE 63792N for advanced technology demonstration and transition.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63792N to continue the development and further demonstration of hybrid LIDAR/radar technology in the Claymore Marine advanced technology demonstration.

Hyperspectral research

The budget request contained $79.9 million in PE 62232N for applied research in communications, command and control, intelligence, and surveillance technology.

The committee notes that hyperspectral sensor systems provide the capability to detect and identify targets that are not discernible with conventional sensors by exploiting the spectral signature of both the target and the environment. The Naval Research Laboratory has conducted extensive research into the use of hyperspectral technology to provide a surveillance sensor that is capable of finding difficult military targets in clutter-rich environments. The laboratory has made excellent progress in developing hyperspectral technology and has conducted successful testing on board Navy intelligence collection aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62232N to continue the Navy's development, integration, and testing of hyperspectral sensors with other sensors.

Insensitive munitions

The budget request contained $28.6 million in PE 63609N for conventional munitions demonstration and validation, including $3.2 million for insensitive munitions advanced development; and $7.5 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability, including $1.8 million for aircraft and ordnance safety.

The committee notes that insensitive munitions reduce the severity of cook-off and bullet/fragment impact reactions, and minimize the probability for sympathetic detonation (both in normal storage and in use) without compromising combat performance, and are recognized as a critical technology requirement in the design of new weapons systems. The committee also notes that, despite the Navy's requirements for insensitive munitions, nearly all Navy munitions require a wavier to be carried aboard ships. The committee notes that the Navy is the lead service for the development of insensitive munition technology and that the budget request would reduce insensitive munition technology development funding almost $6.0 million below the amount provided in fiscal year 2000 as well as the average program level of the past several years. In view of joint requirements and the Navy's requirements for insensitive munitions, the committee believes that the Navy needs to assign a high priority to the insensitive munitions program and directs the

Secretary of the Navy to address this issue in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Integrated aviation life support systems

The budget request contained $17.5 million in PE 64264N for aircrew systems engineering and manufacturing development, including $8.9 million for development of aviation life support systems.

The committee notes progress in development of the two-part, tri-service modular helmet, the advanced visionics helmet system for day/night, all-weather sight display, and the helicopter aircrew integrated life support system. The committee also notes that the current program, which develops the helicopter life support system and helmet systems separately, could result in an overall aviation life support system that is geared to the lowest performing component. The committee believes that integrated development of these systems will result in an aviation life support system that provides optimal performance, greater tactical advantage, and improved aircrew safety.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $25.5 million in PE 64264N, an increase of $8.0 million for continued development and flight evaluation of an integrated aviation life-support system that includes the tri-service modular flight helmet, the advanced visionics helmet system, and the helicopter aircrew integrated life support system.

Integrated semiconductor bridge based fuze

The budget request contained $38.0 million in PE 62111N for applied research in air and surface launched weapons technology.

The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of semi-conductor bridges as electrical initiators for explosives and their potential for replacing conventional hot bridgewire devices with significant reductions in size, weight, power and cost. The coupling of semiconductor bridge devices with microelectromechanical systems technology in initiation and safe/arm components offers the opportunity for the development of electromechanical fuzes with superior accuracy and reliability, reduced power consumption and weight, and lower cost.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 62111N to initiate a proof-of-concept development and demonstration of an integrated semiconductor bridge based fuze for potential use in air and surface launched weapons systems.

Intermediate modulus carbon fiber and ultra-high thermal conductivity graphite fibers

The budget request contained $68.1 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials and radio frequency/electro-optics/infrared electronics technology and $72.8 million in PE 62102F for materials applied research, including $44.1 million for materials for structures, propulsion, and subsystems.

The committee notes that the joint strike fighter (JSF), the F/A–18E/F strike fighter, the V–22 tilt-rotor aircraft, the joint air-to-surface standoff missile, and many other advanced aviation and weapons systems use composite structures which have carbon fiber as a major component. The committee is aware of proposals for the

use of intermediate modulus carbon fiber materials as an alternative to the carbon fiber that could result in as much as a 50 percent reduction in the cost of raw materials used in these weapons systems.

The committee also notes initial progress in the evaluation and qualification of ultra-high thermal conductivity graphite fiber materials for critical spacecraft requirements related to countermeasures and spacecraft protection, high energy/thermal loading, very large antennas, high-efficiency solar collectors, and other applications.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should place priority on the development of procedures for qualifying new materials for potential use in military systems that could result in lower costs while maintaining system performance requirements. The committee supports continued validation of design methods, material performance in various service environments, and the capability of the materials to manage thermal loads generated by electronics.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62234N for evaluation of new, lower cost, commercially available carbon fibers for JSF and other Navy aircraft and missile applications and $2.0 million in PE 62102F to continue the program for evaluation and qualification of ultra-high thermal conductivity graphite materials for critical spacecraft requirements.

Joint forces command operational testbed

The budget request contained $113.1 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles, but included no funds for the Joint Forces Command unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) joint operational testbed.

Congress previously provided funds for two Predator unmanned aerial vehicles and a tactical control system (TCS) ground station to support development of TCS and UAV operational employment procedures. The committee notes that the joint tactical UAV program office (JPO) was disestablished. The committee further notes that the Joint Forces Command has responsibility for oversight of joint operational testing and evaluation of weapons systems, a function previously conducted by the UAVJPO for specific UAV systems.

The committee supports the efforts of the Joint Forces Command and recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 35204N for the Joint Forces Command UAV testbed. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the two Predator UAVs and TCS ground station to the Joint Forces Command for use by the joint operational UAV testbed.

Joint helmet mounted cueing system

The budget request contained $248.1 million in PE 24136N for operational systems development for F/A18 naval strike fighter aircraft, including $3.3 million to continue development of the joint helmet mounted cueing system, digital communications systems, and positive identification system.

The committee notes that the joint helmet mounted cueing system, when combined with state of the art missile systems currently

in development, provides a significant improvement in air to air combat survivability. The committee is also aware that this improved capability is essential to the success of the Navy's F/A–18 E/F strike fighter aircraft currently being deployed.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 24136N for continued development of the joint helmet mounted cueing system for the F/A–18C/D fighter.

Joint tactical combat training system

The budget request contained $27.1 million in PE 24571N for consolidated training systems development, including $7.8 million for development of the Joint Tactical Combat Training Systems (JTCTS).

The JTCTS is a joint Air Force/Navy program for the development of fixed, transportable, and mobile range instrumentation for shore-based tactical aircrew training and for deployable, at-sea naval expeditionary force training. The statement of managers that accompanied the conference report on H.R. 4103 (H. Rept. 105–746) directed the Department of Defense to conduct a technical evaluation to compare the capabilities, performance, and costs of competing system approaches to JTCTS, and to identify the best technical solution with the best value for meeting the Department's operational training requirement. In November 1999, the Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) reported that after completion of the technical evaluation and a thorough analysis, the JTCTS was determined to be the system of choice to meet the joint training requirement.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 24571N to accelerate the development and fielding of JTCTS for fleet and fixed range support of Navy and Air Force tactical air combat training.

Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA)

The budget request contained $7.5 million in PE 63216N for aircraft survivability demonstration and validation.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63216N to continue the application of lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA) sealing technology for use on existing and planned parachutes for Navy ejection seats.

Littoral support fast patrol craft

The budget request contained $76.3 million in PE 63792N for advanced technology transition.

The committee notes that the Office of Naval Research (ONR) has evaluated initial results of the concept evaluation of a littoral warfare fast patrol craft and is favorably impressed with the potential for such a system. The committee continues to believe that such a craft could provide significant advances in logistics support, surveillance, communications and fire support capabilities for naval forces in littoral environments.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $22.0 million in PE 63792N to develop a prototype for demonstrating the operational concepts of a littoral support fast patrol craft.

Location of global positioning systems (GPS) jammers

The budget request contained $97.3 million in PE 64270N for electronic warfare development but included no funds to continue development and demonstration of a state-of-the-art precision surveillance and targeting system for location of global positioning systems jammers (LOCO GPSI).

The committee notes that the Navy has developed a prototype LOCO GPSI airborne detection system, capable of rapid, precision location sources for GPS interference. In the committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee recommended an increase of $6.0 million to continue development and evaluation of the LOCO GPSI system and directed the Navy to assess its operational requirement.

Consistent with its past action, the committee recommends $103.3 million in PE 64270N, an increase of $6.0 million, to complete advanced development for the LOCO GPSI system, provide two additional sensor systems, and to complete system testing.

Malaria deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) vaccine

The budget request contained $10.1 million in PE 63706N for advanced medical technology development.

The committee notes the outstanding achievement by the military medical research community in collaboration with the pharmaceutical industry in developing DNA vaccines for complex multistage pathogens and for multiple pathogens of military importance. This collaboration has resulted in the promising development of an effective recombinant protein malaria vaccine of unprecedented efficacy. Successful completion of the development will result in a cost-effective means of controlling malaria, the most important infectious threat to ground troops and to third-world populations.

Of the funds authorized for PE 63706N, the committee recommends $1.5 million to continue development of the recombinant protein malaria vaccine, and recommends that the Secretary of the Navy accelerate the development of this technology in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Manned reconnaissance systems

The budget request contained $27.5 million in PE 35207N for manned reconnaissance systems, including $25.3 million for development of the shared airborne reconnaissance pod (SHARP).

The committee continues its support for the SHARP program to increase dramatically real-time tactical reconnaissance capabilities. The committee is aware of developmental EO framing processing techniques that will provide for real-time precision strike targeting and solid-state shutter technology that will greatly reduce operational costs and improve camera performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35207N for long-range optical sensor technology and $3.0 million for development of a solid-state shutter mechanism that can be retrofitted on currently fielded framing array cameras.

Marine corps dragon warrior UAV

The budget request contained no funds in PE 35204M for Marine Corps close range tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes that the Marine Corps Warfighting Laboratory (MCWL) is developing the Dragon Warrior, a low cost, small UAV that combines the speed of a fixed wing UAV with some operational characteristics of a rotary wing UAV. The committee notes that Dragon Warrior would carry a variety of payloads that are currently being examined by the MCWL to provide the Marine Corps with a highly, flexible close range reconnaissance capability that will enlarge the area of influence of a small expeditionary force.

The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE 35204M, an increase of $5.0 million for Dragon Warrior.

Marine mammal research

The budget request contained $381.1 million in PE 61153N for the Navy's defense research sciences program, but included no funds for marine mammal research.

The committee notes recent activities involving potential interaction of Navy tactical sonar operations with cetaceans in littoral waters of the Atlantic Ocean near the Bahamas. The committee believes that the Navy should place a priority on gaining an increased understanding of the reaction of marine mammals to tactical sonar and other underwater sounds that are characteristic of naval operations.

The committee recommends $381.9 million in PE 61153N, an increase of $750,000 for the Navy's cooperative marine mammal research program.

Maritime technology (MARITECH) program

The budget request contains $9.4 million in PE 78730N for the Maritime Technology (MARITECH) program. The request also contained $244.4 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development and $46.9 million in PE 63564N for ship preliminary design and feasibility studies.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) initiated the MARITECH program in 1994 to enhance the commercial viability of U.S. shipbuilding and preserve the defense industrial shipbuilding base. An independent study of the economic impact of the program concluded that the Navy shipbuilding industrial base experienced considerable productivity improvements and cost savings from the application of technologies developed in the MARITECH program. In fiscal year 1999 the program was moved to the Department of the Navy and a five-year, $20 million per year, Navy MARITECH Advanced Shipbuilding Enterprise (ASE) was established to build upon the progress made by the original DARPA program.

The committee believes that the success of the original MARITECH program was the result of the application of innovative management and technologies, and stable funding throughout the five-years of the program. The committee believes that the reduction in the budget request for the ASE breaks the paradigm established in the original program and will adversely affect the program objective of assisting the Nation's shipbuilding industry in achieving significant reductions in the cost and time required for commercial and Navy ship construction, conversion, and repair.

The committee believes that all Navy shipbuilding programs will benefit from the MARITECH ASE and should share in funding the program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $15.4 million in PE 78730N, an increase of $6.0 million to fully fund the MARITECH program. The committee further recommends a decrease of $3.0 million each in PE 63513N and PE 63564N.

Mobile electronic warfare support system

The budget request contained $96.2 million in PE 26313M, and included $449,000 for improvements to the Marine Corps' mobile electronic warfare support system (MEWSS).

The committee notes that the Marine Corps' MEWSS tactical reconnaissance system is a cooperative effort with the Army's ground based common sensor (GBCS) program. The GBCS program was terminated and all residual equipment was transferred to the Marine Corps for use in the MEWSS. However, no funds were included in the budget request to transfer and integrate GBCS components into the MEWSS vehicles or to maintain the limited rate initial production items.

The committee recommends $104.7 million in PE 26313M, an increase of $8.5 million for the specific purposes of transferring, integrating and maintaining the equipment gained from GBCS.

Mobile integrated diagnostic and data analysis system (MIDDAS)

The budget request contained $5.3 million in PE 64771N for medical development.

The committee understands that the Navy has no trauma management tools to aid medical personnel in monitoring and analyzing wounded patient medical data on a real-time basis in the field. The committee further understands that the Navy has made significant progress in the development of the MIDDAS to provide such a capability but that additional resources are required to complete this effort.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $7.3 million in PE 64771N for medical development, an increase of $2.0 million to accelerate development of the MIDDAS and demonstrate its ability to interface with communications and medical data systems.

Multi-function radar/volume search radar and the Navy's radar roadmap

The budget request contained a total of $305.3 million in PE 64300N for total ship systems engineering and manufacturing development for the DD–21 land attack destroyer, including $69.6 million for the multi-function radar (MFR) for ship defense and $57.5 million for the volume search radar (VSR) for air search and track.

The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) expressed concern that significant radar upgrades are required to meet the objective capabilities of the Navy theater wide (NTW) system. The report also noted that radar upgrades for TMD need to be thoroughly integrated with continued radar improvements required for fleet defense, development of the cooperative engagement capability (CEC), and development of next generation Navy destroyers and

cruisers. The report called for a clearly defined roadmap of radar requirements and technology to identify the best approaches for meeting the overlapping requirements of fleet defense and TMD.

The committee notes the Navy's submission of the *Surface Navy Radar Roadmap Study* as an interim report on the Navy's radar roadmap. The study states that a series of time-phased radar development decisions must be made to support varying surface ship acquisitions:

(1) Immediate decisions to be made regarding the radar suite configuration for new ships including DD–21 and the CVN–77 aircraft carrier.

(2) Near term decision on the radar configuration for the initial phase (Block I) of the NTW program.

(3) Near- to mid-term decisions (2–3 years) for Block II of the NTW program and for improvement in self-defense capabilities of ships now in service.

(4) Radar technologies to be developed for the next-generation air dominance/theater ballistic missile defense (TBMD) cruiser that would reach the fleet in 2015.

The plan provides a strategy to reduce the large number of redundant, obsolescing radars currently in the fleet to a small number of radars common across multiple ship classes. The plan confirms the need for:

(1) A radar suite composed of MFR and VSR for ships whose radar requirements are limited to self-defense and air control.

(2) A next generation radar suite, either derived from MFR/VSR, or perhaps involving one additional radar, for ships with TBMD and area anti-air warfare requirements.

The committee expresses concern that a clearly defined and funded radar roadmap is necessary to ensure the necessary upgrades to legacy radar systems and the development of new radar systems. The committee awaits Secretary of the Navy approval of the radar roadmap, delivery to the congressional defense committees, and incorporation of the approved program in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Multipurpose processor

The budget request contained $34.8 million in PE 64503N for submarine systems equipment development, including $28.2 million for submarine sonar improvements.

The committee notes that that the Acoustic Rapid Commercial-Off-the-Shelf Insertion (A–RCI) program has provided a tremendous improvement in sonar processing capabilities through the application of a cost-effective multipurpose acoustic signal processing technology and the advanced process build software development initiative. The committee continues to support incorporation of this advanced multipurpose signal processing technology into the Navy's acoustic surveillance and intelligence systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $49.8 million in PE 64503N, an increase of $15.0 million, to support the accelerated development and extension of common acoustic processing capabilities for undersea warfare applications through the use of the multipurpose processor.

Naval space surveillance

The budget request contained $2.0 million in PE 35927N for the Navy Space Surveillance network life extension activities.

The committee notes that the budget request for the fiscal year 2001 included a request for design concept activities that were provided in fiscal year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends $1.4 million in PE 35927N, a decrease of $600,000.

Navy mine countermeasures program

The budget request contained a total of $647.3 million for the Department of the Navy mine countermeasures program, including $334.9 million for research, development, test and evaluation, $118.4 million for procurement, and $177.4 million for operations and maintenance.

The committee has reviewed the U.S. Naval Mine Warfare Plan and the Department of the Navy's mine countermeasures (MCM) program for fiscal year 2001. The plan highlights mine warfare as a core competency of the naval services and near-, mid-, and long-term measures to ensure the continued readiness of the Navy's dedicated force of 26 MCM ships and the development and fielding of organic MCM systems in the fleet.

The committee notes that the increased funding levels provided for the MCM program through fiscal year 2005 will allow deployment of the programmed organic MCM capability to a carrier battle group in 2005, as well as continued modernization of dedicated MCM forces. The committee also notes that the Navy is establishing a capstone requirements document for a MCM system of systems that will baseline current requirements and identify shortfalls in existing MCM systems. Because the deployment of advanced MCM systems to the fleet will require new tactics, techniques, and procedures for their employment, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy consider the establishment of a Mine Warfare Battle Laboratory to accelerate the introduction of new technologies and concepts of operations for both MCM forces.

The committee is aware that the Navy has begun an analysis of alternatives for replacement of the USS INCHON (MCS–12) MCM support ship and a second analysis of alternatives for a future MCM(X) ship for the dedicated MCM fleet. The committee notes that technical problems encountered with the development of the shallow water assault breaching system (SABRE) and the Army's cancellation of the "Grizzly" combat breaching vehicle program severely impacts the development of the Navy and Marines in-stride assault mine-clearing capability. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the congressional defense committees the revisions to the MCM plan and programs that address these issues with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Advanced sensors for mine countermeasures and oceanography

The budget request contained $60.3 million in PE 62435N for oceanographic and atmospheric technology, including $22.6 million for applied research in natural and environmental influences on MCM systems and littoral oceanography.

The committee notes significant progress in the development of advanced underwater chemical, optical, and physical sensors and sensor systems for mine countermeasures and other underwater sensor applications, including the successful test of an underwater mass spectrometer for detection and mapping of trace quantities of volatile organic compounds that might be associated with underwater mines, chemical or biological agents, or hazardous wastes. The committee also notes the development of a small spectrophotometric and fluormetric analysis system for detection of trace elements underwater and of a high-speed, high resolution laser line scanner for three-dimensional mapping sea floor topography, both of which have potential application for mine countermeasures and other purposes.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62435N to continue the development and demonstration of advanced underwater chemical, optical, and physical sensors and sensor systems for mine countermeasures and other applications.

AN/AQS–20/X mine hunting sonar

The budget request contained $47.3 million in PE 64373N for airborne mine countermeasures engineering and manufacturing development, including $14.9 million to continue development of the AN/AQS–20/X helicopter-towed, mine hunting sonar system.

The AN/AQS–20/X will be the common mine hunting sonar system for the submersible AN/WLD–1 Remote Minehunting System (RMS) and the CH–60S airborne mine countermeasures (AMCM) helicopter that will provide the primary organic mine countermeasures capabilities for the fleet. The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of the AN/AQS–20/X mine hunting sonar and the Navy's decision in fiscal year 1999 to add an electro-optical sensor to the system's mine detection, localization and classification capabilities. The committee also notes that incorporating current state-of-the-art, commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) processor technology in the AN/AQS–20/X would significantly improve system performance, eliminate obsolescent components dating from the early 1990s, permit any system to operate from either the AMCM helicopter or the RMS, and significantly upgrade computer-aided detection and classification of mines and mine-like objects.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $64.3 million in PE 64373N, an increase of $17.0 million for incorporation of COTS processor technology in the AN/AQS–20/X mine hunting sonar.

Synthetic aperture sonar development for long-term mine reconnaissance system

The budget request contained $97.9 million in PE 63502N for demonstration and validation of surface and shallow water mine countermeasures, including $26.1 million for development of unmanned underwater vehicles (UUV).

The committee notes that the Navy developed the near-term mine reconnaissance system (NMRS) as a single operational prototype mine hunting UUV system, which is capable of mine detection, classification, and localization, and is launched and recovered from an SSN–688 class submarine. Employing forward- and side-

scanning sonar systems, the AN/BLQ–11 long-term mine reconnaissance system (LMRS) will replace the limited capability provided by the NMRS with a submarine launched and recoverable, autonomous capability that will have increased endurance, reliability, and search rate, and will provide the fleet a greatly improved capability to conduct clandestine mine reconnaissance. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has identified the development of a synthetic aperture sonar capability for the LMRS as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends $103.4 million in PE 63502N, including $5.5 million for development of a synthetic aperture sonar capability for the LMRS.

Naval modeling and simulation

The budget request contained $9.1 million in PE 38601N for naval modeling and simulation.

The committee notes recent advances in modeling and simulation for command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) systems. These advances demonstrate the use of efficient systems engineering and business practices and leverage and promote simulation based acquisition applied to the assessment, planning, testing, and technology insertion for C4ISR systems. The committee also notes progress in modeling and simulation systems engineering initiatives that aid operations analysis, engineering assessment, and additional efforts directed at understanding model development, fidelity, accuracy, and simulation efficiencies and their effects on tradeoff analyses involving C4ISR systems. The committee supports the development and understanding of new modeling and simulation tools that will assist in more effective decision-making and in the design of C4ISR systems and information architectures.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $12.1 million in PE 38601N, an increase of $3.0 million to continue initiatives for the development of improvements in C4ISR modeling and simulation.

New composite materials for aircraft canopies

The budget request contained $21.1 million in PE 62122N for applied research in aircraft technology.

The committee notes that aircraft windscreens and canopies are made of relatively soft materials, which can degrade over time, resulting in significant replacement costs. The committee is aware of proposals for the use of nano-composite materials that combine the ultraviolet stability, hardness and abrasion resistance of glass and the durability and adhesion of a plastic coating, offering significant improvements over conventional coating materials. The committee believes that the successful development and demonstration of the use of such materials on canopies and windscreens could significantly reduce operations and maintenance cost for the armed services.

The committee recommend $23.1 million in PE 62122N, an increase of $2.0 million for applied research and development of nano-composite hard coat materials for aircraft windscreens and canopies.

Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition

The budget request contained $28.6 million in PE 63609N for conventional munitions demonstration and validation.

The committee notes the progress in the development and demonstration of optical correlation technology to enhance target discrimination and aim point selection for next-generation weapon system seekers.

The committee recommends $33.6 million in PE 63609N, an increase of $5.0 million to continue the program for development and demonstration of miniature, rugged optical correlators for automatic target recognition and improved aim point selection for the Navy's Standard Missile.

Optically multiplexed wideband radar beam-forming array

The budget request contained $79.9 million in PE 62232N for applied research in communications, command, control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance technology, including $17.6 million for radar technology.

The committee notes that Congress provided a total of $4.0 million in fiscal year 2000 to initiate a cooperative program for research, development, and demonstration of a prototype optically multiplexed, wideband, radar beam-forming array that uses optical wavelength-division multiplexing (WDM). The committee also notes that the use of optical WDM is expected to reduce hardware complexity and system cost in a wideband electronically-steered active radar antenna that has high instantaneous bandwidth and the resolution necessary for theater ballistic missile defense and ship self defense in a littoral environment.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62232N to continue the program for development and demonstration of an optically multiplexed wideband radar beam-forming array.

P–3 modernization program

The budget request contained $2.9 million in PE 64221N for the P–3 maritime patrol aircraft modernization program, which provides upgrades to the aircraft's systems in order to enhance its surface and subsurface tracking and classification capabilities.

The committee continues to note the increasing demands placed by the major theater commanders on the P–3 for intelligence and surveillance missions in maritime, regional, and littoral operations. The committee also notes the Navy's cancellation of the sustained readiness program for the P–3 and the postponement of previous plans to initiate an analysis of alternatives for a replacement maritime patrol aircraft. Yet, the Navy's Integrated Submarine Warfare Roadmap cites the need for improvements in P–3 capabilities that are critical to near-term anti-submarine warfare operational capabilities. The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) expressed the belief that increased priority must be given to the maintenance of a robust, continuing research and development to sustain current P–3 capabilities and support introduction of new capabilities and recommended that the Secretary of the Navy review the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the P–3 to ensure that it follows the program priorities established in the roadmap.

The committee is concerned that the Navy is not taking the steps necessary to maintain the P–3 fleet and support the introduction of new operational capabilities that may be required in the future. The committee is aware of the need for the Navy to balance its competing program priorities among available funds, but believes that there is a systemic problem in the Navy in which insufficient attention is given to funding for the sustainment, technology refreshment, and improvement of legacy systems that are expected to remain in service and have no programmed replacement. The average age of the P–3 fleet is over 20 years, and the aircraft and its weapons systems are expected to remain in service until after 2020. The aircraft electrical system was designed for analog equipment and has become less compatible with modern digital equipment as technology has advanced. As expressed in previous reports, the committee believes that additional funding is required for combat systems development and integration of commercial-off-the-shelf signal processing technology to ensure that the P–3 provides the advanced anti-submarine warfare, anti-surface warfare, and surveillance capabilities that are required by the fleet.

Therefore, the committee recommends $7.8 million in PE 64221N, an increase of $1.9 million for the design, demonstration, and testing of a new electrical system and an increase of $3.0 million for advanced concept systems development. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report on the Navy's plans for sustaining the operational capabilities of the P–3 and for development of a replacement aircraft to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

P–3 special mission squadron sensor upgrade

The budget request contained $ 27.5 million in PE 35207N for manned reconnaissance systems research and development, including $2.2 million for special mission P–3 reconnaissance squadrons.

The committee notes the increased operational requirements placed on the P–3 special mission reconnaissance squadrons by the major combatant commanders and the need for improvements in aircraft sensors capabilities identified by the Chief of Naval Operations as an unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.6 million in PE 35207N to accelerate the development of three sensor upgrades for special mission P–3 aircraft squadrons.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request contained $58.3 million in PE 63747N for undersea warfare advanced technology development and $69.9 million in PE 64216N for the multi-mission helicopter upgrade program, but included no funds for the parametric airborne dipping sonar (PADS).

The committee notes that the Navy's advanced technology demonstration of a prototype PADS has indicated the significant potential of parametric sonar technology against both mine-like and submarine targets in littoral waters. The results of the Navy's at-sea test of PADS indicated that the essential goals of the PADS demonstration had been met and suggest PADS potential for mine detection. The Secretary of the Navy's evaluation report, dated Janu-

ary 1999, stated that the PADS technology merits further pursuit and that the Navy intended to continue demonstration of parametric sonar technology. The committee is aware that the Navy plans at-sea tests of the PADS prototype against submarine targets later this summer. Pending the successful completion of those tests, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the Navy's plan for further development of the PADS system with the submission of the fiscal 2002 budget request.

The committee recommends no additional funds for PADS in PE 63747N and PE 64216N and awaits recommendations from the Secretary of the Navy regarding the program.

Power node control centers

The budget request contained $37.4 million in PE 63508N for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and engineering advanced technology.

The committee notes the progress made in the development and demonstration of power node control centers for integrated switching, conversion, distribution, and control of electrical power aboard naval vessels. The committee is aware of other new electric power distribution and propulsion system architectures that can be automatically reconfigured to maintain the combat readiness of the shipboard navigation, communication, and weapons systems following accidental or hostile damage. The committee also notes the Navy's plans for the application of power node control centers in integrated power systems for the DD–21 land attack destroyer and other ships.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the development and demonstration of power node control centers and other flexible power distribution architectures and their application in integrated power systems.

Project M

The budget request contained $37.4 million in PE 63508N for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and engineering advanced technology, but contained no funds to continue Project M development of advanced machinery quieting technology.

The committee notes the initial reports of successful testing of Project M quieting technology installed in the one-quarter scale submarine at the Navy's acoustic test range, and believes that the technology is ready for transition from the Navy's science and technology base to potential applications in Navy propulsion and other machinery systems. The committee is aware that an issue of the potential magnetic signature of the technology must be resolved as a part of any transition to ship board applications.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63508N to transition Project M technology for Navy systems applications. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees on the Navy's plan for transition of the technology with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Radio frequency integration and testing environment

The budget request contained $270.3 million in PE 65864N for test and evaluation support.

The committee notes that the proliferation of antennas and radio frequency emitters on board Navy ships results in potentially severe electromagnetic interference among communications and sensor systems, which compete for bandwidth in the electromagnetic spectrum, unless careful attention is given to electromagnetic compatibility. While research and development continues to pursue the use of common aperture antenna arrays to reduce shipboard "antenna farms", the requirement to resolve potential electromagnetic compatibility issues can only grow as demands for communications channels and bandwidth increase and new sensors which use the electromagnetic spectrum are deployed to counter new threats.

The committee believes that the requirement may exist for a testing environment for radio frequency integration and ship electronic interoperability that would address the electromagnetic compatibility of ships in the demanding radio frequency environment of modern, joint littoral warfare. Such a testing environment would provide the capability for instrumented electronic testing for ship-based equipment to identify and resolve electromagnetic interference problems, before the deployment of the equipment to the fleet. The committee believes that a fully instrumented, electromagnetic simulation environment, similar to that currently used in aircraft and telecommunications system testing, would be reconfigurable for different ship classes and capable of participating in distributed interactive simulations. This capability could enable fleet analysis, technology evaluation, and development of new tactics, techniques, and procedures.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, to conduct an assessment and provide recommendations on requirements for electromagnetic compatibility testing of ship-based equipment and the potential need to establish a radio frequency integration and ship interoperability testing environment. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit the results of the assessment and any recommendations to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee recommends $270.3 million, the budget request, in PE 65864N for Navy test and evaluation support.

Remote precision gun

The budget request contained $ 54.7 million in PE 63640M for Marine Corps advanced technology demonstrations, but included no funds for the remote precision gun.

The committee is aware that a remotely operated precision gun platform is being developed to reduce risk to personnel under a variety of conditions. The committee notes that this remote fire system allows the operator to remain out of the line of fire and eliminates human error in aiming and firing a weapon.

The committee recommends $55.7 million in PE63640M, an increase of $1.0 million for completion of development of the remote precision gun aiming platform for military applications.

S–3B surveillance system upgrade program

The budget request contained $455,000 in PE 64217N for engineering and manufacturing development for the S–3 weapons system improvement program.

The committee notes that the objective of the S–3B surveillance system upgrade program is the integration of off-the-shelf radar, electro-optic, and infrared sensors; electronic support measures; and tactical data links to demonstrate an enhanced stand-off capability for this systems that could be achieved with low risk and at relatively low cost.

The committee strongly supports efforts to improve Navy battle group operations and, therefore, recommends $12.5 million in PE 64217N, an increase of $12.0 million to continue the S–3B surveillance system upgrade prototype demonstration program.

Ship service fuel cell program

The budget request contained $37.4 million in PE 63508N for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical advanced technology development, including $17.6 million for advanced electrical systems.

The committee notes the progress in the Navy's marine fuel cell program in the development of advanced ship service fuel cell power systems as affordable, alternative electrical sources for ship service power and the potential use of such systems in the DD–21 land attack destroyer program and for other ship service power applications. The committee notes program emphasis on leveraging commercial fuel cell technology and solving Navy issues such as operation in salt-laden air, shipboard shock and vibration, and reforming diesel and other common naval fuels for use in fuel cells systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million in PE 63508N to accelerate the on-going Phase II program for development and demonstration of a molten carbonate ship service fuel cell power system.

Silicon carbide and gallium nitride semiconductor substrates

The budget request contained $68.1 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics and computer technology.

The committee is aware that silicon carbide and gallium nitride are wide band-gap semiconductor materials with unique physical and electrical properties, which make possible the fabrication of a next-generation of microelectronic devices that will be capable of operating in radiation environments and at high temperatures, high voltages, high power levels, and microwave frequencies. These capabilities will enable a wide range of applications in military and commercial systems such as advanced radars, power systems, sensors and satellite communications. The committee continues to support the development of silicon carbide and gallium nitride materials and encourages the establishment of partnerships with industry to exploit the technology for commercial uses.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62234N for the continued development of silicon carbide and gallium nitride semiconductor materials and microelectronic applications.

Single flux quantum electronics

The budget request contained $68.1 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials and radio frequency/electro-optics/infrared electronics technology.

The committee notes the steady progress in laboratory demonstration of single flux quantum electronics and the potential of this technology for applications in high-speed military electronic systems and the processing of high-speed electronic signals. The committee notes that the development of the technology can be accelerated to take single flux quantum electronics from the present stage of component demonstration in the laboratory to the development of integrated modules that demonstrate key functions needed for specific military electronics applications, including analog to digital conversion of very high-speed electronic signals.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $3.0 million in PE 62234N for the initial two-year phase of a program for the development and demonstration of single flux quantum electronic technology for military applications.

SSGN Conversion

The budget request contained $34.8 M in PE 63559N to initiate the option for converting Ohio class Trident ballistic missile submarines (SSBN), currently scheduled for retirement, to a conventional cruise missile submarine (SSGN) configuration.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is assessing alternatives to maintain the nuclear attack submarine (SSN) force at the minimum force level of 55 SSNs, as recommended in the recent submarine force requirements study approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense directed the addition of $1.1 billion spread across the future years defense plan (FYDP) to sustain the 55 SSN structure by refueling four additional SSN–688s. The committee notes that the Secretary directed that conversion of up to four Trident SSBNs to an SSGN configuration be considered as an alternative to SSN refueling to maintain the 55 SSN force.

In the statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on S.1059 (H. Rept. 106–301), the conferees directed the Secretary to initiate arms control studies and cost and operational effectiveness analysis required to provide the basis for a defense acquisition milestone decision to proceed with the SSBN-to-SSGN conversion program. The committee notes that significant arms control issues relating to the Trident SSBN to SSGN conversion remain unresolved and that the cost and operational effectiveness assessment of the SSGN conversion is incomplete.

The committee notes that the Navy's notional plan for an SSGN conversion program would begin refueling and conversion of the first SSBN in fiscal year 2003. The notional schedule includes a Milestone 0 review by the Defense Acquisition Board late in fiscal year 2000, preliminary design and risk reduction studies in fiscal year 2001, a Milestone I/II decision to begin engineering and manufacturing development in fiscal year 2002, and initial operational capability for the first SSGN in fiscal year 2007. The committee notes, however, that the Navy budget projection for fiscal years 2002 through 2005 contains no additional funds for the program.

Senior Navy officials have confirmed that the budget request of $34.8 million is sufficient only to sustain the option for a version of the SSGN accountable under Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), and that $260 million is required in fiscal year 2001 to retain the option for a treaty-compliant SSGN conversion. The Navy estimates the cost of converting four SSBNs to START-accountable SSGNs at $1.3 billion and the cost of conversion to START-compliant SSGNs at $3.4 billion. Either of these two versions of SSGNs would require an additional $1.1 billion for refueling if SSGN conversion is conducted in addition to SSN refueling.

Navy officials acknowledged that the budget request is predicated on indications from the Administration that future START negotiations might include discussion of a change to the START protocol which would exempt non-treaty compliant SSGNs from START accountability. The committee is concerned that the proposed START-accountable SSGN acquisition strategy, dependent on successful resolution of START negotiations including a new protocol allowing special consideration of SSGNs, does not support the Navy's stated requirements to initiate design immediately in fiscal year 2001 to support a fiscal year 2002 milestone decision to begin the program.

Navy officials indicated that the converted SSBNs, although possessing unique operational capabilities, would not satisfy the mission capabilities required of nuclear attack submarines, and further indicated that an SSGN conversion program would affect the submarine industrial base and the schedule for the Virginia class SSN construction.

The committee expresses deep concern for the initiation of additional major program acquisition programs not currently in the Navy's outyear planning budgets. These new efforts threaten the funding available for Navy aircraft modernization and ship construction programs through the end of the FYDP and beyond, and are, (as noted elsewhere in this report), resulting in consideration of significant changes in modernization and procurement programs required to maintain essential Navy capabilities and core competencies. The funding required for Navy core programs and the cost of the SSGN conversion program, even if the arms control and cost and operational effectiveness issues can be resolved, will severely impact the Navy's future budget projections. The committee also notes that a development strategy for preserving the SSGN conversion option that is based on the assumption of a willingness to negotiate an exception to START could, if the negotiations were not successful, have a significant impact on the U.S. strategic nuclear force levels under START II and an unacceptable impact under proposed START III limits.

The committee recommends $34.8 M in PE 63559N, the budget request for the SSGN conversion program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with an approved acquisition strategy and program plan for the SSBN–SSGN conversion that identifies program funding and schedule, which addresses a milestone schedule for resolution of the arms control issues and a decision as to whether the SSGN

shall be START-accountable or START compliant, with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Submarine sonar dome window

The budget request contained $207.1 million in PE 64558N for the Virginia class SSN program.

The committee notes the Navy's progress in the application for submarine sonar domes and windows of an advanced glass-reinforced plastic and rubber structural acoustic sandwich material system, which was originally developed for surface ship sonar domes and windows. The committee understands that at-sea testing of a quarter-scale submarine sonar dome indicates potentially significant improvements in sonar performance and sonar dome durability for the VIRGINIA class SSN and that system manufacturing costs for this dome should be reduced compared to the current sonar dome.

The committee recommends $209.1 million in PE 64558N for Virginia class SSN engineering and manufacturing development, an increase of $2.0 million to continue the program for fabrication of a full-scale sonar dome using the advanced acoustic sandwich material system for further evaluation and testing.

Supply chain management and development best practices

The budget request contained $949,000 in PE 65804N for technical information services that support cooperative advanced technology initiatives between the Navy and U.S. industry with the goals of improving affordability and reducing life cycle costs of new and modernized Navy systems.

The committee notes that technology advances by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, other military services, and other government agencies provide the Navy with an opportunity to leverage research and development investments that could lead to radical improvements in the affordability and effectiveness of Navy systems. Similarly, technology and production and business practices developed by industry can also contribute to the development of more effective and affordable defense systems. With a growing reliance on industry as the integrator of ships and other weapon systems, the understanding and promotion of new technologies and the adoption of best business practices between government and industry can result in significant improvements in operational effectiveness and affordability over the life cycle of systems. The committee notes, however, that logistical support and supply activities are often brought into the development cycle at late stages and are, as a result, not able to influence the development of the system at a time when the adoption of improvements in management and business practices could have the greatest effect on the system life cycle.

The committee strongly supports coordination and involvement by the materiel developer, the user, the logistical support chain, government, and industry in the development of new systems and the modernization of existing systems. The committee believes that there is much to be gained from the development and adoption of best business practices in the materiel and systems development life cycle from its initial stages through research and development,

acquisition and fielding, and support of the systems in the field, and in facilitating the exchange of information and technology between industry and government for this purpose.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $ 4.9 million in PE 65804N, an increase of $4.0 million to establish a program that will facilitate the development and adoption of logistical best business and management practices among government and industry that are involved in the development, acquisition, and support of defense systems.

Surface ship torpedo defense

The budget request included no funds for continuation of the Navy's joint surface ship torpedo defense program with the United Kingdom.

The committee recommends $8.4 million in PE 63506N to continue the joint collaborative surface ship torpedo defense program with the United Kingdom for upgrades to the SLQ–25A torpedo countermeasures capability and development and integration of promising soft kill and hard kill countermeasures.

Tactical unmanned aerial vehicles

The budget request contained $113.1 million in PE 35204N for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles, but included no funding to continue development of the multi-function self-aligned gate (MSAG).

The committee is aware that the MSAG technology successfully demonstrated ability to transmit and receive full-motion video and communication. This new form of antenna, with no moving parts, offers reduced life-cycle costs and enables production of light, conformal, multi-beam antennas for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (TUAV) and associated systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million in PE 35204N to construct and test a line-of-sight array for the tactical control system for the UAV.

Vacuum electronics

The budget request contained $68.1 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials and radio frequency, electro-optics, and infrared electronics technology, including $10.0 million for applied research in vacuum electronics.

The committee is aware of the potential need for increased funding levels for vacuum technology research and development in order to support the development of advanced high power vacuum tubes for Navy radar and other applications that cannot be met with current solid state devices. In the committee report on H.R. 1402 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee noted its support for continuation of a robust vacuum electronics research and development program within the Department of Defense (DOD) and other federal agencies. The committee directed the Secretary of the Navy to assess DOD's requirements for advanced vacuum electronics technology and to report the results of that assessment and the long-term funding plan for the vacuum electronics program.

The committee notes that the Secretary's interim report to the congressional defense committees, dated March 7, 2000, states that an ongoing assessment of vacuum electronics and solid state tech-

nologies and applications will lead to the development of a long-term investment strategy and roadmap for future vacuum electronics and solid state technology activities. The results of the assessment will be reported to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2002 President's budget request. In the interim, the Department of the Navy intends to continue its current investment level in vacuum electronics.

The committee recommends $10.0 million in PE 62234N for applied research in vacuum electronics technology and awaits the Secretary's final report and recommendations for the long-term vacuum technology program with the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter demonstration

The budget request contained $76.3 million in PE 63792N for advanced technology transition, including the vectored thrust ducted propeller (VTDP) compound helicopter advanced technology demonstration project, and $13.2 million in PE 64212N for development of the CH–60S airborne mine counter measures helicopter.

The committee notes that the Navy has placed a high priority on the development of an organic airborne mine countermeasures capability and the demonstration of a variant of the CH–60 helicopter for the towed airborne mine counter measures (AMCM) missions. As a back-up technology, the Navy plans an advanced technology demonstration (ATD) of the VTDP compound helicopter to demonstrate and assess the helicopter's towed AMCM capability, other multi-mission capabilities, and life cycle cost effectiveness.

The committee notes reports by Navy officials that early results from CH-60 land- and sea-based tow tests indicate that the helicopter should be able to perform the towed AMCM mission and that the final phase of the tow test will begin in late fiscal year 2000. Following integration of AMCM systems and sensors on the CH–60S helicopter, the Navy plans initial operational capability of the helicopter in its organic AMCM role in fiscal year 2005.

The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) directed the Secretary of the Navy to assess the requirements, schedule, and cost of conducting the ATD for the VTDP compound helicopter. The Secretary's report, dated March 2000, states that the requirement to demonstrate the potential value of this back-up technology for the AMCM mission and other multi-mission applications remains unchanged, and that the Navy has programmed the funds required through fiscal year 2002 to complete the demonstration, including $11.3 million in fiscal year 2001. The Department plans to begin a two-phased ATD in the third quarter of fiscal year 2000, contingent upon successful completion of VTDP ground test, and to complete flight testing in fiscal year 2004. The report also indicated delays in completion of the ground test are being assessed for their effect on project cost, schedule, and risk. The Secretary's report concludes that the Department will proceed with the ATD as planned and will advise the Congressional defense committees regarding any significant information that would affect the project's progress.

The committee intends to monitor closely the Navy's progress in development of the CH–60S helicopter for the AMCM mission and

progress in the VTDP compound helicopter ATD. The committee recommends $11.3 million, the requested amount, in PE 63792N for continuation of the VTDP compound helicopter demonstration project.

Virtual test bed for advanced electrical ship systems

The budget request contained $37.4 million in PE 63508N for advanced development of surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and engineering advanced technology.

The committee continues to support the development and application of technologies that will lead to lower cost designs for future naval ships. The committee notes the progress that has been made in the development of a virtual, distributed test bed that supports the integration of power electronics into ship systems. As a part of the Navy's program leading to the development of an all-electric ship, the virtual test bed provides a virtual test laboratory of new software and hardware modeling tools for shipboard machinery design, and allows government and industry ship designers to evaluate machinery alternatives in a virtual prototype before committing to full-scale development.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the development and application of the virtual test bed for the design and evaluation of advanced shipboard electrical power system concepts and designs.

AIR FORCE RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $13,685.6 million for Air Force RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $13,677.1 million, a decrease of $8.5 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Air Force RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table and in the classified annex to this report.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206,149	3,000	209,149
		Upper Atmospheric and Astronomical Research			[+3,000]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	206,149	3,000	209,149
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	206,149	3,000	209,149
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	72,815	7,250	80,065
		Special Aerospace Materials and Manufacturing Processes			[+5,250]
		Ultra-High Thermal Conductivity Graphite Materials			[+2,000]
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	48,775	1,000	49,775
		Composite Affordability Initiative			[+1,000]
0602202F	4	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	62,619		62,619
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	116,262	6,000	122,262
		IHPTET/IHPRPT			[+6,000]
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE SENSORS	65,644		65,644
0602269F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	-		-
0602601F	8	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	57,687		57,687
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
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	590,255	14,250	604,505
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	590,255	14,250	604,505
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
0603106F	13	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	13,895		13,895
0603112F	14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,678	5,250	26,928
		Special Aerospace Materials and Manufacturing Processes			[+5,250]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603202F	15	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	34,440		34,440
0603203F	16	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	28,311	2,000	30,311
		Combat Identification			[+2,000]
0603205F	17	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	2,445		2,445
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	2,000	14,479
		Aircrew Laser Eye Protection			[+2,000]
0603245F	22	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	13,184	56,000	69,184
		21st Century Affordable Aircraft Thrust Demonstration Project			[+56,000]
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	33,700	57,983
		High Energy Propulsion Systems			[+23,700]
		Low Cost Launch Technology			[+10,000]
0603311F	26	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	-	12,000	12,000
		Ballistic Missile Technology			[+12,000]
0603401F	27	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	97,327	5,000	102,327
		Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS)			[+5,000]
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	-		-
0603723F	33	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603726F	34	AEROSPACE INFO TECH SYS INTEGRATION	7,429		7,429
0603728F	35	BATTLESPACE C2 TECHNOLOGY	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603789F	36	C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,468		19,468
0603876F	37	SPACE-BASED LASER	63,216		63,216
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	494,942	115,950	610,892
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	494,942	115,950	610,892
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603260F	38	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,401		4,401
0603319F	39	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	148,637	(148,637)	-
		Transfer to 0603XXXC			[-148,637]
0603430F	40	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	246,396		246,396
0603432F	41	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	26,068		26,068
0603434F	42	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYS (SPA(	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	15,000	144,538
		JSF Alternate Engine Program			[+15,000]
0603850F	50	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,488	(8,700)	15,788
		Integrated Broadcast Service			[-8,700]
0603851F	51	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	39,246		39,246
0603854F	52	WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	134,029		134,029
0603856F	53	AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)	3,370	(2,000)	1,370
		Air Force/ NRO Partnership			[-2,000]
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	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604237F	57	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT	-		-
0604327F	58	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	-		-
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	888,451	(144,337)	744,114
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	888,451	(144,337)	744,114
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
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	10,000	178,122
		Link 16 Data Link			[+10,000]
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	94,000	142,313
		Smart Bomb Rack			[+56,000]
		Link 16/Center Instrument Display			[+38,000]
0604270F	67	EW DEVELOPMENT	58,198	24,700	82,898
		Precision Location and Identification Technology			[+17,700]
		MALD			[+7,000]
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)	-
		Transfer to BMDO PE 0603871C			[-241,021]
0604479F	70	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	236,841	1,000	237,841
		Automated Communication Satellite Management			[+5,000]
		MILSTAR			[-4,000]
0604480F	71	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)	-		-
0604600F	72	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0604602F	73	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,876	15,000	23,876
		Miniaturized Munitions Capability			[+15,000]
0604604F	74	SUBMUNITIONS	4,775		4,775

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604617F	75	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	668		668
0604618F	76	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,157	25,000	26,157
		Increase			[+25,000]
0604703F	77	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	5,929		5,929
0604706F	78	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	14,758	(6,900)	7,858
		Joint Ejection Seat Program			[-10,900]
		Standardized Cockpit and Crew Seats			[+4,000]
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	4,000	16,559
		AMODSM			[+4,000]
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 COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (JINTACC	5,825		5,825
0604800F	87	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	299,540		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
0604XXXF	xx	EXTENDED RANGE CRUISE MISSILE	-	86,100	86,100
		Increase			[+86,100]
0605011F	91	RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	14,204	12,000	26,204
		Aging Landing Gear Life Extension			[+12,000]
0207249F	92	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS	3,965		3,965
0305176F	93	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	10,842		10,842
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,553,609	23,879	3,577,488
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	270,032	(229,021)	41,011
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,283,577	252,900	3,536,477
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0604256F	94	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,785		34,785

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	-		-
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
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	590,067	-	590,067
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	590,067	-	590,067
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
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	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	992		992
0102411F	113	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM	-		-
0102445F	114	COUNTERDRUG AEROSTATS	-		0
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	7,600	68,860
		BOL Countermeasures			[+7,600]
0207136F	119	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,670		14,670
0207141F	120	F-117A SQUADRONS	3,912		3,912

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	4,000	13,826
		Hyperspectral Imagery System			[+4,000]
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
0207277F	xxx	EAGLE VISION	-	4,500	4,500
0207320F	127	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS	-		-
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	3,000	93,713
0207438F	135	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	41,068		41,068
0207581F	136	JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JOINT STARS)	144,118	2,500	146,618
0207590F	137	SEEK EAGLE	19,472		19,472
0207591F	138	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	266,458	14,500	280,958
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 - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0303131F	156	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	15,302	5,000	20,302
		B-52 MMRT Configurations			[+5,000]
0303140F	157	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,212		7,212
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		17,797
0304311F	163	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-		0
0305099F	164	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	8,508		8,508
0305110F	165	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	58,643		58,643
		Space Battlelab			[1,500]
0305111F	166	WEATHER SERVICE	19,942		19,942
0305114F	167	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (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	(7,100)	38,049
		Defense Reconnaissance Support Program			[-7,100]
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 SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	250,197		250,197
0305182F	180	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	53,654	6,200	59,854
		New Flight Termination System			[+700]
		Space Launch Operations Complex			[+5,500]
0305202F	181	DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	27,546	4,000	31,546
		U-2 SYERS			[+4,000]
0305205F	182	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	109,215		109,215
		Global Hawk EO/IR Sensor Packages			[12,000]
0305206F	183	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	136,913		136,913

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305207F	184	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	-	2,000	2,000
		Multi Link Antenna System			[+2,000]
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
		Naval Modeling and Simulation			[+3,000]
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	4,500	57,582
		Specialty Aerospace Metals			[+4,500]
0708026F	203	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	15,227		15,227
0708071F	204	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,238		11,238
0708611F	205	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	32,258		32,258
0708612F	206	COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CRSIP)	2,356		2,356
0901218F	207	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,209		7,209

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1001018F	208	NATO JOINT STARS	3,270		3270
XXXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	4,123,225	(71,910)	4,051,315
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,238,878	50,700	3,289,578
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,238,878	50,700	3,289,578
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, AIR FORCE	13,685,576	(8,468)	13,677,108
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,401,999	(261,368)	10,140,631
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,283,577	252,900	3,536,477

Items of Special Interest

21st century affordable aircraft thrust demonstration project

The budget request contained $13.2 million in PE 63245F for flight vehicle performance and supportability technologies but included no funds for the 21st century affordable aircraft thrust demonstration project, a unique, science and technology approach to legacy aircraft modernization which provides an integrated, life-cycle focus for key technologies that support acquisition affordability processes.

The committee is increasingly concerned with the rising operations and support costs for the services' aging inventory of fighter and attack aircraft and believes that such rising costs have the potential to adversely impact the budgets required to both modernize and maintain future operational readiness. To address this concern, the committee understands that the Air Force Research Laboratory completed a fiscal year 1999 study which determined that near-term advanced technology, when coupled with innovative acquisition, design, production and support processes, could produce a new and more capable F–15C aircraft. The committee also understands that the aircraft's 20-year life cycle cost, including acquisition, would be dramatically less that the projected cost of both upgrading and sustaining the existing F–15C fleet.

In an effort to reduce rising operations and support costs, the committee recommends $69.2 million in PE 63245F, an increase of $56.0 million to begin construction of two demonstration aircraft consistent with the Air Force Research Laboratory's fiscal year 1999 study and believes that lessons learned and data collected from this project will be applicable to aircraft of all services.

Aging landing gear life extension

The budget request contained $14.2 million in PE 65011F for RDT&E For Aging Aircraft.

The committee notes the increasing incidence of Class A aviation mishaps attributable to landing gear failure, as well as rising Mission Incapable rates for high priority aircraft such as the KC–135 and C–130 due to limited availability of replacement landing gear components. The committee is aware that the Air Force is working to develop improved components and advanced inspection and overhaul equipment to address a number of aging problems for the current inventories of U.S. aircraft. However, the limited funds available in the RDT&E For Aging Aircraft program are insufficient to support the promising goals of the Aging Landing Gear Life Extension (ALGLE) program.

The committee recommends $26.2 million in PE65011F, an increase of $12.0 million for acceleration of the ALGLE program.

Airborne laser

The budget request contained $148.6 million in PE 63319F for the Airborne Laser (ABL) program.

The committee is disturbed that the budget request represents a reduction of $92.4 million compared to the funding level projected in the fiscal year 2000 budget request. The committee understands that this reduction will delay the first lethal test against a missile

by two years, from fiscal year 2003 to fiscal year 2005. The committee further understands that the Air Force reduced ABL funding throughout the future years defense plan by approximately fifty percent, a decrease that would delay initial operational capability by five years or more. The committee notes that, prior to these funding decreases, the program was on schedule, meeting costs and technical milestones.

The committee also notes that the Air Force justified the proposed reductions on the basis that the service has higher priorities. The committee is aware that the ABL is an important part of the ballistic missile defense architecture developed by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), yet the changes to the ABL budget profile and the program delays that would result were not coordinated in any way with the Director of the BMDO.

The committee continues to believe that ballistic missile defense remains a very high priority and that the challenge of meeting rapidly evolving missile threats requires an integrated approach. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (section 235) to establish a new program element within defense-wide research and development for the ABL program. The committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of Defense realign resources throughout the future years defense program to assure that the BMDO can manage the ABL program to achieve timely development and testing.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish the Director of BMDO as the ABL program acquisition executive through development and operational testing, at which time the committee would support a recommendation by the Secretary of Defense to transfer procurement responsibilities to the Air Force. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force has executed this program since its inception and directs the Director of BMDO assure that the Department of the Air Force continue to execute program management during ABL development and operational testing. The committee further understands that the Air Force will provide ABL training and that Air Force personnel will operate the ABL system when deployed.

The committee recommends no funds in PE 63319F, a decrease of $148.6 million, and $231.0 million in a new PE 63XXXC, an increase of $82.4 million and transfer of all funding for ABL.

Airborne reconnaissance systems

The budget request contained $136.9 million in PE 35206F for airborne reconnaissance systems.

The committee notes that the joint signals intelligence (SIGINT) avionics family (JSAF) under development, consisting of a low-band subsystem (LBSS) and high band subsystem (HBSS), has applications in several intelligence collection platforms. The committee notes that the joint airborne SIGINT architecture (JASA) provides future SIGINT payloads, such as JSAF, with a standard architecture, thereby providing the potential for reducing costs through use of commercial off-the-shelf technologies. The committee fully supports the research and development of this program in order to determine if the JASA potential can be realized. However, the committee is concerned that procurement of JSAF is not properly fund-

ed and sequenced to preclude adverse effects on intelligence collection operations. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the emerging commercial silicon germanium (SiGe) technology may offer significant size, weight, performance, and cost advantages over existing technology, and believes it may well be beneficially applied to the JSAF requirements. The committee strongly recommends rapid development of SiGe technology for appropriate applications.

Therefore, the committee recommends $136.9 million in PE 35206F. Further, the committee makes specific procurement funding modifications elsewhere in this report to better support both the continued development of the JSAF and operational SIGINT capabilities already fielded.

Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) partnership

The budget request contained $3.4 million in PE 63856F for the Air Force/National Reconnaissance Office Partnership.

The committee understands that $2.0 million of the funding requested would be used for studies and analysis of synergies between the Air Force and the NRO. The committee notes that the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Space, also serves as the director of the NRO. The committee believes that coordination between the two organizations is inherently institutionalized, and should be a matter of routine.

The committee recommends $1.4 million in PE 63856F, a reduction of $2.0 million.

Air Force science and technology

The budget request contained $1,291.3 million for Air Force science and technology (S&T) funding, including $206.1 million for basic research, $590.3 for applied research, and $494.9 for advanced technology development.

The committee notes that the total request for Air Force S&T represents a decrease from the amount provided for fiscal year 2000, and a third consecutive year of decline for this critical area of modernization investment. The Air Force has shown modest improvement in this area by increasing the fiscal year 2001 S&T request above the forecasted level. However, the committee remains concerned that Air Force modernization investments still reflect a much higher priority on near-term modernization and sustainment of legacy systems than on sustaining adequate levels of investment in S&T to enable future modernization.

The committee is aware that the Air Force is designated as the lead service for a number of technology areas including aerospace propulsion, flight vehicle technology, and space systems development, and that many Army, Navy, and Marine Corps acquisition programs depend on adequate levels of S&T funding being sustained in these areas. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense has recently taken action to correct the unacceptable decline in the Air Force funding for aerospace propulsion and fully supports the revitalized emphasis in this important technology area.

To correct the investment imbalances caused by the Air Force prioritization of legacy system sustainment and near term mod-

ernization, the committee recommends an increase of $77.2 million for Air Force science and technology as described in the following adjustments to the specific programs. Elsewhere in this report, the committee provides support for special materials development including an increase of $2.0 million in PE 62102F for intermediate modulus carbon fiber and ultra-high thermal conductivity graphite materials.

Aerospace propulsion

The budget request contained $116.3 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion applied research, $38.0 million in PE 62111N for air and surface launched weapons technology, and $24.3 million in PE 63302F for space and missile rocket propulsion technology.

The committee notes the numerous advances in Integrated High Performance Turbine Engine Technology (IHPTET) and Integrated High Performance Rocket Propulsion Technology (IHPRPT) achieved over the past several years. The IHPRPT initiative has enabled the services to pursue needed advances in liquid and solid propulsion research for small missile projects such as the lightweight, low cost SPIKE infantry guided missile project and the solid fuel ramjet deep strike missile. Programs that benefit from IHPTET include F–22 Raptor and Joint Strike Fighter advanced turbine engines, all current turbine engine aircraft programs, and numerous strategic and tactical missile systems.

The committee also notes important technology advances in the area of magnetic bearing cooling turbine designs that offer significant improvements in operational readiness and safety of the KC–135 and C–130 aircraft fleets. The magnetic bearing provides near frictionless bearing capability resulting in dramatically reduced lifecycle costs and improved mission capable rates.

The committee notes that many space launch vehicles, both planned and currently under development, will transition from traditional propulsion systems to high-pressure systems that use liquid oxygen and kerosene. The committee notes that this rocket fuel is both more energetic than hydrogen fuels and is environmentally friendly. The committee is concerned, however, that the research and development test infrastructure is inadequate to validate the performance of new high-energy propulsion technologies in a timely manner and believes that additional funding is needed to reinforce this effort. The committee believes that such upgrades would also support a wide range of IPHRPT programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62203F, and an increase of $4.0 million in PE 62111N for acceleration of advanced aerospace propulsion initiatives associated with the IHPTET and IPHRPT programs. The committee further recommends an increase of $23.7 million in PE 63302F for new technology insertion into existing large propulsion test facilities to test new high-energy propulsion systems.

Aircrew laser eye protection

The budget request contained $12.5 million in PE 63231F for crew systems and personnel protection technology, including $1.3 million for aircrew laser eye protection.

The committee has consistently supported the Department of Defense's efforts to enhance aircraft crewmember protection systems. The committee is aware of the ongoing efforts to develop both laser eye protection in both the near-infrared and visible light portions of the spectrum. The committee notes the exceptional future battlefield benefit of providing maximum protection in the visible spectrum urges the continued development of these initiatives and encourages them to be viewed as a high priority.

The committee recommends $14.5 million in PE 63231F, an increase of $2.0 million to address visible spectrum technologies and development.

Ballistic missile technology

The budget request contained no funds in PE 63311F for the ballistic missile technology (BMT) program.

The committee notes that both the Navy Trident D–5 submarine launched ballistic missile and the Air Force Minuteman III land-based intercontinental ballistic missile are aging, will require continuing efforts to assure their operational viability, and will eventually need to be replaced. The committee also notes that current defense planning guidance directs the Air Force and Navy to apply common technologies and components to meet requirements for ballistic missile sustainment and upgrades. The committee is aware that the Navy and Air Force are actively seeking to avoid duplication of missile technology development efforts. If adequately funded, BMT is the Air Force program in which these efforts will be pursued. The committee also believes that the BMT program could support a number of other on-going technology developments with potential to meet important military needs, including the demonstration of a portable Global Positioning System range safety system and technologies relevant to the destruction of hardened and deeply buried targets.

The committee believes these efforts offer significant contributions to Air Force missile programs and is concerned with the lack of support for the BMT program. The committee, therefore, recommends $12.0 million in PE 63311F, an increase of $12.0 million.

Combat identification

The budget request contained $13.7 million in PE 63203F for target attack and recognition technology.

The committee notes the importance placed by the military services on pursuing technological advances to improve rapid combat identification of friendly and opposing forces, and is disturbed by recent Air Force funding reductions in this area. All-weather positive target identification at long stand-off ranges was specifically cited as a limiting factor during operations in Kosovo.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63203F for acceleration of combat identification development.

Composite affordability initiative

The budget request contained $48.8 million in PE 62201F for aerospace flight dynamics, including $1.8 million for concepts and initiatives to reduce manufacturing cost.

The committee is aware of a number of technologies being developed under the Composite Affordability Initiative (CAI) program, including 3D weaving technology. This technology offers the potential for improved performance and cost reduction in applications such as future military aircraft unitized structures and lightweight civil aircraft.

The committee supports the CAI program and recommends an increase of $1.0 million in PE 62201F for 3D weaving technology.

Low cost launch technology

The budget request contained $24.3 million in PE 63302F for development of space and missile rocket propulsion, but included no funds for low cost launch technology.

The committee is aware of a number of technologies and concepts that offer the potential to reduce launch costs dramatically, including Scorpius, which utilizes simplified processes and technologies to achieve streamlined, low cost launch and has successfully demonstrated launch capabilities. The committee believes that continued research in this area is important to the long-term viability of the U.S. launch industry and that those technologies that have demonstrated success deserve priority. The committee believes that the Air Force, as the service primarily responsible for meeting national security launch needs, should manage this effort rather than the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63302F, for low cost launch technologies including Scorpius.

Miniature satellite threat reporting system

The budget request contained $97.3 million in PE 63401F for advanced spacecraft technology, of which $1.1 million is for space systems protection.

The miniature satellite threat reporting system (MSTRS) program is developing technologies for a variety of space platforms to provide warning against ground-based, broadband radio frequency threats to satellites and to help protect against interference, intrusion, jamming, and unauthorized use of U.S. satellites. Prior year funding has supported miniaturization of the technology, preparations for a test flight of MSTRS technology in fiscal year 2001, and a year-long demonstration of these technologies starting in fiscal year 2004. The committee continues to believe that MSTRS is an important effort given the increasing reliance of U.S. military forces on space assets and the potential vulnerability of these assets to evolving threats.

The committee understands that additional funding is needed to accommodate the 2001 flight test and to complete miniaturization. Therefore the committee recommends $102.3 million in PE 63401F, an increase of $5.0 million for further development of MSTRS technology.

Specialty aerospace metals

The budget request contained $72.8 million for PE 62102F for applied research and $21.7 million in PE 63112F for advanced development of materials technologies for aerospace systems and

$53.1 million in PE 78011F for the Air Force's manufacturing technology program.

The committee notes the continuing need for advances in special aerospace metals and metal alloys for aircraft and space vehicle structures, propulsion, components, and weapon systems. Both the Navy and the Air Force are seeking access to materials that are lightweight, high strength, high performance, and capable of withstanding the stressing environments that are experienced by aerospace systems, and for the development and optimization of manufacturing processes for these materials.

The committee recommends increases of $5.25 million in PE 62102F, $5.25 million in PE 63112F, and $4.5 million in PE 78011F to establish an integrated program for the development and demonstration of special aerospace materials and materials manufacturing processes, and encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a continuing program for special aerospace metals and alloys as an integral part of the Air Force's science and technology and manufacturing technology programs. The committee requests the Secretary to assess Air Force requirements for advanced special aerospace metals and alloys and to report to the congressional defense committees on the Air Force's plan for meeting those requirements with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Upper atmospheric and astronomical research

The budget request contained $206.1 million in PE 61102F for Air Force basic research, but included no funding for proposed enhancements to upper atmospheric and astronomical research activities.

The committee understands that completion and testing of a proposed thirty-six reflector telescope would support Air Force relevant space research and efforts to increase fundamental understanding of the upper atmosphere. The committee supports this effort and recommends $209.1 million in PE 61102F, an increase of $3.0 million for upper atmospheric and astronomical research.

Advanced message-oriented data security module (AMODSM)

The budget request contained $12.6 million in PE 64735F for combat training range development but included no funds to integrate AMODSM units in the Nellis Air Combat Training System (NACTS) or the Tyndall Range Expansion (TRE). Additionally, the budget request contained $398.5 million for in the procurement miscellaneous production charges and $26.0 million for combat training ranges but included no funds for procurement of AMODSM units.

Both the NACTS and the TRE are used to train aircrews for combat and are configured with instrumentation to determine aerial combat outcomes. AMODSM units provide encrypted fly-out information for the advanced medium-range air-to-air missile (AMRAAM), the primary beyond-visual-range air-to-air weapon for Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps fighter and attack aircraft, and enable aircrews to determine AMRAAM training mission results at the NACTS and TRE. The committee believes that AMOSM units are required for training at the NACTS and TRE and rec-

ommended an increase for this purpose in its report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) for fiscal year 2000.

To complete the AMODSM unit integration effort on the NACTS and TRE, the committee recommends $16.6 million in PE 64735F, an increase of $4.0 million. Additionally, the committee recommends $399.5 million in miscellaneous production charges, an increase of $1.0 million, to begin procurement of AMODSM units for aircraft installation; and $27.0 million for combat training ranges, an increase of $1.0 million, for procurement of ground-based AMODSM equipment at the NACTS and TRE. The committee expects these additional funds to be expeditiously obligated in order to achieve AMODSM operational capability at the earliest possible date.

B–1B link 16 data link

The budget request contained $168.1 million in PE 64226F for B–1B bomber modernization but included no funds for B–1B Link 16 connectivity.

The committee believes that upgraded data links are needed for the B–1B that can provide real-time information to B–1B flight crews to improve their situational and threat awareness and their ability to plan and execute missions. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified the B–1B Link 16 data link as one of his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends $178.1 million in PE 64226F, an increase of $10.0 million for the B–1B Link 16 data link.

B–2 upgrades

The budget request contained $48.3 million in PE 64240F for continued development of technologies to enhance the capabilities of the B–2 bomber.

The committee continues to accept the conclusion of the 1998 Long Range Air Power panel that additional investments are required for the B–2 to reach its full operational potential. The committee notes that the Air Force has identified a number of technologies that would enhance B–2 capabilities, including development of a bomb rack assembly with communications interfaces, development of a 500-pound variant of the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM), improvements in B–2 connectivity, and upgrades of B–2 data displays. Development of the smart bomb rack and the smaller JDAM will improve the B–2's operational flexibility by allowing it to carry larger payloads of all-weather near-precision munitions. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified development of the smart bomb rack assembly as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 and recommends an increase of $56.0 million for development of the smart bomb rack assembly for the B–2 bomber.

The committee notes the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) added funds for Link 16 integration with the B–2. The committee notes that this datalink in conjunction with a center instrument display (CID) capable of augmenting the current display system will enhance the situational awareness of B–2 aircrews and B–2 mission effectiveness. There-

fore, the committee also recommends an increase of $38.0 million for Link 16 integration and development of the CID.

In total, the committee recommends $142.3 million in PE 64240F, an increase of $94.0 million for B–2 upgrades.

B–52 modified miniature receive terminals configuration

The budget request contained $15.3 million in PE 33131F for research and development on the minimum essential emergency communications network (MEECN), of which $2.7 million was for improvements for aircraft very low frequency/low frequency (VLF/LF) communications.

The committee notes that B–52 bombers have not been equipped with modified VLF/LF miniature receive terminals (MMRT) that provide high data rate capability and that modification of existing miniature receive terminals has been directed by the Joint Staff. This capability is critical for timely reception of emergency action messages by nuclear-capable bombers.

The committee recommends $20.3 million in PE 33131F, an increase of $5.0 million to modify the B–52 miniature receive terminals to the MMRT configuration with high data rate capabilities.

Defense reconnaissance support program

The budget requested contained $45.1 million in PE 35159F for various projects within the defense reconnaissance support program (DSRP).

The committee recommends $38.0 million in PE35159F, a decrease of $7.1 million. This reduction is taken without prejudice.

Discoverer II

The budget request contained $97.3 million in PE63401F, including $54.2 million for Discoverer II, and $182.2 million in PE 63762E for sensor and guidance technology, including $40.1 million for Discoverer II. The request also contained additional funding in a classified program element for the design and development of the Discoverer II space-based moving target indicator (MTI) demonstration project.

The committee remains supportive of the Discoverer II demonstration and believes that space-based radar has the potential to meet identified military requirements. However, the committee believes that the capabilities promised by space-based radar are valuable only if the capability is developed and deployed at affordable cost, and that cost discipline will be key to success for Discover II. The committee also notes that the Department of Defense has yet to provide a concept of operations that achieves synergies between space and airborne MTI assets and other national and tactical sensor assets, and believes that the ultimate value of the program cannot be determined without this definition.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, by February 15, 2001 describing the Discoverer II concept of operations as defined, as of that date and a firm cost estimate for the two-satellite demonstration program that will provide a benchmark by which the committees can judge the cost of the technologies.

Eagle vision

The budget request included no funds to improve the Eagle Vision imagery ground station's capability to receive and process new commercial imagery sources.

The committee notes the recent successful launch and initial operations of the Ikonos II commercial imagery satellite. The committee also notes that two other U.S. commercial companies are about to launch their own high-resolution imagery satellites. Currently, the Eagle Vision ground station is designed to receive and process relatively low-resolution imagery from Canadian and French commercial satellites. It is, however, not able to process imagery from the higher resolution U.S. systems that are either in or soon to be in orbit.

Therefore, the committee recommends $4.5 million in PE 27277F, an increase of $4.5 million, for the purpose of integrating into the Eagle Vision ground stations a receive and processing functionality necessary to exploit current and future U.S. commercial satellite imaging systems.

Electronic warfare development

The budget request contained $58.2 million in PE 64270F for electronic warfare (EW) development, but included no funds for the PLAID technology program. The budget request also included $4.0 million for the miniature air-launched decoy (MALD) program, which, the committee notes, only partially funds its transition from the advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) to the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase.

The PLAID technology program will enhance aircrew situational awareness by providing accurate ground emitter location and identification. The improved situational awareness resulting from this technology will help combat pilots to effectively avoid radar-guided surface-to-air missiles. In its report on H.R. 1401 (H.Rept. 106–162) for fiscal year 2000, the committee recommended an increase of $13.7 million for PLAID, and understands that recent test reports indicate that PLAID technology has been remarkably successful. Further, the committee notes that PLAID technology has been identified as critical for the joint strike fighter, unmanned aerial vehicles, and suppression of enemy air defense platforms. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $17.7 million, to continue the PLAID technology development.

The MALD is a low-cost decoy intended to stimulate enemy integrated air defense systems to enable pilots to either avoid or target these systems. The committee understands that the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center recently evaluated the MALD and found it to be potentially both operationally effective and suitable with tactically significant capabilities for the Air Force. Encouraged by these results, the committee believes that the MALD should complete its ACTD effort and transition to EMD in fiscal year 2001. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to increase the MALD's suitability for operational use.

In total, the committee recommends $82.9 million, an increase of $24.7 million, for EW development.

Extended range cruise missile (ERCM)

The budget request contained no funds for either the conventional air-launched cruise missile (CALCM) or for the ERCM, a proposed replacement for this weapon.

The committee recalls that as a result of CALCM combat expenditures between 1991 and 1999 that substantially reduced inventory, Congress required the Secretary of the Air Force to report on CALCM replacement options in Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2000 (P.L. 106–65). The committee notes that this report detailed the Air Force's need for an ERCM that would meet the requirement to quickly increase the inventory of cruise missiles and provide an extended-range missile capability to protect the Air Force's aging bomber force. The committee also notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff has included the start of an ERCM program among his top 20 unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $86.1 million in PE 64XXXF to begin an ERCM program and expects the Department of the Air Force to both employ fair and open competitive practices and to fund fully a 618-unit program in its fiscal year 2002 and future years defense program. If the Department of the Air Force proposes to pursue an acquisition strategy using other than full and open competition, the Secretary of the Air Force shall inform the congressional defense committees the rationale and justification therefore at least 30 days prior to obligating any funds.

Additionally, the committee understands that the currently planned ERCM program does not include missiles configured with a penetration warhead. If the Department of the Air Force subsequently opts to include a penetration warhead as part of the ERCM program, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering shall report to the congressional defense committees, 30 days prior to the obligation of funds for such a warhead, his independent assessment of penetration warhead improvements necessary for the ERCM to defeat the full spectrum of those targets identified by a Joint Requirements Oversight Council-approved requirement.

Global hawk unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request included $109.2 million in PE 35205F for endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV), including $103.2 million for continued development of the Global Hawk UAV.

The committee supports the Global Hawk and believes that it has the potential for providing intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance support to military customers, complementing the current U–2 operations.

The committee notes that due to a crash of the one air vehicle, and a runway accident of another, there are no electro-optic/infrared (EO/IR) sensors to continue test and evaluation of the UAV. The committee believes it is important to procure sensor sets to replace those lost to the accidents. Further, the committee is aware of unobligated and unexpended funding from prior year funds provided for endurance UAV that could be used to purchase these sensors and continue the Global Hawk engineering and development in fiscal year 2001.

Therefore, the committee recommends $109.2 million in PE 35205F for endurance unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV), of which $12.0 million is for the purchase of two EO/IR sensors for the Global Hawk aircraft.

Hyperspectral imagery system

The budget request contained $9.8 million in PE 27247F for Air Force tactical exploitation of national capabilities (TENCAP) projects.

The committee recalls Congress provided additional funding in fiscal year 2000 for continuing development of a hyper-spectral sensor for application on Navy P–3 and Air Force unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV). The committee is aware that this initiative has resulted in a joint effort to integrate and demonstrate a real-time hyper-spectral sensor on a Predator UAV. The committee notes that no funding was provided in the budget request to continue this effort through demonstration. The committee believes that a hyper-spectral sensor will significantly mitigate the problems of detecting and targeting camouflaged targets that has hampered aerial targeting in past operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends $13.8 million in PE 27247F, an increase of $4.0 million to continue this demonstration with the goal of producing an operational real-time hyper-spectral sensing system on UAVs and other intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance aircraft.

Integrated broadcast service

The budget request included $24.5 million in PE 63850F for development of the Integrated Broadcast Service (IBS). The request also included $15.1 million in operation and maintenance, Navy, for operating the legacy systems, including the Tactical Information Broadcast Service (TIBS), the TRAP Data Dissemination System (TDDS), the Tactical Reconnaissance Information Exchange System (TRIXS), the Tactical Digital Information Exchange System (TADIXS–B) and the Near-real-time Dissemination (NRTD) System.

The committee has been very supportive of the IBS program since its inception in fiscal year 1995. IBS was to result in a coordinated broadcast capability and the termination of the legacy systems, providing better support to real-time users of intelligence. This goal clearly has not been achieved, and the committee is extremely disappointed with the Department's progress toward IBS. The original program schedule provided for the legacy systems to be integrated into an initial IBS functionality in the 2000 time frame. The current schedule now shows such a capability in 2007. Further, there has been no progress in terminating any or all of the legacy systems. In fact, some of the legacy systems have actually been modified to increase their capabilities. It is clear that the program managers have had no intention of terminating these systems. In preparation of the fiscal year 2001 budget markup, the committee drafted legislation to direct the Department to terminate all legacy broadcast systems on a date certain. However, the committee decided to rescind the provision, allowing the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and In-

telligence) (ASD(C3I)) to be responsible for commitments to the Congress to move forward with IBS.

The committee notes that the IBS executive agent has been moved from the Navy to the Air Force. However, the budget request for IBS had been submitted before this change. Therefore, all operation and maintenance funding should be transferred to the Air Force in accordance with the transfer of management responsibility.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has tentatively decided to proceed with IBS in a phased spiral-development approach beginning with an "increment one" that uses the current, or slightly modified, TIBS message set as the baseline. This will allow the Department to baseline the IBS program using an existing program, and improve on it, rather than begin wholly anew. The committee supports this approach and expects the ASD(C3I) personally will oversee its progress and the most expedient retirement of all other legacy systems.

Finally, the IBS contract was terminated for non-performance prior to the beginning of fiscal year 2000. The committee understands that, accordingly, there are funds available from previous congressional appropriations. Further, the committee believes the current request for program office personnel and funding is far in excess of need. Therefore, the committee recommends $15.8 million, a decrease of $8.7 million in PE 63850F for IBS. Further, the committee recommends a transfer of $15 million from operation and maintenance, Navy, to operation and maintenance, Air Force.

Joint ejection seat program

The budget request contained $14.8 million in PE 64706F for life support systems, including $10.9 million for ejection seat development, but included no funds for standardized cockpit and crew seats.

The committee notes the serious shortage of ejection seat manufacturers available to meet U.S. aircraft ejection seat requirements and fully supports the Joint Ejection Seat Program (JESP). The goal of this joint program is to distribute equally, JESP funds among viable ejection seat producers to enable them to compete for Air Force and Navy requirements, including the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program. However, the committee is aware that ejection seat development efforts are currently being conducted, that assists only one of the potential competitors in preparing to meet these requirements. Although well intentioned, these ongoing projects result in unfairly disadvantaging other potential competitors during this highly sensitive period immediately prior to selection of the ejection seat producer for the JSF. The committee notes that the Department of Defense is making every effort to ensure that the JSF program is closely monitored and that the enormous implications to the fighter aircraft industrial base are completely understood and taken into account prior to the planned "winner take all" selection for development and production of JSF. However, the committee is concerned that similar precautions are not in place to prevent a potential imbalance to the competitive playing field for selection of the JSF ejection seat. In order to protect the JSF program from potentially damaging program delays due to unfair com-

petition claims, the committee recommends that no funds other than that included in the JESP be allowed for ejection seat development efforts involving producers identified as potential JSF ejection seat competitors .

Thus, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.9 million in PE 64706F for all Air Force ejection seat development efforts. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a thorough assessment of all development work for fighter aircraft ejection seats within the Department to ensure that no funding is provided which unfairly benefits any potential competitor prior to a full and open competitive selection for the ejection seat for JSF. The Secretary shall provide the results of this assessment to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee is also aware of Air Force efforts previously supported in PE 64706F to develop standardized cockpit and crew seats to protect aircrew members and passengers against crash loads up to 1.6 times the force of gravity. The committee notes that these efforts are separate from ejection seat development and recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64706F for continued development and testing of standardized cockpit and crew seats.

Joint strike fighter

The budget request contained $856.6 million for the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program, including $129.5 million in PE 63800F, $299.5 million in PE 64800F, $131.6 million in PE 63800N, and $296.0 million in PE 64800N.

The committee notes that $261.1 million of the total funds requested for JSF are intended to support completion of the demonstration and validation phase of the program and a "winner take all" selection of one of two competing approaches for entry into engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). The remaining $595.5 million will support award of an EMD contract to the winning competitor.

The committee understands that the JSF program is attempting to integrate a significant number of challenging new technologies into one joint service multi-purpose aircraft for the Air Force, Marine Corps, Navy, and United Kingdom to replace a number of aging fighter and attack aircraft fleets. The committee believes that, in light of the program's scope and technological advances, the Secretary of Defense should take all necessary measures to ensure that the JSF program's critical technologies are sufficiently mature before entry into the EMD phase. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (Section 213) that would limit the JSF program's approval to proceed beyond the demonstration and validation phase until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the technological maturity of the JSF program's key technologies is sufficient to warrant its entry into EMD stage.

The Committee continues to express concern for the stability of the fighter aircraft industrial base and notes that the JSF program represents the only new fighter aircraft acquisition program proposed by the Department of Defense during the next three decades. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (Section 141)

that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress providing the results of a study of production alternatives for the JSF and the effects on the tactical fighter aircraft industrial base of each alternative considered.

Additionally, while the Department is currently reviewing the planned JSF "winner take all" strategy to ensure that aircraft industrial base concerns are addressed, the committee notes that no specific concern has been stated with respect to the future stability of the fighter aircraft engine industrial base. The committee supports continuation of the JSF alternate engine program (AEP) as directed in section 211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (P.L. 105–85) and recommends that the Department specifically address measures to ensure the health of the fighter aircraft engine industrial base in any proposed restructure of the acquisition program for JSF.

The committee also notes that the JSF AEP, as currently funded, will not be capable of completing development and flight qualification of the alternate engine until after award of lot five of the JSF production program. In order to reduce risk to JSF production and aircraft fielding, the Committee supports acceleration of AEP development to ensure that the alternative engine completes configuration compatibility for the JSF airframe.

The committee recommends $299.5 million in PE 64800F, $131.6 million in PE 63800N, and $296.0 million in PE 64800N, the requested amounts. The committee also recommends $144.5 million in PE 63800F, an increase of $15.0 million, to accelerate the JSF AEP.

Military strategic and tactical relay (MILSTAR)

The budget request contained $236.8 million in PE 64479F for development of the Military Strategic and Tactical Relay (MILSTAR) communications satellite, including $14.2 million for the automated communications management.

The committee understands that demand for military satellite communications continues to rise and that the efficient use of military satellite communications resources remains a priority. The committee believes that web-based satellite communications management technologies that utilize the Secret Internet Protocol Router Network, such as the Satellite Planning Information Network (SPIN), have the potential to greatly expand flexibility in the use of satellite communications, improve insight into system status, balance communications loads, and provide superior connectivity during wartime or humanitarian operations. The committee believes that the use of common standards will allow such efforts to improve utilization of legacy systems, such as MILSTAR, as well the effectiveness of next generation communications satellites, including the Advanced Extremely High Frequency system. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64479F for development of new technologies, such as SPIN, to improve the automated management and command and control of communications satellites.

The committee notes that the MILSTAR budget request represents an $11.0 million increase over the level forecast in the fiscal year 2000 budget submission. Although this increase is in-

tended to fund engineering change orders, the committee does not believe that adequate justification has been provided for the full increase requested. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in PE 64479F.

Overall, the committee recommends $237.8 million in PE 64479F, an increase of $1.0 million.

Mobile approach control system

The budget request contained $15.9M in PE 35114F for development of the Mobile Approach Control System (MACS).

MACS is the Air Force replacement for the Air National Guard MPN–14K and Active Force TPN–19 mobile and tactical approach control facilities. These facilities enable expeditionary operations by providing safe launch and recovery for combat air operations in all weather conditions at deployed airfields. These facilities are also the primary means by which the Air National Guard trains its force of air traffic controllers and maintenance personnel to meet their wartime commitments.

The committee is aware of the deplorable condition of the current systems and that the schedule for the program to replace these systems is unacceptably late. Several, if not all, Air National Guard and Active units with the current antiquated equipment will be forced to discontinue operations over the next several years until replacement equipment is in place. The committee is also aware that the current MACS acquisition strategy, a combination of Air Force and Navy acquisition efforts, will place the first operational units into service in 2004. The committee is concerned with the operationally unacceptable position this imposes on the Air National Guard forces and the limitations placed on their ability to train and operate.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, as lead service for the MACS program, to restructure its MACS acquisition strategy to initiate low-rate initial production (LRIP) at the earliest opportunity, but not later than fiscal year 2002, and to include necessary funds to support LRIP and appropriate modifications in the fiscal year 2002 and beyond budget requests.

Multi-link antenna system

The budget request contained no funding in PE 35207F for manned reconnaissance systems including exploitation technologies for RC–135 aircraft.

The Congress provided funds for development and evaluation of the Multi-function, self-aligned gate (MSAG) active array antenna technology on the RC–135 aircraft in fiscal year 2000. The conferees were convinced that the MSAG technology, now called Multi-link Active System (MLAS) has the potential for satisfying several RC–135 antenna deficiencies, and also has the potential for reducing the size and number of antennas for many other applications. In fact, the committee is aware that the Department of Defense has determined that the potential for this technology merited funding through an advanced concept technology demonstration.

The committee is aware that the budget request was insufficient to complete the fabrication, installation and evaluation of an MLAS

antenna on an RC–135. Therefore, the committee recommends $2.0 million in PE35207F for this purpose.

Satellite control network

The budget request contained $58.6 million in PE 35110F for satellite control network research and development, and $39.1 million for satellite control network procurement.

The satellite control network is a global system of control centers, remote tracking stations, and communications required to control satellites in orbit. The committee understands that telemetry and command data rates need to be improved and supports the modernization of the current system, which is inefficient and increasingly difficult to support. The committee believes that current technology can meet these improvement needs, but is concerned, however, that the current Air Force program fails to adequately leverage opportunities offered by commercial technology to reduce the cost of modernizing and operating the network.

The committee recommends the requested amount for PE 35110F and directs that $1.5 million shall be available to the Space Battlelab to evaluate the utility of commercial antennae networks for satellite control. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide to the congressional defense committee, by February 15, 2001, a report on satellite control network modernization, including possible architectures, the command and control interface between the satellite control network and satellite operations centers, the roles that commercial technology and services might play, a description of commercial technology demonstrations that would be useful, and operational, manpower, cost and schedule implications associated with the architectures.

Small smart munitions

The budget request contained $1.2 million in PE 64618F for continued development of the joint direct attack munition (JDAM) but included no funds for the 500-pound variant of the JDAM. The budget request also contained $8.9 million in PE 64602F for Air Force armament development, but included no funds for miniaturized munitions capability (MMC).

The committee is supportive of Department of Defense efforts to increase future weapons load-outs and combat effectiveness for bomber and other ground attack aircraft. The committee believes that development of a 500-pound JDAM variant and a 250-pound MMC are important in this regard.

The committee notes that the B–2 bomber, when deployed with a smart bomb rack assembly, will be able to carry up to 80 500-pound JDAMs for near-precision delivery against individual targets or target sets and that the Air Force Chief of Staff has identified development of the 500-pound JDAM as an unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001. The committee believes that this development should proceed rapidly and will serve as a strong foundation for follow-on MMC technologies. Therefore, the committee recommends $26.2 million in PE 64618F, an increase of $25.0 million for development of the 500-pound JDAM.

The committee notes that the February 2000 interim report of the Secretary of the Air Force and Secretary of the Navy on MMC,

prepared in response to a requirement in the committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–62), did not include consideration of development of a 250-pound MMC. However, the committee has been informed that there are relatively mature MMC technologies which offer considerable potential capability against both fixed and mobile targets and can support an initial operational capability (IOC) sooner than fiscal year 2007, the currently planned date. Accordingly, the committee recommends $23.9 million in PE 64602F, an increase of $15.0 million to accelerate development of a 250-pound MMC variant.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to submit a final report on the MMC analysis of alternatives to the congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2002 budget request. The report shall include a review of all 26 government and industry MMC concepts noted in the interim report, specific analysis of the technical feasibility of a future-250 pound MMC variant, and funding requirements associated with a fiscal year 2007 IOC as well as accelerated IOCs for 250-pound MMC variants.

Space-based infrared system-high (SBIRS-High)

The budget request contained $569.2 million in PE 64441F for engineering and manufacturing development of the space-based infrared system-high (SBIRS-High) program, including $162.1 million for geosynchronous SBIRS-High satellites.

The committee notes that the ground control segment to support the SBIRS-High satellites has been delayed due to difficulty in developing and integrating the computer codes needed to manage the data flow from both SBIRS-High and the Defense Satellite Program early warning satellites. While concerned with these delays, the committee has been informed that the ground control segment will be operational in time to support the scheduled launch of the first SBIRS-High satellite into a highly elliptical orbit in fiscal year 2001. The committee further understands that the delays, while delaying the development of follow-on upgrades of the ground control segment, will not impact the scheduled fiscal year 2004 launch of the first geosynchronous SBIRS-High satellite.

The committee notes that SBIRS-High capabilities will be essential to achieving the required levels of confidence in the performance of the national missile defense system and continues to support the deployment of SBIRS-High satellites without delay. Consequently, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide written notification to the congressional defense committees of any proposed change to the currently established milestones for the SBIRS-High program prior to approval of those changes.

The committee recommends $569.2 million for SBIRS-High.

Space-based infrared system-low (SBIRS-Low)

The budget request contained $241.0 million in PE 64442F for research and development on the space-based infrared system-low (SBIRS-Low) system.

The committee notes that Section 231 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) establishes ballistic missile defense as the primary mission of SBIRS-

Low and that SBIRS-Low will be critical to achieving advanced national missile defense (NMD) and theater missile defense (TMD) capabilities.

The committee further notes that Section 231 also directs that the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) will have authority to approve or disapprove any changes to the baseline SBIRS-Low schedule, budget and system level technical requirements. The committee has been informed that BMDO and the NMD lead system integrator have not been sufficiently consulted with by the Air Force and the SBIRS contractor to assure that missile defense requirements are effectively reflected in the SBIRS Low development process. The committee understands that the Secretary of the Air Force acknowledges these concerns and has testified that he recommends moving SBIRS-Low program management from the Air Force to BMDO. Senior BMDO officials have confirmed to the committee that BMDO management would ensure appropriate interaction between the NMD and SBIRS-Low programs. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (section 212) that would transfer management authority for the SBIRS-Low program from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

The committee concurs with views expressed by senior DOD officials that the primary SBIRS Low mission is ballistic missile defense. The committee, however, believes that the director of BMDO, in coordination with other defense agencies, should afford appropriate priority to ancillary SBIRS Low requirements in battlespace characterization and technical intelligence, to the extent that they do not increase technical or schedule risk to the primary SBIRS Low mission. The committee believes that the intelligence community and other organizations that seek to add technical capabilities to the SBIRS Low system to meet those ancillary requirements must provide the resources needed to do so.

Consistent with the transfer of ABL management authority, the committee recommends no funds in PE 64442F, a decrease of $241.0 million and an increase of $241.0 million in PE 63871C, the national missile defense program. The committee understands that the Air Force would remain the executive agent for the SBIRS-Low development program and would retain operational control of the system when deployed.

Spacelift range system

The budget request contained $53.7 million in PE 35182F for research and development for the spacelift range system.

The Air Force spacelift range system program funds modernization for the Eastern Range at Cape Canaveral, Florida, and the Western Range at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California. This is accomplished through the Range Standardization and Automation (RSA) project, which funds long-term upgrades, and the Space Lift Range System contract, which supports short-term system integration and engineering and recapitalization priorities.

The Air Force continues to subsidize heavily the commercial launch industry at the Eastern and Western Ranges, even though commercial launches and other government launches now far outnumber Air Force launches. The subsidy results from Air Force

funding of the modernization, management, and operation of the launch ranges, while recovering only about five percent of direct incremental costs and none of the indirect support costs of a commercial launch.

The committee believes that the funding burden of modernizing, managing and operating the spacelift ranges should be shared more equitably by the range users. Such an arrangement would more accurately reflect the costs and benefits to each of the users and allow the Air Force to meet its legitimate priorities more fully. At the same time, the committee recognizes that the Air Force must be responsible for sustaining the ranges until satisfactory alternative funding and management arrangements that meet civil, national security and commercial requirements can be established.

The committee notes that the February 2000 report of the interagency working group on "The Future Management and Use of the U.S. Space Launch Bases and Ranges" supports maximizing the use of "non-federal" funding sources "for the continued maintenance and modernization" of the launch bases and ranges. The report also points to restrictions imposed by in the Commercial Space Launch Act (Public Law 98–575) that limit reimbursement to the Air Force for costs incurred in supporting commercial launch activities and the Air Force ability to accept privately financed range improvements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, with appropriate consultation with other federal and state officials and private industry, to identify the legal impediments to such non-federal funding of range improvements and maintenance, and the changes required to eliminate these impediments. The Secretary shall submit a report on his findings to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2001.

The committee understands that the flight termination system in use at both the Vandenberg Air Force Base and Cape Canaveral test ranges is obsolescent, expensive to maintain, unreliable, subject to unintentional signal interference during flight missions, and unable to preclude inadvertent flight termination. The committee recommends an increase of $700,000 in PE 35182F to initiate a study for a new flight termination system.

The committee also endorses an effort to develop a space launch operations complex at the Vandenberg test range to improve space launch operations through improved communications and better integration of launch system technologies. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 35182F for this purpose. The committee expects that this effort will become a public-private partnership in the future.

Overall, the committee recommends $59.9 million in PE 35182F, an increase of $6.2 million for the spacelift range system.

U–2 senior year electro-optic system polarimetry

The budget request included $27.5 million in PE 35202F for Dragon U–2 reconnaissance aircraft.

The committee notes that the use of a polarization technique on the U–2 Senior Year Electro-optic System (SYERS) will provide the ability to discern military targets hidden under camouflage or con-

cealed in dense vegetation. The committee believes the SYERS polarization processor will provide a force multiplying effect.

Therefore, the committee recommends $31.5 million in PE 35202F, an increase of $4.0 million for this purpose.

DEFENSE WIDE RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained $10,238.2 million for Defense Agencies RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of $11,077.8 million, an increase of $839.5 million.

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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
0601101D8Z	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,007		2,007
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	90,415		90,415
0601103D8Z	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	253,627	9,500	263,127
		MEMS Sensors			[+9,500]
0601105D8Z	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	16,978		16,978
0601108D8Z	xxx	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT	-	10,000	10,000
		High Energy Lasers			[+10,000]
0601111D8Z	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	6,715		6,715
0601114D8Z	6	DEF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH	9,859	10,000	19,859
		DEPSCoR			[+10,000]
0601384BP	7	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	33,197	4,500	37,697
		Chemical and Biological Defense			[+3,000]
		Optical Computing Device Materials			[+1,500]
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	412,798	34,000	446,798
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	412,798	34,000	446,798
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
0602110E	8	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	15,000		15,000
0602173C	9	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	37,747	10,000	47,747
		Wideband Gap Materials			[+10,000]
0602227D8Z	10	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	15,029		15,029
0602228D8Z	11	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	14,236		14,236
0602234D8Z	12	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	18,602		18,602
0602301E	13	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	376,592	(45,000)	331,592
		Computing Systems and Communications Technology			[-45,000]
0602302E	14	EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	69,282	(20,000)	49,282
		Extensible Information Systems			[-20,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602383E	15	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	162,064	(20,000)	142,064
		Biological Warfare Defense			[-20,000]
0602384BP	16	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,600	5,000	78,600
		Chemical and Biological Defense			[+5,000]
0602702E	17	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	121,051		121,051
0602708E	18	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,761		31,761
0602712E	19	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	249,812		249,812
0602715BR	20	NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIES	230,928	(17,000)	213,928
		Nuclear Sustainment and Counterproliferation Technology			[-20,000]
		Thermionics for Space Powered Systems			[+3,000]
0602787D8Z	21	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,680		8,680
0602890D8Z	xxx	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT	-	25,000	25,000
		High Energy Laser Applied Research			[+25,000]
0305108K	22	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	-		-
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,424,384	(62,000)	1,362,384
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,424,384	(62,000)	1,362,384
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING	-	-	-
0603002D8Z	23	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,043		2,043
0603104D8Z	24	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,964		8,964
0603121D8Z	25	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,622		8,622
0603122D8Z	26	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	41,307	4,000	45,307
		Facial Recognition Technology			[+4,000]
0603160BR	27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES	77,391	23,163	100,554
0603173C	28	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	93,249	29,000	122,249
		Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT)			[+20,000]
		Exoatmospheric Interceptor Technology (EIT)			[+5,000]
		Robust Adaptive Algorithms			[+4,000]
0603174C	29	SPACE BASED LASERS (SBL)	74,537		74,537
0603225D8Z	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,670		16,670
0603232D8Z	31	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,534		7,534
0603285E	32	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	26,821		26,821

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603384BP	33	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	46,594		46,594
0603704D8Z	34	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,777	5,000	15,777
		Complex Systems			[+5,000]
0603711BR	35	ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	52,930		52,930
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,082	3,000	26,082
		Competitive Sustainment Demonstration Program			[+3,000]
0603716D8Z	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,357		51,357
		Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies (TRIES)			[3,000]
0603727D8Z	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,607		7,607
0603738D8Z	39	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH	-		-
0603739E	40	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	191,800		191,800
0603747E	41	ELECTRIC VEHICLES	-		-
0603750D8Z	42	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,425	1,000	117,425
		Ultra-wideband Radar			[+1,000]
0603755D8Z	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	-		-
0603832D8Z	51	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	56,971		56,971
0605160D8Z	52	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,483		1,483
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,657,219	65,163	1,722,382
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,657,219	65,163	1,722,382
		ENGINEERING AMD MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION			
0603228D8Z	56	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	35,108		35,108
0603708D8Z	57	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	-		-
0603709D8Z	58	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	10,294		10,294
0603714D8Z	59	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,534	9,500	25,034
0603736D8Z	60	CALS INITIATIVE	1,585		1,585
0603790T	61	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603851D8Z	62	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	24,906		24,906
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	25,000	407,671
		Advanced Technology Kill Vehicle			[+15,000]
		Radar Technology Demonstration			[+10,000]
0603869C	66	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	63,175		63,175
0603870C	67	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603871C	68	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	1,740,238	326,021	2,066,259
		Risk Reduction			[+85,000]
		Transfer From PE 0604442F (SBIRS Low)			[+241,021]
0603872C	69	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603873C	70	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	231,248	24,600	255,848
		Classified			[+24,600]
0603874C	71	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	270,718	44,400	315,118
		Classified			[+20,400]
		Liquid Surrogates Targets			[+9,000]
		Wide Bandwidth Information Infrastructure			[+15,000]
0603875C	72	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	116,992		116,992
0603876C	73	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	22,621		22,621
0603XXXC	xxx	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	-	231,037	231,037
		Increase			[+82,400]
		Transfer From 0603319F			[+148,637]
0603884BP	74	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	83,800		83,800
0603892D8Z	75	ASAT	-		-

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603920D8Z	76	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	12,728		12,728
0603923D8Z	77	COALITION WARFARE	11,839		11,839
0604722D8Z	78	JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0605104T	79	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	-		-
0605110T	80	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (PIMS)	1,932		1,932
0901585C	81	PENTAGON RESERVATION	4,772		4,772
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	3,030,161	660,558	3,690,719
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,030,161	660,558	3,690,719
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0604384BP	82	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	100,815		100,815
0604709D8Z	83	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	11,553		11,553
0604764K	84	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	14,685		14,685
0604771D8Z	85	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,250		16,250
0604805D8Z	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
0605013D8Z	90	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,000	3,600	15,600
		TRICARE Encounter Data System			[+3,600]
0605013S	91	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,671		1,671
0605014S	92	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (FIELD ACTIVITY)	26,797		26,797
0605015S	93	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (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

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0303141K	96	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	22,287		22,287
0305840K	97	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	28,094		28,094
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,184,669	3,600	1,188,269
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	136,171	3,600	139,771
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,048,498	-	1,048,498
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
0603858D8Z	98	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,204		1,204
0604942D8Z	99	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	-		-
0604943D8Z	100	THERMAL VICAR	4,882		4,882
0605104D8Z	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
0605116D8Z	104	GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	3,769		3,769
0605117D8Z	105	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	32,173		32,173
0605123D8Z	106	AFCC ENGINEERING AND INSTALLATION	6,000		6,000
0605124D8Z	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	-		-
0605128D8Z	110	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	-		-
0605130D8Z	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 - CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF	-		-
0605502D8Z	115	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605502E	116	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605710D8Z	117	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	641		641
0605790D8Z	118	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,728		1,728
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 AND EVALUATION	8,776		8,776
0605804D8Z	122	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	43,915		43,915

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605898E	123	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	34,679		34,679
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	313,615	-	313,615
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	313,615	-	313,615
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
0604805D8Z	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	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	7,099		7,099
0303140G	135	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	290,771		290,771
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		3800
0305102BQ	141	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	74,975	22,000	96,975
		GeoSar			[+15,000]
		National Technology Alliance			[+3,000]
		Rome Lab			[+4,000]
0305127V	142	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	444		444
0305159I	143	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	-		-
0305190D8Z	144	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	25,182		25,182
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	2,000	97,671
		COTS VME Receiver Technology for SIGINT Applications			[+1,000]

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		Commercial Silicon Germanium Integrated Circuits			[+1,000]
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
1001017D8Z	157	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES	-		-
1160279BB	158	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PRO	-		-
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	14,200	147,720
		CV-22 Osprey Radar Improvements			[+9,200]
		MC-130 Autonomous Landing Guidance System			[+5,000]
1160405BB	162	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,022	2,000	5,022
		Special Operations Tactical Video System			[+2,000]
1160407BB	163	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,065		2,065
1160408BB	164	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	87,071		87,071
XXXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,323,435	98,000	1,421,435
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	891,961	40,200	932,161
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	891,961	40,200	932,161
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE WIDE	10,238,242	839,521	11,077,763
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,189,744	839,521	10,029,265
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,048,498	-	1,048,498

Items of Special Interest

Advanced sensor applications program

The budget request contained $15.5 million in PE 63714D8Z for the advanced sensor applications program.

The committee recommends $25.0 million in PE 63714D8Z, an increase of $9.5 million for the program. Details of the recommendations are contained in the classified annex.

Ballistic missile defense (BMD)

The budget request contained $4,490.6 million for the programs of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), of which $3,737.6 was for research and development, $444.0 was for procurement, and $103.5 million was for military construction.

The committee notes a succession of BMD test successes that provides considerable confidence that hit-to-kill technology is fundamentally sound. The Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC–3), Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD), and National Missile Defense programs all conducted highly successful tests that demonstrated substantial degrees of system maturity and the potential for more rapid progress.

The committee also notes that the BMDO budget request represents a substantial increase compared over the fiscal year 2000 request and the funding level anticipated for fiscal year 2001 in last year's budget request. The committee is gratified that this request would more fully fund ballistic missile requirements than in the past. The committee believes that the urgent need to meet substantial and growing ballistic missile threats and demonstrated technical progress fully justifies these increases.

However, the committee remains deeply concerned about the pace and direction of BMD programs on a number of grounds:

(1) The committee notes that the Director of BMDO identified $1.0 billion in additional funding for BMD programs for fiscal year 2001 that would reduce risk, speed deployment schedules, and provide greater capability. The committee continues to believe that BMD programs remain seriously underfunded.

(2) Major BMD programs such as Navy Theater Wide and THAAD are not adequately funded throughout the future years defense program to achieve timely operational capability.

(3) Funding for advanced BMD technologies has declined dramatically to a level that cannot support next generation BMD systems. The committee believes that such funding is critical to prevent the obsolescence of systems now being developed and to meet more demanding threats in the future.

(4) The commitment to BMD by the services to service-funded BMD programs remains highly suspect. The committee notes that the Air Force budget request would reduce funding for the Airborne Laser by 50 percent over the future years defense program.

(5) Deployed missile defenses are not adequate to meet identified threats. The missile threat from North Korea is particularly stressing for deployed U.S. systems.

(6) Deployment timelines for key systems may fail to meet expected threats, particularly new ballistic missile developments in North Korea and Iran.

(7) The President has not committed to deployment of NMD, in spite of the fact that the Secretary of Defense has stated that the threat justifies such a deployment.

The committee believes that ballistic missile defense remains a very high priority and urges the Department of Defense to commit the funds needed to achieving timely deployment of systems that will defeat current and future ballistic missile threats.

Overall, the committee recommends $5,245.8 million for BMDO including an increase of $283.2 million and transfers of $472.0 million.

Advanced technology development

The budget request contained $93.2 million in PE 63173C for advanced ballistic missile defense technologies. The committee remains concerned that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) technology efforts are insufficiently funded to keep pace with expected threats, and strongly recommends that the Director of BMDO identify funds throughout the future year defense program to support a technology development effort capable of doing so.

The budget request included $19.4 million in project 1281 for atmospheric interceptor technology (AIT). The AIT program develops advanced interceptor technologies to support the theater high-altitude area defense (THAAD), Navy theater wide (NTW), and Patriot advanced capability-3 configuration 3 (PAC–3) missile defense systems. This effort is needed to keep pace with rapidly evolving ballistic missile threats. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in project 1281 for this effort. The budget request also included $18.9 million in project 1282 for exoatmospheric interceptor technology (EIT). This effort is key to keeping pace with evolving long-range missile threats. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in project 1282 for development of advanced sensors that will enhance NMD, NTW, and THAAD capabilities.

The committee notes that the Director of BMDO identified funding to develop robust adaptive algorithms needed to counter evolving and off-nominal ballistic missile threats as an unfunded priority. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to initiate this effort.

The committee recommends the $122.2 million in PE 63173C, an increase of $29.0 million for advanced technology development.

Liquid surrogate target

The budget request contained $270.7 million in PE 63874C ballistic missile defense (BMD) technical operations, including $49.1 million was for BMD targets, but contained no funds for liquid surrogate targets.

The committee notes that many of the operational targets for the airborne laser (ABL) will be liquid-fueled theater ballistic missiles and the ABL program has a validated requirement for a liquid surrogate target. The committee also understands that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) has concluded that development of a liquid surrogate target will be required to support other

BMD programs by emulating threat missiles in their boost and ascent phases.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 63874C for the development of a liquid surrogate target.

National missile defense (NMD)

The budget request contained $1,740.2 million in PE 63871C for national missile defense research and development, $74.5 million for NMD procurement, and $101.6 million for NMD military construction.

The committee notes that the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) provided an accounting of unfunded BMDO priorities that included additional NMD risk reduction activities. The committee continues to believe that NMD remains one of the highest defense priorities.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $ 85.0 million in PE 63871C for additional kill vehicle emulators to reduce risk during integration and assembly of kill vehicles, in-flight interceptor communications system modem development to reduce schedule risk, site activation teams to provide required support at potential deployment sites, an additional target booster to reduce schedule risk in the event of target problems, and additional development of the test and training evaluation center to enhance system test and evaluation capabilities. To further reduce risk, the committee also encourages the Director of BMDO to maximize the use of test launches of ballistic missiles to analyze and advance the NMD battle management, command, control, and communications system.

The committee notes that BMDO has planned an evolutionary deployment of NMD capabilities to address long-range missile threats. The committee believes that a new radar technology proposal may offer improved capabilities to discriminate warheads from sophisticated offensive countermeasures that may be deployed in the future. The committee recommends that the director of BMDO fully assess future NMD radar requirements; all radar technologies and architectures relevant to the NMD program beyond fiscal year 2005; and technical risk, schedule and cost implications associated with those technologies and architectures. The committee also recommends that the director of BMDO assure the use of all appropriate competitive procedures in the development and acquisition of NMD radars. The committee directs the director of BMDO, if he determines that the development and acquisition of NMD radars should not be competed, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the justification for that determination not later than 30 days prior to the proposed initiation of any noncompetitive effort.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee also recommends that the budget request for the space-based infrared system—low (SBIRS Low), $241.0 million, be transferred from PE 64442F to PE 63871C. The committee believes that this transfer will provide needed focus and management efficiencies that will allow more rapid maturation of both SBIRS Low and NMD capabilities. Overall, the Committee recommends $2,066.3 million in PE 63871C for NMD research and development. The committee also

recommends $74.5 million for NMD procurement and $101.6 million for NMD military construction.

Navy theater wide

The budget request contained $382.7 million in PE 63868C for the Navy theater wide (NTW) missile defense system.

The committee is concerned that the NTW deployment schedule is both inadequate to meet expected threats and inadequately funded. The current NTW schedule provides for a four missile contingency Block I capability by fiscal year 2006, a limited capability on two dedicated missile defense ships by fiscal year 2008, and a full Block I capability by 2010. However, the committee understands that NTW Block I will only defend against very limited numbers of unsophisticated missile threats. Further, the committee notes that funding for even this limited capability is not programmed through the future years defense plan, and that no timeline has been laid out for development and deployment of NTW Block II, which will be capable of defense against larger numbers of more sophisticated threats.

The committee understands that NTW will be tested a number of times in fiscal year 2001, and that the budget request fully supports these tests. The committee expects that if these tests meet with substantial success that funds will be identified and programmed to provide for rapid development and timely NTW deployment.

The committee believes that an effort is needed to provide greater NTW capability earlier than planned and notes the support of the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization for that research and development on an advanced technology kill vehicle. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63868C to support this effort.

The committee also understands that the Navy has considered an X band high power discriminator and modifications to the current SPY–1 radar to meet ballistic missile defense radar needs for NTW. However, the committee believes that a new radar technology approach may offer improved capabilities in the 2010 timeframe. The committee understands that this new approach would take advantage of new algorithms and beam steering technology to achieve improved capabilities to discriminate warheads from sophisticated offensive countermeasures that may be deployed in the future.

Therefore, the committee directs the director of BMDO to assess NTW radar requirements and technologies and architectures relevant to the NTW program, and provide a report on his assessment to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2001. The report should include consideration of expected threats, and technical risk, schedule and cost implications associated with those technologies and architectures.

The committee also recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63868C to initiate a demonstration of the alternative radar approach.

Overall, the committee recommends $407.7 in PE 63868C for research and development of the Navy theater wide system.

Russian-American cooperative national missile defense

The committee notes that representatives of the government of Russia have expressed concern that deployment of a U.S. national missile defense (NMD) would undermine the effectiveness of the Russian deterrent forces and existing arms control agreements. The committee is also aware of ongoing discussions between the U.S. and Russian governments related to U.S. plans for deployment of an NMD system.

The committee believes that these discussions are important and that additional confidence building measures are warranted to assure the Russian government that NMD deployment does not threaten Russian interests. One such measure could include discussions and eventual development of a joint U.S.-Russian national missile defense system that could defend both nations from a range of missile threats.

The committee encourages the Administration to continue the discussions with Russia to explore this possibility. The committee directs the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) to examine this concept and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2001. The report should include consideration of possible architectures, technical merits and challenges, and potential cost, effectiveness, technology transfer risks, and areas of technical cooperation related to a joint U.S.-Russian national missile defense effort.

Support technology

The budget request contained $37.7 million in PE 62173C for ballistic missile defense support technologies.

The committee remains concerned that funding for innovative ballistic missile technology projects is insufficient to support Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's (BMDO) future needs. The committee strongly recommends that the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) to identify funds throughout the future year defense program sufficient to support a technology program that hedges against rapidly evolving missile threats.

The committee also understands that BMDO has identified wide-band gap electronic materials for high speed and high temperature device operation as a high priority that is insufficiently funded. The committee notes that significant progress has been made in the development of these materials and believes that additional research offers the opportunity for further progress.

The committee recommends $47.7 million in PE 62173C, an increase $10.0 million for the continuation of wide-band gap materials research.

Wide bandwidth information infrastructure

The budget request contained $270.7 million in PE 63874C for ballistic missile defense technical operations.

The committee understands that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) is using recent advances in wide band information technology to enhance operational efficiency and improve the test infrastructure. BMDO's efforts have linked geographically dispersed radar and missile hardware-in-the-loop test facilities to improve the ground testing of theater missile defense systems and

increase the probability of successful flight tests. The committee believes that the use of this technology can be expanded into other critical areas, including battle management, command, control, communications, and intelligence.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million in PE 63874C to continue the development of a wide bandwidth information infrastructure for BMDO.

Chemical-biological defense program

The budget request contained $835.8 million for the chemical biological defense (CBD) program, including $361.9 million in research, development, test and evaluation, and $473.9 million in procurement. The budget request also contained $162.1 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency biological warfare applied research program.

In order to insure an integrated CBD program within the Department of Defense (DOD), section 1703 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160) mandated the coordination and integration of all DOD CBD programs and the funding of these programs in a defense-wide account, separate from the accounts of the military departments. The committee notes that funding for the DOD program has grown significantly from $387.8 million in fiscal year 1996, and is projected to continue at an average of $876 million per year through fiscal year 2005.

The committee has reviewed the Department's Chemical and Biological Defense Program Annual Report to Congress, dated March 2000, and notes that the oversight and management of the program continue to mature. The report details the considerable progress made in improving cooperation among the military departments and the jointness of CBD research, development, and procurement since the establishment of the consolidated program, but indicates a number of issues with regard to chemical-biological medical defense, logistics, readiness, and training. As addressed elsewhere in this report, the committee intends to examine these issues in greater detail during upcoming oversight hearings.

The committee also notes a growing tendency to fund individual CBD projects directly within the budget accounts of the military services. The committee emphasizes that this practice violates the intent and purpose of Congress in establishing the consolidated program.

Chemical and biological defense program initiatives

The committee believes that the Department of Defense has established a robust chemical and biological defense research and development program that focuses on meeting joint and service unique operational requirements for medical and non-medical chemical and biological defense in the areas of contamination avoidance, battle management, collective protection, decontamination, and individual protection. The committee recognizes the challenges faced by the medical chemical and biological defense program in the development of medical prophylaxes, pretreatments, and therapies necessary to protect personnel from the toxic or lethal effects of exposure to chemical or biological agents. The committee notes the development and fielding of a number of medical

countermeasures that improve individual medical protection, treatment, and diagnoses. The committee also notes technical and procedural shortcomings in the development, licensing, and production of vaccines and drugs that require both short-term and long-term solutions. The committee continues to monitor closely the Department's policy for the development and production of vaccines against anthrax and for vaccination of members of the armed forces who might be exposed to anthrax.

The committee continues to support initiatives for research, development, and demonstration of advanced chemical and biological defense technologies and systems. The committee directs that these initiatives compete for funding within the appropriate program elements of the joint chemical and biological defense program and the DARPA biological defense program on the basis of technical merit and the anticipated ability of the technology or system to meet joint and service unique needs.

The committee recommends increases of $3.0 million in PE 61384BP and $5.0 million in PE 62384BP for research, development, and demonstration of advanced chemical and biological defense technology, systems, and capabilities for contamination avoidance, battle management, collective protection, decontamination, and individual protection.

Optical computing device materials for chemical sensors

The committee recommends an increase of $1.5 million in PE 61384BP to continue the basic research program in organic and inorganic optical computing device materials for use in standoff sensors for detection and identification of chemical agents.

Commercial off-the-shelf-receiver development

The budget request included $95.7 million in PE 35885G for development of tactical cryptologic systems.

The committee is concerned about the lack of a true commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) signals intelligence (SIGINT) receiver that is based on open-architecture standards established by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the Versa Module Europa (VME) backplane. The Department of Defense has stated that all future signals intelligence systems will be COTS based. However, most SIGINT developments the Department is currently pursuing are based wholly, or in part, on custom approaches that are not "interchangeable" at the circuit board level. The committee is further concerned that these customized approaches do not encourage competitors for U.S. signal intelligence systems to utilize the COTS marketplace, thereby forcing more expensive solutions.

The committee is aware of a small business development that has produced a true COTS receiver solution for several Defense Cryptologic Program needs. The committee notes that this solution is cost-effective and based completely on ANSI and VME standards, thereby allowing true "plug and play" use between systems. The committee also notes that the Joint SIGINT Avionics Program Office has sought to use this technology as a commercial replacement for one of its custom applications. However, there is no funding in the budget request to pursue or procure this commercial solution.

The committee is aware of other innovative small business development using emerging commercial silicon germanium technology and supports rapid application of this leading-edge commercial technology for defense applications.

Therefore, the committee recommends $97.7 million in PE 35885G, an increase of $1.0 million for development of COTS VME receiver technology for SIGINT applications, and an increase of $1.0 million for development of commercial silicon germanium integrated circuits for defense and intelligence applications.

Competitive sustainment demonstration

The budget request contained $23.1 million in PE 63712S for generic logistic research and development technology demonstrations.

The committee notes that an increasing portion of the defense budget is being used to support and manage large inventories of older weapons systems. The committee believes that costs associated with logistics and maintenance must be reduced in order to free resources to develop and procure modern systems. Leveraging the best practices of commercial industry in logistics and maintenance planning and management could permit the Department of Defense to reduce these costs in weapons and supporting systems. The committee notes the establishment by the Defense Logistics Agency of a sustainment demonstration program that pursues dramatic reductions in sustainment costs and improvements in logistics efficiency.

The committee recommends $26.1 million in PE 63712S, an increase of $3.0 million to continue the competitive sustainment demonstration program.

Complex systems design

The budget request contained $10.8 million in PE 63704D8Z for special technical support, but included no funds for complex systems design.

The committee notes that the effort to develop an integrated digital environment for complex systems design has made significant progress, and is ahead of schedule. This development is critical to improving the acquisition process and minimizing life-cycle costs of future weapons systems.

The committee recommends $15.8 million in PE 63704D8Z, an increase of $5.0 million for complex systems design.

Computational fluid dynamics and finite element analysis

The Department of Defense university research initiative supports basic research in a wide range of scientific and engineering disciplines that are relevant to maintaining the superiority of U.S. military technology such research contributes to the education of scientists and engineers in disciplines critical to defense needs, and helps build and maintain the infrastructure needed to improve the quality of defense research performed at universities.

The committee notes the increased reliance in defense research, development, and acquisition on the use of computer modeling and simulation and the testing of system and component scale models to evaluate system concepts, technology, and design. The ability to extend the results of such modeling, simulation, and testing to the

development and fabrication of full-scale operational systems which can then be expected to operate in accordance with the test results of the system scale model places a premium on advances in the development and application of finite element analysis and computational fluid dynamics. The committee believes that the application of such capabilities to real-world problems associated with analysis of advanced structures and materials will provide an effective vehicle for research, education of scientists and engineers, and establishment of the infrastructure required to insure future U.S. capabilities in these disciplines.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to place increased emphasis in the university research initiative on the development of advanced capabilities in finite element analysis and computational fluid dynamics.

Computer network security

The budget request contained $164.0 million in PE 63755D8Z for the High Performance Computing Modernization Program (HPCMP).

The committee understands that the Department of Defense's HPCMP is the primary source of Department of Defense computer system upgrades and enhancements and that the HPCMP specifically supports needed computer system modernization for defense laboratories as well.

The committee strongly supports the HPCMP, but expresses concern that the programs charter does not highlight efforts to address the increasing security threat to computer systems.

The committee recommends authorization of $164.0 million, the budget request, in PE 63755D8Z for HPCMP and strongly urges the DOD to work with industry and basic research organizations to ensure that computer modernization efforts include the latest state-of-the-art computer network security and access assurance capabilities.

CV–22 Osprey radar improvements

The budget request contained $133.5 million in PE 116404BB for special operations tactical systems development.

The committee is aware that the covert, all-weather, nap-of-the-earth operations that are characteristic of the special operations command make stealth and terrain avoidance imperative. The committee notes that low probability of intercept/ low probability of detection (LPI/LPD) radar and terrain following/terrain avoidance (TF/TA) capability are essential to safe and successful CV–22 Osprey operation.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.2 million in PE 116404BB for LPI/LPD radar and terrain avoidance improvements.

Defense agency science and technology funding

The budget request contained $7,543.2 million for defense science and technology, including all defense-wide and military service funding for basic research, applied research, and advanced development.

The committee notes that this amount represents a decrease of $853.3 million from the amount provided in fiscal year 2000. As

outlined elsewhere in this report, the committee continues to be disturbed by the growing number of military service research and development programs that have been reduced or eliminated as a result of insufficient research and development funding, and is particularly concerned with the low level of science and technology funding. The committee views defense science and technology investments as critical to maintaining U.S. military technological superiority in the face of growing and changing threats to national security interests around the world.

As expressed in previous reports, the committee is also concerned by the Department's continuing trend of placing higher priority on defense agency research and development programs at the expense of the already inadequate service research and development budgets. The committee believes that the Department has not provided sufficient justification to support these imbalances in funding levels between defense agencies and the services, and, therefore, recommends correcting these imbalances by maintaining funding of several defense agencies at the levels projected by the Department for fiscal year 2001.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following adjustments and, except as noted, decreases are made without prejudice:

Biological warfare defense

The budget request contained $162.1 million in PE 62382E for applied research in biological warfare defense, including $10.0 million for applied research in consequence management information systems.

The committee supports the progress being made in the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's biological warfare defense program in research in medical countermeasures, advanced diagnostics, sensors for the detection of biological and chemical warfare agents, and decontamination. The committee also notes ongoing efforts within the chemical-biological defense program as noted elsewhere in this report to transition technologies developed in the DARPA program to the military services and other agencies for exploitation and further development.

The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) expressed the belief that DARPA's consequence management project did not meet the high risk, high payoff, breakthrough concepts and technology criteria normally associated with DARPA programs and directed transfer of the program to the DOD chemical and biological defense program following completion of the prototype phase. In reviewing the project after another year has passed, the committee maintains its original view.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $142.1 million in PE 62383E for the DARPA biological warfare defense program, a decrease of $20.0 million for the DARPA consequence management project.

Computing systems and communications technology

The budget request contained $376.6 million in PE 62301E for applied research in computing systems and communications technology.

The committee recommends $331.6 million, a decrease of $45.0 million in PE 62301E.

Extensible information systems

The budget request contained $69.3 million in PE 62302E for applied research in extensible information systems.

The committee recommends $49.3 million in PE 62302E, a decrease of $20.0 million.

Nuclear sustainment and counter-proliferation technologies

The budget request contained $230.9 million in PE 62715BR for applied research in nuclear sustainment and counterproliferation technologies.

The committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in PE 62715 BR for nuclear sustainment and counter-proliferation technologies.

Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research

The budget request contained $9.9 million in PE 61114D8Z for the defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research (DEPSCoR).

The committee is aware that the DEPSCoR program provides funding that enables broader university participation in national defense research.

The committee supports DEPSCoR and notes that the Department of Defense has acknowledged the importance of the program by requesting funding under a separate program element line in the budget request, and recommends $19.9 million in PE 61114D8Z, an increase of $10.0 million for DEPSCoR.

Facial recognition technology

The budget request contained $41.3 million for DOD combating terrorism technology support (CTTS) in PE 63122D8Z.

The CTTS is an interagency program for development and demonstration of surveillance, physical security, and infrastructure protection technology. The committee supports use of advanced technology to control access to critical facilities and is aware of the Department's examination of biometric access control technology, including the use of authentication software and the principal component method of facial recognition.

The committee recommends $45.3 million in PE 63122D8Z, an increase of $4.0 million for continued development of facial recognition technology.

High definition displays for military applications

The budget request contained $31.8 million in PE 62708E for applied research in high definition displays.

The committee notes that many Department of Defense systems utilize the display of visual and graphical information and are therefore dependent on high definition display production capability. Major components of the program are the development of technologies for advanced flexible emissive displays, development of equipment and components required to manufacture advanced display technologies, and prototyping display systems for system eval-

uation. The program is designed to establish a domestic capability for the manufacture of components necessary for high-resolution military displays.

The committee notes the efforts by the Department of Defense and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to develop advanced high definition display technologies for military applications and to establish a domestic production base for these displays. However, despite the Department's investment and the strength of the commercial display industry, the number of suppliers of military-qualified displays has declined. The committee notes the efforts by the Department to form a Joint Display Acquisition Working Group and proposals to form a permanent Display Overarching Integrated Process Team to address these issues. The committee is concerned, however, that the budget request indicates no funding for the DARPA high definition display program beyond fiscal year 2001.

The committee believes that the Department must renew efforts to define a comprehensive strategy for development and acquisition of high definition display technology and for maintaining a domestic high definition display infrastructure capable of supporting the requirements of the military services and defense agencies. The committee believes that the strategy should include appropriate funding levels for the development of advanced high definition display and display manufacturing technology, and should build on prior Department efforts to ensure that this technology becomes reliably and widely available to all Services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for meeting the Department's requirements for advanced high definition displays that addresses the issues raised above, and to report the proposed strategy and budget requirements to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

High energy laser research and development

The committee notes that the March 2000 DOD laser master plan mandated by section 251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) will facilitate better coordination between service high energy laser (HEL) programs and will enable the Department of Defense to direct a more coherent and more effective investment strategy for all future high energy laser development. The committee believes that the management structure recommended in the plan represents a substantial improvement over the current situation, where such coordination is virtually absent. The committee believes that high energy lasers hold considerable promise for weapons applications sooner than widely anticipated, and believes that these efforts deserve greater attention and priority than they have received in the past.

Defense-wide high energy laser development

The budget request contained no funds in PE 61108D8Z, PE 62890D8Z, or PE 63921D8Z for HEL research development.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has established program elements 61108D8Z, 62890D8Z, and 63921D8Z through which it will manage HEL development investments. The

committee understands that $5.7 million in fiscal year 2000 funds were made available for these program elements to initiate these efforts.

The committee believes that the establishment of these program elements will provide the Department of Defense with an effective management tool that can reinforce HEL developments managed and funded by the services and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. The committee recommends a provision (section 211), described elsewhere in this report, to reinforce and provide additional structure to this effort. The committee notes that this provision would require the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to conclude a memorandum of agreement to conduct joint high energy laser research.

The committee recommends $10.0 million in 61108D8Z to support basic research in high energy lasers, and $25.0 million in PE 62890D8Z, to support heat capacity laser development being conducted by the Army and other HEL applied research. The committee further recommends that of these funds, $10.0 million may be made available for high energy laser research and development pursued jointly with the NNSA.

Free electron laser

The budget request contained $38.0 million in PE 62111N for applied research in electronic warfare technology, but included funds for free electron laser development.

The committee notes the Navy's support for a proposal to upgrade the Department of Energy's free electron laser demonstration facility for applied research in the potential use of tunable free electron lasers as countermeasures against anti-ship missiles and anti-aircraft missile infrared seekers.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62111N to continue the demonstration facility upgrade program.

Solid state laser

The budget request contained $1.0 million in PE 62307A for research and development of high power lasers for tactical weapons systems. The committee is aware that the Army, in cooperation with Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, has developed a prototype ten kilowatt solid state heat capacity glass laser that has been tested successfully. The committee understands that the Army plans to develop a 100 kilowatt demonstration laser that could be mounted on Army vehicles for weapons applications depending on the availability of funds.

The committee believes that this technology has reached a state of maturity that supports such a demonstration, and if successful, has significant potential in air defense, missile defense, and other weapons applications. Therefore, the committee recommends $11.0 million in PE 62307A, an increase of $10.0 million, for the Army's solid state laser demonstrator.

The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Army to provide funds for this initiative in the fiscal year 2002 budget request and throughout the future years defense plan.

Information technology, superiority and assurance

The budget request contained a total of $19,913.7 million for the Defense information technology program: including $2,456.3 million for information technology research, development, test, and evaluation, and $1,233.6 million for information assurance.

The budget request for information technology research and development represents an increase of $472.2 million, while the budget request for information assurance contains an increase of $95.2 million.

The committee notes that the goal of the "National Plan for Information Protection, Version 1.0," dated January 2000, is to establish a full operational capability by 2003 to defend the United States against deliberate attacks aimed at disrupting national critical infrastructures, such as communications, banking, electric power. Key elements of the plan include establishing the Federal government as a model for infrastructure protection; the development of public-private partnerships to defend our national infrastructures; meeting the nation's needs for skilled information technology personnel; and ensuring a robust and comprehensive critical infrastructure protection research and development program.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has a major role in information protection, accounting for approximately $450 million of the $606 million in research and development that is specifically contained in the President's request for the National Plan. The committee is aware of other ongoing information systems security and critical infrastructure protection activities that are part of the Department's information assurance program.

The committee notes that *Joint Vision 2010,* the capstone document for joint forces, emphasizes information superiority and information technology as key enablers for joint operations by U.S. forces. The committee also notes that the globalization of information systems and networks has created a new dimension for warfare in which the dependence of U.S. Forces upon advanced information technology and information systems is both an advantage and vulnerability.

The committee notes that considerable progress has been made in the program to achieve information superiority, provide information assurance, and protect critical defense infrastructure. The committee recognizes, however, that additional work is required, particularly in the areas of operations-other-than-war or asymmetrical conflict. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense must continue to assign a high priority to resolving critical shortcomings in the Department's information technology program.

The committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106-162) directed the Assistant Secretary of Defense to provide a comprehensive report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on the Department of Defense's information superiority program. The report by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) (ASD C3I) cites the need to focus more attention and to accelerate efforts on the following:

(1) Information assurance to better protect information and information processes;

(2) Establishing the connectivity and interoperability needed in the global information grid;

(3) Collection and analysis capabilities and end-to-end integration of communications and intelligence systems;

(4) Education, training, and retention of information technology professionals;

(5) Removal of legal impediments to protecting information and information processes; and,

(6) Implementation of electronic commerce and electronic business practices within the Department.

To address these issues the committee recommends the budget request for information technology research, development, test, and evaluation. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess shortfalls in the information technology program and to report his findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2000.

Interference with global positioning system

The committee notes that section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) provided for an interagency review and assessment and report to Congress and the President on the progress made in implementation of national spectrum planning, the reallocation of Federal Government spectrum to non-Federal use, and the implications of such reallocations to the affected federal agencies. The report would also include which would include the effect of the reallocation on critical military and intelligence capabilities, civil space programs, and other Federal government systems used to protect public safety.

The committee notes the potential interference to the communications frequency bands used by the global positioning system (GPS) due to the emergence of new telecommunications and information technologies that could aversely affect GPS use in both military and civilian sectors. As a part of the Department of Defense contribution to the interagency review and assessment, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to identify potential interference with the GPS frequency bands as one of the issues that should be addressed in the assessment. The Secretary shall coordinate with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in developing the technical information, support, and assistance necessary to address this issue and to begin the development of appropriate regulations and enforcement procedures to protect the delivery of GPS signals during peacetime.

MC–130 autonomous landing guidance system

The budget request contained $133.5 million in PE 116404BB for special operations tactical systems development but included no funds for the autonomous landing guidance (ALG) system for the MC–130 aircraft.

The MC–130 aircraft provides night and all-weather infiltration and extraction of special operations forces (SOF) personnel and equipment, as well as military re-supply operations, in hostile areas. To accomplish this mission, the committee understands that the ALG system will provide SOF MC–130 pilots with a precision approach system that enhances their ability to land under adverse weather conditions. Since the committee also understands that the

ALG system may have application to other aircraft such as the C–130X and the C–17, it believes that both the ALG system's MC–130 flight tests and its engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) should be accelerated.

Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 116404BB to accelerate the ALG system's flight tests, EMD and installation on the MC–130.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request contained $15.0 million in PE 62227D8Z for medical free electron laser (MFEL) technology.

The committee is aware of the progress made by the medical free electron laser program. The committee notes that recent accomplishments include a new method of treating chemical burns, controlling sepsis, the development of artificial cartilage for injured joints, non-thermal cutting of bone, tissue welding and delivery of drugs through the skin. These new health care technologies are not only cost effective but also address key health care issues important both to military personnel and the general population.

The committee commends the Department of Defense for requesting sufficient funding for the MFEL to maintain the merit-based program's continued research momentum and recommends $15.0 million. The committee supports the MFEL program and encourages the Department of Defense to sustain this level of funding.

Microelectromechanical systems sensor development

The budget request contained $253.6 million in PE 61103D8Z for the Department of Defense university research initiative.

The committee continues its support for and recommends funding for research and development in microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) and applications of MEMS technology in precision weapons guidance and control, reconfigurable antenna elements, and a variety of other applications.

The committee recommends $263.1 million in PE 61103D8Z, including an increase of $9.5 million for basic research in MEMS sensors for radionuclide detection and ordnance monitoring.

National imagery and mapping agency

The budget request contained $75.0 million in PE 35102BQ for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency's (NIMA) to conduct research and development of imagery and geospatial exploitation tools and for the National Technology Alliance (NTA).

The committee is concerned that the variety of current synthetic aperture radar (SAR) imaging systems, including the Joint Surveillance, Target and Attack Radar System (JSTARS), the U–2 Advanced SAR System (ASARS) and unmanned aerial vehicles have limited to no capability to image moving targets. The committee notes that the Air Force Research Laboratory in Rome, New York, has been developing the Multi-Platform Target Exploitation Processing capability that will allow SAR imaging of moving targets. However, no funds were included in the budget request to field such a capability, which, the committee is convinced, will result in significant new capabilities for SAR-equipped platforms.

Further, the committee notes that the NTA has proven its ability to rapidly apply commercial technology to defense applications, reducing cost and increasing systems performance. The committee also notes that the NTA has been a very effective means of leveraging commercial technology to solve intelligence community technical problems.

The committee is aware that the airborne geographic synthetic aperture radar GeoSAR) is being developed to provide a dual band interferometric radar that is able to provide the military high resolution, three-dimensional maps of the earth, above, through and below the vegetation canopy.

Therefore, the committee recommends $97.0 million in PE 35102BQ, an increase of $22.0 million, $4.0 million for continuing the Rome Laboratory moving target exploitation effort, and $3.0 million for the NTA to continue national imagery and mapping agency viewer development and $15.0 million for GeoSAR.

Requirement for "designated laboratory"

The committee notes that section 2, paragraph (18) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 providing the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), established the condition that the President certify to the Senate that no sample collected in the United States pursuant to the Convention will be transferred for analysis to any laboratory outside the United States. In its verification annex, the CWC requires that samples for off-site analysis be analyzed in at least two "designated laboratories," i.e. laboratories that have been "designated" for such testing by the Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). The Army's Edgewood Forensic Science Laboratory is currently the only U.S. designated laboratory. The committee notes that establishment of a second designated laboratory within the United States is necessary in order to fulfill U.S. ratification commitments, as well as the requirements imposed by the Senate.

The committee requests that the Secretary of Defense report to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request, the Department of Defense position, actions, and funding requirements relative to establishment of a second designated laboratory.

Science and technology affordability initiative

The committee is aware of the Department's "Defense Science and Technology Strategy 2000" and notes the potential for significant savings in defense systems ownership cost savings associated with science and technology investments. The committee agrees that science and technology advancements can contribute to the affordability of both current and future systems, and supports the Department's emphasis in this area as one of its top five priorities.

Further, the committee is aware that each service has a current program of emphasis in this area. Anticipated Army science and technology investments focus a great deal of attention to reduced logistical requirements for improved deployability and maneuverability. Air Force plans anticipate targeted investments to facilitate the fielding of a more lean and efficient expeditionary force. The Navy has embraced a concept called Total Cost of Ownership as

one of its twelve Future Naval Capabilities. Two initiatives, Shipboard Integration Logistics System (SILS) and a proposed knowledge-based diagnostic and maintenance system, offer significant potential cost savings during the operation and maintenance of naval assets.

The committee urges further development of these proposals and supports the budget request. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, a report on the manner in which the science and technology program addresses total life cycle costs of weapons systems. The report shall include a description and assessment of the programs, associated funding requirements, and related policy initiatives.

Special operations tactical video system

The budget request contained $3.0 million in PE 116405BB for Special Operations Forces (SOF) intelligence system developments, including $100,000 for continued development of the Special Operations Tactical Video System (SOTVS).

The committee notes that no commercial solution to the SOF underwater camera requirements exists, and that a dedicated research and development program is necessary to satisfy this critical mission requirement. Therefore, the committee is dismayed that the budget request is insufficient to develop and procure a replacement for the aging cameras currently in the inventory.

The committee recommends $5.0 million in PE116405BB, an increase of $2.0 million to expedite the development of the SOTVS camera.

Tactical and support aircraft noise reduction

The committee notes problems with increasing levels of noise pollution associated with aircraft operations ashore and afloat and the potential physical and environmental hazards posed by high frequency and intensity noise and vibration to aircrew, ground support personnel, and those residing and working in the vicinity of active aviation operations. The committee also notes the impact of high noise and vibration levels experienced in tactical aircraft on aircraft structural fatigue.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not given adequate attention to noise reduction as an essential element of the tactical aircraft modernization program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of the National Aeronautical and Space Administration, to assess requirements for establishment of an aviation noise and vibration reduction research and development program that will lead to reduction in noise associated with tactical and support aircraft operations. The committee further directs the Secretary to report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2001, the status of funding and plans for noise reduction in tactical and support aircraft and for the reduction of sound pressure levels that can cause vibration problems and structural fatigue.

Texas regional institute for environmental studies

The budget request contained $51.4 million in PE 63716D8Z for the strategic environmental research program, but included no funds for the ongoing Texas regional institute for environmental studies (TRIES) program

The committee recommends $51.4 million in PE 63716D8Z for the strategic environmental research program, including $3.0 million for the TRIES computer-based land management model and to collaborate with Brooks Air Force Base San Antonio, Texas for potential application of environmental technologies.

Thermionics for space power systems

The budget request contained $230.9 million in PE 62715BR for applied research in nuclear sustainment and counterproliferation technologies, but included no funds to continue the program for development of thermionic power conversion technology.

The committee notes that the Air Force and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have identified potential applications for large capacity (40–100 kilowatt) nuclear space power systems having long lifetimes. The committee also notes the progress being made in the advanced thermionics program to develop technologies for making thermionics a more viable power conversion option for space power systems, demonstrate highly reliable thermionic power converters capable of providing high output power per unit mass, and design of thermionic system concepts. The committee further notes that the program supports the Defense technology area plan for space platforms.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the progress being made in the advanced thermionics program, the potential for incorporation of the program in the Department of Defense core science and technology program, and anticipated requirements for thermionic power conversion systems. The Secretary shall report the results of the assessment and plans for continuation of the program to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62715BR to continue the development of advanced thermionics power conversion technology.

TRICARE encounter data system

The budget request included $12.0 million in PE 65013D8Z for information technology development.

The committee is concerned that no funds were included to accelerate the development and deployment of the TRICARE encounter data system (TEDS), a key system for improving the efficiency of the TRICARE claims processing system.

The committee recommends $15.6 million in PE 65013D8Z, an increase of $3.6 million to complete development of TEDS.

Ultra-wideband radar

The budget request contained $116.4 million in PE 63750D8Z for advanced concept technology demonstrations, but included no funds to demonstrate ultra-wideband, single-cycle radar and communications.

The committee is aware that recent unanticipated technology breakthroughs in radio frequency electronics have resulted in applications for radar and communications. The committee notes that ultra-wideband, single cycle technology is now ready for demonstration of wall penetrating radar capability.

The committee recommends $117.4 million in PE 63750D8Z, an increase of $1.0 million for radar vision demonstration.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $201.6 million for Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends authorization of $219.6 million, an increase of $18.0 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2000 Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense programs are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Operational Test and Evaluation request are discussed following the table.

TITLE II - RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE			
0604940D8Z	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	121,401	18,000	139,401
		CTEIP			[+18,000]
0605118D8Z	2	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	17,172		17,172
0605131D8Z	3	LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,712		9,712
0605804D8Z	4	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	53,275		53,275
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	201,560	18,000	219,560
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	201,560	18,000	219,560
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-

Items of Special Interest

Central test and evaluation investment program

The budget request contained $121.4 million in PE 64940D8Z for Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program (CTEIP).

The committee notes that the objective of the CTEIP is to fund critically needed, high priority, test and evaluation capabilities for joint and multi-service system test requirements. The Department of Defense recently disbanded the office of the Director, Test, Systems Engineering and Evaluation, formerly responsible for CTEIP as an element of the Department's developmental test and evaluation (DT&E) program, and transferred responsibility for the CTEIP to the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E). The committee notes that the first CTEIP budget request under the DOT&E management represents a decrease in funding for this important program.

The committee expresses concern that while the Department's decreased request for CTEIP indicates that less funding is required, the military services are, at the same time, identifying an alarming increase in critically needed test facility upgrades and instrumentation modernization. The committee believes that the combination of declining research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) budgets and an increasing number of test facility sustainment issues is largely responsible for the decline in utilization of service operated test facilities. The committee is also aware of test and evaluation (T&E) community concerns that the continued decline in utilization of these T&E facilities is a primary cause of the underfunded status of these facilities within the service budget requests and, therefore, a direct cause of the higher testing costs assessed to test program customers.

The committee is aware that the Department is reviewing this critical test facility sustainment issue, but believes that decreases in the CTEIP are premature and do not address the importance of the growing list of proposed test facility and range modernization efforts. The committee notes that the Army Chief of Staff has identified a high priority unfunded requirement in fiscal year 2001 for $26.0 million of test and evaluation upgrades. The committee also notes that the Air Force is conducting a propulsion wind tunnel (PWT) upgrade program to modernize the primary wind tunnel facilities used for transonic and supersonic testing of major propulsion development programs including F–22 and the Joint Strike Fighter. Additional funds for the PWT program would enhance structural test monitoring and data analysis and enable Air Force test facilities to increase and enhance turbine engine test capability. The committee is also aware of an innovative new technology, Laser Induced Surface Improvement (LISI), which would have far reaching joint service benefits. A multi-service cooperative program incorporating the LISI technology would cut test time and costs, as well as reduce long term maintenance and material construction costs through the use of new laser surfacing technologies synergistically applied to several Air Force, Navy, and Army assets vulnerable to corrosion and abrasion. The committee believes LISI is a project with a limitless potential for the military and eventu-

ally for private sector use, and is a worthy candidate for funding under CTEIP.

The committee believes that many of the service test facility modernization proposals such as digital video data collection and similar instrumentation upgrade efforts would support establishment of uniform test data collection for all service-run T&E facilities.

The committee is disturbed by the Department's inability to ensure sufficient funds necessary to sustain T&E facilities, as well as the many worthy test facility upgrades identified by the services. The committee is aware that the Department is conducting an assessment of various funding methods, to include consideration of working capital funding and other T&E customer cost-sharing alternatives in order to ensure adequate sustainment funding for T&E facilities. The committee expresses strong congressional interest in this issue and directs the Secretary of Defense to report any recommended change to current funding procedures for these facilities prior to including them in future budget requests.

The committee recommends $139.4 million, an increase of $18.0 million to address additional T&E facility upgrade proposals within the CTEIP and supports this program as an appropriate method of ensuring coordinated investments to support joint requirements for T&E facility upgrades and capability sustainment efforts.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E) funding for fiscal year 2000.

Section 202—Amount for Basic and Applied Research

This section would specify the amount authorized for fiscal year 2000 for technology base programs.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—High Energy Laser Programs

This section would authorize funds for high energy laser (HEL) research and development; require a designated senior civilian official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to carry out responsibilities for coordinating, prioritizing, planning, programming, and oversight of HEL programs, establish appropriate policy to guide funding of OSD, services and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) HEL programs; state a sense of Congress concerning funding levels for HEL research and development; require the establishment of a memorandum of agreement between the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to conduct joint laser research programs; and establish certain reporting requirements.

The committee notes that the High Energy Laser Executive Review Panel (HELERP) prepared the laser master plan mandated by section 251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65). This report identifies many of the technical challenges in maturing laser technologies for weapons applications and establishes a High Energy Laser Board of Directors, chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, to oversee and approve HEL science and technology investments. The committee believes that this organization represents a significant advance over the past, in which laser development activities proceeded within the services with little or no coordination.

However, the committee remains concerned that the management structure established by the HELERP may not vest sufficient authority in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to assure that service and BMDO HEL programs are fully coordinated. The committee is also concerned that this structure and the funding mechanisms established in the laser master plan will not be adequate to encourage the services to invest scarce resources in a potentially revolutionary capability. Section 211 would define the authorities of a designated OSD official to assure that HEL programs within the Department of Defense are adequately funded and coordinated. The committee also believes that requiring OSD funding to support service—and BMDO—funded HEL programs at a level no greater than that provided by the service or BMDO will maximize the relevance of OSD efforts to service and BMD requirements and incentivize appropriate investment in these technologies.

Section 212—Management of Space-Based Infrared System-Low

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assign program management authority for the Space-Based Infrared System-Low to the Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

Section 213—Joint Strike Fighter

This section would limit the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program's approval to proceed beyond the demonstration and validation phase until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the technological maturity of the JSF program's key technologies is sufficient to warrant its entry into the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) stage.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 231—Funding for Fiscal Year 2001

The section would authorize appropriations for research and development for National Missile Defense for fiscal year 2001.

Section 232—Sense of Congress Concerning Commitment to Deploy National Missile Defense

This section would make certain findings and express the sense of Congress that the enactment of the National Missile Defense Act

of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) entails a commitment to deploy a national missile defense.

The committee believes that integrated flight tests to date demonstrate the feasibility of the National Missile Defense (NMD) technology under development. Integrated Flight Test-3 (IFT–3) confirmed the ability of the exoatmospheric kill vehicle (EKV) to discriminate a warhead from other objects. IFT–4, notwithstanding the fact that the EKV missed the target because of failure of EKV sensors, confirmed the ability of the NMD battle management, command and control system, early warning sensors, and radar to provide engagement information to the kill vehicle as a functioning system of systems. The committee recognizes that much test and evaluation remains to be done, but believes that the tests to date provide confidence that NMD system technologies are feasible.

The committee believes that the North Korean development of long-range missiles capable of reaching the continental United States is sufficiently mature that a commitment to a firm deployment schedule is warranted. The committee notes that the September 1999 threat assessment by the National Intelligence Council states that Iran could test an ICBM by the latter half of this decade. The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense shares the view that "the threat threshold has been crossed."

The committee notes that the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) established that it is the policy of the United States to deploy an NMD system as soon as technically possible. The committee remains baffled by Administration statements to the effect that, while the policy of the United States is to deploy a national missile defense, no decision has been made to deploy such a defense. The committee believes that the establishment of any policy incurs an inherent commitment to execute it.

Section 233—Reports on Ballistic Missile Threat Posed By North Korea

This section would require the President to issue, within two weeks of the next test of a long-range ballistic missile by North Korea or 60 days after the date of enactment, a report to assess the North Korean missile threat, the U.S. capability to defend against that threat, proliferation threats, steps the U.S. will take to reduce the threat while the nation is vulnerable, and the viability of testing other BMD systems against targets with flight characteristics similar to those of long range North Korean missiles.

The committee believes that if North Korea should test a long-range missile, the Department of Defense should quickly revise threat assessments and rapidly put into place actions to reduce the increased vulnerability that are assessed as result of the test.

Section 234—Plan to Modify Ballistic Missile Defense Architecture to Cover Intermediate-Range Ballistic Missile Threats

This section would require the Director of Ballistic Missile Defense Organization to develop a plan to address threats posed by ballistic missiles of 2500 to 4000 kilometers in range.

The committee notes that the National Missile Defense system under development will defend the United States from interconti-

nental range ballistic missiles, and theater missile defense systems under development will provide effective defense for U.S. forces and allies from ballistic missiles with ranges out to approximately 2000 kilometers. The committee notes that, according to public reports, Iran is developing an intermediate range ballistic missile with a range well in excess of 2000 kilometers, capable of striking virtually all of Europe. The committee believes that the evolution of this threat must be addressed in BMD architecture and technology development.

Section 235—Designation of Airborne Laser Program as a Program Element of Ballistic Missile Defense Program

This section would establish a new program element in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) for the airborne laser.

The committee notes that Airborne Laser (ABL) is a key element of BMDO architectures. The committee notes that the Air Force drastically reduced funding and delayed ABL testing and deployment schedules by as much as seven years. The committee further notes that the Air Force did so without consulting BMDO and without consideration of the impact on the BMD architecture developed by BMDO or requirements for upper and lower tier BMD systems. To properly coordinate the elements of the BMD architecture and BMD technology development, the committee believes that ABL is more effectively managed and funded by BMDO.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 241—Recognition of Those Individuals Instrumental to Naval Research Efforts During the Period from Before World War II Through the End of the Cold War

This provision would recognize those individuals instrumental in the establishment and conduct of oceanographic and scientific research partnerships between the Federal Government and academic institutions during the period beginning before World War II and continuing through the end of the Cold War, support efforts by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Research to honor those individuals, and express appreciation for the ongoing efforts of the Office of Naval Research to support oceanographic and scientific research and the development of researchers in scientific fields related to the missions of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2001 for operation and maintenance represents an increase in spending of just $3.0 billion over spending levels authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2000. Increasing fuel prices account for $1.2 billion of that increase, and the remaining represents inflation assumptions of about one percent. Despite the Administration's reported funding increase, the reality of the budget request is that there are little if any real increases. The committee is concerned that current budget estimates project a decrease in operation and maintenance funding for critical readiness needs for fiscal year 2002.

Despite increased funding by Congress for readiness, the budget request for fiscal year 2001 falls well short of addressing many of the military services' current and future readiness requirements. Compounding the problem, the budget request does not adequately take into account the current and future financial impacts on equipment, training, and facilities being created by the high pace of unscheduled contingency operations around the world. The committee remains deeply concerned that the continued underfunding of key readiness and quality of life accounts, coupled with a continued high pace of operations, will exacerbate readiness and personnel retention concerns. For example, in spite of the addition by Congress of $858.4 million to the real property maintenance and repair accounts of the four military services in fiscal year 2000, the chiefs' fiscal year 2000 unfunded priorities list still identifies a real property and repair shortfall of over $1.03 billion. Despite a Congressional increase last year of $135.0 million for spare parts, the services unfunded priorities list nonetheless identifies a shortfall in spare parts funding of $250.0 million in fiscal year 2001. As a further example, Congress increased the budget request for ship depot maintenance by $25.0 million last year, yet this year's unfunded priorities list reflects a shortfall in fiscal year 2001 of $182.3 million.

In an effort to obtain a more accurate and detailed assessment of current and near-term readiness, the committee conducted a series of hearings. The evidence received during the hearings was of an overextended force struggling to maintain acceptable readiness levels in an environment of declining human and budgetary resources. The committee continues to hear significant complaints about lack of spare parts, aging equipment, decaying infrastructure and growing equipment and facilities' backlogs and the difficulties of conducting quality training and operational deployments with significant personnel shortages.

The committee continues to believe that DOD must continue to take steps to reduce costs in non-readiness related accounts. At the

same time, DOD must provide more aggressive oversight of the military department's proposals to reduce costs through contracting out and privatization. As an example, the Department of the Navy has proposed the contracting out of a major portion of its communications requirements without including any documentation for this proposed five-year, $10.0 billion program. Proposals of this magnitude may have serious budgetary consequences for other DOD programs. The committee fully supports well developed and justified programs that will reduce costs; but, at a time when readiness shortfalls are growing almost exponentially, the committee does not believe that poorly developed and uncoordinated new programs, or that funding for administrative and support activities, such as headquarters management, should be increasing. Consistent with past practice, the committee has identified spending that does not directly support military readiness and has reprioritized it into areas that will. In making decisions on how best to apply resources to address readiness problems, the committee relied heavily on lessons learned during extensive oversight hearings and on the unfunded priorities lists provided by the service chiefs.

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	19,123,731	368,886	19,492,617
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	23,300,154	21,655	23,321,809
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,705,658	146,020	2,851,678
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	22,346,977	4,187	22,351,164
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	11,920,069	(246,217)	11,673,852
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,521,418	44,500	1,565,918
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	960,946	6,700	967,646
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	133,959	16,510	150,469
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,885,859	5,000	1,890,859
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	3,182,335	54,500	3,236,835
OPEATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,446,375	15,500	3,461,875
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	389,932	-	389,932
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	294,038	-	294,038
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	376,300	-	376,300
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,412	-	23,412
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	186,499	-	186,499
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES	836,300	5,200	841,500
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	4,100,577	-	4,100,577
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	144,245	-	144,245
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	8,574	-	8,574
OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	64,900	(9,100)	55,800
PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	25,000	-	25,000
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	11,310,423	261,100	11,571,523
COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	458,400	(25,000)	433,400
QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE			
TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**108,746,081**	**669,441**	**109,415,522**
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	916,276	-	916,276
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	388,158	348,951	737,109
TOTAL WORKING CAPTIAL FUNDS	**1,304,434**	**348,951**	**1,653,385**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES	3,330,899	122,300	3,453,199
010	DIVISIONS	1,174,856		1,189,156
	Military Gator		9,300	
	Soldier Support--Field Kitchen Burn Unit (MBU)		5,000	
020	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	321,297		321,297
030	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	350,844		350,844
040	ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	503,390		503,390
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	980,512		980,512
	TRAINING RANGE MODERNIZATION/MANAGEMENT		108,000	108,000
	LAND FORCES READINESS	2,370,841	137,450	2,508,291
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	125,000	819,662
	CORROSION CONTROL		12,450	12,450
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	3,879,341	-	3,879,341
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (OPERATING FORCES)	2,698,913		2,698,913
100	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OPERATING FORCES)	916,378		916,378
110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	131,042		131,042
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	82,388		82,388
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	50,620		50,620
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	9,581,081	259,750	9,840,831

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**526,913**	**-**	**526,913**
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		20,666
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**526,913**	**-**	**526,913**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**364,026**	**7,000**	**371,026**
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		141,581
	Senior ROTC Recruiting		7,000	
220	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (ACCESSION TRAINING)	75,468		75,468
230	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACCESSION TRAINING)	49,668		49,668
	BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	**2,193,890**	**42,402**	**2,236,292**
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	242,799	15,000	257,799
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	323,414		323,414
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	100,260		100,260
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	417,639	4,000	421,639
280	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	845,136		845,136
290	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (BASIC SKILL/ADVANCED TRAINING)	264,642		264,642
	INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING		15,000	15,000
	CRYPTOLOGIC SKILL TRAINING		4,000	4,000
	DEPOT APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM		4,402	4,402

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	895,653	-	895,653
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		77,491
350	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (RECRUIT/OTHER TRAINING)	188,375		188,375
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	3,453,569	49,402	3,502,971
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	472,588	-	472,588
360	SECURITY PROGRAMS	472,588		472,588
	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	(40,000)	3,249,407
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	(40,000)	72,851
470	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	69,439		69,439
480	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	1,076,077		1,076,077
490	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	177,821		177,821

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	249,083	(18,700)	230,383
500	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	194,381		194,381
510	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	54,702	(6,300)	48,402
520	EXPANSION OF NATO	-		-
	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS		(12,400)	(12,400)
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN. & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	5,562,168	(58,700)	5,503,468
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	SECTION 912 HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION		(27,086)	(27,086)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		(2,700)	(2,700)
	REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(11,000)	(11,000)
	FOREIGN CURRENCIES EXCESS BALANCES		(150,000)	(150,000)
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		280,360	280,360
	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		4,000	4,000
	ULTRA LIGHTWEIGHT CAMOUFLAGE NET SYSTEM		15,000	15,000
	ARMY WORKLOAD PERFORMANCE SYSTEM		2,000	2,000
	SYSTEMS TECHNICAL SUPPORT		40,000	40,000
	FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAM		3,000	3,000
	WCF CASH BALANCE/RATE STABILIZATION SUPPLEMENTAL ADJUSTMENT		(55,550)	(55,550)
	WRM PREPOSITIONED EQUIPMENT SUPPORT		40,000	40,000
	DFAS PROGRAM GROWTH		(19,590)	(19,590)
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	-	118,434	118,434
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	19,123,731	368,886	19,492,617

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	4,267,564	30,000	4,297,564
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,636,230		2,636,230
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	798,956		798,956
030	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	59,407		59,407
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	102,182		102,182
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	648,745	20,000	678,745
	P-3 Aircraft Depot Maintenance		10,000	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,044		22,044
	SHIP OPERATIONS	6,334,227	208,150	6,542,377
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,237,075		2,240,925
	Man Overboard system		3,850	
080	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	539,919		539,919
090	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	393,478		393,478
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,113,052	142,300	2,295,352
	AOE Ship Depot Maintenance		40,000	
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,703		1,072,703
	Berthing Barge Maintenance		22,000	
	COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT	1,667,580	-	1,667,580
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		257,981
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	548,600		548,600
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	163,062		163,062
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	791		791

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	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**	**-**	**3,017,265**
250	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	866,050		866,050
260	BASE SUPPORT	2,151,215		2,151,215
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**16,692,678**	**238,150**	**16,930,828**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES	**428,418**	**32,000**	**460,418**
270	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	428,418		428,418
	WRM/MATERIALS STOCKS		32,000	32,000
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	**196,403**	**-**	**196,403**
280	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,939		2,939
290	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	193,464		193,464
	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**	**32,000**	**700,934**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	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	890	914,154
360	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	276,861		276,861
370	FLIGHT TRAINING	342,553		342,553
380	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	107,625		107,625
390	TRAINING SUPPORT	186,225		186,225
	DEPOT APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM	-	890	890
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	354,956	-	354,956
400	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	180,737		180,737
410	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	86,613		86,613
420	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	56,234		56,234
430	JUNIOR ROTC	31,372		31,372
	BASE SUPPORT	522,786	-	522,786
440	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	198,071		198,071
450	BASE SUPPORT	324,715		324,715
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	1,965,639	890	1,966,529
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	1,346,099	(15,557)	1,330,542
460	ADMINISTRATION	618,145		618,145
470	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	19,987		19,987

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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	(15,557)	292,668
520	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	-		-
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	**1,728,826**	**-**	**1,728,826**
530	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,105		186,105
540	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	-		-
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**	**3,000**	**625,854**
610	SECURITY PROGRAMS	622,854		622,854
	ASHORE FORCE PROTECTION		3,000	3,000
	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	**8,508**	**-**	**8,508**
620	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,508		8,508
	BASE SUPPORT	**266,616**	**-**	**266,616**
630	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	109,485		109,485
640	BASE SUPPORT	157,131		157,131
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,972,903**	**(12,557)**	**3,960,346**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(53,800)	(53,800)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		(3,752)	(3,752)

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	SECTION 912 HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION		(13,340)	(13,340)
	REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(1,014)	(1,014)
	FOREIGN CURRENCIES EXCESS BALANCES		(30,000)	(30,000)
	NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM		5,000	5,000
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		162,170	162,170
	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE		(15,100)	(15,100)
	ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT		(45,681)	(45,681)
	WCF CASH BALANCE/RATE STABILIZATION SUPPLEMENTAL ADJUSTMENT		(227,250)	(227,250)
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(14,061)	(14,061)
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**(236,828)**	**(236,828)**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**23,300,154**	**21,655**	**23,321,809**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	**1,908,545**	**67,600**	**1,976,145**
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	420,702		443,802
	Initial Issue		23,100	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	235,561		243,061
	Corrosion Control Coating		7,500	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,194	22,000	129,194
	Maintenance of Aging Equipment		10,000	
040	BASE SUPPORT	760,299		760,299
050	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	394,789		394,789
	PERSONAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,000	5,000

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	USMC PREPOSITIONING	**86,281**	**11,200**	**97,481**
060	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	82,390		82,390
070	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,891		3,891
	MPS REPLENISHMENT/REPLACEMENT STOCKS		11,200	11,200
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,994,826**	**78,800**	**2,073,626**
	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**	**4,000**	**209,972**
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
	INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING	-	4,000	4,000
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	**140,518**	**12,100**	**152,618**
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	100,001	7,500	107,501
190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	17,961		17,961
200	JUNIOR ROTC	11,917		11,917
210	BASE SUPPORT	8,006	600	8,606

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
220	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,633		2,633
	STAFFING FOR VOLUNTARY EDUCATION PROGRAM		4,000	4,000
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**432,876**	**16,100**	**448,976**
	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	**-**	**-**	**-**
280	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	-		-
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMIN. & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**277,956**	**-**	**277,956**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	FOREIGN CURRENCIES EXCESS BALANCES		(2,200)	(2,200)
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		38,320	38,320
	ULTRA LIGHTWEIGHT CAMOUFLAGE SYSTEM		15,000	15,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**51,120**	**51,120**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,705,658**	**146,020**	**2,851,678**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	8,673,688	82,100	8,755,788
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	77,800	1,419,024
	ENGINE R&M IMPROVEMENTS		4,300	4,300
060	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,093,924		1,093,924
070	BASE SUPPORT	1,849,247		1,849,247
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
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

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
200	BASE SUPPORT	377,605		377,605
210	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	134,276		134,276
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**11,490,451**	**82,100**	**11,572,551**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	**3,159,544**	**7,700**	**3,167,244**
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
270	BASE SUPPORT	466,832		466,832
280	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	120,515		120,515
	AFLOAT PREPOSITIONED FLEET--AF		7,700	7,700
	TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION	**3,159,544**	**7,700**	**3,167,244**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING	**266,841**	**400**	**267,241**
290	OFFICER ACQUISITION	68,142		68,142
300	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,302		4,302
310	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	61,522		61,922
	Open Air Force Senior ROTC Support		400	
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**	**5,000**	**1,674,169**
340	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	256,003		256,003
350	FLIGHT TRAINING	618,293		618,293

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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
	INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING	-	5,000	5,000
	RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	305,491	-	305,491
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		31,819
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	2,241,501	5,400	2,246,901
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	3,131,611	-	3,131,611
460	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	985,411		985,411
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	(20,500)	1,603,874
520	ADMINISTRATION	153,206	(10,000)	143,206
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	322,654		322,654
540	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	146,783		146,783
550	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	59,073		59,073
560	ARMS CONTROL	41,094	(10,500)	30,594

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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**	**(20,500)**	**5,434,981**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	SECTION 912 HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION		(14,500)	(14,500)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		15,801	15,801
	REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES		(12,200)	(12,200)
	FOREIGN CURRENCIES EXCESS BALANCES		(37,700)	(37,700)
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		176,040	176,040
	LD/HD FLIGHT CREW TRAINING		5,100	5,100
	AIRCRAFT SPARES		45,000	45,000
	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE		15,100	15,100
	ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT		(8,800)	(8,800)
	WCF CASH BALANCE/RATE STABILIZATION SUPPLEMENTAL ADJUSTMENT		(222,200)	(222,200)
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(4,633)	(4,633)
	DFAS PROGRAM GROWTH		(27,521)	(27,521)
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**(70,513)**	**(70,513)**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**22,346,977**	**4,187**	**22,351,164**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE WIDE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	396,489		388,575
	Mobility enhancement Funds		25,000	
	Exercise Program		(32,914)	
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,263,572		1,263,572
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,660,061**	**(7,914)**	**1,652,147**
	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		100,331
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
100	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	49,158		49,158
	TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**262,675**	**-**	**262,675**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
110	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	94,525		94,525
120	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	88,431		88,431

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
130	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,207,597		4,207,597
140	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (FY 98/99)	-		-
150	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE (NO YEAR)	-		-
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		1,165,496
	Document Conversion		10,000	
	CTMA Program		12,000	
220	DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,827		14,827
230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	67,598		65,312
	PfP Program		(2,286)	
240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	126,929		126,929
250	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	215,624	(1,000)	214,624
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,434,204		1,434,204
270	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	157,883		157,361
	Section 912 Headquarters Reduction		(522)	
280	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	22,495		22,495
290	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	417,126		412,680
	Section 912 Headquarters Reduction		(4,446)	
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	-		-
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	43,864		42,182
	Section 912 Headquarters Reduction		(1,682)	
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	299,334	(33,959)	265,375
330	NATURAL DISASTERS	-		-
340	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	315,000	(200,000)	115,000
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**9,951,656**	**(221,895)**	**9,729,761**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(900)	(900)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM		(44,322)	(44,322)
	SECTION 912 HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION--DEFENSE WIDE		(12,586)	(12,586)
	FOREIGN CURRENCIES EXCESS BALANCES--DEFENSE WIDE		(10,100)	(10,100)
	IMPACT AID		35,000	35,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL LEGACY PROGRAM		6,500	6,500
	INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PROGRAM AT SENIOR MILITARY COLLEGES		2,000	2,000
	RECRUITER-HIGH SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELOR INTERNET CONNECTION		2,000	2,000
	EAGLE VISION COMMERCIAL IMAGERY		6,000	6,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**-**	**(16,408)**	**(16,408)**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE WIDE	**11,920,069**	**(246,217)**	**11,673,852**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES	**680,318**	**12,000**	**692,318**
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
	EXTENDED COLD WEATHER SYSTEM		12,000	12,000
	LAND FORCES READINESS	**211,288**	**-**	**211,288**
060	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	129,020		129,020
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	35,501		35,501
080	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	46,767		46,767

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	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	-		-
120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,340		1,340
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	1,353,421	12,000	1,365,421
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	167,997	9,000	176,997
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	9,000	78,213
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	167,997	9,000	176,997
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	ADDITIONAL MILITARY TECHNICIANS		20,500	20,500
	FUNERAL HONORS		3,000	3,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		23,500	23,500
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,521,418	44,500	1,565,918

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	478,297	-	478,297
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	355,803		355,803
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	-		-
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	-	130,106
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		68,721
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
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	855,098	-	855,098

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	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	-	-	-
220	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	-		-
	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	-	-	-
230	CANCELLED ACCOUNTS	-		-
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	105,848	-	105,848
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING		3,700	3,700
	RECRUITING SUPPORT		3,000	3,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	-	6,700	6,700
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	960,946	6,700	967,646

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	MISSION FORCES	98,867	11,400	110,267
010	TRAINING	17,938		17,938
	TRAINING CENTER IMPROVEMENTS		1,200	1,200
	INITIAL ISSUE		5,200	5,200
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	2,000	11,014
	MAINTENANCE OF AGING EQUIPMENT		2,000	2,000
	CORROSION CONTROL COATING		1,000	1,000
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	98,867	11,400	110,267
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	35,092	2,000	37,092
060	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,907	2,000	9,907
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	2,000	37,092
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	-	3,110	3,110
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	-	3,110	3,110
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	133,959	16,510	150,469

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	**1,800,275**	**-**	**1,800,275**
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,199,990		1,199,990
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	49,309		49,309
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	281,177		281,177
040	BASE SUPPORT	224,138		224,138
050	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	45,661		45,661
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**1,800,275**	**-**	**1,800,275**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**85,584**	**-**	**85,584**
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**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	TECHNICIAN PILOT RETENTION BONUS	-	5,000	5,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**-**	**5,000**	**5,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**1,885,859**	**5,000**	**1,890,859**

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	LAND FORCES	1,639,496	24,000	1,663,496
010	DIVISIONS	420,846		420,846
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
	EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM		24,000	24,000
	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	-	1,085,439
080	BASE OPERATIONS	460,632		460,632
090	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	202,431		202,431
100	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	422,376		422,376
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	2,987,354	24,000	3,011,354
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	194,981	-	194,981
110	STAFF MANAGEMENT	73,993		73,993
120	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	20,115		20,115

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
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**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	ADDITIONAL MILITARY TECHNICIANS		30,500	30,500
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		**30,500**	**30,500**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**3,182,335**	**54,500**	**3,236,835**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	**3,433,996**	**6,000**	**3,439,996**
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,216,504		2,216,504
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	368,761		368,761
030	BASE SUPPORT	291,414		291,414
040	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	104,385		104,385
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	452,932		452,932
	EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM		6,000	6,000
	TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES	**3,433,996**	**6,000**	**3,439,996**
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**12,379**	**9,500**	**21,879**
060	ADMINISTRATION	2,668		2,668

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,711	6,000	15,711
	RECRUITING SUPPORT		3,500	3,500
	TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**12,379**	**9,500**	**21,879**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**-**	**-**	**-**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**3,446,375**	**15,500**	**3,461,875**
	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	5,200	841,500
70	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	4,100,577		4,100,577
80	PENTAGON RENOVATION	-		-
	TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS	**6,207,058**	**5,200**	**6,212,258**
	MISCELLANEOUS			
90	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	11,310,423		11,571,523
	Fund Study of DHP Accrual		2,000	
	Fund Study of Medicare-Eligible Health Options		2,000	
	Fund Study DOD/VA Joint Research Facility		2,500	
	Modernize TRICARE Management/Increase Use of Treatment Facilities		134,500	
	Reimburse Travel Expenses for Long-Distance Referrals		15,000	
	Reduce Catastrophic Cap for Retirees		32,000	

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Benefit		94,000	
	Foreign Currency Excess Balances		(15,400)	
	Foreign Military Training		(10,000)	
	Chiropractic Services for Active Duty Personnel		3,000	
	Telemedicine Radiology Demonstration		1,500	
100	EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND, DEFENSE	-		-
110	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	458,400	(25,000)	433,400
120	INSPECTOR GENERAL	144,245		144,245
130	OPPLAN 34A-35 P.O.W.	-		-
140	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	64,900	(9,100)	55,800
150	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	25,000		25,000
160	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS	-		-
170	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	8,574		8,574
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS	**12,011,542**	**227,000**	**12,238,542**
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE:	**108,746,081**	**669,441**	**109,415,522**

TITLE III - WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	916,276	-	916,276
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	388,158		737,109
Procurement of one ADC(X) vessel		348,951	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	**1,304,434**	**348,951**	**1,653,385**

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST INCREASES

Critical Readiness Accounts

The committee continues to place a high priority on addressing funding shortfalls for critical readiness accounts. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of approximately $1.4 billion to support a number of underfunded readiness accounts. Although the committee has significantly increased funding above the budget request in key readiness accounts by just under $10.0 billion during the past six years, this has not been sufficient to significantly improve readiness across the military services. The committee recommendations emphasize problems highlighted throughout extensive hearings and have been guided by the shortfalls identified by the service chiefs.

Depot maintenance

The committee notes that operational tempo is at an all-time high and that aging military equipment is approaching a point beyond its useful service life. As a consequence of the aging of significant elements of the services' combat equipment, the maintenance of such equipment is increasingly difficult, time consuming, and expensive. The committee recommends an increase of $461.1 million for depot maintenance to address the added requirements of aging combat equipment as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$125.0
Navy (Air)	30.0
Navy (Sea)	204.3
Marine Corps	22.0
Marine Corps Reserve	2.0
Air Force	77.8

Real property maintenance

The committee continues to note that shortfalls in real property maintenance accounts remain among the principal unfunded requirement identified by the service chiefs. To address the backlog of facility maintenance, the committee recommends an increase of $660.0 million as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$280.36
Navy	162.17
Marine Corps	38.320
Marine Corps Reserve	3.11
Air Force	176.04

Miscellaneous unfunded requirements

The committee recommends an increase of $403.992 million in funding for miscellaneous unfunded readiness-related requirements identified by the service chiefs and the committee:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$136.152
Army Reserve	12.0
Army National Guard	24.0
Navy	44.74

Marine Corps	75.8
Marine Corps Reserve	8.2
Air Force	67.1
Air National Guard	6.0

Mobility enhancement funding

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million to improve the deployment and mobility of military forces and supplies through investment in en route infrastructure. These funds are provided to the United States Transportation Command Mobility Enhancement Fund (MEF), which was established to address strategic mobility shortcomings that were apparent during the conduct of Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm. The committee believes that these funds will improve the ability of the military services to respond to future contingencies.

Training accounts

The committee continues to focus its attention on the training accounts of the military services. In hearings this year, the committee continued to hear reports that insufficient funding has been a contributing factor in the decline in the quality of training provided our combat forces. Shortages of equipment, parts, decaying infrastructure, and personnel shortages were identified as serious problems. The committee believes that training equipment and base facilities at many of the established training ranges is in urgent need of both repair and upgrade.

Therefore, based on shortfalls identified by the military services, the committee recommends an increase of $153.3 million as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army:	
Training Range Modernization	$76.0
Training Area Environmental Management	32.0
Institutional Training	15.0
Specialized Skill Training	15.0
Marine Corps:	
Institutional Training	4.0
Marine Corps Reserve:	
Training Center Improvements	1.2
Air Force:	
LD/HD Flight Crew Training	5.1
Institutional Training	5.0

Army Cold Weather Clothing

The committee is aware of unbudgeted requirements for the reserve components for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS), which is designed to provide protection during cold and wet weather. The committee notes, for example, that the Army National Guard has equipped only 25 percent of its forces with this clothing. The committee believes ECWCS is a significant contributor to the combat readiness of the individual soldier. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of funding for ECWCS as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army National Guard	$24.0
Army Reserve	12.0
Air National Guard	6.0

BUDGET REQUEST REDUCTIONS

Civilian Personnel Reductions

The committee understands that in order to determine civilian personnel requirements for the budget request, the Department of Defense relied on actual fiscal year 1999 personnel levels and the estimated personnel levels the Department would have on hand at the end of fiscal year 2000 to forecast civilian personnel levels for fiscal year 2001. The committee notes that the Department was unable to estimate accurately the fiscal year 2000 end strength prior to the submission of the budget request. The committee further notes the General Accounting Office (GAO) has determined that the Department will employ fewer civilian personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 than are assumed in the budget request. Therefore, the committee recommends decreases in funding as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Navy	$49.6
Defense Agencies	0.9

Excess Foreign Currencies Reductions

Since the submission of the budget request, the U.S. dollar has increased in value compared to various foreign currencies. As a result, the committee believes that the budget request is overstated. In addition, the committee understands that the Defense Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account already contains a balance of over $600.0 million to be used in the event that unfavorable currency fluctuations develop. The committee believes the requested amount is, therefore, in excess of the needs of the Department and recommends the following reductions:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$150.0
Navy	30.0
Marine Corps	2.2
Air Force	37.7
Defense Agencies	10.1

Headquarters Reductions

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Department has failed to comply with the reductions in headquarters personnel mandated by section 921 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). Therefore, the committee recommends decreases in funding for headquarters activities as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$27.086
Navy	13.340
Air Force	12.200
Special Operations Command	1.682
Office, Secretary of Defense	4.446
The Joint Staff	0.552
Defense Agencies	12.586

Joint Chiefs of Staff Training Exercises

The committee continues to be concerned with the increasing pace of operations throughout the military services and believes that requirements for Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) training exercises are levied against units already overextended with operational deployments, home station training exercises, and training exercises at the services' major combat training centers. The committee questions whether the benefits of the current scope of JCS exercises exceeds the costs to military units otherwise experiencing the effects of high operational tempo. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction for participation in JCS exercises as follows:

[Dollars in millions]

Army	$11.000
Navy	1.014
Air Force	12.200
Joint Chiefs of Staff	32.914

OTHER ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Accountability of Operation and Maintenance Funding

The committee is alarmed by recent reports regarding the movement within the military services of large amounts of funds authorized and appropriated for operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts. The committee notes recent reports by the General Accounting Office (GAO) indicate the Department of Defense (DOD) redirected funds within O&M readiness accounts by almost $43.0 billion between fiscal years 1994 and 1998. These changes to the original intent specified by Congress included transfers into, as well as out, of several accounts considered critical to readiness. Although these transferred funds were subsequently used for shortfalls in other O&M accounts, the committee is especially concerned about the underexecution of funding provided by Congress in the readiness critical accounts. The committee notes that over the five-year period assessed by GAO, the Department of the Navy underexecuted by $1.2 billion the ship depot maintenance portion, and that the Department of the Air Force underexecuted by $988.4 million support of primary combat forces. The Department of the Army, over just the past two years, underexecuted by $579.9 million its support of combat divisions. Although the committee understands that the unexecuted funds were applied to other requirements, the committee believes that movements of funds intended for critical readiness accounts will have a severe impact on the ability of the services to maintain readiness at acceptable levels.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Fines and Penalties

The committee supports the goal of the Department of Defense (DOD) environmental quality program to transition from a reactive, compliance-driven focus to a more proactive goal-oriented approach. The committee is concerned, however, with the Department of the Army's effort to achieve this goal. The committee notes that the Army continually receives a disproportional number of environ-

mental non-compliance assessments, and that the Army pays the majority of fines and penalties levied against DOD. The committee further notes, of the total DOD fines and penalties paid in fiscal years 1997, 1998, and 1999, the Army's portion was 97, 53, and 87 percent, respectively. The committee believes that the Secretary of the Army must place greater emphasis on efforts to achieve environmental compliance and to achieve DOD's goals within the environmental quality program.

Navy Environmental Leadership Program

The committee continues to support the Chief of Naval Operation's Navy Environmental Leadership Program (NELP) and believes that while there have been numerous programmatic successes in NELP, many of which are being implemented throughout the Navy, budget constraints have prevented NELP from reaching its full potential in providing solutions to priority Navy environmental problems. Current requirements include pollution prevention technologies, implementation of Green Energy Management initiatives, and development of a regional prototype for hazardous waste management. To support improved environmental stewardship efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for the NELP. The committee strongly believes that this increase in funds would permit a cost-effective leveraging of ongoing efforts to meet urgent Navy environmental requirements.

INTELLIGENCE ISSUES

Cryptologic Skills Training

The budget request contained $1.3 million in operation and maintenance, Army, for conducting cryptologic and language skills training at the U.S. Army Intelligence Center (USAIC).

The committee is aware of a unique Korean language training program developed in-house at the USAIC. The committee believes this computer-based tool has the potential of providing critical language maintenance training for many language specialists, and it believes this effort should be expanded to other languages.

Consequently, the committee recommends $5.3 million in operation and maintenance, Army, an increase of $4.0 million, for continued development of this language training program into the service's seven core language requirements. The committee also recommends that this program be provided to the other services for language training maintenance.

Defense Foreign Language Program

The budget request contained $61.9 million in operation and maintenance, Army, for the Defense Language Institute (DLI)

The committee is supportive of DLI training efforts to provide high quality linguists for the growing requirement of many agencies and services but believes that its language laboratories are in need of technical upgrades, to include new equipment and access to the internet. The committee is aware of local area Marine Corps self-help efforts that have done similar upgrades very cost effectively. The committee believes the Army should utilize the Marine

Corps self-help assistance to upgrade the DLI language laboratories

Further, the committee is aware of an unfunded DLI initiative to provide better language training by issuing laptop computers to students. These computers would be used to provide language laboratory access to on-line language training materials, allow "after hours" access from the institute's dormitories, and access to "live" world-wide foreign training materials. The committee believes this is a worthwhile effort that should be properly funded

Therefore, the committee recommends $64.9 million in operation and maintenance, Army, an increase of $3.0 million, for the Defense Foreign Language Program. Of this amount, $1.0 million is for self-help upgrade of the language laboratories and $2.0 million is for the laptop computer initiative.

Distributed Common Ground System

The committee understands that the Air Force is currently operating with a waiver to utilize communications for the Air Force's Distributed Common Ground Systems (DCGS) reachback operations that are provided in whole or part by national agencies within the National Foreign Intelligence Program. The committee further understands that this arrangement has allowed the DCGS to have access to wideband communications at very inexpensive rates, and accordingly, that the Air Force is seeking a permanent waiver to continue this arrangement.

However, the committee has learned that the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence) has directed that all continental United States DCGS long-haul communications are to be procured through the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA). The committee understands that this will increase the Air Force's communications costs by a factor of 16 and that this cost increase is unfunded in the fiscal year 2001 request. The committee finds this increase incomprehensible and notes that such direction is not in accord with congressional efforts to create an interoperable, networked Intelligence Community communications environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence) to provide the defense and intelligence committees a report that clearly identifies the costs, the rationale for the cost differences and the benefits versus drawbacks of providing DCGS communications through the national partner or the DISA. Further, this report is to provide the rationale for approval of the current temporary waiver and the Assistant Secretary's decision for a permanent waiver. The committee directs that no DCGS funding authorized for appropriation in this act be obligated or expended by DISA, or transferred through DISA, for procurement or lease of DCGS communications until this report is provided.

Eagle Vision Commercial Imagery

The budget request contained $10.0 million for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to purchase commercial data.

The committee notes the successful Air Force operation of the Eagle Vision commercial imagery ground station, which has resulted in timely, unclassified imagery support to the theater commanders-in-chief (CINCs). Much of this imagery has been unique and could not be provided by other technical means due to higher priorities. The committee believes that there are insufficient funds to meet the CINCs' commercial image and mapping needs and, therefore, recommends $16.0 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for purchasing Eagle Vision commercial imagery.

Integrated Broadcast Service

The budget request contained $15.1 million in operations and maintenance, Navy, for the Integrated Broadcast Service (IBS).

The committee notes that, subsequent to the submission of the budget request to Congress, the IBS executive agent was changed from the Navy to the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends a transfer of $15.1 million from operation and maintenance, Navy, to operation and maintenance, Air Force.

RC–135 and U–2 Operations and Maintenance

The budget request contained a total of $373.1 million for operations and maintenance of the RC–135 and U–2 aircraft fleets.

The committee is concerned that funding for many Intelligence Community programs, including intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft are regularly transferred from the programs for which funds were authorized and appropriated to fund shortfalls in other programs, often not related to ISR requirements. The committee understands the theater and functional Commanders in Chief have stated that their number one shortfall is in ISR aircraft and systems. The committee is concerned that transferring funding, particularly operation and maintenance funding, from ISR aircraft to fund non-intelligence programs exacerbates the CINCs' ISR shortfalls.

Therefore the committee directs that the RC–135 and U–2 programs be designated as congressional interest items.

MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ISSUES

Armed Forces Recreation Centers

The committee notes that the Army operates, on behalf of all military personnel, several popular recreational facilities known collectively as Armed Forces Recreation Centers (AFRC). These facilities provide much needed recreation opportunities to service members and their families at a reasonable cost, and the committee has consistently supported these important programs. The committee is aware that access to AFRC facilities is not limited to active duty, reserve, and retired service members, but is also available to a broad array of other personnel, including many with no military service. The committee believes that such a relatively unrestricted access policy suggests that honorably discharged veterans could be accommodated by these facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the categories of personnel with AFRC privileges to determine whether those categories should

be broadened to include honorably discharged veterans, and to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2001.

Lodging Programs

The committee is aware of a recent change in lodging policy by the Department of Defense (DOD) that all permanent change of station travel be considered as official travel for the purposes of on-base lodging. The committee notes this change in policy will cost Army Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) programs alone over $14.0 million annually. The committee is also concerned that this action essentially donates approximately $75.0 million soldier dollars invested in bricks and mortar lodging facilities to appropriated fund accounts. In the course of attempting to determine the policy reason underpinning the regulatory change, the committee learned that the files documenting the reason for this decision could not be found. DOD officials were thus forced to speculate as to the actual policy rationale used, but most often have cited consistency among the military services as the reason. The committee believes that a shift of this magnitude should be the subject of open debate, rather than a seemingly arbitrary decision apparently made in the name of consistency. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to review this change in policy, detailing the reasons for the change, and to submit a plan to hold harmless Army and Marine Corps MWR by this action to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2001.

Nonappropriated Fund Support of Official Activities

The committee is pleased to note that the service secretaries have at last begun to provide nonappropriated fund activities with the minimum established standard of appropriated fund support. The committee expects this trend to continue. In that regard, the committee heard testimony that some nonappropriated fund category C activities, which are generally expected to be self-sustaining, have become essential elements of command programs on some installations. An example of this phenomenon is the club system, which is generally prohibited from receiving appropriated fund support, but which is frequently used for official functions and training sessions. The committee notes that previous criticism of club management practices resulted in stringent restrictions on the amount of appropriated fund support for these activities. The committee is concerned that the restrictions are too rigorous, and that category C activities of all types are unduly penalized as a result. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the support that category C activities provide to official activities without reimbursement and report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

OTHER ISSUES

Army Apprenticeship Program

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Army has paid little attention to sustaining critical readiness workforce skills at Army depots. The committee heard testimony that the majority of skilled workers at these depots will be eligible to retire by fiscal year 2005, and that there is no plan to fill these jobs. Many of these workers are highly proficient craftsmen, possessing skills that take years to develop under careful supervision. The committee believes that the Army should establish a program to hire and train new workers equally capable of repairing complex Army vehicles and weapons systems. The committee understands that the Secretary of the Navy operates a successful apprenticeship program in its shipyards to address a similar shortfall in the Navy.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of the Army to establish an apprenticeship program for Army maintenance depots to address these critical needs and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2001, on his plans to implement this program. In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million as a separate line item in the Department of the Army's Budget Activity 03 to establish this depot-level apprenticeship program.

Army Workload and Performance System

The committee has long supported the Department of Defense in the development of analytical systems based on workload requirements to support its civilian personnel budget requirements. The committee commends the Department of the Army for leading the effort to correct this material weakness in the staffing requirements determination process by the development of the Army Workload and Performance System (AWPS). Although slow in its formulation, the committee continues to believe that AWPS should be the standard functional management system for all industrial operations and should be adequately funded. In the committee report on H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (H. Rept. 105–532), the Secretary of the Army was required to provide the committee with a long-range master plan for the implementation of AWPS. In its review of the AWPS master plan, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reported to the committee that untimely and inadequate funding was causing major delays in the full implementation of AWPS. In addition, the GAO reported that the Army needs to develop a more detailed master plan that includes better system cost estimates for future modules, and an improved management and oversight structure. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to update the AWPS master plan to incorporate GAO's recommendations and submit a revised master plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2001.

In order to sustain this important program at an adequate funding level, the committee recommends the addition of $2.0 million specifically for AWPS during fiscal year 2001. The committee be-

lieves that this minimum level of funding is necessary for AWPS to develop in a timely and effective manner.

Automatic Identification Technology

The committee continues to be concerned with reports of shortages of repair parts that have necessitated the grounding of critical aviation assets and other combat equipment, and by the decrease in mission capable rates due to a combination of increased maintenance requirements and a lack of spare parts. Although the committee has increased funding for spare parts and additional maintenance by nearly $3.5 billion between fiscal years 1994 and 2000, the committee notes that improvement trends in these areas show minimal improvements.

The committee understands that Automatic Identification Technology (AIT), currently being developed by the Department of the Army, has the potential to provide the needed solutions to these problems and could significantly improve readiness. As also discussed elsewhere in this report, AIT would make key maintenance information available to all participants in the repair process and would improve productivity and effectiveness to enhance overall logistics operations. In addition, AIT will provide connectivity and information to related business processes such as financial, supply and transportation. Although Congress included funding for AIT in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000, there is no funding in the budget request for AIT.

Because of the potential to significantly improve readiness in the military services, the committee recommends the addition of $4.0 million for the Department of the Army to continue AIT integration.

Civilian Air Traffic Controllers

The committee notes that civilian air traffic controllers who are employed by the Federal Aviation Administration are compensated significantly better than air traffic controllers who are employed by the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee understands that the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–50) established a separate personnel system for the Federal Aviation Administration, even though DOD air traffic controllers perform the same work to the same standards. The committee has learned that this disparity of pay has created a difficult recruiting and retention challenge for DOD as the Department strives to maintain safety at military airfields around the world. The committee is disturbed that the Department has known about this problem for some time, but has yet to formulate a solution. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to determine the best method to solve the Department's recruiting and retention problem for air traffic controllers and report his recommendations accompanied by any necessary legislative changes to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2001.

Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The committee continues to believe that the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program, created by the Department of Defense (DOD) in 1998 to bring the most modern and advanced manufacturing capabilities from commercial industry to depot and related maintenance activities, is valuable as a technology resource which will have a positive effect on the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department's industrial activities. The CTMA program is a by-product of section 361 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) that required DOD to re-engineer industrial processes and adopt best-business practices at their depot-level activities. The committee is concerned that DOD has not provided funding for this vital and cost-effective program. Therefore, the committee recommends the addition of $12.0 million for the Defense Logistics Agency to pursue strategies for re-engineering at depot-level activities that will lower operations and sustainment costs. The committee believes the addition of these funds will allow depot-level activities to participate in manufacturing technology demonstration projects in collaboration with more than 220 of the leading U.S. manufacturers. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that funds for the CTMA program will be forthcoming in future budget requests.

Container Freight Station Operations

The committee is aware that the Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC) is presently considering the transfer of workload from the Container Freight Station (CFS), Norfolk, Virginia, to the Defense Distribution Center (DDC), New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. While supportive of the efforts of MTMC for its efforts to reduce costs, the committee is concerned that MTMC has not adequately evaluated the potential adverse impact on fleet operational requirements, contingency operation flexibility, mission readiness of forward deployed units, operations at the Military Ocean Terminal, Norfolk, Virginia, and operations at the Norfolk Naval Air Station. The committee is also aware that MTMC is conducting a business case analysis to evaluate the potential impacts of the CFS transfer on current and future military readiness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of the MTMC business case analysis and to assess the effects of the proposed transfer on military readiness. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to take no action on the transfer of any existing CFS functions until 180 days after the submission of this report.

Core Logistics Capabilities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is undertaking a study to examine the military logistics system, including a review of the implementation by the military departments of core logistics capabilities methodology as required by section 2464 of title 10, United States Code. Because the military departments have not had the benefit of clear policy guidance con-

cerning core logistics, the implementation of DOD's current core logistics determination policy has not been consistent. As a result, significant confusion has developed, which the committee believes has worked against the most effective capitalization of resources made available for core logistics activities.

The committee believes that the DOD core logistics study represents a necessary first step and opportunity to develop and implement the required policy and methodology on a consistent basis, and urges the Department to complete the study as soon as possible. Every effort should be made to develop a consensus of all those involved on those items that would be included in any final policy guidance.

Defense Joint Accounting System

As well documented by General Accounting Office, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and other Department of Defense (DOD) studies, the DOD has had a longstanding history of poor and inadequate automated financial accounting systems. DOD has repeatedly indicated a commitment to financial management reform, part of which is to integrate and thus reduce the number of financial and accounting systems. In 1996, DOD initiated the Defense Joint Accounting System (DJAS), a financial information management system that supports the general ledger for general and working capital funds at the installation level. The committee understands that DJAS will ultimately cost $322 million to develop and fully deploy. The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force do not intend to participate in this program.

The committee has consistently urged DOD and the military departments to move away from service unique automated information systems. The DJAS, as its title indicates, appears to be a financial accounting system that has been designed to be truly joint. The committee fails to understand why the Navy and the Air Force have failed to incorporate this joint accounting system and have decided to retain their own service specific legacy systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than September 1, 2000, that addresses the following:

(1) The decision to withdraw the Air Force from DJAS to include the date of the decision and justification used;

(2) The impact of the decision to withdraw the Air Force from DJAS on the projected cost of DJAS; and

(3) The rationale why the Department of the Navy was not required to participate in this joint program.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than September 1, 2000, that address the following:

(1) The specific rationale as to why DJAS will not meet service needs;

(2) The identification of any business process reengineering initiatives that were attempted in order to participate in the DJAS program; and

(3) The accounting systems are currently in use to support the general ledger, funds control, budget execution, disbursing, travel, cost accumulation and asset accounting for general and transportation working capital funds at the installation level, the level of funding in fiscal year 2001 to support these systems, and whether any of the identified systems will migrate to any other system in the next five years, and if so identify the new system.

The committee expects that a milestone III decision on DJAS shall not be made until these reports are submitted.

Defense Personnel Records Imaging System-Electronics Military Personnel Records System

The committee is concerned with the Defense Personnel Records Imaging System-Electronics Military Personnel Records System (DPRIS-EMPRS). DPRIS-EMPRS is an automated imaging system whereby a digital image replaces the current military personnel records systems which are stored on obsolete and worn out microfiche. The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy is not adequately committed to DPRIS-EMPRS because the Navy has not adequately funded this program since fiscal year 1996. The committee notes that the Navy recently reported that this automated system is not being properly developed and implemented, and that an inadequate number of program management support personnel is the principal cause of problems in the program. The Navy also reported that the infrastructure to support the system development, testing, and configuration management is currently non-existent. The committee, however, notes the obligation of the Department of Navy to maintain an adequate personnel-reporting system. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2000, identifying the strategy for the sustainment of this system.

Department of Defense Civilian Personnel

Personnel safety

The committee is concerned with civilian personnel safety and notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has a safety and worker incident rate over twice the rate of comparable companies in the private sector. The committee further notes that accidents to federal civilian employees cost the taxpayer approximately $2.4 billion per year. In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 2561 (H. Rept. 106–371), the conferees directed the Secretary of Defense to initiate programs funded from within existing Operation and Maintenance accounts at designated DOD facilities that employ alternative, private sector proven, models of safety to determine the best ways to improve DOD's record with respect to injury incidence rates and associated costs. The committee fully supports this effort and strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to initiate expeditiously the required worker

safety enhancement programs to bring the Department of Defense accident rate more in line with private sector achievements.

Recruiting and retention

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) has not begun the planning necessary to recruit and retain civilian employees with the technical skills required to fill the critical jobs of the future. The committee received testimony from workforce shaping experts that such planning is essential for large, complex organizations such as DOD. Yet, the committee continues to receive numerous unofficial requests for special hiring authorities from various components of DOD that would solve a particular need for hiring scientific and engineering personnel.

While the committee desires the Department to attract high quality scientists and engineers, the committee is disturbed by the lack of a comprehensive plan to meet this critical need. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive plan to meet these requirements, and to report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2001.

Distance Learning Courseware Development Program

The committee is aware that distance learning technologies have the potential to benefit the armed forces in many ways. These technologies enable those stationed or who perform required duty away from major military installations to complete required educational courses, receive updates on important information, and to participate remotely in operationally-oriented learning activities. In short, the "anytime-anywhere" characteristics of distance learning enable service members, particularly those in the National Guard and Reserve, to better meet military education, training and readiness requirements. Such technologies could also have benefit in new, evolving areas of military endeavor, such as weapons of mass destruction-related response activities. The committee anticipates that funds authorized for distance learning will be used to create web-based courseware to meet National Guard requirements associated with the development of weapons of mass destruction response capabilities.

Financial Policy

The committee is aware of circumstances where the military services have not recorded financial obligations at the time that their legal obligation is incurred. The committee notes the established financial management policy of the Department of Defense (DOD) requires all obligations to be recorded not later than 10 calendar days following the date the obligation is incurred. The committee believes that prompt recording of all obligations is absolutely essential to prudent financial management. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide further guidance to the military departments and to take the necessary steps to ensure that all defense agencies follow DOD guidelines for the accurate and timely recording of financial obligations.

Local School Renovation and Repair

The committee is concerned that children of military personnel are forced to attend many local schools around the country that are falling into disrepair. The committee understands that school districts that serve a great number of military families often have difficulty raising bond issues because the local tax base is constrained by the presence of large federal reservations. Nevertheless, the committee believes that failing school infrastructure is a national problem that is not restricted to local schools serving children of military personnel, and is therefore not appropriately solved using Department of Defense funds. The committee is heartened to learn that the House Committee on Education and the Workforce has passed the impact aid reauthorization bill of 2000 (H.R. 3616), which when enacted, will provide authority for funding these needs. The committee commends the House Committee on Education and the Workforce for its farsighted efforts on behalf of all children of the United States, including the children of military personnel. The committee agrees that these pressing needs should be addressed by appropriations authorized by the committees with jurisdiction over Department of Education funding.

Logistics Support Planning

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) is implementing a logistics support strategy that is resulting in actions that move more authority and responsibility for the performance of logistics support operations from the public to the private sector. Some of these actions are being taken using best practices from the private sector and directly applying them to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of logistics support operations. In the past, DOD has based many of these initiatives on a series of studies that promote the outsourcing of various logistics support activities such as supply and base level maintenance. The committee understands that these initiatives are intended to provide resources that can be applied to the modernization of military systems and equipment. The committee is concerned, however, that these activities may or may not be performed more cost-effectively in the private sector, and to what extent that at least some of these activities should be retained by the military departments to support military requirements. In addition, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has issued a series of reports that question the adequacy of DOD's long-range logistics strategic planning process. The committee believes that a comprehensive long-range logistics strategic plan that is in concert with current statutes and past GAO recommendations will ensure the best utilization of DOD's current logistical infrastructure.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 15, 2001 that addresses the following issues:

(1) An analysis of the various studies that form the basis for DOD's privatization initiatives to determine the extent to which these studies provide evidence to support the cost effectiveness of on-going and proposed privatization initiatives;

(2) Cost and management data for military systems managed using contractor logistics support to determine the extent to which these systems provide information on cost-effectiveness of this strategy of weapons system support;

(3) An examination of depot maintenance contracts and military costs for the same workloads to compare the cost and responsiveness of both categories of maintenance support;

(4) An examination of DOD core depot maintenance policy and its implementation in each of the military services to determine:

a. How core maintenance policy is being implemented;

b. The extent to which the military depots are being allocated workloads to support new technologies and systems; and

c. The extent to which the DOD depot maintenance strategy and the implementation of that strategy is supporting the long-term viability of the military depots.

(5) An assessment whether source-of-repair decisions are being made in coordination with all sectors of the logistics community and whether acquisition officials are considering total life-cycle costs in weapons systems purchasing decisions;

(6) The type and extent of usage of waivers to bypass supportability analyses, including source-of-repair decisions for developments, modifications, new acquisitions, and upgrades, and the impact on the field of these waiver decisions;

(7) An assessment of the current status of the Department of the Army's merger of logistics into the acquisition community, including benefits/problems encountered to date and the validity of the rationale for the merger; and,

(8) An assessment of the methodology used by DOD in the formulation of their long-range logistics strategic plan, and whether the plan conforms with current statutes.

Military Affiliate Radio System

The committee reiterates its long-standing support for the Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS), a Department of Defense-sponsored program that relies on volunteer civilian amateur radio operators to provide an auxiliary means of communication in the event of local, national, or international emergencies. Although the MARS program operates at low cost to the Department, the committee believes that the Department continues to underutilize the system and is failing to derive maximum benefit from it.

With this in mind, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense take a number of actions to improve the utility of MARS. Such actions should include:

(1) Increasing the visibility of MARS to senior military and civil authority leadership;

(2) Incorporating MARS into appropriate contingency and emergency operations plans;

(3) Increasing the use of MARS as a cost-effective and viable alternative to commercial telecommunications for the purposes of troop morale and welfare;

(4) Ensuring that all forward deployed units possess communications equipment capable of operation on MARS frequencies; and

(5) Considering the applicability of using MARS as a low-cost test bed for the evaluation of new communications technology and equipment.

The committee notes that contemplated changes to communications modes and frequency allocations between military and commercial use may negatively impact the ability of MARS to fulfill its auxiliary communications role in the event of emergency. The committee also notes that section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) prevented the commercial use of certain frequencies previously assigned to the federal government and used primarily by the Department of Defense, and further required an interagency review prior to the commercial reallocation of frequencies currently used by the Department. The committee encourages the Department to ensure that issues related to MARS frequency allocations are addressed in connection with any review of emergency response mission requirements.

National Maintenance Program

The committee commends the Secretary of the Army for addressing the critical maintenance needs of the Army with the establishment of the National Maintenance Program (NMP) and the inclusion in the budget request of $16.8 million as an incremental step to execute this program worldwide. While the Army is making significant progress in developing the NMP, as well as developing other needed organizational changes such as the Depot Maintenance Corporate Board, further improvements are needed. The committee continues to believe that the Army needs an effective total depot maintenance and repair program to sustain readiness. For example, the Army still cannot identify the total amount of depot-level maintenance work conducted at field locations. Depot-level maintenance work is currently being performed by civilians and active duty personnel in military units, by contractors in various field locations, as well as in the public depots. Until the Army is able to distinguish and account for depot-level maintenance workloads from other work performed by organizations outside of the established maintenance depots, it is unclear how the Army can realistically comply with existing statutes, including section 2466 of Title 10, United States Code.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Service by February 1, 2001 that identifies the proliferation of depot-level maintenance that is performed outside of the public depots. The committee further requests that the Comptroller General of the United States review this report and provide an analysis, including an assessment of the Army's ability to comply with section 2466 of title 10 United States Code, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Naval Audit Service

The committee supports the Department of Defense and the military services to implement initiatives to become more efficient and more cost effective. As an example, the Department of the Navy plans to reorganize and consolidate the Naval Audit Service. The committee supports this reorganization to the extent that there is efficiency to be gained and all applicable rules, regulations, and statutes are followed. The committee questions, however, whether it would be efficient and economical for the Department of Navy to close audit sites in major fleet concentration areas. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Navy to inform the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services of any decision to close audit sites in major fleet concentration areas, and to submit documentation to support this decision, within 10 days of such a decision being made. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to take no action to implement such a decision until 180 days after the Congressional notification.

Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS)

The committee notes that the Reserve Component Automation System (RCAS) is a system critical to the day-to-day operational capabilities and mobilization of the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. The committee is concerned that without continued support and modernization, the Army Reserve could experience a serious deterioration in readiness. The committee is further concerned that the Army has allocated only limited funding for the RCAS program in the future years defense program. In order to ensure this program continues to enable the effective administrative support and mobilization capability required by the reserve components, the committee expects the Department of the Army to program sufficient funds for RCAS. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report not later that March 1, 2001 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services detailing programmed funds for RCAS for fiscal years 2002 through 2007.

Spare and Repair Parts

The committee continues to be concerned by reports of persistent shortages of spare and repair parts throughout the military services. The committee believes that one of the primary causes of unacceptable reliability rates, especially for operational unit aircraft, is the shortage of spare repair parts. The status of critical Air Force C–5 aircraft repair and spare parts is illustrative of the committee's concern. The C–5 remains a key asset in air mobility and the airlifting of heavy equipment and personnel to both military contingencies and humanitarian relief efforts around the world. While the Air Force has identified several problem areas, and has begun to implement actions that are intended to mitigate this problem, the committee continues to receive reports of spare and repair parts backlogs and repeated parts cannibalization of air-worthy C–5 aircraft.

The committee is concerned whether the Air Force will be able to meet all of its commitments in the future without addressing its parts shortfall problems. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than January 31, 2001 and again on September 30, 2001 on the overall status of the Air Force spare and repair parts program, with a specific emphasis on the C–5 aircraft, to include whether the necessary resources are programmed to address future spare and repair parts requirements.

Urban Warfare Training

The committee notes favorably the recent assessment conducted by General Accounting Office of the Department of Defense's (DOD) urban warfare training. The committee is concerned about significant shortfalls in the areas of joint experimentation, joint training and training facilities, and intelligence. The committee is aware that joint experimentation, which is designed to systematically evaluate what new doctrine, organizations, and equipment are needed for urban operations, is not taking place. Although urban operations will likely involve larger units such as battalions and brigades, the military services continue to concentrate their urban training on individual soldiers and small units, such as squads, platoons, and companies.

The committee supports the recommendation of the GAO that the Secretary of Defense should designate a single entity to lead and coordinate Joint Staff and service efforts to improve capabilities to conduct urban operations. The committee believes that the current Joint Urban Working Group does not have the resources or authority necessary to ensure the necessary coordination in this area.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to designate an appropriate executive agent with the authority to develop and coordinate a master plan for a DOD-wide strategy, with milestones, for improving service and joint capabilities to conduct military operations in urban environments. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report on such a master plan to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize $_____ million in operations and maintenance funding for the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense.

Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize $_____ million for Working Capital Funds of the Department of Defense.

Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $69.832 million from the Armed Forces Retirement Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, including the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the Naval Home.

Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than $150.0 million from the amounts received from sales in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the operation and maintenance accounts of the military services.

SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 311—Payment of Fines and Penalties Imposed for Environmental Violations

This section would authorize the secretary of the army and the Secretary of the Navy to pay for specific environmental violations at several locations within the united states.

Section 312—Necessity of Military Low-Level Flight Training to Protect National Security and Enhance Military Readiness

This section would mandate that the environmental impact statements previously completed for special use airspace designated by a military department, for the performance of low-level training flights, satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (title 42, United States Code).

Section 313—Use of Environmental Restoration Accounts to Relocate Activities from Defense Environmental Restoration Sites

This section would amend section 2703 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize environmental restoration funds to be obligated or expended in order to permanently relocate facilities on land under the control of the Department of Defense, or formerly under control of the Department, if there is a release of a hazardous material on the land, and the Department is obligated to cleanup and restore the land. This new authority would be in effect for the next three fiscal years.

SUBTITLE C—COMMISSARIES AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES

Section 321—Use of Appropriated Funds to Cover Operating Expenses of Commissary Stores

This section would provide that funds appropriated for the operation of the Defense Commissary Agency (DECA) may be used for salaries, utilities, communications, operating supplies and services, second destination transportation costs, and above store level costs.

The committee notes that the surcharge fund currently supports several of these items. The committee is concerned that since the surcharge must pay operational expenses first, little or no funds re-

main to provide for store maintenance and replacement. The committee believes that appropriated funds are the correct funding source for commissary store operating costs, leaving to the commissary patron the responsibility of providing for capital replacement through payment of the surcharge. The committee expects, however, that DECA will aggressively pursue efficiencies that will result in no increase in the requirement for appropriated fund support.

Section 322—Adjustment of Sales Prices of Commissary Store Goods and Services to Cover Certain Expenses

This section would clarify that commissary store prices shall include the cost of first destination transportation of the goods to the stores and the actual or estimated cost of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of commissary stores. The committee notes that the Defense Commissary Agency has an exceptional record in controlling shrinkage and expects that high standard to continue.

Section 323—Use of Surcharges for Construction and Improvement of Commissary Stores

This section would limit the responsibility of the patrons to finance the commissary system with their surcharge dollars to store replacement and maintenance only, putting the surcharge fund on sound financial footing. This section would provide that funds received from the surcharge on the price of goods sold in commissary stores shall be used exclusively for construction and maintenance of commissary stores and central product processing facilities.

The committee notes that the surcharge currently is responsible to fund these items, as well as other expenses such as utilities, operating supplies, and Defense Commissary Agency wide information technology. The committee notes further that the surcharge is unable to meet these expenses and still provide for the maintenance and replacement of older stores. The committee believes that commissaries are an essential non-pay benefit for the nation's service members, retirees, and their families; and that a system of commissary stores bereft of capital funding is not a true benefit.

Section 324—Inclusion of Magazines and Other Periodicals as an Authorized Commissary Merchandise Category

This section would remove magazines and periodicals as items that may be sold in commissary stores as noncommissary store inventory and add magazines and periodicals to the list of authorized commissary store merchandise.

The committee believes that military patrons rightfully expect to find magazines and periodicals at the checkout counter, as is the practice in commercial grocery stores. The committee understands that this change will provide extra funding to the commissary surcharge fund through increased sales with little impact on military exchange sales.

Section 325—Use of Most Economical Distribution Method for Distilled Spirits

This section would amend section 2488 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the restriction on the procurement of distilled spirits from a private distributor by nonappropriated fund instrumentalities if the use of a private distributor results in direct or indirect state taxation.

The committee notes that in some instances nonappropriated fund instrumentalities are currently compelled to make less than optimal purchases in order to avoid state taxes. The committee urges nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to explore the most economical means of procurement of all products intended for resale.

Section 326—Report on Effects of Availability of Slot Machines on United States Military Installations Overseas

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress the effect that the military services' slot machine operations overseas have on military community life and service members' personal financial stability.

SUBTITLE D—PERFORMANCE OF FUNCTIONS BY PRIVATE-SECTOR SOURCES

Section 331—Inclusion of Additional Information in Reports to Congress Required before Conversion of Commercial or Industrial Type Functions to Contractor Performance

This section would amend section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress additional information on studies concerning the change of performance of Department of Defense functions by civilian personnel to performance by the private sector. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to identify when outsourcing studies were initiated, how the results of the study will affect the government workforce, and a certification that necessary funds have been specifically included in a budget request to perform the study.

Section 332—Limitation Regarding Navy Marine Corps Intranet Contract

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from using FY2001 funds for payment of a long-term contract for comprehensive end-to-end information services until supporting documentation is provided to Congress.

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy's initiative, known as the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI), is an effort to acquire information technology that would require a private sector contractor to own and maintain all Navy and Marine Corps desktop computers, network hardware, and software, and to provide all other required information technology services. The proposed transfer of responsibility from the Navy to the private sector is to be achieved through a "seat management" contract. The com-

mittee notes that the Navy's expected contract for at least 360,000 seats would exceed all prior government contracting experience.

The committee recognizes the Navy's requirement for seamless and interoperable data, voice, and video communications. The committee, however, is quite concerned with the Navy's overall approach to this multi-billion dollar initiative. First, of utmost concern, is the Navy's failure to present Congress with any documentation in the budget request for this initiative. In pursuit of this initiative the Navy has circumvented internal financial management regulations and Office of Management and Budget requirements. Despite repeated requests, the Navy has not identified what funds will be used in the procurement of the Navy Marine Corps Intranet. The committee is concerned by the Navy's failure to provide basic funding information when the Navy plans to award a multi-billion contract in fiscal year 2000. This section would prohibit the use of FY2001 funds for NMCI until the Navy provides Congress the specific funding requirements for the NMCI contract.

The committee expects that if the Navy enters into the NMCI contract, that in future year budget submissions the Navy will comply with all planning and budgeting documents.

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION

Section 341—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize $35.0 million for educational assistance to local education agencies where the standard for the minimum level of education within the state could not be maintained because of the large number of military connected students. The committee's long-standing commitment to the children of military personnel has provided significant assistance to their education.

The committee acknowledges that the Department of Education impact aid program provides supplementary funds to eligible school districts nationwide, and the committee believes that the Department of Education should continue to asserts its leading role to provide federal support for the educational needs of the children of military personnel.

Section 342—Eligibility Requirements for Attendance at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit a student who is a dependent of an employee of the American Red Cross performing armed forces emergency services on a full-time basis to enroll in Department of Defense domestic schools located in Puerto Rico on a reimbursable basis. The committee notes that children of Red Cross employees stationed in overseas areas are currently authorized to enroll in Department of Defense overseas schools on a reimbursable basis. The committee believes that similarly-situated dependents of American Red Cross employees in Puerto Rico should have similar privileges.

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY READINESS ISSUES

Section 351—Additional Capabilities of, and Reporting Requirements for, the Readiness Reporting System

This section would amend section 117 of title 10, United States Code to include an annual report detailing the funding programmed for deficiencies identified in the Joint Monthly Readiness Review process. Currently, section 117 requires the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a quarterly report detailing the readiness of military units. Although generally satisfied with the information provided by this report, the committee believes there should be additional information included to provide an indication that adequate funding is being programmed for identified military readiness and capability deficiencies. This section would provide Congress with more visibility of the existence of these readiness deficiencies and the programmed funding to rectify these known deficiencies.

This section would also require the reporting of the amount of cannibalization performed on vehicles and aircraft during the quarter and the efforts being made to decrease the amount of cannibalization required. The committee is concerned with the increasing amount of cannibalization that takes place in each of the service's maintenance programs due to the chronic shortage of spare and replacement parts. The committee continues to hear of numerous occasions where aircraft sit in hangars and are used for spare parts, which are unavailable through normal parts requisition channels. The cannibalization of parts creates extra work for an already overworked maintenance crew and often leads to the damage of other parts in the process.

Section 352—Reporting Requirements Regarding Transfers from High-Priority Readiness Appropriations

This section would amend section 483 of title 10, United States Code, which currently requires an annual report to Congress on any transfers from several specified high-priority readiness accounts. This section would extend the requirement for this report and expands the report to include additional high priority sub-activity groups.

In recent years, the Department of Defense has improved the information it gives to Congress on the movement of Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds. The report, submitted pursuant to section 483, has been useful to the committee in trying to understand the transfers of funds from several critical readiness accounts. The committee believes that extending and expanding the requirement for this report would continue to be helpful in reviewing the transfer of funds within operation and maintenance accounts.

Section 353—Department of Defense Strategic Plan to Reduce Backlog in Maintenance and Repair of Defense Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop an overall strategic plan for the maintenance, repair, and sustainment of facilities and infrastructure of the Department of Defense (DOD) to include a comprehensive strategy for facilities revitalization, re-

placement, demolition of unusable facilities, and sustainment maintenance tied to measurable goals, specified time frames, and expected funding in the five year defense plan. The provision would require the plan to be submitted to the Congressional defense committees by March 15, 2001, and be updated annually.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense and the military services do not have complete, reliable information on the cost associated with either maintaining their current facilities infrastructure or the cost associated with various infrastructure reduction options. Such information is critical to the development of a department-wide strategic plan that considers difficult options for the care and maintenance of essential facilities and infrastructure. The committee is also concerned that the complete disclosure of costs associated with facilities' deferred maintenance and repair and demolition cannot be adequately calculated without such a plan.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361—Authority to Ensure Demilitarization of Significant Military Equipment Formerly Owned by the Department of Defense

This section would amend chapter 153 of title 10, United States Code to allow the Secretary of Defense to recover significant military equipment that has been released by the Department of Defense without proper demilitarization. Section 1051 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) identified the need for the Department of Defense to improve demilitarization of excess and surplus defense property. This section would clarify the authority of the United States to recover critical and sensitive defense property that has been inadequately demilitarized.

Section 362—Annual Report on Public Sale of Certain Military Equipment Identified on United States Munitions List

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report annually to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on excess military items sold to the public. The report would list all items sold to the public that were included on the United States Munitions List and labeled with a Department of Defense (DOD) demilitarization code of "B". Demilitarization code "B" is placed on any item of inventory that is included on the United States Munitions List and for which the Department of Defense does not require demilitarization before the item is sold to the public.

The committee is concerned that once again sales of excess military items may have been diverted to uses and individuals that could be harmful to national security. The committee is aware of a recent case in which individuals were indicted for illegally exporting items on the munitions list to China without the required export license. The committee understands that the items included export-controlled electronic parts for missiles and military aircraft.

Section 363—Registration of Certain Information Technology Systems with Chief Information Officer

This section would require that for the next three fiscal years all mission essential and mission critical information technology system be registered with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

Section 364—Studies and Reports Required as Precondition to Certain Manpower Reductions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services prior to the initiation of any civilian manpower reductions at any organizations within the Department of Defense. A separate report would also be required once a decision has been made to consolidate, restructure, or reengineer an organization or function within the Department.

Section 365—National Guard Assistance for Certain Youth and Charitable Organizations

This section would amend section 508 of title 32, United States Code to include an additional youth organization, known as Reach for Tomorrow, to the list of youth and charitable organizations that are eligible for assistance by the National Guard.

MILITARY PERSONNEL OVERVIEW

The committee's military personnel recommendations have four major complementary goals that, taken together, will advance and help to sustain the manpower readiness of the all-volunteer force. Those four goals are to:

(1) Reform the Defense Health Program (DHP) to improve the TRICARE managed care program; to achieve savings in the DHP through management and process changes; to provide access for all Medicare-eligible military retirees to a pharmacy benefit; and to set the stage for the near-term implementation of a permanent health care program for Medicare-eligible military retirees.

(2) Continue improvements in the economic well-being of military personnel and their families—a long term effort begun last year by the committee—through both targeted and broad-based pay and benefits initiatives that put real dollars in the pockets of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

(3) Assist the armed services in the demanding task of attracting and retaining sufficient numbers of quality personnel.

(4) Provide targeted increases in active and reserve military manpower where such increases improve readiness or otherwise directly facilitate the recruiting effort.

A fundamental challenge facing the committee in achieving these goals was that the President's budget request was clearly inadequate in several key aspects and required substantial enhancement.

With regard to health care, for example, the budget request failed to support the commitment of the Chairman of the Joint

Chiefs of Staff to provide health care reform for military retirees. To fulfill that commitment and to make substantial progress toward defining permanently future military retiree health care, the committee recommends a retail and mail order pharmacy benefit for all Medicare-eligible military retirees and their families. The committee also is committed to renewing TRICARE Senior Prime (the Medicare subvention demonstration program) that the Department of Defense would have allowed to expire this year, and extending the two other demonstration programs—TRICARE Senior Supplement and the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program. In addition, believing that final decisions must soon be made to define the military health care benefit for Medicare-eligibles, the committee recommends a process to implement a permanent benefit in 2004. To fund the pharmacy benefit and other health care initiatives, including DHP reforms designed to reduce spending by as much as $500.0 million over the next five years, the committee recommends an increase of over $286.0 million to the DHP.

With regard to its longstanding effort to improve the economic viability of service members and their families, the committee again went beyond the welcome, but limited, initiatives contained in the budget request. For example, the committee authorizes a targeted subsistence payment, and $5.0 million, that is designed to assist the most economically challenged service personnel—those living off post and receiving food stamps. To more comprehensively address the economic difficulties confronting junior enlisted people, the committee also authorizes $30.0 million and requires an upward revision of minimum housing standards. Also, the committee provides $30.0 million, an increase of nearly 19 percent over the budget request to accelerate the reduction in service members' out-of-pocket housing costs, and $6.0 million to establish a minimum dislocation allowance. This latter measure, targeting junior enlisted military personnel, would begin to reduce the substantial out-of-pocket costs military people experience while moving. Moreover, despite numerous other proposals in the President's budget request that both increased and reduced entitlement spending, the budget request gave no priority to the entitlement spending needed to allow service members to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). To rectify this significant shortfall, the committee, building on the funding provided in the conference agreement on the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, authorizes service members to begin enrolling in TSP.

Being aware of the severe and continuing challenges facing each of the military services in their mutual goal of sustaining the all-volunteer force with sufficient numbers of quality personnel, the committee is disturbed to learn that most service budget requests for fiscal year 2001 reflect either steady state or decreased funding from fiscal year 2000 when measured in the investment per recruit, or in select critical recruiting accounts, and that the recruiting and retention budget shortfalls identified by the services amount to more than $700.0 million. Furthermore, the current Deputy Secretary of Defense testified to the committee that the services deliberately underfunded recruiting and retention, with the expectation that Congress would step up to fill the shortfalls.

This information directly affected the committee's decision regarding funding allocations for the services' recruiting and retention. First, where in the past the committee has willingly provided added resources to meet much of the services' unfunded requirements, this year the committee recommends additional funding for less than one third of the shortfall, an increase of $217.6 million. Second, the recommended additional funding gives priority to enlistment and reenlistment bonuses, rather than recruiting advertising because bonuses not only are highly effective at drawing and retaining people, but they also put money into service members' pockets. The committee strongly urges the military services to resolve the remaining fiscal year 2001 recruiting and retention requirements in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Finally, in an effort to overcome the manpower shortfalls contained in the budget request for both the active and reserve components, the committee authorizes nearly 650 additional active duty Navy personnel, and a total of nearly 2,900 full time support personnel in the Army National Guard, the Army Reserve, Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the armed forces as of September 30, 2001.

Service	FY 2000 authorized & floor	FY 2001 request	FY 2001 committee recommendation	Change from FY 2001 request
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000	0
Navy	372,037	372,000	372,642	642
USMC	172,518	172,600	172,600	0
USAF	360,877	357,000	357,000	0
DOD	1,385,432	1,381,600	1,382,242	642

The committee, responding to the critical manpower shortfall identified by the Chief of Naval Operations, recommends an increase in Navy end strength by 642 above the requested level. The increase will provide 500 recruiters, as well as 142 personnel for the crew of the U.S.S. Houston that the Navy intends to retain in the force structure. To support the additional end strength, the committee authorizes an increase of $18.5 million in Navy military personnel accounts.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would amend section 691 of title 10, United States Code, by establishing end strength floors for the active forces at the end strengths contained in the budget request.

The committee is surprised that each of the active and reserve components of the Air Force are projected to end fiscal year 2000 below the strengths authorized by law. The committee notes that the Congressional Budget Office projects that the active Air Force could have a shortfall of up to 4,700, the Air National Guard a shortfall of up to 3,200, and the Air Force Reserve a shortfall of as much as 2,300. If these predictions should become fact, the active Air Force will violate the statutory end strength floor for a second consecutive year. The existence of these projected shortfalls in the Air Force is surprising because Congress provided, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 105–65) and the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–79) the full funding requested by the Department of Defense to sustain end strengths at the requested levels, as well as additional funding beyond the budget request for recruiting and retention initiatives. While the committee applauds the recent Air

Force decision to launch major short-term initiatives to stave off active component recruiting and retention shortfalls in fiscal year 2000, the committee believes that the fundamental cause of the projected fiscal year 2000 end strength shortfalls is a lack of early full commitment by the Department of the Air Force to sustain required manpower levels with adequate resources.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to ensure that future budget requests comply with the requirements of section 691 of title 10, United States Code, and to provide the full funding required to sustain active and reserve end strengths at the levels required by law.

Section 403—Adjustment to End Strength Flexibility Authority

This section would authorize the Secretary to reduce the end strength below the floor in cases where the authorized end strength was higher than the floor. Section 691(e) of title 10, United States Code, provides authority to the Secretary of Defense to reduce by one-half of one per cent the authorized end strength of a service when the statutorily authorized end strength is equal to the end strength floor established in law.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for the selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 2001:

Service	FY 2000 authorized	FY 2001 request	FY 2001 committee recommendation	Change from FY 2001 request
Army National Guard	350,000	350,000	350,706	706
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,300	300
Naval Reserve	90,288	88,900	88,900	0
Marine Corps Reserve	39,624	39,500	39,558	58
Air National Guard	106,678	108,000	108,000	0
Air Force Reserve	73,708	74,300	74,358	58
Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,000	0
Total	873,298	873,700	874,822	1,122

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 2001:

Service	FY 2000 authorized	FY 2001 request	Committee recommendation	Change from FY 2001 request
Army National Guard	22,430	22,448	23,154	706
Army Reserve	12,804	12,806	13,106	300
Naval Reserve	15,010	14,649	14,649	0
Marine Corps Reserve	2,272	2,203	2,261	58
Air National Guard	11,157	11,148	11,148	0
Air Force Reserve	1,134	1,278	1,336	58

Service	FY 2000 authorized	FY 2001 request	Committee recommendation	Change from FY 2001 request
Total	64,807	64,532	65,654	1,122

The committee believes that full time manning is a crucial component of readiness in the reserve components and therefore recommends an increase of 1,122 above the requested end strength for reserves on active duty to support the reserve components. To support the increase, the committee authorizes an additional $37.5 million.

Section 413—End Strength for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2001:

Service	FY 2000 authorized (floor)	FY 2001 request	Committee recommendation (floor)	Change from FY 2001 request
Army National Guard	23,125	22,357	23,392	1,035
Army Reserve	6,474	5,271	5,921	650
Air National Guard	22,247	22,221	22,247	26
Air Force Reserve	9,785	9,733	9,785	52
Total	61,631	59,582	61,345	1,763

The committee recommends an increase of 1,763 in the requested end strength for military technicians (dual status). The bulk of the increase is to meet high priority manning shortfalls in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. To support the increases, the committee authorizes a total increase of $51.0 million to the civilian personnel pay accounts of those two components.

The committee is aware that some of the military services have attempted to reduce civilian personnel funding for technicians in the belief that because the annual defense authorization act does not specifically authorize end strength for non-dual status technicians, the committee is suggesting that non-dual status technicians should not be funded. To the contrary, the committee believes that the civilian personnel accounts of the military services must fund not only the military technician (dual status) end strength authorized above, but also the end-strength for the non-dual status technician end strength indicated below:

Service	*FY 2001 request*
Army National Guard	1,600
Army Reserve	997
Air National Guard	326
Air Force Reserve	0
Total	2,923

Section 414—Increase in Number of Members in Certain Grades Authorized To Be on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize increases in the grades of reserve members authorized to serve on active duty or on full-time national guard duty for the administration of the reserves or the national guard. The section would authorize 20 additional colonels, 82 additional lieutenant colonels, 138 additional majors, 97 additional E–

9s, and 90 additional E–8s in the Air Force. This section would also authorize 76 additional colonels, 219 additional lieutenant colonels, 178 additional majors, 221 additional E–9s, and 373 additional E–8s in the Army. The committee believes these increases are necessary to support the additional missions now being performed by the reserve components.

The committee notes that the increases listed above would be the third consecutive year in which the grade tables were adjusted for reserve officers on active duty in support of the reserves. The committee recognizes that section 555 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) expanded the roles that could be performed by reserve officers on active duty in support of the reserves and that there would be new requirements for career progression for these officers. The committee believes a comprehensive solution for the controlled grades is now necessary.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the grades assigned to reserve officers on active duty in support of the reserves and to recommend a permanent solution for managing the grade structure for those officers. In developing his recommendations, the Secretary should consider the following areas during the study:

(1) The grade structure authorized for the active duty forces and the reasons why the grade structure for reserve officers on active duty in support of the reserves is different;

(2) The need for independent grade limits for each reserve component;

(3) The potential for repealing the current grade tables in favor of a system that would manage grades based on the grade authorized for the position occupied by the service member; and

(4) The current mix within each reserve component of traditional reservists, military/civilian technicians, regular component officers, and reserve officers on active duty in support of the reserves in each controlled grade and how that mix for each component would shift over time under the Secretary's recommended solution.

The committee further directs the Secretary to report on his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel

This section would authorize $75,801.7 million to be appropriated for military personnel.

This authorization of appropriations reflects both reductions and increases to the budget request that are itemized below.

[Dollars in millions]

	Military personnel accounts	O&M accounts
RECOMMENDED INCREASES		
Active End Strength:	.....	.....
Navy:		
Add Recruiters (500)	$15.0	.....
USS Houston (142)	3.5	.....
RC End Strength:		
Army National Guard:		
Add AGR's (706)	23.5	.....
Add Military Technicians (Dual Status) (1035)	.....	$30.5
Army Reserve:		
Add AGR's (300)	10.0	.....
Add Military Technicians (Dual Status) (650)	.....	20.5
Air Force Reserve:		
Add AGR Recruiters (50)	1.7	.....
Add Red Horse AGR's (8)	0.4	.....
USMC Reserve Add ARs (58)	1.9	.....
Compensation		
Change Minimum Housing Standards for BAH	30.0	.....
Accelerate Buydown of Out-of-Pocket Housing Costs	30.0	.....
Increase Minimum Dislocation Allowance	6.0	.....
Special Subsistence Stipend	5.0	.....
Reimburse Pet Quarantine Fees	1.0	.....
Recruiting & Retention:		
Army:		
Enlistment Bonus	50.0	.....
Senior ROTC Recruiting	.....	7.0
Army National Guard Enlistment Bonus	12.0	
Army Reserve:		
Recruiting Advertising	.....	9.0
Additional Recruiters	1.0	.....
Enlistment Bonus	12.0	.....
College First	5.0	.....
Navy Enlistment Bonus	24.0	.....
Navy Reserve:		
Recruiting Advertising	.....	3.7
Recruiter Support	.....	3.0
Non-prior Svc Enlistment Bonus	2.4	.....
USMC:		
Enlistment Bonus	4.0	.....
Selective Reenlistment Bonus	4.0	.....
College Fund	4.4	.....
Recruiting Advertising	.....	7.5
Recruiter Support	.....	0.6
USMC Reserve Recruiting Advertising	.....	2.0
Air Force:		
Enlistment Bonus	7.5	.....
Selective Reenlistment Bonus	29.0	.....
College-to-USAF Enl. Program	6.0	.....
Air Guard:		
Recruiter Support	.....	3.5
Recruiting Advertising	.....	6.0
AF Reserve:		
Tuition Assistance	5.2	.....
Air Reserve Technician Pilot Retention Bonus	.....	5.0
AGR Pilot Retention Bonus	3.8	.....
Senior ROTC:		
Open Air Force Senior ROTC Detachment	.....	0.4
Other Issues:		
Army Reserve Funeral Honors	.....	3.0
Naval Reserve:		
Reserve Annual Training	2.4	.....
Reserve ADT (CINC Support)	13.4	.....
Reserve ADT (Schools)	4.4	.....

[Dollars in millions]

	Military personnel accounts	O&M accounts
ADSW (Voluntary Support)	1.2	.....
Inactive Duty for Training Travel	3.5	.....
USMC Reserve Active Duty for Special Work	3.0	.....
USMC Staffing for Voluntary Education Programs	.....	4.0
International Student Program at Senior Military Colleges	.....	2.0
Recruiter-High School Guidance Counselor Internet Connection	.....	2.0
Defense Health Program:		
Fund Study of DHP Accrual	.....	2.0
Fund Study of Medicare Eligible Health Options	.....	2.0
Feasibility Study DOD/VA Joint Research Facility	.....	2.5
Modernize TRICARE Management/Increase Use of Treatment Facilities	.....	134.5
Reimburse travel expenses for long-distance referrals	.....	15.0
Reduce Catastrophic Cap for Retirees	.....	32.0
TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Benefit	.....	94.0
Chiropractic Services for Active Duty Personnel	.....	3.0
Telemedicine Radiology Demonstration	.....	1.5
Total Recommended Additions	326.2	396.2

[Dollars in millions]

	Military personnel accunts	O&M accounts
RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS		
Active Component Strength and Grade Underexecution:		
Army	$5.3	.....
USMC	16.0	.....
Air Force	59.6	.....
Reserve Component Strength, Grade and Drill Underexecution:		
Army National Guard	4.2	.....
USMC Reserve	0.7	.....
Air National Guard	1.0	.....
Air Force Reserve	8.1	.....
DOD Reserve Mobilization Income Insurance Fund	17.0	.....
Defense Health Program Foreign Military Training	.....	$10.0
Unemployment Compensation:		
Army	2.1	.....
Navy	1.4	.....
Marine Corps	0.7	.....
Air Force	0.6	.....
Foreign Currency Fluctuation:		
Army	73.3	.....
Navy	45.4	.....
Marine Corps	4.8	.....
Air Force	86.0	.....
Defense Health	.....	15.4
Total Recommended Reductions	326.2	25.4

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Office

The committee notes that section 1501 of title 10, United States Code, charges the Defense Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Office (DPMO) with broad responsibilities throughout the Department of Defense concerning policy, control, and oversight of the process for the investigation and recovery of missing persons. The committee has learned that DPMO is developing a strategic plan intended to serve as a roadmap for all elements of the Department in carrying out those important responsibilities. However, the committee is concerned that the strategic plan envisions a lessening of ongoing efforts to account for the thousands of service members still unaccounted for in previous wars. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to consult the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services before implementing any plan that would reduce the current level of effort to account for missing personnel.

The committee further notes that the Secretary of Defense has published directives implementing the Missing Persons Act (section 569 of Public Law 104–106), as amended. However, the committee is disappointed that the directives do not provide a means to inform family members of the existence of classified information that could pertain to one or more missing persons as required by section 1506(d) of title 10, United States Code. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to incorporate the procedures required by law into a revised directive by December 1, 2000.

Department of Defense International Student Program at the Military Colleges

The committee, despite working cooperatively last year with Department of Defense (DOD) officials to incorporate the Senior Military Colleges (SMC) into the DOD international student program in a manner to allow the Secretary of Defense to expand the impact and scope of that program, was severely disappointed that the fiscal year 2001 budget request did not include funds for the SMC international student program. The committee, therefore, authorizes $2.0 million for the Secretary of Defense to carry out the SMC international student program and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide funding to the program from funds, other than those for the Senior ROTC program, made available to the Secretary for fiscal year 2001. The committee also strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to fund this program in the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Funding for Recruiting and Retention

The committee continues to be concerned about the ability of the services to recruit and retain a quality force, as well as the apparent unwillingness or inability of the armed services to adequately resource their recruiting and retention programs. Furthermore, based on testimony presented to the committee, it appears that the armed services are taking advantage of Congressional support for recruiting and retention by underfunding their budget requests with the expectation that additional resources for recruiting and retention will be provided in the authorization and appropriations process.

Congressional support for recruiting and retention has been substantial, with over $400.0 million in additional funding to recruiting accounts alone provided by Congress over the last three years. In addition, Congress crafted the extensive pay and retirement reforms enacted by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Despite this support, the committee notes that the active Army, the Army Reserve, the active Navy, the Naval Reserve, the active Air Force, and the Air Force Reserve all failed to achieve recruiting objectives in fiscal year 1999. In fiscal year 2000, the armed services continue to experience difficulty in recruiting due to increased college attendance, reduced youth population, and record low unemployment rates, with all components of the Air Force (active, national guard and reserve), the Army Reserve and the Naval Reserve unlikely to meet recruiting goals. Additionally, the active Army, the active Marine Corps and active Navy will be severely challenged to do so.

Similarly, the armed services continue to experience difficulty in retaining personnel with certain technical skills and within units burdened with high operations tempo. Additionally, both the active component Air Force and the active component Navy failed to meet retention objectives across all segments of the enlisted force during fiscal year 1999, and are unlikely to achieve those retention objectives in fiscal year 2000.

The committee believes that DOD's inadequate funding for recruiting and retention programs only exacerbates the recruiting and retention difficulties. For example, following the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2001, the armed services reported $704.0 million in unfunded requirements in recruiting and retention programs. Additionally, the budget request included examples for each of the armed services, including both active and reserve components, of recruiting and retention accounts that were funded at considerably lower levels for fiscal year 2001 than what the armed services expected to execute during fiscal year 2000. The committee concludes from these facts that inadequate defense budgets have forced the service secretaries into tough choices, with recruiting and retention getting a lower priority than other programs. The committee believes that the low priority placed on recruiting and retention programs by budget managers can be attributed in part to the presumption that Congress will add the needed resources that the secretaries concerned are unwilling or unable to provide.

In recognition of the general inadequacy of the defense budget to meet all the armed services requirements, the committee recommends an increase of $217.6 million over the amounts requested for the recruiting and retention by the active and reserve components. In deciding what shortfalls to address, the committee gave priority to those recruiting and retention initiatives that provide money directly to service members. The details of the recommended increases are provided in the table accompanying section 421 above.

The committee notes, however, that the recommended increase is less than one third of the funding shortfall reported by the armed services. The committee expects DOD and the armed services to move aggressively to eliminate the remaining shortfall in fiscal year 2001. Furthermore, the committee strongly recommends the secretaries concerned include full funding for recruiting and retention programs in the fiscal year 2002 budget request and not rely on Congress to provide the necessary resources to sustain the all volunteer force.

Additionally, the committee is disappointed that progress in developing recruiting kiosks using computer technology has been slowed due to inadequate funding. The committee believes that recruiting kiosks are an important initiative that should be developed expeditiously. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to initiate a fully funded joint program to expand the testing of computer kiosks within all the military departments.

Homosexual Conduct Briefings

The committee desires to clarify the objectives of the briefings and training sessions on the policy, regulations, and laws governing homosexual conduct that are required by section 654 of title 10, United States Code, or directed by the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes that all briefings and training sessions on homosexual conduct should focus on the standards of behavior as required by law, and should be limited to the behavior expected of service members regarding the professional treatment of other members. The briefings and training sessions should respect and acknowledge the personal or religious values of service members, and they shall be informed of their right to retain them.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to review all homosexual conduct briefings and training being conducted by the armed services and bring them in compliance with the committee's directions.

Incentives for Overseas Assignments

The committee is concerned that the military services are having difficulty filling overseas duty positions with volunteers. The committee notes that volunteers for overseas duty in the Navy are considered to have met their sea duty requirement, and further notes that volunteers in overseas shore-based positions hinder the Navy's ability to meet its ship staffing requirements. While overseas duty is often desirable for younger unaccompanied service members, senior service members are frequently reluctant to go overseas because of family concerns. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary

of Defense to study incentives for overseas assignments and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2000, on attainable and affordable recommendations to resolve this problem.

National Guard Military Technician Overtime Pay

The committee notes that section 709(h) of title 32, United States Code, prohibits Army and Air Force National Guard military technicians from receiving overtime pay. Instead, that section requires that technicians be granted compensatory time for overtime work. The committee recognizes that the law concerning national guard military technician overtime has remained essentially unchanged since the enactment of the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 (Public Law 90–486). The committee believes that a review of this policy is needed, however, because the role and utilization of the full time support force has changed fundamentally since 1968. This increased reliance on the full time force causes many military technicians to routinely work irregular and overtime hours. While the law directs that these national guard military technicians be given time off in lieu of overtime, the reality is that they are receiving neither. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the policy and cost considerations by which national guard military technicians are treated for overtime work and to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Uniformed Services Former Spouse Protection Act

The committee notes that section 643 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Uniformed Services Former Spouse Protection Act (USFSPA) and to report his findings to Congress by September 30, 1999. The committee considers this an important review with significant implications for many service members and their families. The committee is disappointed the review remains incomplete and encourages the Secretary to submit the report as soon as possible.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES

Section 501—Authority for Secretary of Defense to Suspend Certain Personnel Strength Limitations During War or National Emergency

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to suspend in time of war or national emergency the limits on the number of personnel serving on active duty in the grades of E–8 and E–9, and the number of personnel serving on active duty in support of the reserves in grades 0–6, 0–5, 0–4, E–9, and E–8. This section would also make the procedures for calculating the number of service members authorized to serve in controlled grades in time of war or

national emergency for the categories of personnel listed above consistent with the procedures used for active duty officers.

Section 502—Authority to Issue Posthumous Commissions in the Case of Members Dying Before Official Recommendation for Appointment or Promotion is Approved by Secretary Concerned

This section would clarify that the secretary concerned may confer posthumous commissions in cases where military members die prior to the approval of an official recommendation for appointment or promotion.

Section 503—Technical Correction to Retired Grade Rule for Army and Air Force Officers

This section would repeal conflicting provisions of law regarding the determination of retirement grade for reserve officers. This section would also clarify that retirement grade for reserve officers will be determined in accordance with section 1370 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 504—Extension to End of Calendar Year of Expiration Date for Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities

This section would extend through December 31, 2001, certain force drawdown transition authorities. These authorities include:

(1) Active duty early retirement authority;

(2) Special separation benefit authority;

(3) Voluntary separation incentive authority;

(4) Increased flexibility in the management of selective early retirement boards;

(5) Reduction of time-in-grade requirement for retention of grade upon voluntary retirement;

(6) Reduction of length of commissioned service for voluntary retirement as an officer;

(7) Enhanced travel and transportation allowances and storage of baggage and household effects for certain involuntary separated members;

(8) Increased flexibility for granting educational leave relating to continuing public and community service;

(9) Enhanced health, commissary and family housing benefits;

(10) Increased flexibility in the management of enrollments of dependents in the Defense Dependents' Education System;

(11) Definition of the force reduction transition period for reserve forces;

(12) Force reduction period reserve retirement authority;

(13) Reduction of length of non-regular service requirements for reserve retirements;

(14) Reserve early retirement authority;

(15) Reduction of time-in-grade requirement for retention of grade upon voluntary reserve retirement;

(16) Increased flexibility in the management of the affiliation of active duty personnel with reserve units;

(17) Increased flexibility in the management of eligibility for reserve educational assistance.

Section 505—Clarification of Requirements for Composition of Active-Duty List Selection Boards When Reserve Officers are Under Consideration

This section would clarify section 612 of title 10, United States Code, by specifying that reserve officers serving on active duty may be appointed to serve on promotion boards even though they are not on the active-duty list.

Section 506—Voluntary Separation Incentive

This section would authorize service members who simultaneously receive retired or retainer pay and voluntary separation incentive (VSI) to terminate their eligibility for VSI. The section would also allow the service member who is eligible for retired pay and who has received VSI to reimburse the government for the amount of VSI received without concurrently increasing the amount of VSI that is owed.

Section 507—Congressional Review Period for Assignment of Women to Duty on Submarines and for Any Proposed Reconfiguration or Design of Submarines to Accommodate Female Crew Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress written notification prior to any policy change affecting the current male-only assignment policy for submarines take effect, and prior to the expenditure of funds to reconfigure or design a submarine to accommodate the assignment of female crewmembers. Such changes could take place only after 120 days of continuous congressional session have expired following receipt by Congress of the notice of the proposed changes.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 511—Exemption from Active-Duty List for Reserve Officers on Active Duty for a Period of Three Years or Less

This section would prevent a reserve officer voluntarily serving on active duty for a period of three years or less from being placed on the active-duty list and required to compete for promotion with active duty officers. This section would also authorize such officers to remain on the Reserve Active Status List and compete for promotion with other reserve officers. The committee considers this section to apply to reserve component officers serving in positions authorized by section 526(b)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code.

Section 512—Exemption of Reserve Component Medical and Dental Officers from Counting in Grade Strengths

This section would exempt medical and dental officers from the calculation of the number of officers in each grade authorized to serve in an active status in a reserve component. This section would also make the procedures for calculating the number of officers serving in controlled grades for the reserve components consistent with the procedures used for active duty officers.

Section 513—Continuation of Officers on the Reserve Active Status List Without Requirement for Application

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to offer continuation on the Reserve Active Status List to reserve officers without requiring the officer to request continuation.

Section 514—Authority to Retain Reserve Component Chaplains and Officers in Medical Specialties Until Specified Age

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend the service of Medical Service Corps and biomedical sciences officers to age 67.

Section 515—Authority for Temporary Increase in Number of Reserve Component Personnel Serving on Active Duty or Full-Time National Guard Duty in Certain Grades

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to increase the number of reserve members serving on active duty in support of the reserves in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the grades of 0–6, 0–5, 0–4, E–9, and E–8 by the same percentage the Secretary is authorized to increase the end strength of that force by section 115 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 516—Authority for Provision of Legal Services to Reserve Component Members Following Release from Active Duty

This section would authorize legal services assistance to reservists who served on active duty for more than 29 days and their dependents for a period not to exceed twice the length of time served on active duty.

Section 517—Entitlement to Separation Pay for Reserve Officers Released from Active Duty Upon Declining Selective Continuation on Active Duty After Second Failure of Selection for Promotion

This section would clarify that the separation of a reserve officer on active duty who was non-selected for promotion twice to the same grade, and who subsequently declines selective continuation shall be considered an involuntary separation, and would authorize such an officer to be eligible for separation pay.

The committee is disappointed that the Secretary of the Army was unable to prevent a number of reserve captains from being separated from active duty involuntarily without separation pay because the officers declined continuation on active duty after being non-selected for promotion. The committee notes that regular captains non-selected for promotion by the same promotion board did receive separation pay after declining continuation on active duty. This section would insure that similarly situated reserve officers receive separation pay in the future, but would not allow separation pay to be provided to those reserve captains separated during fiscal year 2000.

The Secretary of the Army indicates that he will rely on the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) to restore fairness and equity to the reserve captains denied separation pay

during fiscal year 2000. The committee requests that the Secretary expedite consideration of these cases by the ABCMR to minimize hardships for these members and their families.

Section 518—Extension of Involuntary Civil Service Retirement Date for Certain Reserve Technicians

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to retain certain non-dual status reserve technicians until age 60, an age beyond which these technicians would otherwise be required to separate from federal civil service as required by section 10218 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that current law was intended to reduce the numbers of non-dual status technicians while providing for a process that minimized the impact on the technicians being separated. The committee has learned that the process has not worked as intended, and the committee is concerned that some technicians would be forced to retire without adequate notice as a result of that process.

SUBTITLE C—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 521—College Tuition Assistance Program for Pursuit of Degrees by Members of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Program

This section would authorize the use of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class Tuition Assistance Program for the purpose of providing educational assistance to include legal training to commissioned officers participating in the Platoon Leaders Class program.

Section 522—Review of Allocation of Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps Units Among the Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review and redistribute the current service Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps (JROTC) allocations for fiscal years 2001 to 2006 to enable those services that want to more quickly eliminate their current JROTC waiting lists and are willing to commit the necessary resources to do so, have the opportunity to grow. Further, if the reallocation results in the Secretary of Defense determining that the current statutory cap of 3,500 JROTC units should be increased, then his recommendations for the increase should be included in the fiscal year 2002 budget request. The Secretary of Defense has begun expanding the number of JROTC units from the present 2,700 to the statutory maximum of 3,500. The committee commends this effort and encourages the Secretary of Defense to achieve expansion before 2006, the target completion date. To that end, the committee believes that if a military service is willing to commit the resources to expand its JROTC program to eliminate its waiting list of high schools that have requested a JROTC program more quickly than envisioned by the six-year Department of Defense (DOD) plan, then the service should not be constrained by the internal unit allocation limits of the DOD plan.

Section 523—Authority for Naval Postgraduate School to Enroll Certain Defense Industry Civilians in Specified Programs Relating to Defense Product Development

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enroll up to ten defense-industry civilians at any one time at the Naval Postgraduate School in a defense product development curriculum leading to the award of a master's degree. The defense-industry civilians would be joined in the curriculum by Department of Defense civilian and military personnel who themselves are engaged in defense product development. The committee believes that the new authority granted by this section will create a shared learning environment that will facilitate the growth and development of government-industry partnerships that are critical to faster and more efficient defense acquisition.

SUBTITLE D—DECORATIONS, AWARDS, AND COMMENDATIONS

Section 531—Authority for Award of the Medal of Honor to Andrew J. Smith for Valor during the Civil War

This section would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of the Medal of Honor to Andrew J. Smith for valor during the Battle of Honey Hill in South Carolina.

Section 532—Authority for Award of the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman for Valor during the Vietnam Conflict

This section would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of the Medal of Honor to Ed W. Freeman for valor during the battle of the IaDrang Valley in the Republic of Vietnam.

Section 533—Consideration of Proposals for Posthumous or Honorary Promotions or Appointments of Members or Former Members of the Armed Forces and Other Qualified Persons

This section would authorize Members of Congress to request the secretary concerned review a proposal for posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment of a member or former member of the armed services or other person. The section would require the secretary concerned to review the case and provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the requesting Member of Congress written notice of one of the following determinations, to include a statement of the reasons supporting the determination:

(1) The appointment or promotion does not warrant approval on the merits.

(2) The appointment of promotion warrants approval on the merits and has been recommended to the President as an exception to policy.

(3) The appointment or promotion warrants approval on the merits and authorization by law is required, but not recommended.

The committee is concerned that requests for posthumous or honorary promotions and appointments are being considered by Congress without the benefit of the views of the service secretaries.

Section 534—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Navy Distinguished Flying Cross to Certain Persons

This section would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of Distinguished Flying Cross to individuals recommended for award of the Distinguished Flying Cross by the secretaries of the military departments.

Section 535—Addition of Certain Information to Markers on Graves Containing Remains of Certain Unknowns from the U.S.S. Arizona Who Died in the Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941

This section would require that the Secretary of the Army, based on a review of existing information related to the interment of unknown casualties from the U.S.S. Arizona, provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with information to be added to the inscriptions on the grave markers of those unknowns who are interred at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Section 536—Sense of Congress Regarding Final Crew of U.S.S. INDIANAPOLIS

This section would express the Sense of Congress that the commander of the U.S.S. INDIANAPOLIS, Admiral (then Captain) Charles Butler McVay III was not culpable for the sinking of the ship. The section would also express the Sense of Congress that the President should award the Presidential Unit Citation to the final crew of the U.S.S. INDIANAPOLIS for courage and fortitude after the torpedo attack.

Section 537—Posthumous Advancement of Rear Admiral (Retired) Husband E. Kimmel and Major General (Retired) Walter C. Short on Retired Lists

This section would request the President to advance Rear Admiral Husband E. Kimmel to admiral and Major General Walter Short to lieutenant general on the retired list with no increase in compensation or benefits. The provision also expresses the Sense of Congress that both officers were professional and competent, and the losses incurred during the attack on Pearl Harbor were not the result of dereliction in the performance of duties in the case of either officer.

Section 538—Commendation of Citizens of Remy, France, for World War II Actions

This section would commend the bravery and honor of the citizens of Remy, France for their action to bury Lieutenant Houston Braly, 364th Fighter Group, during World War II. The section would also recognize the efforts of the surviving members of the United States 364th Fighter Group to raise funds to restore the stained glass windows of Remy's 13th century church that were destroyed.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY JUSTICE MATTERS

Section 541—Recognition by States of Military Testamentary Instruments

This section would amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, to require the fifty states of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and each territory and possession of the United States, to include Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands to recognize a will prepared for a person eligible to receive legal assistance under section 1044 of title 10, United Sates Code. This section would also ensure that wills prepared by members of the armed forces, their spouses, and other persons eligible for legal assistance are admitted for state probate proceedings. This section would also simplify will preparation for eligible personnel and afford them greater certainty and security in accomplishing their testamentary intent.

Section 542—Probable Cause Required for Entry of Names of Subjects into Official Criminal Investigative Reports

This section would require the Department of Defense to apply the "probable cause" standard before titling a crime suspect. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to amend the standards and procedures for the removal of titling information from the Defense Clearance and Investigations Index to permit the removal of a titled person's name by the head of the submitting Defense Criminal Investigative Organization when there is reason to believe that the titling is in error, a person is falsely accused, no crime occurred, or the entry does not serve the interests of justice.

The committee is concerned that the standard of the Department of Defense for titling a crime suspect as established by Department of Defense Instruction 5505.7 requires "credible information." This standard appears to be significantly different from the "probable cause" standard common in state and federal criminal procedure.

Section 543—Collection and Use of DNA Identification Information from Violent and Sexual Offenders in the Armed Forces

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to collect a deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) sample from each member of the armed forces who is, or has been, convicted of a violent or sexual offense. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to analyze each sample and furnish the results of each DNA analysis to the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for use in the Combined DNA Index System of the FBI.

Section 544—Limitation on Secretarial Authority to Grant Clemency for Military Prisoners Serving Sentence of Confinement for Life Without Eligibility for Parole

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to make two changes to the procedures for considering clemency for prisoners serving sentences of life without parole. First, the authority for the

granting of clemency to prisoners serving sentences of life without parole would be vested solely in the secretary of the military department concerned and would not be delegable to any other person. The section would also establish as a minimum that a prisoner will have served twenty years of a sentence of life without parole before being eligible for consideration for clemency. The committee is aware that a majority of the members of the Department of Defense Corrections Council has recommended these or similar actions. The committee supports these recommendations to ensure that prisoners serving sentences of life without parole will remain incarcerated for a significantly longer period of time than would otherwise be expected for prisoners serving lesser sentences.

Section 545—Authority for Civilian Special Agents of Military Department Criminal Investigative Organizations to Execute Warrants and Make Arrests

This section would authorize the secretaries of the military departments to grant the authority to execute and serve warrants and make arrests to the civilian special agents of their respective military criminal investigative organization subject to certain guidelines.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 551—Funeral Honors Duty Compensation

This section would authorize a reserve component member assigned to a funeral honors detail for the funeral of a veteran to be compensated at the same rate as the member would be compensated for participating in inactive-duty training.

Section 552—Test of Ability of Reserve Component Intelligence Units and Personnel to Meet Current and Emerging Defense Intelligence Needs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a three-year test to determine the most effective peacetime structure and operational employment of reserve component intelligence assets for meeting future Department of Defense peacetime operational intelligence requirements, and to establish a means of coordinating the transition of the peacetime operational support network into wartime requirements.

Section 553—National Guard Challenge Program

This section would authorize the head of a federal agency or department to provide funds to the Secretary of Defense to support the National Guard Challenge Program, and would allow the Secretary to expend those funds notwithstanding the $62.5 million limit in defense funding established by section 509(b) of title 32, United States Code, for the Challenge program. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish regulations for the Challenge program.

Section 554—Study of Use of Civilian Contractor Pilots for Operational Support Missions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility and cost of using civilian contractor personnel as pilots and other aircrew members to fly government aircraft performing non-combat personnel transportation missions worldwide. Military pilots and aircrew now perform these missions. The committee recommends this study to determine whether such contracting out would help to resolve pilot shortages being experienced by several of the armed services, and help to improve pilot retention.

Section 555—Pilot Program to Enhance Military Recruiting by Improving Military Awareness of School Counselors and Educators

The committee has noted that at some locations the strained relationship between military recruiters and student counselors and educators limits the access of recruiters to students. The committee believes that historical barriers between the two groups can be overcome and access to students enhanced by improving the understanding of student counselors and educators about military recruiting and career opportunities.

Accordingly, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to improve communication with student counselors and educators by providing funding, assistance, and information to an existing interactive Internet site designed to provide information and services to employees of local education agencies and institutions of higher education. The pilot program would be conducted during a three-year period beginning not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Section 556—Reimbursement for Expenses Incurred by Members in Connection with Cancellation of Leave on Short Notice

This section would authorize the service secretaries to reimburse members for travel expenses when leave is cancelled within 48 hours of commencing due to mission requirements of a contingency operation.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains convinced that compensation provided to service members and their families is the key to reversing unfavorable retention trends. Surveys of military members conducted during the past year have confirmed that compensation remains the most important factor in the decision of service members to leave the military.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) enhanced and reformed the following compensation programs:

(1) Pay raises guaranteed to exceed private sector pay raises were authorized.

(2) Pay table reform was implemented to recognize individual effort.

(3) Military retirement benefits were restored to pre-1986 levels.

(4) Basic allowance for housing (BAH) was increased to promise improved reimbursement levels.

(5) Special pays and retention bonuses were initiated and increased to improve compensation to military members.

(6) A military Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) was authorized to provide military members a retirement savings vehicle.

The committee is committed to fulfill the promise for continued improvement to compensation programs begun in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

The committee is pleased that the budget request for fiscal year 2001 included a pay raise of 3.7 percent, one-half of one percent above the Employment Cost Index (ECI) level, and a program to increase BAH and reduce out-of-pocket housing costs for members to zero by fiscal year 2005. Given the Administration's reluctance to fund adequate pay raises and a decision to abandon after one year a prior six-year plan to reduce out-of-pocket housing costs, the committee applauds the Administration's improvement of military compensation programs.

The committee is disappointed that the Administration was unable to identify the pay-go offsets needed to implement the military Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). The committee is pleased that the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, Fiscal Year 2001, does include the necessary offsets. Accordingly, the committee would authorize the military TSP to be implemented during fiscal year 2001.

The committee is concerned that even a small percentage of military families qualify for the food stamp program. Accordingly, the committee would authorize a family assistance supplemental subsistence allowance specifically targeted to increase compensation

for low-income members who qualify for food stamps. The allowance would pay members the monthly amount of supplemental allowance required to remove them from the food stamp program, not to exceed a maximum of $500 per month. Additionally, the committee would authorize a series of broad-based initiatives to enhance the fiscal welfare of young families by increasing the minimum standards for adequate housing, increasing reimbursement for moving costs, and reducing out-of-pocket housing costs.

The committee also recognizes that military personnel are likely to respond positively to indications that Congress is prepared to make substantial investments in their long-term welfare. Accordingly, the committee would increase the maximum levels on several special pays and would also establish a new retention bonus program that affords the Secretary of Defense a more flexible and responsive tool to retain service members with critical skills.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Briefings on Benefits of Military Service

The committee is concerned that the armed services have not included among the many new retention initiatives a robust program for briefing service members on the benefits of military service. The committee believes that retention would be improved by a program designed to provide service members periodic briefings on benefits.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current programs employed by the armed services to provide service members information on the full array of benefits available to them. The review shall include an assessment of program effectiveness in communicating information on the following benefit programs, at a minimum, as well as other programs operated by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, at the discretion of the Secretary.

(1) Military compensation and retired pay;

(2) Health care benefits, including the TRICARE program;

(3) Survivor benefits;

(4) Montgomery G.I. Bill and other education and training opportunities;

(5) Morale, welfare, and recreational benefits, including child care benefits;

(6) Commissary and exchange benefits;

(7) Retirement homes operated for the benefit of former military members; and

(8) Veteran benefits offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, including health care; disability benefits, education and training, home loan guarantees, life insurance, burial benefits, and survivor benefits.

The Secretary shall also determine if the current programs providing information on benefits to service members require modification and expansion.

The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Extension of Time Limitation on Use of Reserve Education Benefits

The committee is concerned that the time limitation on the use of education benefits by members of the selected reserve detracts from the potential of the program to promote career-long retention. Section 16331 of title 10, United States Code, provides that members of the selected reserve who remain in an active status lose eligibility 10 years from the date the service member becomes eligible for benefits.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the time limitations on the use of education benefits by the selected reserve and determine if an extension of the time limitations is useful and cost effective. The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Improved Basic Allowance for Housing

The committee believes that the additional funding for the basic allowance for housing (BAH) included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) and the proposal to reduce out-of-pocket housing costs in the fiscal year 2001 budget request will improve the quality of life for many military members and their families. The BAH rates in high cost areas have already been significantly increased as of January 1, 2000, pursuant to Public Law 106–65.

The committee is concerned that some landlords will view the increase in the BAH as an incentive to increase housing costs not only for military members, but also for civilians in the local community. The committee supports additional funding for the BAH to ensure that military families receive sufficient compensation for adequate housing as dictated by the local housing market. The committee intends to monitor any growth in housing costs within areas that appear to be fueled by BAH increases and not the economic forces of the local housing market. The committee is prepared to reexamine BAH rates in areas where there is evidence that BAH increases have unduly influenced local housing markets.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the growth of housing costs in areas where the local costs of housing are believed to be directly influenced by increases in BAH rates. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations for correcting the problem to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31 of each year of the period beginning in 2001 and ending in 2006.

Military Pay Day Every 14 Days

The committee recognizes that the current practice of paying military personnel twice a month causes some pay periods to be longer, thus increasing the financial stress for military families. The committee notes that paying military personnel every 14 days would provide military members with more consistent pay periods.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study whether the change to a 14-day pay period for military personnel is both necessary and desirable. The committee directs the

Secretary to report his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Pay Table Reform for Mid-Grade Enlisted Members

The committee is increasingly interested in pay increases targeted for noncommissioned officers in pay grades E–5 through E–7. The committee recognizes that the pay table reform provision included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) did little to restore the historic pay advantages enjoyed by mid-grade and senior enlisted members when compared to junior enlisted members.

The committee is concerned that more needs to be done to improve mid-grade enlisted pay levels. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to study the issue and present with the fiscal year 2002 budget request either a legislative proposal to remedy the concerns of the enlisted force, or an explanation as to why the concerns of the enlisted force are not valid.

Reimbursement for Reservists' Travel Expenses

The committee is concerned that some reservists incur significant expenses traveling to inactive-duty training locations. This problem becomes particularly acute when reserve members are forced to use commercial air when surface transportation is not available or large distances are involved. For example, reservists must use commercial air between Pacific islands and some locations in Alaska.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current travel practices used by reservists to meet training obligations and determine the financial impact on members. The Secretary will assess the potential advantages for reservists and the reserve components of providing reimbursement for travel expenses, to include the potential for increasing retention, improving recruiting, and attracting higher quality members to leadership roles.

The committee directs the Secretary to report his findings and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Reimbursement of Permanent Change of Station Expenses

The committee is aware of the results of a study conducted by the Department of Defense that demonstrates that military members bear approximately 40 percent of the cost of moving to a new duty station. The committee is deeply concerned that personnel in the grades E–4 and below bear approximately 70 percent of the financial burden to change permanent duty stations (PCS).

The committee intends to focus on improving PCS reimbursements. Accordingly, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to develop a legislative proposal designed to enhance PCS reimbursement levels and to submit such a proposal with the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Retired Pay Following Reduction in Grade

The committee notes that during calendar year 2000 longevity retired pay for members of the uniformed services who entered service after September 8, 1980, will be calculated based on the average of the highest 36 months of base pay. The committee is concerned that members covered by the high-36 rule will enjoy a windfall when reduced in grade due to misconduct prior to retirement. Under high-36 procedures, the retired pay of such personnel is largely based on the grade held by the member prior to the reduction in grade.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the need for legislation to provide an alternative method for calculating retired pay when a member has been reduced in grade due to misconduct. The Secretary shall report his finding and recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 2001

This section would authorize a 3.7 percent military pay raise effective January 1, 2001. This pay raise would be one-half of one percent more than the pay raise that would result if the Employment Cost Index (ECI) standard were used.

The committee strongly supports this pay raise and believes it is critical that military members receive military pay increases over the next five years that improve their level of pay compared to the private sector, as authorized in section 602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Section 602—Revised Method for Calculation of Basic Allowance for Subsistence

The committee believes that the program to transition the basic allowance for subsistence (BAS) for enlisted members to a lower rate established in section 602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) is no longer serving the best interests of service members.

Accordingly, this section would repeal the transition program effective October 1, 2001, and establish a process for increasing the BAS rate in effect for the prior year by the increase in food costs as determined by the Department of Agriculture.

The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to pay eligible service members a partial BAS effective January 1, 2002 equal to rate of BAS reduced by the rate of Basic Daily Food Allowance as determined by the Secretary.

Section 603—Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowance for Low-Income Members of the Armed Forces

The committee is concerned that a number of service members are eligible to receive food stamps. Although the number of members receiving food stamps has been reduced from the 12,000 esti-

mated in 1996, there are still 6,300 service members believed to be relying on food stamps to meet the nutritional needs of family members.

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to pay members who qualify for food stamps a monthly amount to supplement the basic allowance for subsistence (BAS). The program would pay members who qualify for food stamps the amount of supplemental allowance necessary to make them ineligible for food stamps, up to a maximum of $500 dollars per month. The member's eligibility for food stamps would be determined by DOD officials using the same gross income standards used by state officials to determine food stamp eligibility for the general public, except that the income for all military members would be calculated to include the payment of basic allowance for housing (BAH) even when the member resides in government quarters.

Section 604—Calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing for Inside the United States

This section would repeal the requirement that service members pay 15 percent of housing costs out-of-pocket. The section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to increase basic allowance for housing rates and to reduce out-of-pocket housing expenses for military members to zero by fiscal year 2005.

Section 605—Equitable Treatment of Junior Enlisted Members in Computation of Basic Allowance for Housing

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a single housing rate for members in grades E–1 through E–4 with dependents and to increase the basic allowance for housing rate paid to such members above the rate previously paid to members in grade E–4.

Section 606—Basic Allowance for Housing Authorized for Additional Members Without Dependents Who Are on Sea Duty

This section would include personnel in the grade of E–4 among those authorized to receive basic allowance for housing (BAH) while assigned to sea duty.

The committee notes that some personnel authorized to receive BAH while assigned to sea duty do not maintain residences on shore when their ships are deployed. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to study this issue. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report on his findings and any recommendations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2001.

Section 607—Personal Money Allowance for Senior Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces

This section would authorize a $2,000 personal money allowance to the senior enlisted members in each of the armed services.

Section 608—Allowance for Officers for Purchase of Required Uniforms and Equipment

This section would increase the one-time initial uniform allowance paid to officers from $200 to $400, and the one-time additional uniform allowance paid to officers from $100 to $200.

Section 609—Increase in Monthly Subsistence Allowance for Members of Precommissioning Programs

This section would increase the minimum stipend to $250 per month, and establish a maximum stipend of $600 per month, and it also would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to establish a tiered-stipend system. Under such a system, the committee intends that the value of the monthly stipend should grow as a student's involvement in ROTC grows. The changes contained in this section would be effective on October 1, 2001. The committee is aware that the senior Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) programs of the Army and the Air Force continue to have difficulty meeting officer commissioning objectives. The committee notes that the Army may miss its objectives by 20 percent, and the Air Force by five percent for fiscal year 2000. The committee further notes that the Department of Defense has reported a 20 percent reduction in the number of ROTC scholarship applications, and that the current monthly fixed subsistence stipend of $200 paid to all contracted cadets is ineffective as a recruiting and retention measure. The committee is concerned by these trends in the ROTC program and believes that a fundamental change is required.

Section 610—Additional Amount Available for Fiscal Year 2001 Increase in Basic Allowance for Housing Inside the United States

The committee remains concerned that military families are not receiving sufficient reimbursement for housing. The committee is pleased that the budget request included an initiative to decrease out-of-pocket housing cost for service members, but the committee is disappointed that the initiative would only reduce out-of-pocket housing costs to 15 percent.

Accordingly, this section would increase the funding available for basic allowance for housing by $30.0 million. This initiative would reduce out-of-pocket housing costs by an additional one-half of one percent.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for health care professionals who serve in the selected reserve in critically short wartime specialties, the selected reserve reenlistment bonus, the selected reserve enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to certain high priority units, the selected reserve affiliation bonus, the ready reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlist-

ment bonus until December 31, 2001. This section would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health care professionals who serve in the selected reserve until January 1, 2002.

Section 612—Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses and Nurse Anesthetists

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, the accession bonus for registered nurses, and the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists until December 31, 2001.

Section 613—Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, reenlistment bonus for active members, enlistment bonus for persons with critical skills, Army enlistment bonus, special pay for nuclear qualified officers extending the period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus to December 31, 2001.

Section 614—Consistency of Authorities for Special Pay for Reserve Medical and Dental Officers

This section would clarify that reserve medical and dental officers are paid special pay in a consistent manner.

Section 615—Special Pay for Coast Guard Physician Assistants

This section would extend the authority to pay special pay currently provided to physician assistants in the military departments to physician assistants in the Coast Guard.

Section 616—Special Duty Assignment Pay for Enlisted Members

This section would increase the maximum amount that may be paid in special duty assignment pay from $275 to $600 per month.

The committee notes that recruiters would be eligible for this increase. Given the stress associated with recruiting duty and the importance of attracting quality service members to recruiting duty, the committee recommends that the secretaries of the military departments begin to pay increased rates of special duty assignment pay to production recruiters at the earliest date possible.

Section 617—Revision of Career Sea Pay

This section would authorize the secretary concerned to restructure career sea pay and increase the rates of career sea pay to a maximum of $750 per month and the rates for premium sea pay to $350 per month after 36 months of sea duty.

The committee continues to be concerned that the eroding value of sea pay has contributed to the shortage of personnel in some sea-going positions. The committee looks forward to the implementation of enhanced sea pay rates by the uniformed services at the earliest opportunity.

Section 618—Revision of Enlistment Bonus Authority

This section would consolidate existing enlistment bonus authorities and establish a maximum amount of $20,000 that may be paid to any enlistee.

Section 619—Authorization of Retention Bonus for Members of the Armed Forces Qualified in a Critical Military Skill

The section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to implement a critical skill retention bonus program providing payments up to $200,000 over the course of the career of a military member effective 90 days after providing notice of the details of the program to Congress.

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense does not have a retention tool sufficiently flexible to allow skill-specific retention problems to be addressed in a timely manner.

Section 620—Elimination of Required Congressional Notification before Implementation of Certain Special Pay Authority

This section would eliminate the requirement for the secretary concerned to notify Congress of the intent to pay special pay to optometrists and nurse anesthetists.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Advance Payments for Temporary Lodging of Members and Dependents

This section would authorize advance payment of temporary lodging and living expenses incident to permanent changes in station.

Section 632—Additional Transportation Allowance Regarding Baggage and Household Effects

This section would authorize the secretaries concerned to reimburse a member for mandatory pet quarantine fees for household pets up to a maximum of $275 when the member incurs the fees incident to a permanent change of station.

Section 633—Equitable Dislocation Allowances for Junior Enlisted Members

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to increase the amount of dislocation allowance paid to service members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–4 to the amount paid to service members in pay grade E–5.

Section 634—Authority to Reimburse Military Recruiters, Senior ROTC Cadre, and Military Entrance Processing Personnel for Certain Parking Expenses

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse service members and civilian employees for expenses incurred in parking their privately owned vehicles at their duty locations if they are assigned to duty as a recruiter, with a military en-

trance processing facility, or with a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps detachment.

Section 635—Expansion of Funded Student Travel for Dependents

This section would authorize funded student travel payments to be made for students pursuing graduate and vocational education programs in addition to secondary and undergraduate education programs.

SUBTITLE D—RETIREMENT AND SURVIVOR BENEFIT MATTERS

Section 641—Increase in Maximum Number of Reserve Retirement Points That May be Credited in Any Year

This section would increase from 75 to 90 the maximum number of days in any one year that a reservist may accrue as credit towards retirement benefits by permitting a reservist to earn more points each year for attending drills, performing annual training and completing correspondence courses.

Section 642—Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan Spousal Consent Requirement

This section would require retirement-eligible reservists to obtain the concurrence of their spouses before making a decision to decline or defer participation in the Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan, to select a level of participation that is less than the maximum available, or to select the coverage of a child but not the spouse. This section would conform the procedures for the Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan to the procedures for the active component Survivor Benefit Plan.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 651—Participation in Thrift Savings Plan

This section would authorize active duty and reserve members of the uniformed services to deposit up to five percent of their basic pay, before tax, each month in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) now available for federal civil service employees. The section would not require the employing department to match the member's contributions. This section would also authorize members to deposit special pays, incentive pays, and bonuses into a TSP account up to the extent allowable under the Internal Revenue Code. The section would also authorize the secretary concerned to make contributions to the TSP account belonging to members serving in a critical specialty as a retention incentive.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee was encouraged by the early, strong commitment late last year by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to make major reforms in the Department of Defense health program a part of the budget request for fiscal year 2001.

Notwithstanding that commitment, the budget request unfortunately provided only a shadow of the program support and improvements recommended by the Joint Chiefs. The request was notably bereft of any initiatives to improve military health care benefits available to Medicare-eligible military retirees.

In the face of an incomplete reform effort by the Department of Defense, and in order to better understand the full range of reforms required, the committee undertook a deliberate oversight and fact finding effort that included field hearings. These hearings, as well as informal staff investigations and meetings, provided all stake holders—beneficiaries, advocacy groups, health care providers and contractors, as well as the Department of Defense—the ability to present options and information upon which the committee could base reform decisions. The oversight developed several significant findings, to include:

(1) The provision of a prescription drug benefit to Medicare-eligible military retirees and their dependents was given the highest priority by all stakeholders.

(2) Neither the Department of Defense, nor Congress, had sufficient information to move the currently running health care demonstration programs for the military Medicare-eligible beneficiaries from the demonstration to the permanent program stage.

(3) The cost to the Defense Health Program (DHP) to process claims was found to be three to four times that of Medicare's cost per claim. As a result, the committee determined that hundreds of millions of dollars annually could be saved through investment in reform of the DHP claims system.

(4) Access to care was severely hampered by the lack of effective use of information technology and funding limits that reduced use of military treatment facilities. The difficulty in getting access to care generated enormous frustration among beneficiaries with the TRICARE system.

(5) Despite a continuing promise that the medical benefits would be portable from one region of the country to the next, military personnel and their families repeatedly found that not to be the case.

To address these and other issues, the committee recommends a range of initiatives to improve and reform the DHP for all beneficiaries including active, retired and the Medicare-eligible. These reforms are explained in more detail below in their respective sec-

tions, but can be summarized as follows by saying that the committee recommends:

(1) Implementation of a TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program to provide the same level of benefits for Medicare-eligible military retirees as is now available to other TRICARE beneficiaries through the mail order pharmacy program and retail pharmacies.

(2) Extension until 2003 of the current Medicare related demonstration programs to ensure each program receives a fair and comprehensive test, with an independent oversight effort required to make recommendations to Congress on what a permanent program of health care for the Medicare-eligibles should provide.

(3) Claims processing reform, with additional investment funding recommended to the DHP to kick-start the reform effort.

(4) Required use of Internet based systems to help improve claims processing, access to health care and portability of benefits.

(5) Additional funding to increase use of the military treatment facilities through the hiring of additional support staff, refurbishment of facilities, and procurement of technology and equipment.

While the committee believes that the reforms recommended here will move DHP reform forward significantly, other challenges will remain to ensure that the DHP is adequately funded and managed. To that end, the committee recommendations also include requirements for the Secretary of Defense to determine if accrual funding of the DHP is necessary, and to assess whether mandatory enrollment of beneficiaries should be required as a possible future step.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Funding for the Defense Health Program

The committee is deeply concerned about the persistent inattention demonstrated by the Department of Defense to adequately fund the Defense Health Program. The committee received testimony that the underfunding will reach $6.0 billion over the future years defense plan. Two foreseeable and unfortunate responses by military health care managers to this chronic underfunding have resulted: reduced funding for maintenance and repair of facilities, and the delay or elimination of infrastructure and technology investments in order to avoid reductions in the provision of health care services. These two critical budget areas are key components of an effective Defense Health Program. Continuing to underfund these areas will result in less efficient facilities and, ultimately, in a reduction in the amount and quality of services available.

The committee is pleased by the active participation of the senior uniformed leadership of the Department of Defense in the important decisions affecting the management of the military health care system. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to foster this level of participation and to ensure the health system is funded to a level that not only provides for continuous patient care, but also invests in the health system infrastructure to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the system.

Preventive Health Care Services

The committee notes the recent report of the Secretary of Defense, prepared pursuant to the committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162) describing the scope of preventive health care benefits provided to all eligible TRICARE beneficiaries. The report favorably compared the TRICARE preventive benefits to those recommended by the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Family Physicians and the Agency for Health Research and Quality. At the committee's direction, the Secretary also evaluated implementation of the "Put Prevention into Practice" (PPIP) initiative prepared by each service and concluded that PPIP needs to be more effectively and uniformly implemented. The committee concurs with that assessment and directs the Secretary to submit a report by March 1, 2001, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the steps taken to improve the implementation of the PPIP initiative.

Report on Computer-Based Patient Record and Medical Records Tracking System

The committee notes the on-going cooperation between the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and the Indian Health Service to develop a Government Computer-Based Patient Record (GCPR) system. The GCPR system would serve as the core of a medical digital network by linking the agencies' currently incompatible health information systems to provide a life-long medical record for all service members. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report, beginning March 1, 2001, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the progress to date and the remaining timelines and tasks associated with integrating these medical information systems. The committee further directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the program with a focus on the agencies' plans for meeting critical GCPR milestones, including budget and cost estimates, and issues related to data quality, privacy, and security. The Comptroller General shall report on his findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2001.

While GCPR will provide for the timely transfer of patient records in the future, the committee has recently learned that the Military Personnel Records section of the National Personnel Records Center (NPRC) has been unable to provide timely retrieval of complete medical records needed for adjudication of claims filed with the VA. Many medical records needed by veterans cannot be retrieved because the records are filed according to the treating hospital or other facilities and copies or reference to hospitalization are normally not included in the service member's records. The committee understands that DOD has been working since 1995 on a Medical Records Tracking System (MRTS) to facilitate the supply of this information to the Medical Records Registry System being developed by the VA and the NPRC. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March

31, 2001, on the progress of the MRTS and any interim measures to assure that all hospital and medical records of service members can be easily identified.

Report on Mandatory Enrollment Program for TRICARE Beneficaries

The committee is aware that military beneficiaries are required to enroll in the Department of Defense TRICARE Prime option if they wish to participate in the managed care program. Enrollment provides the Department of Defense a valuable management tool on which manpower, budget, contracting, and other management decisions are based. The committee is concerned that the same degree of analytic rigor cannot be brought to bear on decisions related to beneficiaries using the point of service options under TRICARE because there is no mandatory enrollment requirement. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the benefits to be gained by requiring TRICARE beneficiaries to enroll in any of the Department's TRICARE programs. The study should include, but not be limited to, an analysis of the benefits of requiring eligible beneficiaries to enroll in TRICARE Prime or risk being prohibited from using the Department of Defense military treatment facilities. The report should include an analysis of the value of requiring all non-active duty beneficiaries to pay a small enrollment fee to enroll in any TRICARE program. The report shall be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 31, 2001.

SUBTITLE A—HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Section 701—Two-Year Extension of Authority for Use of Contract Physicians at Military Entrance Processing Stations and Elsewhere Outside Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would extend for two years, from December 31, 2000, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to contract with physicians to provide health care and new-recruit examination services at military entrance processing stations and other locations. The extension would permit the Secretary of Defense to complete tests of alternative methods for streamlining the new-recruit medical screening and make recommendations for changes to Congress.

Section 702—Medical and Dental Care for Medal of Honor Recipients

This section would authorize Medal of Honor recipients who are not otherwise entitled to military medical and dental care and the dependents of those recipients to be given medical and dental care in the same manner that such care is provided to former members who are entitled to military retired pay and the dependents of those former members.

Section 703—Provision of Domiciliary and Custodial Care for CHAMPUS Beneficiaries and Certain Former CHAMPUS Beneficiaries

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse certain former Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) beneficiaries for costs incurred for custodial or domiciliary care services during a period of temporary ineligibility for such services under CHAMPUS. The section would also authorize a maximum expenditure for the continuing custodial care program at $100.0 million.

Section 704—Demonstration Project for Expanded Access to Mental Health Counselors

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration project to determine the effect of increasing access to certified professional mental health counselors by removing the requirement for physician referral prior to engaging a counselor under the TRICARE program. The committee is aware that certified professional mental health counselors are only authorized to be reimbursed by TRICARE for treating military beneficiaries if a physician refers those beneficiaries to the counselors. The committee views this referral requirement as possibly unnecessary and would test the effect of lifting the requirement in a demonstration project to be conducted in one TRICARE region over a two year period.

Section 705—Teleradiology Demonstration Project

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to implement a teleradiology demonstration project for the purpose of increasing efficiency of operations and coordination between outlying clinics and a major military medical facility (MTF). The teleradiology initiative would be demonstrated at a multi-specialty tertiary care MTF with a university medical school affiliation and would link at least 5 geographically-dispersed Army, Navy and Air Force clinics as well as remote Department of Veterans Affairs and Coast Guard health care clinics. Once implemented, the initiative would be unique in having all but one of the medical facilities in a single TRICARE region using a common Composite Health Care System (CHCS) data platform. The committee expects this teleradiology initiative to increase the efficiency of patient and provider contacts, particularly in the need for follow-up diagnostic and therapeutic appointments. The project will demonstrate the usefulness of teleradiology by eliminating many follow-up appointments and accelerating the processing, reading and interpretation of radiographic exam imagery prior to providing clinical reports and consultation to the primary care providers in the outlying clinics. To fund this demonstration project in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $1.5 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM

Section 711—Additional Beneficiaries Under TRICARE Prime Remote Program in the Continental United States

This section would repeal the requirement for co-payments by family members of active duty military members under TRICARE Prime Remote and would require the same access and claims processing standards as would be available under TRICARE Prime. This section would also extend this program to all uniformed service personnel and their immediate family members as described in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee is concerned that family members accompanying an active duty member who is stationed in a location that is remote from military treatment facilities must pay TRICARE co-payments not normally required of active duty families that have access to military treatment facilities.

Section 712—Elimination of Copayments for Immediate Family

This section would repeal the requirement for co-payments by family members of active duty military members enrolled in TRICARE Prime.

The committee is aware that some active duty families enrolled in TRICARE Prime do not pay co-payments when they receive care in military treatment facilities, while others are required to pay co-payments for care received as a result of a referral from a military treatment facility to a civilian network provider when the required care is not available at the military treatment facility. This section would eliminate that inequity.

Section 713—Modernization of TRICARE Business Practices and Increase of Use of Military Treatment Facilities

This section would require managers for the Department of Defense TRICARE program to implement improvements in business practices by the end of fiscal year 2001, and would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan for improving TRICARE business practices by March 15, 2001, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services and require implementation of the plan by October 1, 2001. This section would also establish improvement benchmarks for the TRICARE program in the area of portability of the benefit. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to simplify and Internet-enable critical administrative processes within the military health system and TRICARE and authorize the Department of Defense to work with a managed care support contractor to build an open architecture model administration system in one TRICARE managed care region.

The committee also recommends an increase of $134.5 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program in fiscal year 2001 to be used solely for the purpose of maximizing the use of military treatment facilities. The committee recommends $85.5 million to provide additional support staff to primary care providers in the military direct care system, $20.0 million to support procurement of a local appointing and scheduling system, and

$29.0 million to support local customer service and support initiatives. While the committee expects these funds to be used to improve access at the military treatment facilities, the committee also directs that the planning and installation of the local appointing and scheduling and customer service operations be coordinated with the regional managed care support contractors in order to integrate and synchronize the local systems with regional applications the managed care support contractors might be operating to the maximum extent possible.

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense is not taking full advantage of business practices and technologies that could result in increased provider satisfaction or budgetary savings, which could be redirected to providing increased benefits. The committee believes opportunities exist for immediate improvements in the areas of claims processing, appointment access, and benefit portability. The committee also continues to be concerned that the scheduling of appointments for beneficiaries is difficult. Many of the administrative procedures currently employed by TRICARE program managers and claims administrators are relics of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) program. The model system would fully exploit all available technologies to enhance beneficiary and provider satisfaction and improve TRICARE efficiency.

Section 714—Claims Processing Improvements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement several changes to the TRICARE claims processing system. These actions include: replacing the Health Care Service Record (HCSR) with the TRICARE Encounter Data system, separating the HCSR and claims payment components of the claims adjudication and payment system, requiring high volume TRICARE providers to submit claims by electronic means, and increasing the use of automated voice response unit systems for determining claims status. The committee has also coordinated with the research and development subcommittee to recommend an increase of $3.6 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program in fiscal year 2001 to be used only for the purpose of implementing the TRICARE Encounter Data system as a replacement for the HCSR during fiscal year 2001. During field hearings and in discussions with TRICARE providers, the committee learned that providers were dissatisfied with TRICARE payment levels seemingly unnecessary, administrative requirements and continuing slow claims payment practices. The committee notes the concern of health care providers that the timeliness of claims processing continues to be a problem, hampering the program's ability to attract and retain qualified health care providers. Several witnesses also testified that processing TRICARE claims could cost three to four times the cost of similar Medicare claims. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to spend money on administration that could be used to provide valuable benefits to military beneficiaries.

Section 715—Prohibition Against Requirement for Prior Authorization for Certain Referrals; Report on Nonavailability-of-Health-Care Statements

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from requiring any TRICARE managed care support contractors to establish prior approval requirements among network providers.

The committee is concerned that some TRICARE patients are being needlessly required to seek approval prior to being referred to another specialist or institution within the TRICARE network of providers and institutions.

Section 716—Authority to Establish Special Locality-Based Reimbursement Rates; Reports

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish higher rates for reimbursement for services in some localities under certain conditions.

The committee is aware that there are a few areas in the United States where recruitment of health care providers into the TRICARE provider networks is hampered by TRICARE provider reimbursement rates which are unusually low, compared to the prevailing local or other governmental reimbursement rates.

Section 717—Reimbursement for Certain Travel Expenses

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse TRICARE beneficiaries for their reasonable expenses incurred while traveling to a referral more than 100 miles from the location at which they normally receive their primary care services. Provisions under TRICARE managed care support contracts require network providers to limit their referrals to specialists available within a one hour drive. However, exceptions are allowed under certain circumstances. These so called "drive time waivers" can require TRICARE beneficiaries to travel great distances at their own expense only because a particular specialist is not available within the local network of TRICARE providers. To fund this policy change in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $15.0 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

Section 718—Reduction of Catastrophic Cap

This section would reduce the maximum amount retired TRICARE beneficiaries could pay under TRICARE to $3000 per family. To fund this policy change in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $32.0 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

TRICARE beneficiaries not enrolled in TRICARE Prime face potential medical expenses of up to $7500 per family. The committee is concerned that as a result of the decreasing amount of space available care to which the retired beneficiary population has access, more families of retired military personnel who are not enrolled in TRICARE Prime will face these burdensome medical expenses.

Section 719—Report on Protections Against Health Care Providers Seeking Direct Reimbursement from Members of the Uniformed Services

The section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report by January 31, 2001, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on ways to discourage or prohibit TRICARE health care providers from seeking inappropriate direct reimbursement from military service members or their families for eligible health care services.

The committee is concerned that the financial credit status of military service members or their family members is being adversely affected by the inability of health care providers to receive reimbursements from TRICARE in a timely manner.

Section 720—Disenrollment Process for TRICARE Retiree Dental Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit retirees who enrolled in the Department of Defense Retiree Dental Program to disenroll from the program under certain circumstances.

SUBTITLE C–HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS FOR MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BENEFICIARIES

Section 721—Implementation of TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program

This section would authorize establishment of the TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program. The TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program would provide Medicare eligible military retirees and their eligible family members the same pharmacy benefit as is currently available to other military health care beneficiaries through the TRICARE preferred provider and fee-for-service options commonly referred to as TRICARE Extra and TRICARE Standard. No enrollment fee or premium would be required, but the co-pays and out of network deductible expenses normally associated with these programs would apply. Participation in the program would also require Medicare-eligible military retirees and their eligible family members to be enrolled in the Medicare Part B supplemental medical insurance program. The TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program would make available the full range of prescription pharmaceuticals now offered through the Department of Defense TRICARE uniform formulary and preserves the beneficiaries' right to choose a non-network pharmacy when that is their best choice. Participants in the TRICARE Senior Pharmacy Program would continue to be eligible to use the pharmacies located in military treatment facilities. To fund this requirement in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $94.0 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

Section 722—Study on Health Care Options for Medicare-Eligible Military Retirees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on alternatives for providing continued health care benefits for Medicare-eligible military retirees. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct the study through an agreement with a federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) and require the Secretary of Defense to appoint an independent committee to advise the Secretary and the FFRDC on the conduct of the study. To fund this requirement in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $2.0 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

Section 723—Extended Coverage Under Federal Employees Health Benefits Program

This section would extend the period of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) demonstration program for one year and would require the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary actions to encourage participation in the program to its full-authorized enrollment level of 66,000 persons.

The committee is concerned that the FEHBP demonstration program has not attracted sufficient retirees to be considered a true test of its value as an alternative source of health care benefits for military retirees. In the selection of additional sites for this program, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to select at least one site with at least 5,000 military retirees served by multiple military installations. The committee expects such a site would show evidence that retirees are heavily reliant on the local Department of Veterans Administration hospitals and outpatient clinics, thereby demonstrating the attractiveness of the FEHBP option relative to Departments of Defense and Veterans Administration facilities. The committee also expects such a site to be representative of both urban and rural populations in order to test the attractiveness of the FEHBP option for persons with easy access to military treatment facilities as well as those residing in locations more remote from military treatment facilities.

The committee is aware that some beneficiaries are reluctant to sign up for the FEHBP program because of concerns about health insurance availability, without any assurance of continuation in the elected FEHBP option, when the test period ends. Congress anticipated this concern in the original authorization for the program and provided assured availability of standard Medigap plans. Unfortunately, the Department of Defense marketing materials for this demonstration program failed to effectively convey this assurance thereby leading potential enrollees to believe they might be without any health insurance options at the conclusion of the demonstration program. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary to modify all marketing materials in such a way as to make clear to potential enrollees that alternative health care insurance will be available at the conclusion of the demonstration project.

Section 724—Extension of TRICARE Senior Supplement Program

This section would extend the period of the TRICARE Senior Supplement Program for one year. The committee is concerned that several Department of Defense TRICARE demonstration programs will not be in effect for sufficient time to permit a complete evaluation of their desirability as an alternative TRICARE benefit or their effectiveness as health benefit management tools.

Section 725—Extension of TRICARE Senior Prime Demonstration Project

This section would extend to December 31, 2003, the Senior Prime Demonstration to make the project consistent with the termination date of other demonstration projects.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 731—Training in Health Care Management and Administration

The section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the continued implementation of section 715 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106). This section would increase the number of senior management positions requiring professional management and administrative experience. Section 715 directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the training of Department of Defense health care managers. Since the submission of that report, the TRICARE managed care environment has changed significantly and even more change lies on the horizon. The committee is concerned that Department of Defense personnel are not being properly prepared before being assigned to duties requiring expert knowledge of the managed care environment.

Section 732—Study of Accrual Financing for Health Care for Military Retirees

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the feasibility and desirability of financing the military health care program for uniformed services retirees on an accrual basis. The committee expects the study be conducted by an organization, which has expertise in financial programs, retirement systems, actuarial methodologies and health care financing and is independent of the Department of Defense. To fund this requirement in fiscal year 2001, the committee authorizes an increase of $2.0 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program.

Section 733—Tracking Patient Safety in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a system of indicators, standards, and protocols necessary to track patient safety. The Department of Defense does not have a process

to systematically report, compile and analyze errors in the provision of health care under the Defense Health Program.

Section 734—Pharmaceutical Identification Technology

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement a pharmaceutical bar code identification program to improve the safety of Department of Defense pharmacy programs. The committee notes that similar pharmaceutical bar code identification applications utilized by the private sector have resulted in significant improvements in patient safety.

Section 735—Management of Vaccine Immunization Program

This section would strengthen Congressional oversight of the Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP). The Department of Defense Inspector General and the Defense Contract Audit Agency have both been critical of the management of financial aspects of the program. The committee is concerned that poor financial practices could lead to wasteful expenditures. The committee is also concerned that these practices, if continued, could undermine service members' confidence in the program itself. Therefore, the committee would require the Secretary of Defense to implement several initiatives to strengthen oversight of the program. These actions include: require the Secretary to keep track of and report separations resulting from refusal to participate in the program; require clear guidance for emergency essential civilian personnel who are participating in AVIP; require the Secretary of Defense to put uniform medical and administrative exemptions into regulation; improve the system for the monitoring of adverse reactions including "active surveillance" and long term follow-up; require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan of action for modernizing all-force protection immunizations and avoid using a single manufacturer wherever possible; require reports on financial and overall program management.

Section 736—Study on Feasibility of Sharing Biomedical Research Facility

Modern biomedical research requires highly sophisticated equipment, sufficient research facilities and a highly skilled and educated workforce. The committee recognizes the desire of the Army to expand its research capabilities and commends its efforts to partner with the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), particularly at the Tripler Army Medical Center (TAMC). The partnering successes between TAMC, VA and the School of Medicine at the University of Hawaii (UH) has allowed for further collaboration. The committee understands that the Army is interested in expanding their research capabilities, but acknowledges the scarcity of funds to expand research. The committee believes that it would be advantageous for the Army to conduct a feasibility study for a medical research facility to be shared by TAMC, VA, and UH that includes a clinical research center, educational, academic, and laboratory research space to better leverage its limited research funds. The committee authorizes an additional $2.5 million in the amount requested for the Defense Health Program to fund this study.

Section 737—Chiropractic Health Care for Members on Active Duty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a plan to phase in over a period of five years, permanent chiropractic services for all active duty military personnel. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to continue to provide the same level of chiropractic health care services and benefits during fiscal year 2001 as were provided during fiscal year 2000. The committee intends that the scope of services offered under this section would include, at a minimum, care for neuro-musculoskeletal conditions typical among military personnel on active duty. The committee does not intend that the scope of chiropractic services should be limited to the treatment of conditions of the lower back.

Section 738—VA/DOD Sharing Agreements for Health Services

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to give full force and effect to any sharing agreement entered into between the Veterans Health Administration and the Department of Defense treatment facilities. The section would also require the Secretary of Defense over the next year to review all sharing agreements.

The committee is concerned that some payments from the Department of Defense to the Department of Veterans Affairs under existing VA/DOD sharing agreements are not being made in accordance with the agreements.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Procurement of Military Clothing and Clothing-Related Items by Military Installations in the United States

Pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) the Department of Defense Inspector General performed an audit of purchases of military clothing and clothing-related items in excess of the micro-purchase threshold by military installations during fiscal years 1996 and 1997 to determine the extent to which such procurements did not comply with the Buy American Act. The committee is concerned with the number of violations of the Buy American Act identified in the audit. The committee directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to perform a follow-up audit on the purchases of military clothing and clothing-related items in excess of the micro-purchase threshold by military installations during fiscal years 1998 and 1999. The audit shall also include an evaluation of DOD actions, if any, taken since the original audit in order to improve compliance by military installations with the Buy American Act.

Compliance with Applicable Labor Laws in Procurement of Military Clothing

The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees, no later than April 1, 2001, any information indicating non-compliance with applicable labor laws by contractors supplying military clothing and clothing-related items. Emphasis shall be placed on proper wage payments and scales. This information shall be gathered pursuant to compliance checking required by part 22 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 801—Extension of Authority for Department of Defense Acquisition Pilot Programs; Reports Required

This section would amend the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) to extend until fiscal year 2005 the acquisition pilot programs originally authorized by that Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit, no later than January 1, 2001, a report evaluating the success of these pilot programs.

Section 802—Technical Data Rights for Items Developed Exclusively at Private Expense

This section would amend section 2320 of title 10, United States Code, by modifying the circumstances under which a contractor would be considered responsive to a solicitation. This section would authorize the Department to negotiate with a potential contractor the United States rights to technical data, developed exclusively at private expense, when the technical data is necessary for normal operations, maintenance, installation, or training. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations describing the difference between normal and critical operations, maintenance, installation, or training.

Section 803—Management of Acquisition of Mission-Essential Software for Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to designate a Director of Mission-Essential Software Management. The Director would oversee development and management of software embedded in software intensive defense acquisition programs.

The committee expects the Director to seek advice from a wide range of organizations and officials, including the Chief Information Officer for the Department of Defense and the Software Program Managers Network. The committee also expects the Director to examine issues best software management practices such as a set of standard metrics, strong risk management analysis, interoperability, and opportunities for reuse of software.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 2001, that identifies plans implemented and recommendations made to improve the acquisition, management, development, and maintenance of mission essential software for major defense acquisition programs. The report shall also describe any necessary legislation needed to carry out plans and recommendations.

Section 804—Extension of Waiver Period for Live-Fire Survivability Testing for MH–47E and MH–60K Helicopter Modification Programs

This section would amend section 142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive the survivability testing requirements of section 2366 of title 10, United States Code, for the MH–47E and MH–60 K helicopters prior to full materiel release of those systems.

Section 805—Three-Year Extension of Authority of Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to Carry Out Certain Prototype Projects

This section would amend section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), by extending for three years the authority of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the military departments, and other offi-

cials designated by the Secretary of Defense to carry out prototype projects using transactions other than contracts, cooperative agreements, and grants, which must be executed with statutes or regulations applicable to contracts.

The committee believes that other transaction authority is an important acquisition tool that facilitates integration of the civilian and military industrial bases and incorporation of commercial technology into military weapon systems. The flexibility of the other transaction authority provides the Department the opportunity to streamline the procurement process, facilitate development of contractor strategic relationship, take advantage of innovative or commercial business practices, and attract companies that do not traditionally do business with the Department of Defense. In an environment where commercial industry is leading defense in many technological areas and defense budgets are declining, it is imperative that the Department continue to have the flexibility provided by this tool to use innovative contractual instruments that provide the opportunity to broaden the technology and industrial base or foster new relationships and practices that support our national security.

Section 806—Certification of Major Automated Information Systems as to Compliance with Clinger-Cohen Act

This section would require that in each of the next three fiscal years the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer certify that each major automated information system is in compliance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 prior to granting milestone approval. This section would also require the Chief Information Officer for the Department of Defense to notify the Congressional defense committees upon each decision to label a major automated information system as a special interest major technology initiative.

Section 807—Limitations on Procurement of Certain Items

This section would amend section 2534 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the limitations on the procurement of ball bearings and roller bearings. This section would also extend the limitations on the procurement of naval valves for another three fiscal years, and authorize limitations on the procurement of polyacrylonitrile based carbon fiber for the next three fiscal years.

Section 808—Multiyear Services Contracts

This section would amend section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that this section applies to the multiyear procurement of property, as well as to the multiyear procurement of services.

Section 809—Study on Impact of Foreign Sourcing of Systems on Long-Term Military Readiness and Related Industrial Infrastructure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study and provide a report to Congress on whether parts, components, and materials of certain systems are obtained through domestic sources

or from foreign sources, and the impact on military readiness of purchasing such items from foreign sources.

Section 810—Prohibition Against Use of Department of Defense Funds to Give or Withhold a Preference to a Marketer or Vendor of Firearms or Ammunition

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from using a preference for the procurement of items from a marketer or vendor of firearms or ammunition that has entered into an agreement to abide by a designated code of conduct, operating practice, or product design.

Section 811—Study and Report on Practice of Contract Bundling in Military Construction Contracts

This section would require the General Accounting Office to study the use of "contract bundling" in military construction contracts. A report on the study findings would be due to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2001.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs

The committee notes that section 914 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs at the National Defense University. Although the Secretary established this center on March 1, 2000, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not placed sufficient priority on ensuring that the center can carry out its mandate. The committee is especially concerned that the Department has not identified a source of funding for the center to allow it to proceed with hiring a permanent director and implementing the research, conference, and other activities for which the center was established.

The committee reiterates its belief that the center should play a central role in assessing political, strategic, and military developments within the People's Republic of China and the security implications of the evolving U.S.-China relationship. The committee believes the importance of the center is highlighted by recent developments in the evolution of Chinese military capability and strategic thought.

The committee believes that these developments reinforce the need to move forward rapidly with the appointment of a permanent director for the center by June 1, 2000, and to ensure that the center is fully operational by June 1, 2001, as required by Public Law 106–65. The committee is aware of proposals by the center's interim director for the center to identify and hire research scholars, create a high-level Board of Visitors, establish a working group, and conduct at least one conference this year. The committee encourages the Department to provide adequate funding to the center in order to allow planned activities to proceed in a timely manner.

Finally, the committee expects the Department to facilitate the center's mission of informing government policymakers, including Congress, of the national goals and strategic posture of the People's Republic of China and that country's ability to develop and deploy effective military power in support of its national strategic objectives. In this regard, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to provide the committee with regular reports on the activities and research findings of the center.

Management Headquarters

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the Department of Defense supports an estimated 60,867 positions performing management headquarters functions, an increase in personnel of nearly 30 percent over the revised fiscal year 1999 level as reported to Congress in March of this year. The committee is aware that this personnel increase is a result of a statutorily mandated directive contained in section 921 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), which was intended to more accurately capture the Department's personnel level of effort in support of management headquarters activities.

The committee continues to strongly believe that management headquarters reductions must be in alignment with overall personnel cuts that have occurred throughout the Department. However, the fiscal year 2001 budget request, after adjusting for the revised baseline, only reduces management headquarters positions by 734 from the fiscal year 2000 estimate, far below the mandated 3,182 positions required by section 921. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of funding for management headquarters activities as provided elsewhere in this report.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 901—Change of Title of Certain Positions in the Headquarters, Marine Corps

This section would abolish the positions of Chief of Staff and Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of Staff from Headquarters, Marine Corps, authorized by sections 5041 and 5045 of title 10, United States Code, respectively. This section would also authorize five Deputy Commandant positions within the Marine Corps. The committee understands that this section would not change the current staffing requirements of the Marine Corps.

Section 902—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition and Support Workforce

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to implement 13,000 reductions in the Defense acquisition workforce in fiscal year 2001. This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by May 1, 2001, containing an implementation plan for re-shaping, recruiting, and sustaining the Department's acquisition workforce and any changes in statutory authorities that the Secretary deems necessary.

The committee is aware that the Department has programmed personnel reductions of 11,800 full-time equivalents (FTEs) in fiscal year 2001 in the defense acquisition workforce, as defined in section 931 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). Since 1996, however, the Department has exceeded its annual reduction goals within the acquisition workforce. The committee supports continued reductions in this area for the purposes of reducing costly overhead, encouraging cross-functional acquisition relationships between the

military services, and improving the acquisition process. In addition, the committee believes the Department must reorganize and streamline its acquisition structure to capitalize on rapidly changing technology and industry practices.

Section 903—Clarification of Scope of Inspector General Authorities under Military Whistleblower Law

This section would authorize the inspectors general of the defense agencies and joint service organizations and civilian employees assigned as inspectors general elsewhere within the Department of Defense to receive and process protected communications and reprisal allegations from members of the armed forces under section 1034 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 904—Report on Number of Personnel Assigned to Legislative Liaison Functions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a report identifying all personnel assigned to legislative affairs and legislative liaison offices throughout the military departments and all defense agencies not later than December 1, 2000.

The committee has long benefited from the Department's various legislative affairs offices and relies on these offices to provide timely and accurate information and to respond to numerous inquires daily. However, the committee is concerned by the increasing number of legislative affairs, or liaison offices throughout the Department. The committee notes that there are now legislative affairs or legislative liaison offices at nearly every unified and specified command, at major military commands, and at most defense agencies. The committee questions how the necessary coordination between these separate various offices and the primary legislative affairs offices of the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries of the military departments can be effectively accomplished.

Section 905—Joint Report on Establishment of National Collaborative Information Analysis Capability

The committee is aware of the emerging capability to collect and analyze information using the latest computer technology to leverage the ability of analysts. The committee notes that this capability to discern meaningful intelligence from disparate data has, to this moment, been best demonstrated through the work of the Army's Land Information Warfare Activity's (LIWA) recent analysis conducted at the request of the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The committee believes that this data mining capability must be rapidly and fully developed as strong foundation for future efforts to support national defense against new and growing worldwide asymmetrical threats.

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to determine the proper architecture for a collaborative operations and analysis capability to fuse the distributed efforts of the more than thirty appropriate entities into a national level center. However, the committee realizes that several approaches are under consider-

ation, including the Joint Counterintelligence Assessment Group and the National Analysis and Operations Hub concepts. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision, (sec. 905) that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence to prepare a joint report assessing alternatives for the establishment of a national information analysis capability. The provision would also require that the Secretary of Defense take maximum advantage of the data mining, profiling and analysis capability of the LIWA.

Section 906—Organization and Management of Civil Air Patrol

This section would revise section 9441 of title 10, United States Code to define more clearly the relationship between the United States Air Force and the Civil Air Patrol (CAP). This section would also authorize a new board of governors for the CAP to include representatives from the Air Force, the CAP, and from outside interests, and would also make numerous changes in the organization of the CAP to improve administrative and financial management.

Section 907—Report on Network Centric Warfare

This section would require a report on Network Centric Warfare (NCW). It would require the Secretary of Defense to clearly define NCW, and outline the conceptual, doctrinal and operational concepts surrounding NCW. It would also require the Secretary to outline how NCW is related the overall strategy for military transformation. Finally, the Secretary would be required to report on any acquisition programs and experiments that are planned or currently underway that relate to NCW.

Historically, revolutions in military affairs (RMA) have occurred when new technologies imbedded in a significant number of military systems, combined with innovative operational concepts, have fundamentally altered the nature of armed conflict. This combination often significantly increases the combat power and military effectiveness of military forces. The committee recognizes that due to the rapid advances in information technology, such a condition may exist today.

One possible concept proposed in relation to the emerging RMA is the idea of Network Centric Warfare (NCW). According to proponents, NCW will integrate emerging technologies to create a "system-of-systems" that will enable the U.S. military to apply force with dramatically greater efficiency while simultaneously reducing the risk to U.S. forces. While there has been much discussion of this concept within the Department, no consensus on the definition, operational concepts, doctrine, programs or experiments relating to NCW has emerged. The committee also recognizes that some detractors are critical of NCW believing it is an attempt to impose a technically rigid theory of warfare on the inherent chaos of armed conflict.

The committee believes this to be an important debate and recognizes the potential enhancement in military capability that could result from transformation concepts such as NCW. Therefore, the committee looks forward to the Department's assessment and to the resultant debate on this issue.

Section 908—Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish and operate the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation. The purpose of the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation would be to provide professional education and training to military, law enforcement, and civilian personnel of nations of the Western Hemisphere in defense and security matters. The section would require that the curriculum of the Institute include a minimum of eight hours of instruction per student in human rights, the rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society. The section would additionally establish a board of visitors to oversee the activities and curriculum of the Institute and require the board to submit a report to the Secretary of Defense and, in turn, to Congress. This section would strike the authority for the Secretary of the Army to operate the School of the Americas contained in section 4415 of title 10, United States Code, and direct the Secretary of Defense to take such steps as he deems necessary to ensure that the Secretary of the Army provides for the transition of the School of the Americas into the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation.

The committee affirms its long-standing support for the mission of the Army School of the Americas to enhance military professionalism and respect for democratic values throughout Latin America. The committee notes the significant contribution the School has played in advancing democratization in the hemisphere over the past two decades. However, the committee is aware of persistent concerns that the School of the Americas does not focus sufficient classroom attention upon critical issues such as rule of law and civilian control of the military within the countries of Latin America. While the committee believes that these concerns are unfounded, the committee recognizes the need to implement fundamental changes to the School of the Americas to ensure that its student curriculum is properly structured. Accordingly, the committee proposes to eliminate the School of the Americas and establish in its place the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation. The committee believes that the establishment of a board of visitors with a broad mandate to examine the activities and curriculum of the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation will serve to address any future concerns associated with the operations of the program.

The committee believes a relationship should exist between the duration of courses offered at the Institute and instruction in human rights, rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consider initiatives to increase such instruction beyond eight hours, where practicable. The committee recommends the Secretary consider a minimum of twelve hours of instruction in human rights, rule of law, due process, civilian control of the military, and the role of the military in a democratic society for each student attending courses of the Institute for up to eight weeks duration; twenty four hours

of instruction for courses between eight and fifteen weeks duration; and forty hours of instruction for courses over fifteen weeks duration.

Section 909—Department of Defense Regional Centers for Security Studies

This section would consolidate in title 10, United States Code, various authorities that currently exist regarding the operation of Department of Defense regional centers for security studies. It would also require congressional notification of an intent to establish additional regional centers and an annual report to Congress by the Secretary of Defense on the status, objectives, and operations of the regional centers.

Section 910—Change in Name of Armed Forces Staff College to Joint Forces Staff College

The section would strike the reference to Armed Forces Staff College contained in section 2165 of title 10, United States Code, and insert in its place Joint Forces Staff College.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2001 for counter-drug activities includes an expanding commitment by the Department of Defense to support the government of Colombia in its counter-drug efforts. In particular, the budget request would support the training and equipping of two Colombian army counter-drug battalions in addition to naval riverine units, upgrade Colombian military aircraft, and expand intelligence collection in Colombia. The committee notes with concern that the budget request continues the trend of requesting authorization of appropriations for foreign military assistance through the Department of Defense as opposed to the Department of State.

The committee is aware that the escalating production of cocaine and heroin in Colombia has fueled the ongoing conflict between the government of Colombia and armed insurgents and paramilitary groups. The increasing level of violence within Colombia continues to cause instability throughout the region and has specifically strained the ability of the governments of Panama, Ecuador, and Peru to respond adequately to incursions by Colombian drug trafficking organizations, guerrillas, and paramilitary forces. The committee recognizes the important contribution that the Department of Defense can play in support of these regional allies as part of a comprehensive and coordinated effort by the United States to contain the drug trade. However, as noted in the committee report on H.R. 1401 (H. Rept. 106–162), the committee remains concerned with the appropriateness of expanding the role of the Department of Defense in support of Colombian governmental security forces and, in particular, the force protection risks for U.S. military personnel stationed or assigned to temporary duty in Colombia.

The committee continues to support a robust Department of Defense counter-drug program and notes the challenges to U.S. Southern Command with the 1999 closure of Howard Air Force Base in Panama that served as a key installation for aircraft monitoring the source and transit zones. The committee notes that long-term agreements for the establishment of forward operating locations (FOLs) for drug interdiction purposes at Manta, Ecuador, and Curacao and Aruba in the Netherlands Antilles, were recently secured and that limited operations are ongoing at these sites. The committee also notes the testimony provided by senior officials of the Department of Defense that an FOL in Central America is crucial in confronting drug trafficking by the way of the Eastern Pa-

cific. The committee has raised concern over the prior two fiscal years that the Department has failed to resource adequately the gaps in Eastern Pacific detection and monitoring despite increased usage by maritime drug traffickers. Therefore, the committee is encouraged that a long-term FOL agreement with the government of El Salvador is pending and urges the Secretary of the Navy, as executive agent, to utilize fully such an FOL for the conduct of detection and monitoring flights over the Eastern Pacific transit zone.

Funding

The budget request for counter-drug activities contained $836.3 million for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $155.9 million for operational tempo, which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget request represents a net increase of $48.2 million from the fiscal year 2000 budget request of $788.1 million, and a decrease of $10.6 million for operational tempo from the previous budget request of $166.5 million. The committee understands that the overall increase in the fiscal year 2001 counter-drug budget request is attributed to increased activities in Colombia.

The committee recommends authorization for Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows:

[Dollars in thousands]

FY01 Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Request	$836,300
Educate America's Youth	23,029
Increase Safety of Citizens	81,974
Reduce Health & Social Costs	74,754
Shield America's Frontiers	339,486
Break Drug Sources of Supply	317,057
Recommended Decreases:	
Air National Guard Fighter Operations	5,000
Coastal Patrol Equipment Procurement	3,000
Recommended Increases:	
Operation Caper Focus	6,000
Puerto Rico ROTHR Security	1,200
Southwest Border Fence	6,000
Recommendation	841,500

Items of Special Interest

Air National Guard Fighter Operations

The committee notes the fighter operations of the Air National Guard previously located at Howard Air Force Base, Panama, in support of the Department of Defense counter-drug program have relocated to Curacao, Netherlands Antilles, and are currently conducting operations. The committee further notes that in fiscal year 1999, the Air National Guard was funded at $7.2 million for this purpose. The fiscal year 2001 budget request included $15.8 million for this purpose, due in part to the high cost of temporary duty for pilots and crews in Curacao. However, the committee believes the budget request significantly overstates the actual costs associated with planned operations and, therefore, recommends a reduction of $5.0 million for this purpose.

Coastal Patrol equipment procurement

The budget request contained $3.0 million for the continued installation of Combatant Craft Retrieval Systems (CCRS) on two Navy Coastal Patrol ships. The committee is aware that such equipment supports various activities of the Special Operations Command, but understands that CCRS provides slight benefit for the conduct of counter-drug operations. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $3.0 million for this program.

Operation Caper Focus

The committee notes with concern that the budget request failed to support fully Operation Caper Focus, a valuable, ongoing operation to disrupt maritime narcotics trafficking in the Eastern Pacific. The committee continues to support strongly this important operation and, therefore, recommends an increase of $6.0 million for this purpose.

Puerto Rico ROTHR security

The committee understands the Relocatable Over-The-Horizon Radar (ROTHR) based in Puerto Rico will greatly enhance the effectiveness of the interagency effort to curtail the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States. The committee supports strongly the ROTHR program but notes with concern that the Navy's planned transfer of land on the western side of Vieques, Puerto Rico, would leave the ROTHR without adjacent federal property. The Navy, as executive agent for the program, recognizes the inadequacy of its force protection plan for the ROTHR but the committee notes the budget request does not contain funding for this purpose. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $1.2 million for security enhancements of the ROTHR facility.

Southwest border fence

The committee remains concerned with the increased smuggling of narcotics across the Southwest border in the San Diego County, California, area. The committee is aware that the Southwest border continues to be one of the most heavily utilized drug trafficking corridors into the United States. Accordingly, the committee believes that existing fence and road-building activities must continue and recommends an increase of $6.0 million for this purpose.

OTHER MATTERS

Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee reiterates its concern over the pending Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). Previous attempts to define U.S. national security interests in the post-Cold War world have been less than satisfactory, as have efforts to identify the proper national military strategy and the force structure required to execute that strategy. The committee has previously expressed its view that any defense strategy should be designed to protect the full range of U.S. national security interests and that forces should be sufficient to do so at the lowest possible risk.

The committee reemphasizes this view and reminds the Department that the QDR should be driven by the demands of strategy and should not be constrained by any presupposition about the size of future defense budgets. Previous reviews, including the 1996 Quadrennial Defense Review and the 1993 Bottom-Up Review, were budget-driven exercises that reduced the size of the armed forces by approximately 40 percent from 1991 levels. Neither study recommended a substantial change to the way the services were structured or organized. This reduced force, coupled with a national security strategy of "engagement and enlargement," has increased operations tempo 300 percent over Cold War levels.

Currently, the force is ostensibly sized and structured to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts. However, the requirement to forward deploy forces on an ever-increasing number of peacekeeping and humanitarian missions on a rotational basis with a force designed to fight major theater wars has strained military readiness. In addition, the committee believes that not enough attention is paid by the Department of Defense to future threats facing this nation and the requirement to maintain forces to meet these threats. These include the rise of a near-peer competitor and the difficulties posed by asymmetric threats, including weapons of mass destruction, improved ballistic missile technology, and cyber-attacks against critical infrastructure.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take a comprehensive approach to the QDR and to develop an honest and realistic assessment of the vital national security interests of this nation. With these interests in mind, the QDR should provide recommendations for a force that is sized and structured to meet the challenges of this new era.

Department of Defense Personnel Security Investigation Requirements Priorities

The federal government uses personnel security investigations to determine whether individuals should be granted access to classified information. These investigations are a critical first step in safeguarding national security information. The committee is concerned over the results of a review conducted by the Comptroller General that established that Department of Defense personnel security investigations are often incomplete and are not conducted in a timely manner. Moreover, there does not seem to be a prioritization scheme for these investigations to ensure that those with the most sensitive duties are investigated first and subject to more frequent review and update.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the service secretaries and heads of defense agencies, to develop a means of quantifying requirements for personnel security investigations for clearances and of prioritizing categories of personnel involved in duties requiring access to the most sensitive national security information. This prioritization scheme should ensure that personnel with sensitive positions should be subject to background investigation review and update at least every five years to ensure the currency of relevant information. Priority categories should be used to guide the submission and expeditious completion of background investigations on personnel with the

most sensitive duties. The Secretary shall submit a report describing the Department's efforts to establish a prioritization scheme and to provide more timely and complete personnel security investigations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than March 1, 2001.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE AU—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would permit the transfer of amounts of authorizations made available in Division A of the bill for any fiscal year to any other authorization made available in Division A upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such a transfer would be in the national interest. The provision would provide the authorization for reprogramming involving the transfer of authorization between amounts authorized as set out in bill language.

The authority to transfer could only be used to provide authorization for higher priority items than the items from which authorization was transferred and could not be used to provide authorization for an item that was denied authorization by Congress. The Secretary of Defense would be required to notify the Congress promptly of transfers. The total amount of transfers would be limited to $2.0 billion. Historically, the transfer authority authorized has changed as follows:

	Billions
FY85–88	2.00
FY89–91	3.00
FY92	2.25
FY93	1.50
FY94–00	2.00

Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex

This section would incorporate the classified annex prepared by the Committee on Armed Services into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

Section 1003—Authorization of Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2000

This section would extend authorization to those defense items appropriated pursuant to the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. Specifically, $5,254,346,000 of national defense appropriations in the Act would be authorized as follows:

Department of Defense

Title I, Chapter 2:
$185,800,000 for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense.
Title I, Chapter 4:
$116,523,000 for Military Construction, Defense-Wide.
Title II, Chapter 2:
$19,532,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army;
$20,565,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy;

$37,155,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps;
$30,065,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force;
$40,000,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide;
$2,174,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve;
$2,851,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard;
$2,050,400,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund;
$73,000,000 for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force;
$3,533,000 for Defense Health Program.

Section 2202:
$1,556,200,000 for Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund.

Section 2204:
$125,000,000 for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.

Section 2205:
$854,500,000 for Defense Health Program.

Title II, Chapter 4:
$12,348,000 for Military Construction, Army Reserve.

Section 2401:
$2,000,000 for Family Housing, Army.
$3,000,000 for Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps.
$1,700,000 for Family Housing, Air Force.

Department of Energy

Title III, Chapter 3:
$63,000,000 for Other Defense Activities.

Title IV, Chapter 1:
$55,000,000 for Weapons Activities.

Section 1004—Contingent Repeal of Certain Provisions Shifting Certain Outlays from One Fiscal Year to Another

This section would repeal, subject to inclusion in appropriations acts, provisions of fiscal year 2000 appropriations acts that delayed obligations of Department of Defense funds for pay and benefits and progress payments.

Section 1005—Limitation on Funds for Bosnia and Kosovo Peacekeeping Operations for Fiscal Year 2001

This section would limit the amount of funds available for peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo to the amounts contained in the budget request, $1,387.8 million for operations in Bosnia and $1,650.4 million for operations in Kosovo. The provision would authorize the president to waive the limitation after submitting to the Congress a written certification that the waiver is necessary to the national security interests of the United States. This section would also require a written certification that the exercise of the waiver will not adversely affect the readiness of U.S. military forces; a report setting forth the reasons for the waiver, a discussion of the impact of the involvement of U.S. military forces in Balkans peacekeeping operations on U.S. military readiness; and a supplemental appropriations request for the Department of Defense for fiscal

year 2001 costs associated with U.S. military forces participating in, or supporting, Bosnia or Kosovo peacekeeping operations.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—National Defense Features Program

This section would amend section 2218 of title 10, United States Code, to permit the payment to a vessel operator, as consideration for making a vessel available to the government on such terms as the Secretary of Defense or secretary of a military department and the operator agree, amounts equal to the cost of maintaining the vessel in a 4 day Reduced Operating Status (ROS−4) condition in the Ready Reserve Fleet for a period of 25 years.

SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Report on Department of Defense Expenditures to Support Foreign Counter-Drug Activities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2001, detailing the total amount and type of, and legal basis for, foreign counter-drug assistance provided by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2000.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has increased its level of counter-drug assistance to foreign law enforcement agencies and militaries in recent years. As part of the fiscal year 2001 budget request, the Department requested additional authority to directly support the governments of Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador. Under section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510) and section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), the Department is presently authorized to support various types of foreign assistance ranging from equipment maintenance to military training and intelligence sharing. While the committee recognizes the important role of the Department of Defense in supporting regional allies in combating the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States, the committee believes that any additional counter-drug authorities for the Department should be considered only after a comprehensive review of the current foreign counter-drug support activities of the Department.

Section 1022—Report on Tethered Aerostat Radar System

The section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commissioner of Customs, to submit to Congress a report on the Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS) by May 1, 2001, that includes the operational availability of each of the existing TARS sites; a discussion of any plans to close TARS sites over the next 5 years and a justification for each proposed closure; a review of the requirements of other agencies, especially the United States Customs Service, for TARS data; an assessment of the value of TARS in the conduct of counter-narcotics, border security, and air sovereignty operations, and; costs associated with the Depart-

ment's planned standardization of the program and the Secretary's analysis of that standardization.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1031—Funds for Administrative Expenses Under Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to allocate up to $500,000 per year from available Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, funds to administer the Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program. The provision would require the Secretary to replenish fully the funds expended under this authority from fees generated from the loans guaranteed under the program.

The committee notes the increasing interest in the Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program recently displayed by domestic defense industry, eligible countries, and the financial sector. The committee believes the program has significant potential to support U.S. national security objectives in certain regions of the world and believes further that the authority in this section will provide the stability needed for the effective long-term management of the program.

Section 1032—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments to existing law of a non-substantive basis.

Section 1033—Transfer of Vietnam Era TA–4 Aircraft to Nonprofit Foundation

This section would permit the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, one surplus TA–4 aircraft to a nonprofit foundation. This section would also require that any aircraft transferred under this authority would be completely demilitarized prior to transfer and that the conveyance would be at no cost to the United States.

Section 1034—Transfer of 19th Century Cannon to Museum

This section would direct the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a specific 19th century cannon that was manufactured in Macon, Georgia, to the Cannonball House Museum, Macon, Georgia. The section would also direct the Secretary of the Army to acquire, by donation or purchase, one or more cannons documented as having been manufactured in Macon, Georgia, during the Civil War in order to replace the cannon conveyed to the museum.

Section 1035—Expenditures for Declassification Activities

This section would require that any future budget request submitted to Congress by the Department of Defense (DOD) specifically identify, in a single display, funds being requested for the Department, each military department, and each defense agency to be used to declassify records to comply with declassification requirements of any statute or executive order. This section would also

limit the expenditure of funds by the Department of Defense for the declassification of records during fiscal year 2001 to no more than $30.0 million.

The review or records for potential declassification and release to the public can be quite costly. The Department estimates that records review for declassification and public release will cost the Department $34.0 million from operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts during fiscal year 2000. The committee is concerned about the drain on operations and maintenance resources resulting from the declassification process. The O&M accounts, and the readiness accounts in particular, have been dramatically underfunded for years, a serious problem that is exacerbated by almost annual unbudgeted contingency operations. The committee believes that record declassification is a significantly lower priority for already scarce O&M funds and believes these funds should be spent addressing shortfalls in higher priority areas such as maintenance, training, spare parts, and other key readiness activities. Consequently, this section would limit the amount of funds available for the Department's fiscal year 2001 records declassification effort to $30.0 million, the amount the Department estimates will be necessary for planned record reviews.

In addition, section 230 of title 10, United States Code provides that the Secretary of Defense shall provide in budget justification materials submitted to Congress "specific identification, as a budgetary line item, of the amounts required to carry out" declassification activities. The Department of Defense failed to provide in the fiscal year 2001 budget request the required declassification line item. Parts of the declassification budget request were scattered across more than 10 budget accounts, and other portions of the declassification budget request were invisible, having been imbedded in other budget lines. The committee believes it is necessary that the full DOD declassification budget be visible in the annual budget request, so Congress will be better able to establish appropriate levels for such expenditures. Therefore, this section would require the Department to include in future budget request materials a single display reflecting the total amount requested for records declassification.

Section 1036—Authority to Provide Loan Guarantees to Improve Domestic Preparedness to Combat Cyberterrorism

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to provide loan guarantees to qualified commercial firms seeking to improve their critical infrastructure protection. It would require the Secretary to prescribe regulations providing that fees assessed for the purpose of loan guarantees be credited to a special account and be available, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, to pay administrative expenses associated with this program. This section would also require the recipients of loan guarantees to report to the Secretary on the results of improvements made pursuant to this program, and would require the Secretary to submit to Congress an annual report on the loan guarantee program.

Section 1037—V–22 Cockpit Aircraft Voice and Flight Data Recorders

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to require that all V–22 Osprey aircraft be equipped with state-of-the-art cockpit aircraft voice and flight data recorders which meet, as a minimum, the National Transportation Safety Board standards for such devices.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Employment and Compensation Provisions for Employees of Temporary Organizations Established by Law or Executive Order

This section would provide legislative and executive agencies the flexibility to use a streamlined process to hire and pay employees for temporary organizations established by law or executive order. The committee notes that temporary organizations are normally established to examine issues of immediate public concern, yet these organizations are often slow to begin substantive work due to the lack of established structures or processes to acquire staff.

Section 1102—Restructuring the Restriction on Degree Training

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay tuition for a civilian employee to obtain an academic degree if that degree training occurs at an accredited institution and is part of a planned Department of Defense (DOD) professional development program. The committee supports education and training programs that the service secretaries conduct for military personnel, but is concerned that DOD civilian personnel professional development programs have been neglected. The committee expects this authority will be used to enhance the professional abilities of the Department's most promising civilian employees.

Section 1103—Continuation of Tuition Reimbursement and Training for Certain Acquisition Personnel

This section would amend section 1745 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the "shortage of personnel" designation for qualified civilian acquisition personnel of the Department of Defense until September 30, 2005, in order for such personnel to qualify for eligibility for reimbursement of expenses for training and tuition. The committee believes such an extension is necessary to enhance the professional development of the acquisition workforce of the Department of Defense.

Section 1104—Extension of Authority for Civilian Employees of the Department of Defense to Participate Voluntarily in Reductions in Force

This section would amend section 3502 of title 5, United States Code, to extend to September 30, 2005, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to allow certain civilian employees to volunteer for separation under reduction in force procedures even though

those employees would not otherwise be subject to separation. The committee believes that this program has ameliorated the disruptive effects of reductions-in-force by lessening the number of civilian employees who would otherwise have been involuntarily separated.

Section 1105—Expansion of Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Positions

This section would amend section 1601 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to create positions within the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System outside the designated intelligence components of the Department of Defense. The committee believes that a limited number of positions should be created outside the designated intelligence components to establish appropriate career broadening intelligence related positions within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence and other activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Section 1106—Pilot Program for Reengineering the Equal Employment Opportunity Complaint Process

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to carry out a pilot program to demonstrate improved processes for the resolution of equal employment opportunity complaints.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Control Implementation

The budget request contained $219.0 million for arms control implementation programs, representing a slight decrease from the fiscal year 2000 current spending level of $222.7 million. The committee recommends $207.5 million, a decrease of $11.5 million from the budget request.

The committee notes that the budget request assumes the entry into force of a number of arms control treaties that remain unratified by all necessary parties. This includes the Open Skies Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT); the latter failed a vote on ratification before the United States Senate. In addition, although the START II Treaty between the United States and Russia was signed in 1993, subsequently ratified by the United States Senate, and ratified by the Russian Duma in April 2000, the Duma has linked Russian observance of START II to acceptance by the United States of a Protocol to the START II Treaty that was agreed to by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin in 1997. The START II Treaty cannot enter into force prior to the Senate giving its advice and consent to the Protocol to the Treaty, which has yet to be submitted to the Senate for its consideration.

In light of the delayed entry into force of these treaties, the committee believes that adjustments to the budget request are warranted. The committee's recommendation to reduce the requested level of funding is premised on the belief that funds should not be expended on activities to comply unilaterally with treaties that have not yet entered into force. The committee expects the Department to take this into account in apportioning the recommended reductions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1201—Support of United Nations-Sponsored Efforts to Inspect and Monitor Iraqi Weapons Activities

This section would amend section 1505 of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992 by extending the authority provided to the Department of Defense under that Act to support the activities of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) in fiscal year 2001. This section would limit assistance provided to UNMOVIC by the Department of Defense to $15.0 million.

The committee continues to be troubled by the efforts of Iraq to develop and potentially to militarize weapons of mass destruction

(WMD). The committee strongly believes that the United Nations must re-establish a robust, long-term monitoring program in Iraq that includes on-site inspections and remote surveillance involving cameras, sensors, seismic devices, and other technology. However, United Nations weapons inspectors have been barred from entering Iraq since October 1998. The committee believes the current status-quo is unacceptable and jeopardizes long-standing U.S. policy that Iraq must be denied access to ballistic missile technology and weapons of mass destruction.

The committee notes the adoption by the United Nations Security Council of Resolution 1284 in December 1999 that established UNMOVIC as the successor to the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM). The committee remains doubtful that Iraq will fulfill its responsibility to allow inspections as mandated by the Security Council. However, the committee supports the Department of Defense's assistance to UNMOVIC under the Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992 and believes the Department should maintain a level of readiness necessary to ensure the swift resumption of monitoring missions should future conditions permit.

Section 1202—Annual Report Assessing Effect of Continued Operations in the Balkans Region on Readiness to Execute the National Military Strategy

This section would amend section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) to make annual the reporting requirement of the Secretary of Defense to submit a report 180 days after enactment assessing the effects of operations in the Balkans on the ability of the United States to meet other regional contingencies and the National Military Strategy. The committee notes that the slow pace of civil implementation in both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo will require the United States and NATO to maintain military forces in the region for the foreseeable future necessitating an annual reporting requirement.

The committee further notes with concern that the Army announced in November 1999 that the two divisions deployed to the Balkans, the 1st Infantry Division in Kosovo and the 10th Mountain Division in Kosovo, had been assigned a C-4 readiness rating. The division commanders of each unit assigned this rating over concerns that neither division could disengage from their peacekeeping duties in time to deploy to a major theater conflict as required by current war plans. These concerns were subsequently reported in the Department's Quarterly Readiness Report of the Department of Defense to Congress for that period, in which the Department expressed concern over the ability of the armed forces to disengage forces from on-going contingencies in order to fight major regional conflicts. The committee believes that as long as the United States has military forces in the Balkans region conducting peacekeeping operations, combat readiness will be degraded.

Section 1203—Situation in the Balkans

This section would require the President to establish militarily significant benchmarks that will create a sustainable peace in

Kosovo and that will facilitate the withdrawal of US troops from Kosovo. This section would also require the President to seek concurrence with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to establish a comprehensive political-military strategy toward the situation in the Balkans. In creating this strategy, this section would urge the President to take into consideration the benchmarks already established for the Bosnia peacekeeping mission as well as those that are to be developed for Kosovo. This section would also require an initial and subsequent semi-annual reports on the progress being made toward developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy in the Balkans. This section would also require an initial and subsequent semi-annual reports on the progress being made on the establishment and implementation of the benchmarks for Kosovo.

The committee remains concerned about the on-going, open-ended peacekeeping missions in the Balkans and their effect on military readiness. Since last year, the United States, in conjunction with the NATO alliance, fought a 78-day air war against Serbia, followed by the introduction of a peacekeeping force into the province of Kosovo. These efforts were in addition to NATO's already extensive commitment to peacekeeping in Bosnia-Herzegovina that began in 1995. As a result, the United States has a significant military commitment to peacekeeping operations in the region.

These extensive military efforts have produced an absence of war in the Balkans. However, the pace of civil implementation has lagged far behind the military operations in both areas. In Bosnia, the slow progress on implementation of the Dayton Accords has led to questions regarding the duration of the Stabilization Force (SFOR) mission. Due to the lack of civil institutions, military forces have assumed many tasks more appropriately reserved for civilian law enforcement and judicial institutions. In Kosovo, the final status of the province remains unresolved. The Kosovar Albanians desire an independent country, while the Serbs desire the area remain a province of Serbia. The committee is concerned that several European nations are not maintaining commitments regarding promised troop levels in the Kosovo Force (KFOR). The committee is also concerned that there is a chronic shortage of civilian international police and that the United Nations Mission in Kosovo is severely underfunded. Without a clearly defined end-state, and with unrest between the warring parties continuing, prospects for stability in Kosovo are bleak.

The committee is concerned that the lack of an overall strategy in the Balkans, compounded by the continuing destabilizing influence of Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, is slowing the pace of civil implementation and prolonging the military mission in the region. The lack of a comprehensive strategy ensures that the military missions in both Bosnia and Kosovo appear vague and open-ended.

The studies conducted by the Government Accounting Office estimates the cost of U.S. operations in Bosnia and Kosovo to the Department of Defense at $15.6 billion between fiscal years 1992 and 2000. These operations are projected to cost the Department $3.1 billion in fiscal year 2001 alone. These operations drain funds from

modernization and operations and maintenance accounts. At the same time, the requirement to maintain large numbers of personnel on a rotational basis in the region adversely affects the ability of the armed forces to conduct wartime missions as required by the National Military Strategy. The increased pace of operations has compelled the Department to augment active duty units with reserve component forces in an attempt to relieve the pressure on already over-committed units.

The committee believes that a comprehensive strategy for dealing with the Balkans is an essential prerequisite to lasting stability in the region and the maintenance of the readiness of the armed forces.

Section 1204—Limitation on Number of Military Personnel in Colombia

This section would restrict funds available to the Department of Defense to support or maintain more than 500 U.S. military personnel on duty in Colombia at any time. This section would exclude from the numerical limitation any U.S. military personnel who are in Colombia for a period of not more than 30 days, unless expressly authorized by law, for the purpose of rescuing or retrieving U.S. military or governmental personnel. This section would also exempt from the limitation U.S. military personnel assigned to the U.S. Embassy in Colombia as an attache, as part of the security assistance office, or the Marine Corps security contingent; service members participating in natural disaster relief efforts, and; non-operational transient military personnel.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $458.4 million for cooperative threat reduction (CTR) activities, representing a slight increase of $0.3 million over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2000. The request included $226.2 million for destruction and dismantlement, $161.1 million for fissile materials and nuclear weapons safety and storage, $32.1 million for reactor core conversion in Russia, $12.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in Russia, $14.0 million for defense and military contacts, and $13.0 million for other program support, including administrative and management costs.

The committee recommends a total of $433.4 million for CTR activities in fiscal year 2001, a decrease of $25.0 million from the budget request. The committee recommends the request of $57.4 million for fissile material storage in Russia; $9.3 million for fissile material processing and packaging in Russia; $14.0 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia; $89.7 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia; $12.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in Russia; and $13.0 million for other program support. The committee recommends the following increases to the budget request: $10.0 million for strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia; and $5.0 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine; The committee recommends the following decreases to the budget request: $35.0 million for chemical weapons destruction; and $5.0 million for defense and military contacts.

Although the committee supports the overriding goal of the CTR program to reduce the threat to the United States posed by the former Soviet Union's residual weapons of mass destruction, the committee remains concerned that the United States is absorbing an increasing share of the costs of implementing CTR projects as a result of the continued poor economic situation in the states of the former Soviet Union. In Congressional testimony on March 6, 2000, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Threat Reduction Policy Susan Koch stated that Russia's economic conditions mean that its financial contribution to threat reduction projects "is less than originally expected." The committee is concerned that U.S. costs will continue to grow unless economic conditions in the former Soviet Union improve markedly. As the General Accounting Office (GAO) noted in recent testimony, "Given the current situation, the United States may have to fully fund not only its implementation but also the operations and maintenance of the threat reduction projects."

In this regard, the committee is troubled by the Department of Defense's willingness to absorb additional costs without prior consultation with the Congress. In response to the reporting requirement contained in section 1308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), the Secretary of Defense noted that the Department "continuously urges the states receiving CTR assistance to contribute their own funds to projects. . . . CTR assesses the contribution arrangements of each project to avoid starting a project under conditions whereby the recipient will not be able to meet its share and restructuring has to occur." Unfortunately, the committee sees no evidence that this strategy has achieved the desired results, and calls on the Department to redouble its efforts in this regard.

Further, the committee is convinced that the focus of the CTR program should remain on eliminating those weapons that pose the most serious and direct threat to U.S. security—first and foremost, strategic nuclear weapons and associated infrastructure. The committee notes that the original focus of the CTR program has expanded in scope since its inception, raising questions about the Department's role in funding certain projects. Section 1306 of Public Law 106–65 prohibits the obligation or expenditure of more than 50 percent of fiscal year 2000 CTR funds until the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a report explaining why the Department is the appropriate funding source for each CTR project for which funding is requested, and identifies those projects that might more appropriately be funded by other agencies. The committee has not yet received this report, but believes that certain projects—for example, those associated with the effort to eliminate the production of weapons-grade plutonium at Russian nuclear reactors—ought not to be funded by the Department.

Finally, the committee's overall support of the CTR program is tempered with the realization that it is increasingly difficult to know with certainty how effective this program is in actually reducing the threat to the United States. This is the case as the program transitions away from more concrete projects involving the destruction of missile launchers and associated hardware and toward support of less tangible projects, such as funding collaborative research with former Soviet scientists. The committee notes recent testimony by the GAO, which points out that "conclusively demonstrating that most of these programs are having a positive impact has proven to be very difficult. . . . Most of these programs . . . are inherently a cost risk in that we may never be able to prove that they have achieved their intended purpose."

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Elimination Projects in Russia

The budget request contained $152.8 million for strategic offensive arms elimination projects in Russia, a 16 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated amount of $182.3 million. The committee recommends $162.8 million for this activity, an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request.

The committee continues to support the accelerated reduction and elimination of Russian strategic nuclear arms. However, the

committee remains concerned that Russia has not been complying with certain arms reduction obligations and that CTR funding provided to assist Russia in meeting its obligations is not being used for this purpose. In particular, the committee notes that under the START I Treaty, Russia committed to eliminating at least 22 SS–18 intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers annually. According to the Department of Defense, Russia eliminated only 6 SS–18 launchers in 1997 and none in 1998 or 1999. In a January 9, 2000 report to Congress on the SS–18 ICBM elimination program, the Department conceded that Russia's commitment to eliminate at least 22 SS–18 ICBM launchers per year is "legally binding."

The committee remains concerned with Russia's failure to carry out its obligations in this regard, and fails to understand why Russia should be allowed to renege on its legally binding obligation while it continues to invest scarce resources in the development, production, and deployment of more modern and capable ICBMs such as the SS–27 "Topol-M." The committee expects the Department to continue to press Russia to comply with its obligations under START I, regardless of the level of CTR assistance provided.

Moreover, the committee notes that under the START II Treaty, recently ratified by Russia, up to 90 SS–18 silos may be converted for deployment of modern SS–27 ICBMs. The committee supports the complete elimination of SS–18 missiles, silos, and related infrastructure, and does not support the use of CTR funds for activities that would facilitate silo conversion. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to focus the Department's SS–18 elimination effort at locations where missile silos are to be eliminated, not converted, to ensure that CTR assistance is not used in support of Russia's strategic modernization program.

Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine

The budget request contained $29.1 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination projects in Ukraine, a 17 percent reduction from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $35.0 million. This decrease continues a downward trend in funding strategic nuclear elimination projects in Ukraine made possible by the completion of certain activities and objectives. The committee recommends $34.1 million for this activity, a $5.0 million increase to the budget request, for the purpose of accelerating dismantlement activity.

The committee notes that last year Ukraine agreed to transfer to Russia 11 heavy bombers, including Tu-95 Bear and Tu-160 Blackjack bombers, in partial payment of energy debts. More than 500 air-launched cruise missiles were also included in the deal. These weapons and platforms were planned to be eliminated in Ukraine. The committee regrets Ukraine's decision to transfer these systems to Russia, and encourages the Department to seek Russia's agreement to the elimination of these systems.

Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia

The budget request contained $12.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention activities in Russia, a 14 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $14.0 million.

This would support approximately one dozen collaborative research projects with Russian scientists at institutes previously involved in biological weapons work. In addition, it would help to secure and safeguard stockpiles of biological pathogens that exist at several institutes in Russia. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee continues to support efforts directed toward reducing the risk of biological weapons proliferation, but continues to have concerns regarding the overall approach taken by the Department to addressing those risks.

First, unlike other collaborative ventures where joint research projects are directed toward exclusively civilian applications, it is difficult to demonstrate that collaborative research projects in the area of biological defense have no offensive military application. According to an April 2000 GAO report, "This type of research is difficult to distinguish from offensive research because of the inherent dual-use nature of biotechnology."

Second, the committee is concerned that funding collaborative research efforts with Russian scientists in the area of biological defense may serve to perpetuate a knowledge base and set of skills among Russian scientists that might make them more attractive targets for recruitment by foreign states seeking to develop their own biological weapons programs. Such an outcome would be precisely the opposite of that intended. As the GAO recently testified, "supplementing the salaries of these scientists is no guarantee that they will not in the future sell their services to individuals or countries that pose national security risks to the United States." Moreover, the GAO's April 2000 report concludes that "sustained U.S. support of institutes, especially through research aimed at advancing U.S. biodefense capabilities, may help to preserve Russian scientists' knowledge and skills and otherwise help to maintain these institutes' capacity to research and develop biological weapons."

Third, the committee remains troubled with the overall lack of transparency with respect to Russia's biological weapons programs. Existing and planned collaborative projects involve scientists at Russian civilian institutes that were a part of the former Soviet Union's massive biological weapons complex. To date, the Russian Ministry of Defense has refused to engage the United States in collaborative projects at sites or institutes exclusively under its control. Moreover, there is much about the former Soviet biological weapons program that remains unknown, and Russia has not been forthcoming in providing information that would reassure the United States that it is not still engaged in offensive biological weapons work. The United States cannot be assured that scientists currently engaged in collaborative efforts at civilian institutes will not be subsequently employed at facilities controlled by the Russian Ministry of Defense. According to the GAO report, "None of these [proposed U.S. risk-mitigation] measures, however, would prevent Russian project participants or institutes from potentially using their skills or research outputs to later work on offensive weapons activities at any of the Russian military institutes that remain closed to the United States."

Fourth, the committee is concerned about the ability of the United States to verify that assistance is being used for the purposes intended and not being diverted to offensive weapons work.

This concern has increased in light of recent revelations that civilian research assistance previously provided to Russia by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Agency for International Development was diverted to Biopreparat, the main civilian support arm of Russia's biological weapons complex.

Fifth, the committee notes that under the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative, the Department of Defense is only one of several agencies involved in support of collaborative biological research efforts with Russian scientists. This places a premium on ensuring that current and planned efforts are not in conflict and raises questions regarding the Department of Defense's overall role in this effort. To this end, section 1309 of Public Law 106–65 required the President to submit to the Congress no later than March 31, 2000 a report on the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative. This report has not yet been submitted, and therefore, the committee does not have all the information it needs to determine whether program redundancies have been avoided. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1311) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of CTR funds for biological weapons proliferation prevention activities until the required report is submitted. The committee will continue to assess carefully the Department's plans and programs with respect to this activity.

Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia

The budget request contained a provision that would repeal section 1305 of Public Law 106–65, which prohibits any funding for the design, planning, or construction of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia. The budget request also contained $35.0 million to restart funding for the chemical weapons destruction facility at Shchuch'ye, Russia. The committee disapproves repeal of the existing statutory prohibition and denies the requested funding for this activity.

The Department of Defense bases its request for repeal of the section 1305 prohibition on three main arguments: 1) that the risk of proliferation of the chemical munitions stockpiled at Shchuch'ye remains a threat to the United States; 2) that Russia has begun to take the actions necessary to move forward with the project; and 3) that the international community is willing to contribute additional resources to the task of assisting Russia with the elimination of its chemical weapons. The committee questions the Department's assessment and does not believe that the situation warrants a reversal of the Congress' decision last year to halt funding for this project.

To begin with, while the committee supports in principle efforts to eliminate Russia's chemical weapons stockpile in accordance with its obligations under the Chemical Weapons Convention, the committee takes issue with the Department's characterization of the proliferation threat at Shchuch'ye. The committee recognizes that there is a risk of proliferation of chemical weapons in Russia. For this reason, the Congress last year directed that $20.0 million in CTR assistance be used to enhance security at Russia's existing chemical weapons sites. Nevertheless, the committee is not aware of any evidence to suggest that the risk of theft or diversion of the chemical munitions stockpiled at Shchuch'ye is particularly acute.

The committee notes that no fiscal year 2001 CTR funds are proposed to be spent on additional security upgrades at Shchuch'ye. This alone calls into question the Department's assertion that the risk of weapons theft or diversion at this site is serious.

Second, the Department has noted that Russia has begun making infrastructure improvements to the local community—a necessary prerequisite to U.S. construction of the chemical weapons destruction facility. For example, new housing units are being constructed and water and sewer lines are being installed. However, the committee notes that, in part, the Congress' prohibition on funding the Shchuch'ye facility last year was not based on the lack of infrastructure improvements but on concern over Russia's ability to absorb all of the prospective costs associated with this effort. This concern has not abated. Consequently, the committee does not believe that recent developments warrant a repeal of last year's statutory prohibition.

Third, the level of international contributions to Russia's chemical weapons elimination effort in general—and to support for the Shchuch'ye facility in particular—is minimal. Based on the Department's projection of the life-cycle costs of the Shchuch'ye facility ($1.6 billion) and the level of international funding required to ensure that the facility meets its chemical weapons destruction objectives ($721.5 million to $756.0 million), current assistance provided by the international community amounts to roughly 0.001 percent of what is required. To date, only Canada has provided assistance to help Russia with the costs of local infrastructure improvements at Shchuch'ye—and only in the amount of $70,000. Great Britain is considering contributing approximately $5 million to the effort, but has conditioned this assistance on a U.S. decision to restart funding. Other countries had previously committed to assist in the overall Russian chemical weapons elimination effort. However, the level of assistance committed is also a small fraction of what is required and little is directed toward the effort at Shchuch'ye.

The Department's latest estimate of the cost to the United States of the Shchuch'ye project has grown significantly, rising from roughly $750 million last year to almost $900 million. The committee expects that this cost estimate will continue to rise and may soon exceed $1.0 billion. Moreover, the committee remains concerned over the ability of Russia to fund the costs of increasing the destruction rate of the facility and to operate and maintain it over the period of time required to eliminate the chemical weapons stockpile located there. Without any assurances that Russia will absorb the costs of running and maintaining the facility over the next decade, the United States may spend more than a billion dollars to build a facility that never accomplishes its objective, unless the United States—despite Administration representations to the Congress—reverses its position and agrees to pay these costs. In fact, the committee notes that Russia continues to significantly underfund its chemical weapons destruction effort.

According to Russian officials, Russia has fallen significantly behind schedule in destroying its chemical weapons stockpiles and has missed the April 1, 2000 deadline established by the Chemical Weapons Convention to eliminate 400 tons of its declared chemical weapons stockpile. As Lieutenant General Valery Kapachin, the

head of Russia's chemical weapons elimination effort, declared on March 31, 2000, "We haven't destroyed anything as of today." With respect to the demilitarization of existing chemical weapons production plants, three Russian officials noted last year that "the Russian Government can provide only ten percent of the necessary budget," and therefore "financial assistance from other countries is crucial."

Finally, the committee notes that Shchuch'ye is only one of seven declared sites where Russian chemical munitions are stored and one of five sites where nerve agents are located. The Department asserts that Russia's arsenal of nerve agents poses the most serious security threat to the United States. However, Russian law prohibits the transportation of agents located at one stockpile site to another site for destruction. Therefore, unless Russia changes its law, additional chemical weapons destruction facilities will need to be built at the other locations.

Last year, the committee directed the Department to use unobligated prior year balances "to provide for an orderly close-out" of activities at Shchuch'ye. To date, the Department has ignored this direction. The committee reiterates its call for an orderly close-out and urges the Department to focus its efforts on projects with greater prospective benefits for U.S. security.

Defense and Military Contacts

The budget request contained $14.0 million for defense and military contacts with the states of the former Soviet Union, a 600 percent increase over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $2.0 million. The Department asserts that this increase is necessary to support approximately 350 contacts annually and that the program has exhausted much of the prior year unobligated funds that allowed it to maintain a consistent level of contacts in recent years with significantly less new funding. The committee recommends $9.0 million for this activity, a decrease of $5.0 million from the budget request.

The committee notes that, according to the latest financial information provided by the Department, there remains approximately $20.0 million in prior year unobligated balances for these activities. Moreover, the committee recalls the long-standing prohibition on conducting peacekeeping exercises or related activities with Russia using CTR funds, and questions whether all planned exercises are consistent with this prohibition. This concern has been exacerbated by the Department's explanation that the description of some planned activities identified to the committee as peacekeeping-related was "in error." The committee expects the Department to ensure that all defense and military contacts are consistent with statutory guidance.

Elimination of Plutonium Production in Russia

The budget request contained $32.1 million for the elimination of plutonium production in Russian nuclear reactors, a slight decrease from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $32.2 million. The committee recommends the budget request, subject to the restriction below.

Since the start of this project, CTR funds have been directed toward core conversion—a process whereby the production of weapons-grade plutonium would be eliminated, but the nuclear reactors would continue producing lower-grade fuel to provide for the energy needs of the communities where they are located. Recently, Russia informed the United States that it would prefer to shut down the reactors entirely and to construct fossil fuel plants to provide for local energy needs. The Department of Defense previously rejected this option as too costly. However, Russia now believes the cost of the fossil fuel option would be less than core conversion. In order to determine of validity of Russian estimates, U.S. and Russian officials met in March 2000 to discuss the issue. In the meantime, all work on the core conversion project has been suspended.

Department of Defense officials have indicated that if the fossil fuel option turns out to be the most cost-effective approach, Russia will link its agreement to shut down the nuclear reactors at Krasnoyarsk and Tomsk with U.S. assistance for the construction of fossil fuel plants. Although the committee supports the elimination of Russia's weapons-grade plutonium production and the shutting down of these reactors, the committee does not believe that CTR funds should be used to build fossil fuel plants in Russia. Therefore, if this option is chosen, the committee believes that any U.S. assistance provided for this activity should be funded through other means, external to the Department of Defense. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1309) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any CTR funds for the construction of fossil fuel plants in Russia.

Fissile Material Processing and Packaging

The budget request contained $9.3 million to assist Russia in processing the fissile components of dismantled nuclear warheads in preparation for long-term storage. This amount is the same as the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee notes that the required implementing agreement that would allow the United States to assist Russia in this endeavor has not yet been negotiated. In addition, discussions regarding effective transparency measures have not produced any agreement. Agreement on transparency measures is essential to ensure that these fissile materials are the actual materials removed from dismantled nuclear warheads. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2001 CTR funds for this purpose until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense notifies the Congress that an acceptable transparency agreement has been concluded.

Fissile Material Storage Facility

The budget request contained $57.4 million for continued construction of a fissile material storage facility in Russia, a reduction of 8 percent from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $62.1 million. The facility, located at Mayak, Russia, would be used to house fissile materials from dismantled nuclear weapons. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee reiterates its previously expressed concern over cost increases and schedule delays in connection with construction of the Mayak facility. In particular, the committee notes that the anticipated cost of this project has increased by roughly 300 percent since 1996. Moreover, the committee remains troubled by the fact that the United States agreed last year to increase its share of the costs of this facility by 50 percent without seeking prior Congressional consultation or approval. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1304) that would establish a funding cap of $412.6 million on the level of U.S. assistance provided for activities associated with the Mayak facility.

Moreover, the committee is aware of plans to construct a second storage wing of the Mayak facility to provide additional storage capacity for weapons-origin fissile materials. However, no agreement with Russia on transparency measures has yet been reached to assure that the fissile materials stored at Mayak are in fact weapons-origin. The committee understands that transparency negotiations are taking place in the context of possible U.S. assistance to Russia in the processing and packaging of fissile material removed from nuclear warheads. Therefore, consistent with last year's Congressional action, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1304) that would prohibit fiscal year 2001 CTR funds from being used for construction of a second wing at Mayak and would restrict funding for design and planning until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense notifies the Congress that a transparency agreement with Russia has been reached.

Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia

The budget request contained $89.7 million for nuclear weapons storage security in Russia, a 7 percent increase from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $84.0 million. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee continues to support the objective of ensuring the safe and secure storage of nuclear weapons in Russia. However, the committee believes it essential that the United States be granted appropriate access to nuclear weapons storage facilities to ensure that assistance provided is being used as intended. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1308) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to seek an agreement with Russia that would grant the United States appropriate access to nuclear weapons storage sites where CTR assistance is being provided to confirm such assistance is being used as intended.

Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security

The budget request contained $14.0 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia, an 8 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $15.2 million. The committee recommends the budget request. However, the committee again urges the Department to seek an agreement with Russia that does not commit the United States to paying the costs of nuclear weapons transportation, costs previously paid by Russia.

Other Assessments and Administrative Support

The budget request contained $13.0 million for other program costs, including management and administrative costs, project development, and audits and examinations, a 550 percent increase from the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level of $2.0 million. The Department asserts that it requires additional new funding because of the drawdown in prior year unobligated balances. The committee recommends the budget request.

The committee notes that this funding is used to support at least 20 audits and examinations of CTR assistance annually, which are intended to ensure that such assistance is being used as intended. However, the committee is concerned that the Department, which is required to report to the Congress annually on the results of these audits and examinations, has not provided this information in a timely manner and, in several instances, provided information that is incomplete or inaccurate.

The committee emphasizes that this reporting requirement is essential to ensure that the Congress can exercise its appropriate oversight role with respect to the CTR program. According to a recent GAO study, the Department "cannot fully support its determination that assistance was used as intended" and places a "relatively low priority" on providing audit and examination information to the Congress. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1310) that would require the Comptroller General of the GAO to conduct an audit and examination of the Department's ability to make accurate assessments of whether CTR funds are being used as intended.

The committee notes that section 1312 of Public Law 106–65 required the Department to include information on Russia's arsenal of tactical nuclear warheads in its annual reports on audits and examinations submitted to the Congress after fiscal year 1999. The committee further notes that the Department's 1997 and 1998 audit and examination reports did not contain this information, even though they were submitted to the Congress in fiscal year 2000. The Department has indicated that it interprets the section 1312 requirement to apply to only those reports covering fiscal year 2000 and beyond, the first of which would not be submitted to the Congress until January 2001. The committee notes that the language of section 1312 is clear and does not support the Department's interpretation. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1306) that would require the Department to provide this information not later than October 1, 2000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title and would make fiscal year 2001 CTR funds available for obligation for three years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 2001 funding for various CTR purposes and activities.

Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Elimination of Conventional Weapons

This section would prohibit the use of CTR funds for conventional weapons elimination purposes.

Section 1304—Limitations on Use of Funds for Fissile Material Storage Facility

This section would restrict the use of CTR funds for activities associated with the construction of a fissile material storage facility in Russia and would establish a funding ceiling on the first wing of such a facility.

Section 1305—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Submission of Multiyear Plan

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2001 CTR funds until the Secretary submits the update to the multiyear plan required by section 1205 of Public Law 103–337.

Section 1306—Russian Nonstrategic Nuclear Arms

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Russian nonstrategic nuclear arms not later than October 1, 2000.

Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds to Support Warhead Dismantlement Processing

This section would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2001 CTR funds to support warhead dismantlement processing in Russia until a transparency agreement with Russia is signed.

Section 1308—Agreement on Nuclear Weapons Storage Sites

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to seek an agreement with Russia allowing for U.S. access to nuclear weapons storage sites where CTR assistance is provided.

Section 1309—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Construction of Fossil Fuel Energy Plants

This section would prohibit the use of CTR funds for the construction of fossil fuel plants in Russia.

Section 1310—Audits of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs

This section would require the Comptroller General to submit to Congress not later than March 31, 2001 a report on procedures used by the Department of Defense to audit CTR assistance.

Section 1311—Limitation on Use of Funds for Prevention of Biological Weapons Proliferation in Russia

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of CTR funds for this purpose until the report required by section 1309 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) is submitted to the Congress.

TITLE XIV—COMMISSION TO ASSESS THE THREAT TO THE UNITED STATES FROM ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE (EMP) ATTACK

OVERVIEW

The committee understands that a nuclear weapon detonated at high-altitude would generate a powerful electromagnetic pulse (EMP), similar to a very high energy radio wave, that can potentially damage or destroy electronic systems over a wide area of the Earth's surface. For example, a single nuclear weapon detonated at an altitude of 500 kilometers could produce an EMP that would blanket the entire continental United States, potentially damaging or destroying military forces and civilian communications, power, transportation and other infrastructure on which modern society depends.

The committee is aware that EMP has been the focus of significant government-funded research and testing for over 30 years. However, the committee is also aware that most of these efforts were conducted during the Cold War and focused on hardening strategic systems against a massive nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. The committee understands that far fewer resources have been dedicated to examining the potential vulnerability of the U.S. civilian and industrial infrastructure to an EMP attack. Moreover, since the Cold War, U.S. military and civilian systems have become increasingly dependent on advanced electronics that are potentially more vulnerable than older electronics to EMP attack, a trend that is likely to continue in the future.

In the committee's view, the potential vulnerability of the United States to an EMP attack may be an issue of greater moment, now that missiles and nuclear weapons are proliferating. Some analysts have suggested that nations having small numbers of nuclear missiles, such as China or North Korea, may consider an EMP attack against U.S. forces regionally, to degrade the U.S. technological advantage, or against the United States' national electronic infrastructure, as a way to get the most utility from their modest nuclear capabilities. Analysts have also suggested that Russia's new military doctrine, which gives unprecedented emphasis to limited nuclear options, may assign increased importance to EMP attacks as a way of limiting a nuclear conflict and averting a massive nuclear exchange in the event of a confrontation with the United States.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the establishment of a commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attacks.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1401—Establishment of Commission

This section describes how the "Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack" is to be selected and organized.

Section 1402—Duties of Commission

This section describes the duties of the Commission, would require the Commission to assess the EMP threat to the United States, to make recommendations on how to better protect U.S. military and civilian infrastructure from EMP, and would require the Department of Defense and Federal Emergency Management Agency to cooperate with the Commission.

Section 1403—Report

This section would require the Commission to submit a report to Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency within twelve months of the Commission's first meeting.

Section 1404—Powers

This section would grant the Commission the power to hold hearings and secure information directly from any Federal department or agency.

Section 1405—Commission Procedures

This section describes the procedural rules for Commission meetings, for establishing Commission panels, and for agents or individual members acting on behalf of the Commission.

Section 1406—Personnel Members

This section would describe and regulate how Commission members are to be paid and reimbursed for travel expenses; and how Commission staff are to be appointed and paid, government employees detailed to the Commission, and temporary services acquired by the Commission.

Section 1407—Miscellaneous Administrative Provisions

This section would make postal, printing, administrative and support services available to the Commission.

Section 1408—Funding

This section would regulate how funds are to be provided to the Commission.

Section 1409—Termination of the Commission

This section would provide for the termination of the Commission within 60 days after the submission of its report under Section 1403.

TITLE XV—PROVISIONS REGARDING VIEQUES ISLAND, PUERTO RICO

OVERVIEW

The committee remains concerned about the situation at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility located on Vieques Island, Puerto Rico. On April 19, 1999, during a routine training event, live ordnance deployed by a Marine Corps F/A–18 accidentally struck an observation post within the Vieques weapons range complex and killed David Sanes Rodriguez, a Navy contract employee. From that day until May 4, 2000, protestors occupying the live impact area on Vieques prevented the Navy and Marine Corps from conducting training on the range.

Due to this situation, the *Eisenhower* and *George Washington* battle groups and their associated amphibious ready groups were unable to conduct pre-deployment training on Vieques. As a result, valuable live naval gunfire, air-to-ground, and combined arms training normally conducted prior to deployment did not take place. This had a substantial negative impact on the overall readiness of these deploying units as reported in the Department of Defense Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress for October to December 1999. The Navy stated in that report that, "Several deploying surface combatants will depart Atlantic ports in February 2000 with reduced training readiness due to expired gunfire qualifications resulting from the continued non-availability of the Vieques training range."

On January 31, 2000, the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico concluded an agreement on the future of Vieques. This agreement would allow the Navy to resume live fire on Vieques with inert ammunition in return for $40.0 million in economic assistance and the conveyance of Navy land on the western end of the island to The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. According to the agreement, the future status of Navy training on Vieques would be determined by a local referendum.

On May 4, 2000, after over a year of occupation, federal law enforcement and Puerto Rican officials cleared the live impact area and Eastern Maneuver Area of protestors. However, even with the range now cleared, training is still restricted to inert munitions. This restriction will not allow the for the full range of live, joint and combined training that is necessary prior to the deployment of carrier battle groups and amphibious ready groups. The committee does not believe that training conducted solely with inert ammunition adequately provides for the readiness of our combat forces.

The committee also believes that the Department of the Navy has not been a good steward of Vieques. The Navy has failed to implement adequately many of the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding of 1983 concluded between the Navy and the Gov-

ernment of Puerto Rico. Furthermore, the committee believes that the Navy has consistently failed to take into account the concerns of the local population regarding training on the island. These facts, combined with the lack of economic development that normally accrues to communities that host military installations, has created an occasionally hostile atmosphere toward the Navy presence on the island that has been central to this situation.

In recognition of this problem and in order to encourage the Navy to be a better neighbor, the committee recommends training restrictions on the use of the range designed to protect the citizens of Vieques. Live fire training would be restricted to 90 days a year, with an allowance for an additional 90 days of non-live fire training. The committee would also require the Navy take steps to ensure the safety of civilians on Vieques while also taking measures to reduce noise in civilian areas of the island. The committee also recommends the establishment of an advisory committee made up of military officers and Puerto Rican citizens appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico and the Mayor of the Municipality of Vieques. The advisory committee would provide a forum for the people of Vieques to express their views to the Navy and to comment on operations and the policies relating to military activities on Vieques. All these measures are recommended by the committee in recognition of the sacrifices made by the people of Vieques toward the national security of the United States.

However, the committee ultimately believes that Vieques is vital to the training of the Nation's naval forces and that it is imperative that live-fire training resume on the island as soon as possible. The committee is concerned about the possibility that the ranges on Vieques may be unavailable in the future and believes that battle groups deploying overseas are not currently receiving the training necessary to meet the challenges they may face during overseas deployments.

The committee rejects the idea that the future of military training on Vieques be determined by referendum. Allowing local communities to vote on the future of military training at local bases would establish a precedent that could endanger access to other critical military installations both in the United States and overseas. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the agreement signed by the President and the Governor of Puerto Rico on January 31, 2000, adequately provides for U.S. national security by ensuring the Navy's future access to this vital training area. The committee believes that its recommendations provide for the fair and equitable treatment of the people of Vieques while preserving access to critical training ranges.

Section 1501—Conditions on Disposal of Naval Ammunition Support Detachment, Vieques Island

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from including any portion of the Naval Ammunition Support Detachment on the western end of Vieques Island, Puerto Rico, in a report of excess real property pursuant to the requirements of section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, until the President certifies to Congress that military training operations have resumed using the full range of live ordnance in use prior to April 19, 2000 and that this

training is conducted without interference. This section would also require any portion of the land declared as excess by the Navy be managed by any recipient as a conservation zone subject to the irrevocable condition that the recipient of the property, and any successor in interest, manage all lands in the same manner. This section would further require the Secretary to retain approximately 100 acres, containing the Relocatable Over-the-Horizon Radar and the Mt. Pirata telecommunication facility, at the Naval Ammunition Support Detachment.

Section 1502—Retention of Eastern Portion of Vieques Island

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from declaring any lands within the Eastern Manuever Area or the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, including the live impact area, on Vieques Island, Puerto Rico, to be excess to the needs of the armed forces or transferring or conveying any such lands from the jurisdiction of the Department of the Navy.

Section 1503—Limitations on Military Use of Vieques Island

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to notify the Government of Puerto Rico at least 15 days prior to any major training exercise on Vieques. This section would also limit the number of training days explosive ordnance can be used to 90 days per calendar year, and allows for an additional 90 days of training with inert ordnance. This section would further require the Secretary of the Navy to establish an advisory committee to review and comment on operations and policies regarding military training on Vieques. This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to ensure the safety of the inhabitants of Vieques and to minimize noise levels in civilian areas to the maximum extent possible. Finally, the section would also provide for a waiver of the advance warning requirements, the safety and noise restrictions and training day limitations for reasons of national security.

Section 1504—Economic Assistance for Residents of Vieques Island

This section would authorize $40.0 million in economic assistance for the citizens of Vieques for the projects outlined in the President's Directive to the Secretary of Defense and Director, Office of Management and Budget (Community Assistance) and the President's Directive to the Secretary of Defense and Director, Office of Management and Budget (Referendum) dated January 31, 2000. However, this section would expressly prohibit any of the funds to be used for a referendum regarding the further use of the island for military training purposes. In addition, the section would withhold all funding until the Department of Defense can resume live-fire training on the island using the full range of live ordnance in use prior to April 19, 1999, without interference.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorizations and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2001. As approved by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $8,433,908,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies for fiscal year 2001.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The military construction authorization request for fiscal year 2001 was introduced by request as division B of H.R. 4205 on April 6, 2000.

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $4,553,427,000 for fiscal year 2001 for military construction, including $1,174,369,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $3,480,481,000 for family housing construction and support. The committee recommends $4,874,647,000 for military construction, including $1,174,369,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and $3,559,261,000 for family housing construction and support for fiscal year 2001.

The committee restates its deepening concern about the condition of the Nation's military installations and facilities and continues to be troubled by the continuing and persistent underinvestment by the Administration in military facilities and infrastructure. The budget request for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the military construction and military family housing programs of the Department of Defense, if enacted, would represent a four percent reduction from current spending levels and a 25 percent reduction from the funding levels authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1996.

To address the serious shortfalls in the Administration's budget request, the committee recommends an increase in new budget authority for these programs of $400,000,000.

In an effort to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the committee reiterates its support for the authorities provided in subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. The Military Housing Privatization Initiative remains a central component of the ultimate resolution of the military housing crisis. The committee recommends an extension of current authorities to support this program for an additional five years to 2006. The committee recognizes that implementation of this program has occurred more slowly than initially anticipated and ex-

pects the secretaries of the military departments to accelerate implementation of this program during the extended pilot program period.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 2001 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change from Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Military Construction, Army	897,938	(225,547)	672,391
Military Construction, Navy	753,422	134,388	887,810
Military Construction, Air Force	530,969	172,904	703,873
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	784,753	30,751	815,504
NATO Security Investment Program	190,000	(12,500)	177,500
BRAC IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369
Military Construction, Army National Guard	59,130	70,009	129,139
Military Construction, Air National Guard	50,179	60,706	110,885
Military Construction, Army Reserve	81,713	23,141	104,854
Military Construction, Navy Reserve	16,103	40,471	56,574
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	14,851	26,897	41,748
SUBTOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	**4,553,427**	**321,220**	**4,874,647**
Family Housing Construction, Army	162,106	36,399	198,505
Family Housing Support, Army	978,275	(24,531)	953,744
Family Housing Construction, Navy	362,822	54,403	417,225
Family Housing Support, Navy	882,638	0	882,638
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	223,483	17,901	241,384
Family Housing Support, Air Force	826,271	(5,392)	820,879
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	0	0	0
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	44,886	0	44,886
Family Housing Improvement Fund	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	**3,480,481**	**78,780**	**3,559,261**
TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING	**8,033,908**	**400,000**	**8,433,908**

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
1	Alabama	Army	Fort Rucker	Physical Fitness Center	0	5,600	5,600
2	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Dining Facility	0	5,100	5,100
3	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Space And Missile Defense Command Building	23,400	0	23,400
4	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	OTS Academic Facility	3,825	0	3,825
5	Alabama	Air Force Reserve	Maxwell AFB	Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar	0	6,362	6,362
6	Alaska	Army	Fort Richardson	Central Vehicle Wash Facility	3,000	0	3,000
7	Alaska	Air Force	Cape Romanzof Long Range Radar Site	Generator Fuel Storage	3,900	0	3,900
8	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Dormitory (120 Rooms)	14,540	0	14,540
9	Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Hazardous Material Storage	1,450	0	1,450
10	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Dormitory (144 Rooms)	15,920	0	15,920
11	Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	11,600	0	11,600
12	Alaska	Special Operations Command	Kodiak	SOF Cold Weather Training Facility Upgrades	0	5,200	5,200
13	Alaska	Tri-Care Management Activity	Fort Wainwright	Hospital Replacement (Phase II)	44,000	0	44,000
14	Alaska	Navy Reserve	Anchorage	Marine Corps Reserve Training Center	6,403	0	6,403
15	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Chapel	0	4,000	4,000
16	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Child Development Center	0	3,350	3,350
17	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Field Operations Facility	1,250	0	1,250
18	Arizona	Navy	Camp Navajo NAVDET	Magazine Modernization	2,940	0	2,940
19	Arizona	Navy	Yuma MCAS	Combat Aircraft Loading Apron	8,200	0	8,200
20	Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Fitness Center	7,900	0	7,900
21	Arizona	Army National Guard	Papago Park, Phoenix	Add/Alter Readiness Center (AASF)	0	2,265	2,265
22	Arizona	Army National Guard	Yuma	Readiness Center	0	1,598	1,598
23	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase V)	43,600	(43,600)	0
24 *	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Chemical Defense Qualification Facility	15,500	(15,408)	92
25	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Combined Child And Family Center	0	2,750	2,750
26	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Add To C-130 Drop Zone	0	1,259	1,259
27	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	7,960	0	7,960
28	Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Fitness Center	9,100	0	9,100
29	Arkansas	Chemical Demilitarization	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase V)	0	43,600	43,600
30	Arkansas	Army Reserve	Conway	US Army Reserve Center	0	3,696	3,696
31	Arkansas	Air National Guard	Fort Smith MAP	Regional Fire Training Facility	1,760	0	1,760
32	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Barracks Complex - North	31,000	0	31,000
33	California	Army	Presidio Of Monterey	Barracks Addition	0	2,600	2,600
34	California	Army	Presidio Of Monterey	Director Of Information Management Computer Center	0	2,000	2,000
35	California	Navy	Barstow MCLB	Paint Undercoat Facility	0	6,660	6,660
36	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Armor/Anti-Armor Tracking Range	4,100	0	4,100
37	California	Navy	Camp Pendleton MCB	Infantry Squadron Battle Course	4,000	0	4,000
38	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	8,260	0	8,260
39	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Child Development Center	0	2,500	2,500
40	California	Navy	Miramar MCAS	Ground Combat Training Range	7,350	0	7,350
41	California	Navy	Miramar MCAS	Physical Fitness Training Center	0	6,390	6,390

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
42	California	Navy	Monterey Naval Postgraduate School	Building 245 Extention (Phase I)	0	5,280	5,280
43	California	Navy	North Island NADEP	Component Repair Clean Room Facility	4,340	0	4,340
44	California	Navy	North Island NAS	Berthing Wharf (Phase II)	12,800	0	12,800
45	California	Navy	Point Mugu NAWCWD	Add/Alter Range Operations Center	11,400	1,200	12,600
46	California	Navy	Port Hueneme NSWC	Weapon/Combat Systems Integration Lab	10,200	0	10,200
47	California	Navy	San Clemente NF	Aircraft Operations Building	8,860	0	8,860
48	California	Navy	San Diego NAVSTA	Berthing Pier (Phase I)	35,700	0	35,700
49	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	21,770	21,770
50	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Urban Assault Course	2,100	0	2,100
51	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Control Tower	0	6,300	6,300
52	California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Water Treatment Plant & Distribution Line	3,800	0	3,800
53	California	Air Force	Los Angeles AFB	Fitness Center	6,580	0	6,580
54	California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	4,650	0	4,650
55	California	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP North Island	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,900	0	5,900
56	California	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP TwentyNine Palms	Fuel Storage Facility	2,200	0	2,200
57	California	Special Operations Command	Coronado NAB	Applied Instruction Facility	4,300	0	4,300
58	California	Special Operations Command	North Island NAS	Small Craft Berthing Facility	1,350	0	1,350
59	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Camp Pendleton MCB	Fleet Hospital Operations & Training Command Support Facilities	2,900	0	2,900
60	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Camp Pendleton MCB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Horno)	3,950	0	3,950
61	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Camp Pendleton MCB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Pulgas)	3,750	0	3,750
62	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Camp Pendleton MCB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Las Flores)	3,550	0	3,550
63	California	Tri-Care Management Activity	Edwards AFB	Medical Clinic Replacement/Dental Clinic Alteration	17,900	0	17,900
64	California	Army National Guard	Bakersfield	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	0	1,380
65	California	Army National Guard	Colton	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	0	489
66	California	Army National Guard	Escondido	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,380	0	1,380
67	California	Army National Guard	Fresno	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	0	1,869
68	California	Army National Guard	Los Alamitos AFRC	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	0	489
69	California	Army National Guard	Richmond	Organizational Maintenance Shop	489	0	489
70	California	Army National Guard	San Jose	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,869	0	1,869
71	California	Army National Guard	San Mateo	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461	0	461
72	California	Army National Guard	Santa Barbara	Organizational Maintenance Shop	483	0	483
73	California	Navy Reserve	Alameda NAS	Seawall	950	0	950
74	California	Air Force Reserve	March ARB	Deployment Equipment Staging Area	0	1,680	1,680
75	Colorado	Army	Pueblo Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	10,700	(10,700)	0
76	Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	Space Based Infrared System Power Connection	2,750	0	2,750
77	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Dormitory (144 Rooms)	11,000	0	11,000
78	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Operations Support Facility	2,260	0	2,260
79	Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Maintain Access Main Gate	0	2,310	2,310
80	Colorado	Air Force	Schriever AFB	Operational Support Facility Addition	8,450	0	8,450
81	Colorado	Air Force	U.S. Air Force Academy	Add To Athletic Facilities	18,960	0	18,960
82	Colorado	Chemical Demilitarization	Pueblo Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase II)	0	10,700	10,700

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
83	Colorado	Army National Guard	Fort Carson	Mobilization And Training Equipment Site (Phase I)	0	15,100	15,100
84	Colorado	Air National Guard	Buckley ANGB	Replace Joint Munitions Maintenance And Storage Complex	0	6,000	6,000
85	Connecticut	Navy	New London NSB	Drydock Support Facility	3,100	0	3,100
86	District of Columbia	Navy	Marine Corps Barracks	Site Improvements and Support Facilities	0	7,400	7,400
87	District of Columbia	Navy	Marine Corps Barracks	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	17,197	0	17,197
88	District of Columbia	Navy	Washington NAVDIST	Navy Museum Annex	2,450	0	2,450
89	District of Columbia	Navy	Washington NRL	Nano Science Research Lab	0	12,390	12,390
90	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Child Development Center	4,520	0	4,520
91	Florida	Navy	Blount Island Command	Land Acquisition (Phase II)	0	3,320	3,320
92	Florida	Navy	Jacksonville NAS	Child Development Center Addition	0	1,400	1,400
93	Florida	Navy	Mayport NS	Aircraft Carrier Wharf Improvements	0	6,830	6,830
94	Florida	Navy	Panama City NSWCSS	Child Development Center	0	1,000	1,000
95	Florida	Navy	Whiting Field NAS	JPATS T-6A GSE/Paint Facility	3,900	0	3,900
96	Florida	Navy	Whiting Field NAS	JPATS T-6A Operations/Maintenance Facility	1,230	0	1,230
97	Florida	Navy	Fort Lauderdale NSWC	Seawall & Ship Berthing Facility	3,570	0	3,570
98	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Upgrade Dormitory (72 Rooms)	5,600	0	5,600
99	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Precision Guided Munitions Maintenance Facility	3,340	0	3,340
100	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Upgrade Access Roads	5,600	0	5,600
101	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Defense Access Road	2,360	0	2,360
102	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	DEOMI Facility	12,970	0	12,970
103	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Add/Alter Maintenance Facility	18,500	0	18,500
104	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	F-22 Operations Facility	6,800	0	6,800
105	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Weapons Controller Training School	0	6,195	6,195
106	Florida	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP MacDill AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	16,956	0	16,956
107	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin Aux Field 9	AGE Maintenance/Dispatch Complex	4,750	0	4,750
108	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin Aux Field 9	Air Field Readiness Improvements	3,000	0	3,000
109	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin Aux Field 9	Corrosion Control Facility	8,100	0	8,100
110	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin Aux Field 9	Hot Cargo Pad	7,354	0	7,354
111	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin Aux Field 9	Supply Package Facility	0	3,319	3,319
112	Florida	Tri-Care Management Activity	Eglin AFB	Hospital Addition Alteration/Life Safety Upgrade	37,600	0	37,600
113	Florida	Tri-Care Management Activity	Patrick AFB	Medical Clinic	2,700	0	2,700
114	Florida	Tri-Care Management Activity	Tyndall AFB	Add/Alter Medical Clinic	7,700	0	7,700
115	Florida	Army Reserve	Clearwater	Clearwater Aviation Support Facility	0	17,800	17,800
116	Florida	Army Reserve	Orlando	Add/Alter AFR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop	17,953	0	17,953
117	Florida	Army Reserve	St. Petersburg	Armed Forces Reserve Center (Phase I)	0	10,000	10,000
118 *	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Barracks Complex - Kelley Hill (Phase IIIB)	24,000	(24,000)	0
119	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Fixed Wing Aircraft Parking Apron	15,800	0	15,800
120	Georgia	Army	Fort Gordon	Consolidated Fire Station	0	2,600	2,600
121 *	Georgia	Army	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Barracks Complex - Hunter Army Airfield (Phase IC)	26,000	(26,000)	0
122	Georgia	Navy	Albany MCLB	Renovate Vehicle Storage Facility	1,100	0	1,100
123	Georgia	Navy	Athens NSCS	Fitness Center	0	2,950	2,950

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
124	Georgia	Navy	TRIREFITFAC Kings Bay	Sand Blasting/Paint Facility	5,200	0	5,200
125	Georgia	Air Force	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Air Support Operations Squadron Facility	4,920	0	4,920
126	Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Water Treatment Plant	2,500	0	2,500
127	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Add/Alter Storm Drainage System	0	11,762	11,762
128	Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Munitions Maintenance and Training Complex	8,500	0	8,500
129	Georgia	Navy Reserve	Atlanta NAS	Fitness Center Addition	2,650	0	2,650
130	Georgia	Navy Reserve	Atlanta NAS	Reserve Training Building Addition	1,769	0	1,769
131	Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFB	C-130 Assault Strip	6,032	0	6,032
132 *	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Barracks Complex - Wilson Street (Phase IB)	46,400	(24,000)	22,400
133	Hawaii	Army	Wheeler AAF	Barracks Complex	43,800	0	43,800
134	Hawaii	Navy	Camp Smith	CINCPAC Headquarters (Phase II)	35,600	0	35,600
135	Hawaii	Navy	Kaneohe MCB	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	18,400	0	18,400
136	Hawaii	Navy	Lualualei	Consolidated Fleet Test Support Facility	2,100	0	2,100
137	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor FISC	Wharf Upgrade	12,000	0	12,000
138	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor NAVSTA	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,500	0	16,500
139	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor NAVSTA	Relocate Seal Delivery Vehicle Team	14,200	0	14,200
140	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Upgrade Hangar Complex	4,620	0	4,620
141	Hawaii	Special Operations Command	Pearl Harbor	SOF SEAL Delivery Vehicle Team Dry Deck Shelter Operations Facility	0	9,990	9,990
142	Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Enhanced Training Range (Phase III)	10,125	0	10,125
143	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Child Development Center	0	3,400	3,400
144	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Recruit Barracks	37,000	0	37,000
145	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Recruit Barracks	37,700	0	37,700
146	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Replace Training Drill Hall	11,700	0	11,700
147	Illinois	Navy	Great Lakes NTC	Physical Training Facility	35,000	0	35,000
148	Illinois	Air Force	Scott AFB	Munitions Storage/Land Acquisition	3,830	0	3,830
149	Illinois	Army National Guard	Aurora	Readiness Center	0	2,871	2,871
150	Illinois	Army National Guard	Danville	Readiness Center	0	2,435	2,435
151	Illinois	Air National Guard	Scott AFB	KC-135 Flight Training Facility	1,500	0	1,500
152	Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	54,400	(54,400)	0
153	Indiana	Navy	Crane NWSC	Microwave Devices Engineering	0	8,460	8,460
154	Indiana	Chemical Demilitarization	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	0	54,400	54,400
155	Indiana	Army National Guard	Delphi	Organizational Maintenance Shop	1,563	0	1,563
156	Indiana	Army National Guard	Elkhart	Organizational Maintenance Shop	2,322	0	2,322
157	Indiana	Army National Guard	Logansport	Organizational Maintenance Shop	739	0	739
158	Indiana	Army National Guard	Plymouth	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951	0	951
159	Indiana	Army National Guard	South Bend	Organizational Maintenance Shop	951	0	951
160	Indiana	Air National Guard	Fort Wayne IAP	Replace Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Facility	0	7,000	7,000
161	Indiana	Air Force Reserve	Grissom ARB	Services Complex (Phase II)	0	11,290	11,290
162 *	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Barracks Complex - Infantry Drive (Phase IC)	15,000	(5,000)	10,000
163	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Child Development Center	0	5,600	5,600
164	Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	KC-135 Squad Ops/AMU	0	9,764	9,764

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
165	Kansas	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP McConnell AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	11,000	0	11,000
166	Kansas	Army National Guard	Kansas City	Organizational Maintenance Shop	641	0	641
167	Kansas	Air National Guard	McConnell AFB	B-1 Power Check Pad with Sound Suppressor	0	1,600	1,600
168	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Support (Phase II)	8,500	(8,500)	0
169 *	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex - Market Garden Road (Phase IIC)	9,400	(9,400)	0
170 *	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase III)	8,450	(8,450)	0
171	Kentucky	Chemical Demilitarization	Blue Grass AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Support (Phase II)	0	8,500	8,500
172	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Fort Campbell	Equipment Maintenance Complex	4,500	0	4,500
173	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Fort Campbell	Flight Simulator Facility	5,400	0	5,400
174	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Fort Campbell	Tactical Equipment Complex	6,400	0	6,400
175	Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Dormitory (96 Rooms)	6,390	0	6,390
176	Louisiana	Army Reserve	Fort Polk	Add/Alter USAR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop/Equipment Concentration Site	9,912	0	9,912
177	Louisiana	Army Reserve	New Orleans	USAR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop/Unheated Storage	10,375	(10,375)	0
178	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	New Orleans NAS	Joint Reserve Center (Phase I)	0	10,375	10,375
179	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	New Orleans NAS	Warehouse Addition	800	0	800
180	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	New Orleans NAS	Air Passenger Terminal	590	0	590
181	Maine	Navy	Brunswick NAS	Aircraft De-Ice/Rinse Facility	2,450	0	2,450
182	Maine	Navy	Portsmouth NSY	Standardize Waterfront Crane Rail System	0	4,960	4,960
183	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	45,700	(45,700)	0
184	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Emergency Services Center	0	5,800	5,800
185	Maryland	Army	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Munitions Assessment/Processing System Facility	3,100	0	3,100
186	Maryland	Navy	Naval Explosive Ord Disp Tech Center Indian Head	Joint Service EOD Equipment Support Facility	6,430	0	6,430
187	Maryland	Navy	Patuxent River NAS	Environmental Noise Reduction Wall	0	1,670	1,670
188	Maryland	Navy	Patuxent River NAS	Research and Development Test Support Facility	0	6,570	6,570
189	Maryland	Chemical Demilitarization	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	0	45,700	45,700
190	Maryland	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Patuxent River	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	8,300	0	8,300
191	Maryland	National Security Agency	Fort Meade	Critical Utility Control (Phase II)	769	0	769
192	Maryland	National Security Agency	Fort Meade	Route 32	3,459	0	3,459
193	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes Municipal AP	Relocate Taxiway	0	4,000	4,000
194	Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Otis ANGB	Upgrade Airfield Storm Water Collection & Detention	0	2,000	2,000
195	Massachusetts	Navy Reserve	Westover AFRB	Marine Corps Reserve Training Center	0	9,100	9,100
196	Massachusetts	Air Reserve	Westover AFRB	Repair/Alter Airman Quarters	0	7,450	7,450
197	Michigan	Army National Guard	Augusta	Organizational Maintenance Shop	3,600	0	3,600
198	Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena County RAP	Replace Operations and Training Complex	4,500	0	4,500
199	Minnesota	Army National Guard	Mankato	Readiness Center	4,681	0	4,681
200	Mississippi	Navy	Meridian NAS	T-45 Aircraft Support Facility	4,700	0	4,700
201	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Technical Training Facility	15,040	0	15,040
202	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp McCain (Elliot)	Modified Record Fire Range (RETS) Range 2B	0	2,000	2,000
203	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Oxford	Readiness Center	0	3,348	3,348
204	Mississippi	Air National Guard	Jackson IAP	Jackson-C-17 Corrosion Control/Maintenance Hangar	10,500	0	10,500
205	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Airport Improvements	0	4,200	4,200

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
206	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Basic Training Complex (Phase IA)	38,600	0	38,600
207	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Conventional Munitions Igloos	4,150	0	4,150
208	Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	B-2 Munitions Assembly Area	7,900	0	7,900
209	Missouri	Navy Reserve	Whiteman AFB	Littoral Surveillance System	0	3,570	3,570
210	Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Minuteman III Missile Service Facility	5,300	0	5,300
211	Montana	Army National Guard	Havre	Organizational Maintenance Shop	461	0	461
212	Montana	Army National Guard	Kalispell	Organizational Maintenance Shop	493	0	493
213	Montana	Army National Guard	Libby	Organizational Maintenance Shop	463	0	463
214	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Gering	Organizational Maintenance Shop	657	0	657
215	Nebraska	Army National Guard	Mead	Organizational Maintenance Shop	714	0	714
216	Nebraska	Army National Guard	North Platte	Organizational Maintenance Shop	508	0	508
217	Nevada	Navy	Fallon NAS	Corrosion Control Hangar	0	6,280	6,280
218	Nevada	Defense Logistics Agency	Fallon NAS	Replace Operating Fuel Tanks	5,000	0	5,000
219	New Hampshire	Army Reserve	Rochester	Land Acquisition	980	0	980
220	New Jersey	Army	Picatinny Arsenal	Armament Software Engineering Center (Phase II)	0	5,600	5,600
221	New Jersey	Navy	Earle NWS	Recreation Center	2,420	0	2,420
222	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Air Freight Terminal/Base Supply Complex (Phase I)	0	10,600	10,600
223	New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Fitness Center	9,772	0	9,772
224	New Mexico	Army	White Sands Missile Range	Professional Development Center	0	9,000	9,000
225	New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	0	7,350	7,350
226	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Battle Simulation Center (Phase I)	0	12,000	12,000
227 *	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Consolidated Soldier Support Center (Phase II)	10,300	(10,300)	0
228 *	New York	Army	United States Military Academy	Cadet Physical Development Center (Phase IIA)	13,600	(13,600)	0
229	New York	Tri-Care Management Activity	Fort Drum	Veterinary Treatment Facility	1,400	0	1,400
230	New York	Army National Guard	Hancock Field (ANG)	Readiness Center	5,376	0	5,376
231	New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field (Syracuse)	Small Arms Range Training Facility	0	1,250	1,250
232	New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field (Syracuse)	Upgrade Aircraft Maintenance Shops	0	9,100	9,100
233	New York	Air National Guard	Niagara Falls IAP	Upgrade Overrun and Runway	0	4,100	4,100
234	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Ammunition Holding Area	12,600	0	12,600
235	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Butner Road (Phase II)	26,000	0	26,000
236	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Longstreet Road (Phase II)	45,600	0	45,600
237 *	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Barracks Complex - Taqaytay Street (Phase IIB)	38,600	(35,492)	3,108
238	North Carolina	Army	Sunny Point Army Terminal	Railroad Equipment Maintenance Facility	2,300	0	2,300
239	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Armories	10,000	4,000	14,000
240	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	14,300	0	14,300
241	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Child Development Center	4,420	0	4,420
242	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Operations/Maintenance Storage Complex	9,500	0	9,500
243	North Carolina	Navy	Camp Lejeune MCB	Operations/Maintenance Storage Facility	3,650	0	3,650
244	North Carolina	Navy	Cherry Point MCAS	Aircraft Hangar Improvements	8,480	0	8,480
245	North Carolina	Navy	Cherry Point NADEP	Aircraft Stripping Facility Addition	7,540	0	7,540
246	North Carolina	Navy	New River MCAS	Air Traffic Control Tower	2,600	0	2,600

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
247	North Carolina	Navy	New River MCAS	Aircraft Rinse Facility	800	0	800
248	North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Dangerous Cargo Pads	24,570	0	24,570
249	North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	Repair Airfield Pavements	0	7,141	7,141
250	North Carolina	Defense Education Activity	Camp Lejeune MCB	Russell Elementary School	5,914	0	5,914
251	North Carolina	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Cherry Point	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	5,700	0	5,700
252	North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Fort Bragg	Media Operations Complex	8,600	0	8,600
253	North Carolina	Army National Guard	Fort Bragg	Military Educational Facility (Phase I)	8,709	0	8,709
254	North Carolina	Air National Guard	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	Replace Supply Warehouse	0	6,300	6,300
255	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Add to Missile Maintenance Facility	0	3,151	3,151
256	Ohio	Army	Columbus	Military Entrance Processing Station	1,832	0	1,832
257	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Consolidated Toxic Hazards Laboratory	0	14,908	14,908
258	Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace West Ramp (Phase I)	22,600	0	22,600
259	Ohio	Air National Guard	Springfield Beckley IAP	Relocate Power Check Pad and Arm/Dearm Pad (Phase I)	0	4,000	4,000
260	Ohio	Air National Guard	Toledo Express AP	Replace Logistics Complex	0	6,900	6,900
261	Ohio	Air National Guard	Mansfield Lahm Airport	Replace Squadron Ops and Communications Training Facility	0	7,700	7,700
262	Ohio	Navy Reserve	Columbus NMCRC	Consolidated Navy and Marine Corps Air Reserve Center	0	7,080	7,080
263	Oklahoma	Army	Fort Sill	Tactical Equipment Shop (Phase II)	0	10,991	10,991
264	Oklahoma	Air Force	Altus AFB	C-17 Cargo Compartment Trainer	0	2,939	2,939
265	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Depot Corrosion Control Strip Facility (WCF)	12,380	0	12,380
266	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitory (96 Rooms)	5,800	0	5,800
267	Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Dormitory	0	8,715	8,715
268	Oregon	Army	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase VI)	9,400	(9,400)	0
269	Oregon	Chemical Demilitarization	Umatilla DA	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase VI)	0	9,400	9,400
270	Oregon	Army National Guard	Baker City	Readiness Center	3,122	0	3,122
271	Oregon	Army National Guard	Camp Rilea	Training Simulation Center	0	1,470	1,470
272	Oregon	Navy Reserve	Portland IAP	Reserve Center Alternation and Vehicle Maintenance Facility	1,420	0	1,420
273	Pennsylvania	Army	Carlisle Barracks	Academic Research Facility	10,500	0	10,500
274	Pennsylvania	Army	New Cumberland AD	Military Entrance Processing Station	3,700	0	3,700
275	Pennsylvania	Navy	Philadelphia NSWC	Gas Turbine Testing Facility	0	10,680	10,680
276	Pennsylvania	Defense Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Replace Controlled Humidity Warehouse	13,000	0	13,000
277	Pennsylvania	Defense Logistics Agency	DDSP New Cumberland	Child Development Center	4,700	0	4,700
278	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Fort Indiantown Gap	Repair Waste Treatment Plant/Sewage Line Replacement	0	8,518	8,518
279	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Johnstown	Regional Maintenance Shop	0	4,500	4,500
280	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	Mansfield	Readiness Center	0	3,100	3,100
281	Pennsylvania	Army National Guard	New Milford	Readiness Center	0	2,675	2,675
282	Pennsylvania	Air Force Reserve	Willow Grove ARS	Alter Hangar and Fire Suppresion	2,400	0	2,400
283	Rhode Island	Navy	Division Newport NUWC	Shore Based Launch Facility	4,150	0	4,150
284	South Carolina	Navy	Beaufort MCAS	Flightline Fire Safety Improvements	3,140	0	3,140
285	South Carolina	Navy	Parris Island MCRD	Field Training Complex	2,660	0	2,660
286	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Add Flight Simulator Facility	2,500	0	2,500
287	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Runway Repair, North Field	0	10,289	10,289

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
288	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Dining Facility	0	5,252	5,252
289	South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	USCENTAF Operations Weather Squadron Facility	2,850	0	2,850
290	South Carolina	Defense Education Activity	Laurel Bay	Laurel Bay Primary Classroom Addition	804	0	804
291	South Carolina	Army National Guard	Beaufort	Readiness Center	0	4,870	4,870
292	South Carolina	Navy Reserve	Fort Jackson	Naval Reserve Armory	0	5,200	5,200
293	South Dakota	Army National Guard	Sioux Falls	Consolidated Barracks/Education Facility	0	4,955	4,955
294	Tennessee	Army National Guard	Henderson	Organizational Maintenance Shop	0	1,976	1,976
295	Tennessee	Army National Guard	New Tazwell	Readiness Center	0	3,510	3,510
296	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Railyard Infrastructure	26,000	0	26,000
297	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Command and Control Facility (Phase I)	0	4,000	4,000
298	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Fire Station/Transportation Motor Pool	0	6,492	6,492
299	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase I)	16,000	0	16,000
300	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Railhead Facility (Phase III)	9,800	0	9,800
301	Texas	Army	Red River Army Depot	Ammunition Container Complex	800	0	800
302	Texas	Navy	Corpus Christi NAS	Parking Apron Expansion	0	4,850	4,850
303	Texas	Navy	Ingleside NS	Mobile Mine Assembly Unit Facility	0	2,420	2,420
304	Texas	Navy	Kingsville NAS	Aircraft Parking Apron	0	2,670	2,670
305	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	C-130 Squad Ops/AMU	0	7,348	7,348
306	Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	Realistic Bomber Training Initiative	12,175	0	12,175
307	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Child Development Center	0	4,830	4,830
308	Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Dormitory (96 Rooms)	5,500	0	5,500
309	Texas	Air Force	Laughlin AFB	Visitors Quarters Facility	0	11,973	11,973
310	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Dining Facility (Phase I)	0	6,450	6,450
311	Texas	Tri-Care Management Activity	William Beaumont Medical Center	Laboratory Renovation	0	4,200	4,200
312	Texas	Army Reserve	Camp Bullis	USAR Center/Unheated Storage	1,464	0	1,464
313	Texas	Army Reserve	Fort Sam Houston	USAR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop/Equipment Concentration Site	13,678	0	13,678
314	Texas	Navy Reserve	Fort Worth NAS, JRB	Indoor Rifle Range	0	3,490	3,490
315	Texas	Navy Reserve	Fort Worth NAS, JRB	Religious Ministry Facility	0	1,580	1,580
316	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	C-130 Corrosion Control Facility (WCF)	16,500	0	16,500
317	Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Dormitory (144 Rooms)	0	11,550	11,550
318	Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	10,300	0	10,300
319	Virginia	Navy	AEGIS CSC Wallops Island	Spy 1-D Test and Evaluation Facility Addition	3,300	0	3,300
320	Virginia	Navy	Dahlgren NSWC	Innovative Technology and Infrastructure	11,300	0	11,300
321	Virginia	Navy	Little Creek NAB	Waterfront Operations Facility	2,830	0	2,830
322	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NAS	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	13,300	0	13,300
323	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NAS	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	11,800	0	11,800
324	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NAS	Taxiway Extension and Lights	6,350	0	6,350
325	Virginia	Navy	Norfolk NAVSTA	Pier Enhancements	4,700	0	4,700
326	Virginia	Navy	NSY Norfolk, Portsmouth	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	16,100	0	16,100
327	Virginia	Navy	Oceana NAS	Airfield Improvements	5,250	0	5,250
328	Virginia	Navy	Oceana NAS	Airfield Perimeter Security	0	4,190	4,190

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars In Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
329	Virginia	Navy	Quantico MCCDC	Physical Training Facility	8,590	0	8,590
330	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Dormitory (96 Rooms)	7,470	0	7,470
331	Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Fitness Center	0	12,180	12,180
332	Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Oceana	Replace Fuel Storage Tank	2,000	0	2,000
333	Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	DSC Richmond	Emergency Services Facility	4,500	0	4,500
334	Virginia	Special Operations Command	FCTC Dam Neck	Operational Support Facility	5,500	0	5,500
335	Virginia	Special Operations Command	Little Creek NAB	Air Operations Facility	5,400	0	5,400
336	Virginia	Special Operations Command	Oceana NAS	Operations Support Facility	3,400	0	3,400
337	Virginia	Army Reserve	Fort A.P. Hill	USAR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop/Area Maintenance Support Activity	4,275	0	4,275
338	Washington	Navy	Bremerton NS	Fleet Recreation Facility	0	1,930	1,930
339	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY, Bremerton	Industrial Skills Center (Phase I)	0	10,000	10,000
340	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY, Bremerton	Chemical Metallurgical Lab	9,400	0	9,400
341	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY, Bremerton	Oily Wastewater Collection	6,600	0	6,600
342	Washington	Navy	Puget Sound NSY, Bremerton	Pier Replacement (Phase I)	38,000	0	38,000
343	Washington	Navy	Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bremerton	Explosives Handling Wharf Modification	1,400	0	1,400
344	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Joint Personnel Recovery Training Facility	0	5,880	5,880
345	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Runway Centerline Lighting	0	2,046	2,046
346	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Add/Alter C-17 Nose Docks	3,750	0	3,750
347	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit	6,500	0	6,500
348	Washington	Army National Guard	Bremerton	Readiness Center	2,639	1,702	4,341
349	Washington	Army National Guard	Yakima Training Center	Readiness Center	5,104	0	5,104
350	Washington	Army Reserve	Tacoma	USAR Center/Organizational Maintenance Shop/Area Maintenance Support Activity Marine	14,759	0	14,759
351	Wyoming	Air Force	F.E. Warren AFB	Command and Control Support Facility	10,200	0	10,200
352	Wyoming	Air Force	F.E. Warren AFB	Minuteman III Missile Service Complex	15,520	0	15,520
353	CONUS Classified	Air Force	Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	1,810	0	1,810
354	CONUS Various	Navy	CONUS Various	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters and Dining Facility	11,500	0	11,500
355	Bahrain	Navy	ASU	Operations Center	19,400	0	19,400
356	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Aruba	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Facility	8,800	(8,800)	0
357	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Aruba	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	860	(860)	0
358	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Aruba	Small Expeditionary Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Apron	590	(590)	0
359	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Curacao	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	9,200	(9,200)	0
360	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Curacao	Airfield Pavement/Rinse Facility	29,500	(29,500)	0
361	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	3,000	(3,000)	0
362	Curacao/Aruba	Office Secretary of Defense	Curacao	Expeditionary Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit/Storage	2,200	(2,200)	0
363	Diego Garcia	Air Force	Diego Garcia	Munitions Storage Igloos	5,475	0	5,475
364	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Nose/Dock/Apron	6,723	(6,723)	0
365	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Maintenance Facilities	4,900	(4,900)	0
366	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Rescue Station	2,200	(2,200)	0
367	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maintenance Unit/Storage	2,600	(2,600)	0
368	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Airmen Quarters/Dining Facility	4,650	(4,650)	0
369	Ecuador	Office Secretary of Defense	Manta	Expeditionary Visiting Officer Quarters	1,600	(1,600)	0

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
370	Germany	Army	Bamberg ASG	Barracks Complex - Warner 7005	7,800	0	7,800
371	Germany	Army	Bamberg ASG	Barracks Complex - Warner 7041	3,850	0	3,850
372	Germany	Army	Darmstadt ASG	Barracks Complex - Kelley 4164	5,600	0	5,600
373	Germany	Army	Darmstadt ASG	Barracks Complex - Cambrai Fritsch 4002	5,700	0	5,700
374	Germany	Army	Kaiserslautern	Child Development Center	3,400	0	3,400
375	Germany	Army	Mannheim	Barracks Complex - Coleman 2	4,050	0	4,050
376	Germany	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Kleber Kaserne	Renovate Administrative Facility	7,500	0	7,500
377	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Hanau	Argonner Elementary School Classroom Addition	1,026	0	1,026
378	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Hohenfels	Construct New Middle/High School	13,774	0	13,774
379	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Schweinfurt	Schweinfurt Elementary School Addition	1,444	0	1,444
380	Germany	Defense Education Activity	Wurtzburg	Wuerzburg Elementary School Classroom Addition	1,798	0	1,798
381	Germany	Defense Threat Reduction Agency	Darmstadt	Darmstadt	2,450	0	2,450
382	Germany	Tri-Care Management Activity	Kitzingen	Health/Dental Clinic Life Safety Upgrade	1,400	0	1,400
383	Germany	Tri-Care Management Activity	Wiesbaden AB	Add/Alter Health/Dental Clinic	7,187	0	7,187
384	Guam	Navy	Naval Activities, Guam	Child Development Center	0	1,000	1,000
385	Guam	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Andersen AFB	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	16,000	0	16,000
386	Guam	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Guam	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	20,000	0	20,000
387	Italy	Navy	Naples NSA	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	15,000	0	15,000
388	Italy	Navy	Sigonella NAS	Community Facilities	32,029	940	32,969
389	Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Dormitory (102 Rooms)	8,000	0	8,000
390	Italy	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Sigonella	Replace Bulk Fuel Storage Facility	16,300	0	16,300
391	Italy	Defense Education Activity	Sigonella	Sigonella Elementary School/High School Addition	971	0	971
392	Italy	Tri-Care Management Activity	Naples NSA	Medical Dental Facility Replacement	43,850	(43,850)	0
393	Japan	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Iwakuni MCAS	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	22,400	0	22,400
394	Japan	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Misawa AB	Bulk Fuel Storage Tanks	26,400	0	26,400
395	Korea	Army	Camp Carroll	Whole Barracks Renewal	0	10,000	10,000
396	Korea	Army	Camp Hovey	Dining Facility Expansion	0	4,200	4,200
397	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Whole Barracks Renewal Complex	14,200	0	14,200
398	Korea	Army	Camp Page	Barracks Complex	19,500	0	19,500
399	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	6,400	0	6,400
400	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 Rooms)	11,348	0	11,348
401	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Upgrade Water Distribution System	10,600	0	10,600
402	Korea	Special Operations Command	Taegu	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Complex	1,450	0	1,450
403	Kwajalein	Army	Kwajalein	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing Renovation	18,000	0	18,000
404	Puerto Rico	Special Operations Command	Roosevelt Roads	SOF Boat Maintenance Facility	1,241	0	1,241
405	Spain	Air Force	Rota NAVSTA	Enhance Rota, Various Facilities	5,052	0	5,052
406	Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Fire Training Facility	1,000	0	1,000
407	United Kingdom	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Mildenhall RAF	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	10,000	0	10,000
408	United Kingdom	Defense Education Activity	Feltwell RAF	Feltwell Elementary School Classroom Addition	1,287	0	1,287
409	United Kingdom	Defense Education Activity	Lakenheath RAF	Lakenheath Elementary School Classroom Addition	3,086	0	3,086
410	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Classified Project	11,500	0	11,500

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
411	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(635)	(635)
412	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation Support	22,600	0	22,600
413	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	72,106	11,155	83,261
414	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	15,000	2,000	17,000
415	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(2,889)	(2,889)
416	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(20,000)	(20,000)
417	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	63,335	4,167	67,502
418	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,659	0	7,659
419	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	54,237	2,712	56,949
420	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,850	0	9,850
421	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	NMD Initial Deployment Facilities	85,095	0	85,095
422	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	14,729	0	14,729
423	Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,694	0	3,694
424	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,786	0	6,786
425	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,800	0	1,800
426	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Wide	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(7,115)	(7,115)
427	Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction (Defense Level)	3,000	0	3,000
428	Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design (Defense Level)	24,000	0	24,000
429	Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design (OSD)	2,900	(2,900)	0
430	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	10,000	0	10,000
431	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	3,790	0	3,790
432	Worldwide Unspecified	NATO Security Investment Program	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	190,000	(12,500)	177,500
433	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,232	2,116	6,348
434	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,295	1,000	3,295
435	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	9,119	756	9,875
436	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000	0	4,000
437	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,400	1,320	7,720
438	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,917	700	2,617
439	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,521	76	1,597
440	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,304	115	2,419
441	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,115	0	4,115
442	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500	0	1,500
443	Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment & Closure IV	1,174,369	0	1,174,369
444	Worldwide Unspecified	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,196	0	6,196
445	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Threat Reduction Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,600	0	2,600
446	Worldwide Unspecified	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	33,570	(33,570)	0
447	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	22,000	0	22,000
448	Worldwide Unspecified	Tri-Care Management Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000	0	3,000
449	Worldwide Various	Navy	Various Worldwide	Host Nation Infrastructure Support	142	0	142
450	Arizona	Army	Fort Huachuca	Replace Family Housing (110 units)	16,224	0	16,224
451	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Replace Family Housing (160 units)	27,768	0	27,768

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
452	California	Navy	Lemoore NAS	Officer/Enlisted Replacement Homes (100 units)	0	20,103	20,103
453	California	Navy	Twentynine Palms MCAGCC	Replacement (79 units)	13,923	0	13,923
454	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase I (57 units)	0	9,870	9,870
455	California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Replace Family Housing (64 units)	0	9,870	9,870
456	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace Family Housing (136 units)	17,137	0	17,137
457	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Replace Family Housing (72 units)	15,500	0	15,500
458	Hawaii	Navy	Kaneohe Bay MCAS	Replace Capehart South (84 units)	21,910	0	21,910
459	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor CNB	Replace Family Housing, Hale Moku (98 units)	22,230	0	22,230
460	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor CNB	Replace Family Housing, Pearl City (62 units)	14,237	0	14,237
461	Hawaii	Navy	Pearl Harbor CNB	Replace Family Housing, Radford Terrace (112 units)	23,654	0	23,654
462	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Family Housing Replacement - Lee Village (46 units)	0	8,000	8,000
463	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Replace Family Housing (56 units)	7,800	0	7,800
464	Louisiana	Navy	New Orleans NAS	Family Housing, New Construction (34 units)	0	5,000	5,000
465	Maine	Navy	Brunswick NAS	Replace/New Enlisted Homes (168 units)	18,722	0	18,722
466	Maryland	Army	Fort Detrick	Replace Family Housing (48 units)	5,600	0	5,600
467	Mississippi	Navy	Gulfport NCBC	Replace Family Housing, Phase I (157 units)	0	20,700	20,700
468	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Replace Family Housing, Phase VIII (26 units)	0	5,000	5,000
469	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Replace Family Housing (112 units)	14,600	0	14,600
470	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Junior Enlisted, Junior NCO Housing (48 units)	0	7,400	7,400
471	North Dakota	Air Force	Cavalier AFS	Improve Family Housing (2 units)	443	0	443
472	North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace Family Housing (134 units)	19,097	0	19,097
473	South Carolina	Army	Fort Jackson	New Family Housing (1 unit)	250	0	250
474	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Replace Family Housing (64 units)	10,200	0	10,200
475	Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	Family Housing, New Construction (27 units)	0	5,500	5,500
476	Virginia	Army	Fort Lee	Family Housing Replacement - Harrison Villa (52 units)	0	8,600	8,600
477	Washington	Navy	Whidbey Island NAS	Replace/New Family Housing (98 units)	16,873	0	16,873
478	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Replace Family Housing (60 units)	21,800	0	21,800
479	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	63,590	8,850	72,440
480	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(1,951)	(1,951)
481	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	6,542	0	6,542
482	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	44,374	0	44,374
483	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(17,960)	(17,960)
484	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest Payment	1	0	1
485	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	202,011	0	202,011
486	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	397,792	0	397,792
487	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	90,286	(6,571)	83,715
488	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	855	0	855
489	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	44,855	0	44,855
490	Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	198,101	0	198,101
491	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	183,547	8,600	192,147
492	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	19,958	0	19,958

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 2001 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 2001 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
493	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	30,884	0	30,884
494	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	142,690	0	142,690
495	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	393,830	0	393,830
496	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	84,914	0	84,914
497	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,239	0	1,239
498	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	71	0	71
499	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	63,953	0	63,953
500	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	165,057	0	165,057
501	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	174,046	0	174,046
502	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(6,839)	(6,839)
503	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	12,760	0	12,760
504	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	38,180	0	38,180
505	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Foreign Currency Adjustment	0	(5,392)	(5,392)
506	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	114,628	0	114,628
507	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	428,456	0	428,456
508	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	55,685	0	55,685
509	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	2,332	0	2,332
510	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	34	0	34
511	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	27,997	0	27,997
512	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	158,959	0	158,959
513	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,564	0	3,564
514	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	25,924	0	25,924
515	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	22	0	22
516	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	316	0	316
517	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	271	0	271
518	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	77	0	77
519	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	421	0	421
520	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	146	0	146
521	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	12,554	0	12,554
522	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	653	0	653
523	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	15	0	15
524	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	64	0	64
525	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	415	0	415
526	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	444	0	444

* Authorization of Appropriations provided in the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Division B of Public Law 106-65)

A tabular summary of the military construction projects included with the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the BRAC IV account follows:

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 budget request contained $897,938,000 for Army military construction and $1,140,381,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $672,391,000 for military construction and $1,152,249,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Condition of Barracks to Support Basic Training

The committee notes favorably the commitment of the Secretary of the Army and the uniformed leadership of the Army to a resolution of the problem of substandard barracks conditions for permanent party personnel by fiscal year 2008. The committee continues to support strongly improvement in the quality of life for unaccompanied military personnel. The committee recognizes that the program to conclude the modernization of permanent party barracks in a timely manner, combined with the requirement to modernize the Army's strategic mobility infrastructure by fiscal year 2004, limits the ability of the Army to program adequately for other military construction priorities given the funds currently allocated to the military construction account in the current future years defense program (FYDP). The committee reiterates its view that additional funds for military construction are required to meet significant infrastructure shortfalls affecting military readiness and the retention of military personnel. The committee is concerned that current Army programming will not permit adequate attention to the problem of substandard barracks conditions for recruits. The committee notes that only one barracks construction project, based on newly adopted Army standards for recruit barracks, is funded within the current FYDP. The committee does not believe such a funding profile is sufficient. The committee is especially concerned that training installations, which may expect increases in the number of new recruits and trainees, lack sufficient barracks spaces to accommodate that training load and that existing barracks spaces are generally substandard. The committee urges the Secretary of the Army to review current plans and programs to improve the condition of barracks to support basic training and directs the Secretary to report on his findings, including any recommendations, coincident with the submission of the fiscal year 2002 budget request.

Improvements to Military Family Housing

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements to military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Army execute the following projects: $4,700,000 for

Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (28 units) at Fort Irwin, California, and $4,150,000 for Whole Neighborhood Revitalization (56 units) at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

Planning and Design

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following projects: $1,600,000 for a power train modification facility at Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, and $4,320,000 for a basic trainee barracks complex at Fort Jackson, South Carolina.

Unspecified Minor Construction

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: $500,000 for multimedia learning centers at the United States Military Academy, New York.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 2001. This section also provides an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 1999 Project

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261) to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for the construction of a railhead facility at Fort Hood, Texas.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $753,422,000 for Navy military construction and $1,245,460,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $887,810,000 for military construction and $1,299,863,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Acquisition of Prepositioned Equipment Maintenance Facilities, Blount Island, Jacksonville, Florida

The committee reiterates its support for the acquisition of prepositioned equipment facilities managed under lease by the Department of the Navy at Blount Island Command, Jacksonville, Florida. The committee recalls that the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79) provided authority for the expenditure of $5,000,000 as the first phase of this major land acquisition. The committee recommends an additional $3,320,000 for this purpose for fiscal year 2001 and expects those funds to be combined to acquire three parcels of real property based on current real estate valuations. The committee notes that the budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 provided by the Secretary of the Navy indicate that sufficient funds are programmed to acquire the remainder of the real property required by the Marine Corps. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to make every effort to complete this acquisition in a timely fashion.

Improvements to Military Family Housing

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements to military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following project: $8,600,000 for Whole House Revitalization (98 units) at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

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.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

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.

Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Fiscal Year 1997 Project at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia

This section would modify the authorized use of funds authorized for appropriation for fiscal year 1997 for a military construction project at Marine Corps Command Development Command, Quantico, Virginia. This section would permit the use of previously authorized funds to carry out a military construction project involving infrastructure development at that installation.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $530,969,000 for Air Force military construction and $1,049,754,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $703,873,000 for military construction and $1,062,263,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Rome Research Site, New York

The committee notes the authority provided by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79) to permit the Secretary of the Air Force to utilize appropriated funds and contributions by the State of New York to support the improvement of facilities at the Rome Research Site, New York. The committee was concerned that such authority could be utilized in a manner that would provide a comparative advantage over similar installations for which the authority did not apply in the event additional base closures and realignments are authorized by Congress. The committee notes that the terms of the memorandum of understanding entered into by Empire State Development, Griffiss Local Development Corporation, and Air Force Materiel Command does not constitute a commitment by the Air Force to preclude the Rome Research Site from being considered, recommended, or selected for closure under any current or future base closure law.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 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.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2001.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 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 budget request contained $784,753,000 for defense agencies military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends authorization of $815,504,000 for military construction and $44,886,000 for family housing.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Forward Operating Locations in Support of Counter-Drug and Drug Interdiction Activities

The budget request contained $76,823,000 for military construction at Manta, Ecuador, and Aruba and Curacao in the Netherlands Antilles for the establishment of forward operating locations to support the counter-drug and drug interdiction activities of the Department of Defense. The committee supports the establishment of forward operating locations at those sites. However, the committee notes that funds to support military construction for this purpose was included in H.R. 3908, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, as passed by the House on March 30, 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of that amount in Military Construction, Defense-Wide.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 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.

Section 2402—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

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.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $190,000,000 for the NATO infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 2001. The committee recommends $177,500,000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security investment program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this bill and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations of $177,500,000 as the U.S. contribution to the NATO security investment program.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $221,976,000 for fiscal year 2001 for guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2001 of $434,560,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$ 129,139,000
Air National Guard	110,885,000
Army Reserve	104,854,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	47,934,000
Air Force Reserve	41,748,000
Total	443,200,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Planning and Design, Army National Guard

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following project: $1,281,000 for a combined support and maintenance shop at Fort Lewis, Washington.

Planning and Design, Army Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for planning and design, the Secretary of the Army complete planning and design activities for the following project: $809,000 for an advanced training barracks complex at Fort Dix, New Jersey.

Unspecified Minor Construction, Army Reserve

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for unspecified minor construction, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: $700,000 for parking and site improvements at Fort Douglas, Utah.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 2001. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2000 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2000 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1998 Projects

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1998 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later.

Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1997 Projects

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1997 military construction authorizations until October 1, 2000, or the date of the enactment of the Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2001, whichever is later.

Section 2704—Effective Date

This section would provide that Titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 1999, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Housing Privatization Initiative

The committee reiterates its strong support for the development of military housing under the authority provided by subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. The committee acknowledges that the privatization of military family housing may, in certain instances, have an effect on local educational agencies and educational infrastructure requirements. The committee notes that section 2871 of title 10, United States Code, provides general authority for the development of facilities to support elementary or secondary education as ancillary supporting facilities to privatized military housing. The committee urges the secretaries of the military departments to assess more adequately the impact of the development of military housing under this authority on local education agencies and infrastructure. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to assess the impact of military housing developed under the authority of subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, at Fort Carson, Colorado. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report on his findings, and any recommendations, concurrent with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2002.

Water Quality Issues Affecting Military Installations in the Area of Kaiserslautern, Germany

The committee is aware of limited environmental contamination at five locations on, or near, military installations supporting the missions of the Army and the Air Force in the area of Kaiserslautern, Germany. The committee urges the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to continue to work cooperatively with local German authorities to resolve matters relating to environmental contamination affecting the water supply supporting military installations and civilians in the area of Kaiserlautern, Germany.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Revision of Limitations on Space by Pay Grade

This section would amend section 2826 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretary concerned to ensure that the room patterns and floor areas of military family housing units con-

structed, acquired, or improved by the secretary shall be generally comparable to those available in the locality of the military installation on which such military family housing units are located.

Section 2802—Leasing of Military Family Housing, United States Southern Command, Miami, Florida

This section would amend section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the authorized terms of leasing for military family housing to support the United States Southern Command in Miami, Florida.

Section 2803—Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This section would amend section 2885 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authorities contained in subchapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, for an additional five-year period to 2006.

Section 2804—Expansion of Definition of Armory to Include Readiness Centers

This section would amend section 18232 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the term "readiness center" shall have the same meaning as the term "armory".

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Increase in Threshold for Notice and Wait Requirements for Real Property Transactions

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the threshold for notice and wait requirements for real property transactions from $200,000 to $500,000.

Section 2812—Enhancement of Authority of Military Departments to Lease Non-Excess Property

This section would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States, to modify the permissible forms of consideration received by the secretary concerned for the lease of non-excess real property under the control of the secretary.

Section 2813—Conveyance Authority Regarding Utility Systems of Military Departments

This section would amend section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, to require the secretary concerned to comply with the competition requirements of section 2304 of title 10, United States Code, in the conveyance of utility system infrastructure.

SUBTITLE C—LAND CONVEYANCES GENERALLY

Part I—Army Conveyances

Section 2831—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois

This section would authorize the transfer of, and exchange of jurisdiction on, a parcel of real property with improvements consisting of approximately 23 acres at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. The parcel is to be incorporated into the Rock Island National Cemetery.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Galesburg, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 4.65 acres in Galesburg, Illinois, to Knox County, Illinois. The property is to be used for the development of municipal and other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the County.

Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Winona, Minnesota

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements to Winona State University Foundation. The property is to be used for educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Foundation.

Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Fort Polk, Louisiana

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 100 acres at Fort Polk, Louisiana, to the State of Louisiana. The property is to be used for the establishment of a State-run veterans' cemetery. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Commission.

Section 2835—Land Conveyance, Fort Pickett, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of not more than 700 acres, at Fort Pickett, Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia. The property is to be used for the development and operation of a public safety training facility. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Commonwealth.

Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Fort Dix, New Jersey

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately two acres and containing a

parking lot inadvertently constructed on the parcel, at Fort Dix, New Jersey, to Pemberton Township, New Jersey.

Section 2837—Land Conveyance, Nike Site 43, Elrama, Pennsylvania

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 160 acres in Elmara, Pennsylvania, to the Board of Supervisors of Union Township, Pennsylvania. The parcel is to be used for municipal and other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Township.

Section 2838—Land Exchange, Fort Hood, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 200 acres at Fort Hood, Texas, to the City of Copperas Cove, Texas. As consideration for the conveyance, the City would convey to one or more parcels of real property, consisting of approximately 300 acres, to the Secretary. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyances would be borne by the City.

Section 2839—Land Conveyance, Charles Melvin Price Support Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements consisting of approximately 752 acres to the Tri-City Regional Port District of Granite City, Illinois. As consideration for the conveyance, the Secretary shall determine if the Port District satisfies the criteria to qualify for a public benefit conveyance. If the public interest is served, the secretary may accept an amount less than fair market value for a lease of the property. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Port District.

Section 2840—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Local Training Center, Chattanooga, Tennessee

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 15 acres at the Army Reserve Local Training Center, Chattanooga, Tennessee, to the Medal of Honor Museum, Inc., Chattanooga, Tennessee. The parcel is to be used as a museum and for other educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Corporation.

Part II—Navy Conveyances

Section 2851—Modification of Authority for Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, California, to Use Certain Navy Property

This section would amend section 2843 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337) to clarify the restrictions on the use of real property

under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy by the Oxnard Harbor District, Port Hueneme, California. This section would also clarify the forms of consideration which the District shall pay to the Secretary for the use of the property.

Section 2852—Modification of Land Conveyance, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California

This section would amend section 2811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189) to modify the permissible uses of funds received by the Secretary of the Navy.

Section 2853—Transfer of Jurisdiction, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California

This section would authorize the transfer of, and exchange of jurisdiction on, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 250 acres at Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California, between the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior. The parcel is to be incorporated into the Vernal Pool Unit of the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge.

Section 2854—Lease of Property, Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 250 acres and known as the Hickman Field, to the City of San Diego, California, for a period not to exceed five years. The lease would be subject to the condition that the City maintain the property at no cost to the United States, make the property available to the existing tenant at no cost, and use the property solely for recreational purposes. The cost of any survey necessary for the lease would be borne by the City.

Section 2855—Lease of Property, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease real property improvements to be designed and constructed by the Naval Aviation Museum Foundation at the National Museum of Naval Aviation at Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, to the Foundation for a period up to 50 years, with an option to renew for an additional 50 years. The improvements are to be used for the development and operation of a National Flight Academy. As a condition for the lease, the Foundation would make the property available at no cost to the Secretary under certain specified conditions. This section would also authorize the Secretary to provide assistance to the Foundation in the form services on a reimbursable basis. The cost of any survey necessary for the lease would be borne by the Secretary.

Section 2856—Land Exchange, Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 45 acres at Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California, to the San Diego Unified Port District. As consideration for the conveyance, the Port District would convey to the Secretary a parcel of real property contiguous to the installation and would construct suitable replacement facilities and necessary supporting structures as determined by the Secretary.

Section 2857—Land Exchange, Naval Air Reserve Center, Columbus, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 24 acres comprising the Naval Air Reserve Center at Rickenbacker International Airport, Ohio, to the Rickenbacker Port Authority of Columbus, Ohio. As consideration for the conveyance, the Authority would convey to the Secretary a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 15 acres. This section would require the Secretary to utilize the property conveyed by the Authority as the site for a joint reserve center for units associated with the Naval Air Reserve Center at the Airport and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center currently located in Columbus, Ohio. The cost of any survey necessary for the exchange would be borne by the Authority.

Section 2858—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Tampa, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 2.18 acres and comprising the Naval Reserve Center, Tampa, Florida, to the Tampa Port Authority. As consideration for the conveyance the Port Authority is required to provide a replacement facility and bear all reasonable costs incurred during the relocation. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Port Authority.

Part III—Air Force Conveyances

Section 2861—Land Conveyance, Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 100 acres at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, to Greene County, Ohio. The property is to be used for recreational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the County.

Section 2862—Land Conveyance, Point Arena Air Force Station, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 82 acres at the Point Arena Air Force Station, California, to Menocino County, California. The property is to be used for municipal and other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the County.

Section 2863—Land Conveyance, Los Angeles Air Force Base, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey on terms the Secretary considers appropriate, any or all portions of four parcels of real property with improvements, totaling approximately 111 acres at Los Angeles Air Force Base, California. As consideration for the conveyance, the recipient shall provide for the design and construction, acceptable to the Secretary, of one or more facilities to consolidate the mission and support functions at the installation. Any such facilities would comply with specified seismic and safety standards. This section would also authorize the Secretary to enter into a lease for the facility for a period not to exceed 10 years in the event the fair market value of a facility provided as consideration for the conveyance exceeds the fair market value of the conveyed property. Rental payments under the lease would be established at the rate necessary for the lessor to recover, by the end of the lease term, the difference between the fair market value of the facility and the fair market value of the conveyed property. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the recipient.

Part IV—Other Conveyances

Section 2871—Conveyance of Army and Air Force Exchange Service Property, Farmers Branch, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to permit the Army and Air Force Exchange Service to sell a parcel of real property with improvements in Farmers Branch, Texas, for an amount equal to the fair market value of the parcel. The section would also require the payment by the purchaser to be handled in the manner provided in section 485(c) of title 40, United States Code. The cost of any surveys necessary for the sale would be borne by the purchaser.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2881—Retention of Easement Authority to Leased Parkland, Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California

This section would amend section 2851 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261) to exempt certain lands located within Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, and leased by the State of California for use as a restricted access highway from the requirements

of section 303 of title 49 and section 138 of title 23, United States Code. This section would also require the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Agency to be responsible for the implementations of any mitigation measures required by the Secretary of Transportation.

Section 2882—Extension of Demonstration Project for Purchase of Fire, Security, Police, Public Works, and Utility Services from Local Government Agencies

This section would amend section 816 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337), as amended, to extend the period under which a demonstration project is authorized for the purchase of fire, security, police, public works, and utility services from local government at specified locations in Monterey, California.

Section 2883—Establishment of World War II Memorial on Guam

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the American Battle Monuments Commission, to establish a suitable memorial on federal property near the Fena Caves in Guam to honor those civilians killed during the occupation of Guam during World War II and to commemorate the liberation of Guam by the armed forces of the United States in 1944.

Section 2884—Naming of the Army Missile Testing Range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll

This section would designate the missile testing range at Kwajalein Atoll as the Ronald Reagan Ballistic Defense Test Site at Kwajalein Atoll.

Section 2885—Designation of Building at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, in Honor of Andrew T. McNamara

This section would designate a building at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, as the Andrew T. McNamara Building.

Section 2886—Redesignation of the Balboa Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, in Honor of Bob Wilson, a Former Member of the House of Representatives

This section would redesignate the Balboa Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, as the Bob Wilson Naval Hospital.

Section 2887—Sense of Congress Regarding Importance of Expansion of National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California

This section would express the sense of Congress that the prompt expansion of the National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California, is vital to the national security interests of the United States.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $13,150.6 million for the national security activities of the Department of Energy. This includes $6,177.6 million for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The budget request also contained $6,832.9 million for defense environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $12,871.4 million, a decrease of $279.2 million. The following table summarizes the request and the committee recommendations:

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)			
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental restoration & waste management	4,551,527	40,000	4,591,527
Defense facilities closure projects	1,082,297	-	1,082,297
Environmental management privatization	515,000	(256,000)	259,000
Energy employees compensation initiative	17,000	(17,000)	-
Other defense activities	555,122	2,000	557,122
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	112,000	-	112,000
Total, Environmental and other defense activities	6,832,946	(231,000)	6,601,946
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,000	(140,000)	-
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	4,594,000	83,800	4,677,800
Other nuclear security activities	1,583,635	(669,600)	914,035
Naval reactors	-	677,600	677,600
Total, National nuclear security administration	6,177,635	91,800	6,269,435
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	13,150,581	(279,200)	12,871,381

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	901,475	40,000	941,475
Construction:			
01-D-402 Intec cathodic protection system expansion	500	-	500
01-D-407 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Blend-down, Savannah River, SC	27,932	-	27,932
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,714	-	7,714
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, ID	4,300	-	4,300
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	1,690	-	1,690
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay laboratory, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	3,949	-	3,949

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	12,512	-	12,512
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC	8,879	-	8,879
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,000	-	2,000
Total, Construction	**69,476**	**-**	**69,476**
Total, Site/project completion	**970,951**	**40,000**	**1,010,951**
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,588,725	-	2,588,725
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	420,000	-	420,000
Construction:			
01-D-403 Immobilized high level waste interim storage facility, Richland, WA	1,300	-	1,300
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	7,812	-	7,812
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	46,023	-	46,023

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	17,385	-	17,385
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	27,212	-	27,212
Total, Construction	**99,732**	**-**	**99,732**
Total, Post 2006 completion	**3,108,457**	**-**	**3,108,457**
Science and technology	196,548	-	196,548
Program direction	359,888	-	359,888
Subtotal, Defense environmental restoration & waste management	4,635,844	40,000	4,675,844
Use of prior year balances	(34,317)	-	(34,317)
Pension refund	(50,000)	-	(50,000)
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Management	**4,551,527**	**40,000**	**4,591,527**
Defense Facilities Closure Projects			
Site closure	1,082,297	-	1,082,297

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Defense Environmental Management Privatization			
Privatization initiatives, various locations	540,092	(256,000)	284,092
Use of prior year balances	(25,092)	-	(25,092)
Total, Defense Environmental Management Privatization	**515,000**	**(256,000)**	**259,000**
Energy Employees Compensation Initiative			
Energy employees beryllium compensation fund	12,800	(12,800)	-
Energy employees pilot project	2,000	(2,000)	-
Paducah employees exposure compensation fund	2,200	(2,200)	-
Total, Energy Employees Compensation Initiative	**17,000**	**(17,000)**	**-**
Other Defense Activities			
Intelligence			
Operation and maintenance	36,059	-	36,059
Construction:			
01-D-800 Sensitive compartmented information facility, LLNL	2,000	-	2,000
Total, Intelligence	**38,059**	**-**	**38,059**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Counterintelligence	**45,200**	**-**	**45,200**
Security and emergency operations			
Nuclear safeguards and security	124,409	-	124,409
Security investigations	33,000	-	33,000
Emergency management	93,600	-	93,600
Program direction	89,367	-	89,367
Total, Security and emergency operations	**340,376**	**-**	**340,376**
Independent oversight and performance assurance			
Independent oversight and performance assurance	-	-	-
Program direction	14,937	-	14,937
Total, Independent oversight and performance assurance	**14,937**	**-**	**14,937**
Environment, safety & health			
Environment, safety and health (defense)	86,446	2,000	88,446
Program direction	22,604	-	22,604
Total, Environment, safety and health	**109,050**	**2,000**	**111,050**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	21,500	-	21,500
Program direction	3,000	-	3,000
Total, Worker and community transition	**24,500**	**-**	**24,500**
Office of hearings and appeals	**3,000**	**-**	**3,000**
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**575,122**	**2,000**	**577,122**
Adjustments:			
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	-	(20,000)
Total, Adjustments	**(20,000)**	**-**	**(20,000)**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**555,122**	**2,000**	**557,122**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	112,000	-	112,000
Total, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**6,832,946**	**(231,000)**	**6,601,946**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,000	(140,000)	-

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities			
Stewardship			
Directed Stockpile Work:			
Stockpile research and development	836,603	(836,603)	-
Stockpile maintenance	-	243,300	243,300
Stockpile evaluation	-	266,994	266,994
Dismantlement/disposal	-	162,710	162,710
Production support	-	29,260	29,260
Field engineering, training and manuals	-	149,939	149,939
	-	4,400	4,400
Total, Directed Stockpile Work	**836,603**	**20,000**	**856,603**
Campaigns:			
Primary certification	1,049,907	(1,049,907)	-
Dynamic materials properties	-	41,400	41,400
Advanced radiography	-	64,408	64,408
Operation and maintenance	-	-	-
	-	43,000	43,000

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Construction:			
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	-	35,232	35,232
Total, Advanced Radiography	**-**	**78,232**	**78,232**
Secondary certification and nuclear systems margins	-	52,964	52,964
ICF ignition and high yield margins			
Operation and maintenance	-	275,500	275,500
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	-	169,100	169,100
Total, ICF Ignition and High Yield	**-**	**444,600**	**444,600**
Certification in hostile environments	-	15,400	15,400
Defense computing and modeling			
Operation and maintenance	-	706,175	706,175
Construction:			
Albuquerque, NM	-	2,300	2,300
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	-	5,000	5,000

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	-	56,000	56,000
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	-	6,700	6,700
Total, Defense Computing and Modeling	**-**	**776,175**	**776,175**
Weapons system engineering certification	-	16,300	16,300
Enhanced surety	-	40,600	40,600
Enhanced surveillance	-	89,651	89,651
Advanced design and production technologies	-	81,735	81,735
Pit manufacturing readiness	-	123,038	123,038
Secondary readiness	-	15,000	15,000
Materials readiness	-	40,511	40,511
Tritium readiness	-	102,000	102,000
Operation and maintenance			
Construction:			
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	-	75,000	75,000
Total, Tritium Readiness	**-**	**177,000**	**177,000**
Total, Campaigns	**1,049,907**	**1,007,107**	**2,057,014**

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities:	1,953,573	(1,953,573)	-
Operations of facilities	-	1,220,732	1,220,732
Program readiness	-	75,800	75,800
Special projects	-	31,297	31,297
Material recycle and recovery	-	22,018	22,018
Containers	-	7,876	7,876
Storage	-	9,075	9,075
Total, Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities	**1,953,573**	**(586,775)**	**1,366,798**
Total, Stewardship	**3,840,083**	**440,332**	**4,280,415**
Secure transportation asset			
Operation and maintenance	79,357	-	79,357
Program direction	36,316	-	36,316
Total, Secure transportation asset	**115,673**	-	**115,673**
Program direction	224,071	(7,200)	216,871
Construction:			
01-D-101 Distributed information systems laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	2,300	(2,300)	-

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
01-D-103 Preliminary Project Design and Engineering, various locations	14,500	-	14,500
01-D-124 HEU storage facility, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	17,800	-	17,800
01-D-126 Weapons Evaluation Test Laboratory, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	3,000	-	3,000
00-D-103, Terascale simulation facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	(5,000)	-
00-D-105, Strategic computing complex, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	56,000	(56,000)	-
00-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	6,700	(6,700)	-
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facilities, LLNL, Livermore, CA	5,000	-	5,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	2,800	-	2,800
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification center, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	5,200	-	5,200
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	-	2,000

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,000	-	13,000
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	23,765	-	23,765
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	4,998	-	4,998
99-D-132 Stockpile management restructuring initiative nuclear material safeguards and security upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	18,043	-	18,043
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium facility modernization and consolidation, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	30,767	-	30,767
98-D-125 Tritium extraction facility, Savannah River plant, Aiken, SC	75,000	(75,000)	-
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	35,232	(35,232)	-
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	2,918	-	2,918
96-D-111 National ignition facility (NIF), LLNL, Livermore, CA	74,100	(74,100)	-
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	13,337	-	13,337

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
88-D-123 Security enhancements, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,713	-	2,713
Total, Construction	**414,173**	**(254,332)**	**159,841**
General reduction	-	(95,000)	(95,000)
Subtotal, Weapons activities	4,594,000	83,800	4,677,800
Other Nuclear Security Activities			
Nonproliferation and national security	-		
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operation and maintenance	225,990	-	225,990
Construction:			
00-D-192 Nonproliferation and international security center (NISC), LANL	7,000	-	7,000
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**232,990**	**-**	**232,990**
Arms control	272,870	-	272,870
Long-term nonproliferation program for Russia	100,000	-	100,000
HEU transparency implementation	15,190	-	15,190

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
International nuclear safety	20,000	-	20,000
Fissile materials disposition			
Operation and maintenance	-	175,517	175,517
Construction:			
00-D-142, Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	-	3,000	3,000
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	-	20,000	20,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, various locations	-	23,000	23,000
Total, Construction	**-**	**46,000**	**46,000**
Program direction	-	-	-
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	**-**	**221,517**	**221,517**
Program direction	41,550	9,918	51,468
Fissile materials disposition			
Operation and maintenance	175,517	(175,517)	-

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
Construction:			
00-D-142, Immobilization and associated processing facility, various locations	3,000	(3,000)	-
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, various locations	20,000	(20,000)	-
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, various locations	15,000	(15,000)	-
Total, Construction	**38,000**	**(38,000)**	-
Program direction	9,918	(9,918)	-
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	**223,435**	**(223,435)**	-
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	627,500	(627,500)	-
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	11,400	(11,400)	-
Construction:			
01-D-200 Major office replacement building Schenectady, NY	1,300	(1,300)	-

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	16,000	(16,000)	-
Total, Construction	**17,300**	**(17,300)**	**-**
Total, Naval reactors development	**656,200**	**(656,200)**	**-**
Program direction	21,400	(21,400)	-
Total, Naval reactors	**677,600**	**(677,600)**	**-**
Subtotal, Other nuclear security activities	1,583,635	(669,600)	914,035
Total, Adjustments	**-**	**-**	**-**
Total, Other Nuclear Security Activities	**1,583,635**	**(669,600)**	**914,035**
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	-	627,500	627,500
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	-	11,400	11,400
Construction:			
01-D-200 Major office replacement building Schenectady, NY	-	1,300	1,300

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001 Authorization Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 2001 Committee Recommendation
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	-	16,000	16,000
Total, Construction	**-**	**17,300**	**17,300**
Total, Naval reactors development	**-**	**656,200**	**656,200**
Program direction	-	21,400	21,400
Total, Naval reactors	**-**	**677,600**	**677,600**
Total, National Nuclear Security Administration	**6,177,635**	**91,800**	**6,269,435**

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request contained $6,832.9 million for environmental and other defense activities.

The committee recommends $6,601.9, a decrease of $231.0 million.

Items of Special Interest

Acceleration of the 94–1 program and restoration of infrastructure at the Savannah River Site

The budget request contained $452.9 million for Site Project Completion at the Savannah River Site.

In May 1994, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board submitted Recommendation 94–1 to the Secretary of Energy dealing with the need to stabilize and to store safely large amounts of fissionable and other nuclear materials at the Savannah River Site. The committee is aware of accomplishments in remediating this material. However, the committee notes severe problems continue to exist. The committee believes that an acceleration of the 94–1 Program is necessary and recommends an increase of $16.0 million to execute the following projects: (1) development of process flowsheets, safety documentation, and pre-operational activities to support planned stabilization campaigns; (2) acceleration of the rack construction and testing for the Amercium/Curium stabilization project; and (3) continued operation of the HB-Line Phase I to process plutonium residues.

The committee notes that much of the Savannah River Site infrastructure is nearing 50 years of age and believes that Savannah River environmental management programs require restorative improvements to support current operations, retain core competencies, and to maintain nuclear materials in a safe and secure manner. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million for Savannah River Site infrastructure improvements, including $16.0 million for design and procurement of site ventilation, electrical, and safety alarm systems and for repair or replacement of leaking roofs, and $8.0 million of the increase for replacement of the computer control system for the Defense Waste Processing Facility.

The committee recommends $492.9 million for Site Project Completion at the Savannah River Site, an increase of $40.0 million.

Energy Employees Compensation Initiative

The budget request contained $17.0 million for the Energy Employees Compensation Initiative to fund a program, separately transmitted to Congress in November 1999, that would establish three programs to compensate current and former Department of Energy (DOE) and contractor employees who are ill due to:

(1) Workplace exposure to beryllium at various DOE nuclear weapons production facilities;

(2) workplace exposure to plutonium and other highly radioactive materials at the Paducah, Kentucky, gaseous diffusion facility; or

(3) workplace exposure to radiation and hazardous materials, at the Oak Ridge, Tennessee, site.

While the committee acknowledges that some DOE or contractor employees may have developed illnesses as a result of being unknowingly exposed to dangerous materials or not being adequately protected from such exposure, it questions whether the funds to compensate these individuals should come from the national defense budget function and why a compensation program should not be set up as an entitlement rather than financed from discretionary appropriations.

The committee notes that the legislative proposal, the Energy Employees' Compensation Act was introduced and referred to committees in both the House of Representatives (H.R. 3418) and the Senate (S. 1954) in November 1999 but was not referred to the House Committee on Armed Services, since authorization for the program would have to be approved by another committee. The committee further notes that no other committee has held hearings or taken any other action on the legislative proposal.

Additionally, the committee notes that the $17.0 million requested is just the beginning of the Department's plans to compensate workers who were exposed to radiation while helping to build the nation's nuclear arsenal. The Department has recently publicized a plan that would cost an estimated $400.0 million over the first five years for this purpose.

The committee believes that the compensation program under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (RECA) provides a useful precedent in addressing compensation of the DOE and contractor employees at issue here. RECA is an entitlement program designed to compensate uranium miners and individuals who suffered radiation exposure because they lived down-wind from nuclear test sites. The program is administered by the Department of Justice, and entitlement funding is carried in Department of Justice budgetary accounts.

The committee believes that the Department of Energy could use RECA as a model in establishing a program to compensate those made ill by working at DOE facilities. Such an entitlement program would have the advantage of guaranteeing appropriate compensation once eligibility criteria are defined. Moreover, the program would not be subject to the funding vagaries of the annual authorization process. Once such a program is established and eligibility criteria are defined, the committee will be in a position to make a more informed judgment about how much funding is appropriate and necessary.

Even though the committee has questions about this compensation initiative, it nevertheless recommends a $2.0 million increase for Environment, Safety, and Health to structure such a program. The committee notes that DOE officials have recently indicated that almost all of the $17.0 million requested would be used for administrative start-up expenses rather than to pay claims. The committee does not support this amount for administrative purposes and believes that the $2.0 million should be adequate for these costs until the committee's concerns can be properly addressed.

Hanford tank waste remediation system privatization, phase I

The budget request contained $450.0 million for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) Privatization, Phase IB–2.

The current contractor for TWRS Phase IB–1 recently submitted a proposal to the Department of Energy (DOE) to complete the design, as well as to construct and operate, a waste treatment facility for the radioactive waste at the Hanford site. The expected cost for this work was $15.2 billion, which the Secretary of Energy denounced as unacceptably high. The Secretary stated that the $15.2 billion cost was proposed just 18 months after the contractor informed the Department that it could design, construct, and operate a waste treatment facility for $6.9 billion and that he would not approve the proposal.

While the Secretary of Energy has rejected the proposal, the committee acknowledges that this waste must be extracted from the tanks, solidified, and safely stored because the risk of leakage is unacceptable. However, the committee believes that given the uncertain path forward for this program, the budget request is overstated. Therefore, the committee recommends $194.0 million, a decrease of $256.0 million for the TWRS.

The committee believes that the $194.0 million in new budget authority should be combined with funds appropriated for TWRS in prior years that remain unobligated. The committee understands that $118.0 million in prior appropriations are currently reserved for termination costs which would be incurred if the Phase IB–1 contract is terminated by the Department. Since DOE intends to allow this contract to be completed in August 2000, these funds will not be needed for termination expenses. The committee also understands that $58.0 million of prior year carryover balances exist in the TWRS program and that DOE intended to apply this amount to Phase IB–2 TWRS design work in fiscal year 2001. Therefore, the $176.0 million of prior appropriations could be combined with the $194.0 million of new budget authority to provide DOE with $370.0 million for the planned continuation of the design work for the waste treatment facility, for procurement of long lead items, and to provide for possible rework required should a different contractor be selected to continue this project.

In order to make the funds held for termination liability available for other purposes, the committee has included a provision (section 3131) that would prohibit the use of appropriated funds to establish a reserve for contract termination costs for the Tank Waste Remediation System. Should the need for termination liability arise, the committee stands ready to assist the Department.

Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility

The budget request contained $15.0 million for design of the mixed oxide fuel (MOX) fabrication facility.

The Department of Energy (DOE) awarded a $65.0 million contract for the design of the MOX fabrication facility in March 1999. The committee understands that since the award of the contract, the contractor has had to make unforeseen changes to the facility's planned configuration and will have to do additional environmental work to satisfy the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

The committee notes that recent DOE security assessments recommend the installation of earth and concrete barriers around the MOX facility to deny or delay access by intruders and that these requirements were not conveyed to the contractor until after the contract award. Similarly, the DOE Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the MOX facility was not available until after the design contract award, and the NRC indicated that significant differences between the MOX facility advance preliminary design and the EIS will require the contractor to do additional environmental impact analyses.

Due to these unforeseen changes and a subsequent requirement for additional contingency funds, the committee recommends $23.0 million for the MOX fabrication facility, an increase of $8.0 million.

Nonproliferation and national security

The budget request contained $38.0 million for a new start design of facilities in Russia for the storage of spent fuel from civil nuclear reactors. The committee understands that this program is intended to encourage Russia to cease separating plutonium from spent reactor fuel due to concerns about the potential for increased risk of proliferation of nuclear weapons material. The committee is concerned that the completed facility should have adequate security to protect the stored fissile material. Therefore, the committee directs that, if this facility is constructed, the Department of Energy (DOE) extend protection to the facility through the Department's International Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting program.

The committee is also concerned about the expenditure of funds on nonproliferation efforts in Russia with little DOE on-site monitoring. The committee understands that the Department currently monitors the various programs in Russia through occasional visits by Department employees and believes that this level of monitoring is insufficient. Therefore, the committee directs that at each Russian site where a significant DOE nonproliferation program is in operation, the Department locate a DOE employee or contractor on a continual basis to monitor the operations of the nonproliferation program and that U.S. funds are efficiently applied.

Worker and community transition

The budget request contained $24.5 million for Worker and Community Transition, of which $6.0 million was designated for assistance at an identified site. The remainder was either designated for administration of the program ($3.0 million) or intended to be held as a contingency for site closings and workforce transitions that were unforeseen at the time the budget was prepared ($15.5 million).

The committee understands that a portion of the Savannah River Site is in Barnwell County, South Carolina, an area of the state experiencing chronic underemployment resulting from workforce reductions at Savannah River during the last decade.

In the 1970s, a facility to reprocess spent nuclear fuel was constructed on the Allied General Nuclear Site (AGNS) in Barnwell County immediately adjacent to the Savannah River Site. However, before reprocessing began, federal policy toward reprocessing was

reversed and the facility was closed. In an effort to mitigate the employment problems surrounding the Savannah River Site, the Tri-County Alliance, consisting of the counties of Barnwell, Allendale, and Bamberg, has agreed to acquire the AGNS site for redevelopment as a special-use industrial park. The committee understands that a major investment is required at the site to develop the necessary infrastructure for industries that would locate there to serve the Savannah River Site and the surrounding community.

Therefore, the committee recommends $24.5 million for Worker and Community Transition and directs that $5.0 million of the undesignated amount be expended on infrastructure development at the AGNS site.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The budget request contained $6,177.6 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2001.

The committee recommends $6,269.4 million, an increase of $91.8 million.

Items of Special Interest

Budget Structure of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA)

The committee notes that section 3251of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required that, beginning with fiscal year 2001, the budget request for the NNSA be set forth in individual, dedicated program elements. The committee notes that the budget request does not include such program elements and, therefore, does not comply with the requirements of current law.

The committee observes that supporting material accompanying the budget request for Defense Programs describes in detail a budget structure organized around directed stockpile work, campaigns, readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF), and construction. Within each of these areas, funds are identified to support discrete project activities or sets of activities. In view of the lack of cooperation from the Department of Energy (DOE) in formulating the budget request in compliance with the requirements of Public Law 106–65, the committee believes that it must take the step of establishing program elements. The committee believes that the discrete activities identified in the budget request provide the basis for such program elements. The designation of program elements and funding levels recommended by the committee are depicted in table entries.

However, the committee does not believe that the Defense Programs activities identified in directed stockpile work, campaigns, RTBF, and construction are appropriately aligned or portrayed. As a first step toward realigning these activities, the committee recommends that related activities and construction projects be consolidated under their associated campaign program elements. The realignment of funds by the committee within the individual program elements is described elsewhere in this report.

The committee urges the Administrator of NNSA to prepare, and the Department to submit, future budget requests that: (1) align major construction projects and facilities with their related campaigns, in order to enhance Congressional and managerial oversight; (2) fund infrastructure and operational readiness by facility, in order to provide a clear picture of the business and overhead costs at NNSA facilities; and (3) organize directed stockpile work by warhead, in order to provide a clear picture of the status of each warhead in the inventory and the work required to sustain it.

The committee also notes that section 3252 of Public Law 106–65 required that, beginning with fiscal year 2001, funding requested for the NNSA be available for obligation for a limited number of years. The committee notes that the DOE has again requested that its funds be available until expended. The committee recommends a provision (section 3128) that would define the length of time for which funding for the NNSA would be available.

Campaigns

The budget request contained $1,049.9 million for campaigns.

The committee recommends $2057.0 million for campaigns, including an increase of $131.0 million, a transfer of $621.8 million from readiness in technical base and facilities, and a transfer of $254.3 million from construction.

Advanced Design and Production Technology (ADAPT)

The budget request contained $75.7 million for the ADAPT campaign, which will develop advanced manufacturing capabilities critical to improving efficiency at the nuclear weapons plants, but included no funds for the American Textile (AMTEX) partnership.

The committee understands that the budget request does not adequately support process development, integrated product and process and design, agile manufacturing, and enterprise integration at the Kansas City plant. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to support these activities.

AMTEX enhances capabilities relevant to both the stockpile stewardship program and the textile industry by developing technologies that integrate product and process design in a concurrent manufacturing enterprise. Consistent with its previous support for AMTEX activities, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in the ADAPT campaign to continue this effort.

In total, the committee recommends $81.7 million for ADAPT, an increase of $6.0 million.

Advanced radiography

The budget request contained $43.0 million for the advanced radiography campaign and $35.2 million for construction of the dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (DARHT). The committee believes that congressional and managerial oversight of these activities would be enhanced if funds for these activities were consolidated in the advanced radiography campaign. Therefore, the committee directs this realignment. The budget request contained a total of $78.2 million in these activities. The committee recommends the requested amount.

The committee understands that hydrotest capabilities are unlikely to provide test results in a timely manner to certify new and remanufactured primaries (the fission device that triggers the fusion reaction in nuclear weapons), that development of advanced radiography technologies has been delayed, and that the advanced radiography and primary certification campaigns are being rebaselined. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2001, on hydrotest and radiography requirements, the process by which they are defined, the technologies available to meet the requirements, the timelines on which these technologies are available, and the funding associated with the technologies and schedules.

The committee also encourages the Administrator to examine the relationship between the advanced radiography and campaign and the primary certification campaign to determine if management insight would be enhanced by an appropriate realignment of these two efforts.

Defense computing and modeling

The budget request contained $477.1 million for the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI) component of advanced simulation and computing in readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF). The budget request also contained the following amounts for ASCI and defense computing: $249.1 million for the defense application and modeling campaign, which provides funds to develop and run nuclear weapons computer codes on ASCI computers; $2.3 million for construction of the distributed information systems laboratory at Sandia National Laboratories; $5.0 million for construction of the terascale simulation facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; $56.0 million for construction of the strategic computing complex at Los Alamos National Laboratory; and $6.7 million for the joint computational engineering laboratory at Sandia National Laboratories. Each of these facilities under construction will be used to house ASCI computers. The committee believes that funding all of these activities in the defense application and modeling campaign will provide better understanding of ASCI costs and enhance congressional oversight and managerial control. Therefore, the committee directs this realignment. As realigned, the budget request contained $796.2 million for defense computing and modeling.

ASCI is an effort to develop by 2004 a computer capable of 100 trillion operations a second. This computer will be powerful enough to conduct three-dimensional simulations of nuclear explosions to be used as a means of assuring the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of U.S. nuclear weapons in the absence of actual testing. The committee understands the significance of ASCI for science-based stockpile stewardship and is encouraged by the technical progress demonstrated to date.

Of the $477.1 million requested for ASCI in RTBF, $55.7 million was included for collaborations with universities and industry. The committee notes that this represents a 38 percent increase over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2000. The committee understands the value of these collaborations in attracting university tal-

ent to the benefit of the stewardship program, but believes that the increase is excessive. The committee recommends $40.7 million for university collaborations, a reduction of $15.0 million.

The budget request also contained $112.8 million for the visual interactive environment for weapon simulation (VIEWS) project, a 68 percent increase over the fiscal year 2000 appropriated level. The committee continues to be concerned about the pace of growth in certain parts of the ASCI project and does not believe that the Department of Energy has adequately justified an increase of this magnitude. Therefore, the committee recommends $107.8 million for VIEWS, a reduction of $5.0 million.

In total, the committee recommends $776.2 million for the defense computing and modeling campaign, a reduction of $20.0 million.

Inertial confinement fusion (ICF) ignition and high yield margins

The budget request contained $120.8 million for the ICF ignition and high yield margins campaign; $100.8 million in readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF) for the National Ignition Facility (NIF), a key component of the ICF ignition campaign; $43.9 million for other RTBF operations related to pulse power and lasers; and $74.1 million for NIF construction. The total request in these various activities is $339.6 million. The committee believes that funding all of these activities in the ICF ignition campaign will provide a better understanding of ICF costs and enhance both congressional oversight and managerial control. Therefore, the committee directs this realignment.

The committee also encourages the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to examine the relationship of the ICF high yield campaign and the secondary readiness campaign and to determine if management insight would be enhanced by an appropriate realignment of these two efforts.

The committee recognizes that NIF is a key element of the effort to sustain the nuclear stockpile in the absence of underground nuclear testing and supports completion of the NIF project. NIF will use a large array of lasers used to achieve a fusion reaction by focusing their energy on a small hydrogen target. Experiments with NIF, both those that achieve a fusion reaction and subcritical experiments, will contribute important experimental data to several stockpile stewardship campaigns and will allow scientists to confirm computer models on the behavior of nuclear weapons explosions.

However, the committee understands that the NIF project is now $750.0 million to $1.0 billion over budget and behind schedule by four years. The cost growth and delay stem from the greater-than-expected complexity of assembling and integrating 192 high energy lasers in a clean, confined space.

The committee is concerned that the NIF project management failed to indicate in a clear and timely way the magnitude of the technical difficulties as they emerged. The committee is also concerned that project oversight by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, independent review teams, the University of California as the contractor with oversight responsibilities, and the Department

of Energy failed to detect or report the technical difficulties. For example, the committee understands that independent reviews examined the program's performance related to schedule and budget, without examining the underlying engineering plans. The General Accounting Office and the Department now both confirm that, in fact, there was no detailed engineering plan for the assembly and integration of the laser components. These failures also highlight the lack of appropriate technical expertise within the Department to allow for effective oversight and the urgent need to address this problem.

The committee, therefore, directs that no more than 35 percent of the funds authorized for appropriation for the NIF program may be obligated until the Administrator certifies to the congressional defense committees that program management flaws resident in the laboratory and contractor have been corrected and that NNSA oversight and management of the program is performed by NNSA personnel with appropriate technical and management expertise.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy has recently recommended a realignment of $95.0 million from various campaigns to NIF. In light of the significance of the NIF project to stockpile stewardship, the committee recommends an increase of $95.0 million to the ICF and High Yield Margins campaign for NIF construction.

However, the committee believes that the sources for the additional NIF funds identified in the Secretary's recommendation will detract from activities that are key to sustaining the safety, reliability, and effectiveness of the nuclear stockpile and that lower priority funding should be identified for realignment. In the absence of credible sources for additional NIF funding, the committee believes that the designation of specific sources to offset the increase to NIF construction is premature. The committee will coordinate closely with the Administrator of the NNSA to assure that that appropriate offsets for this increase are identified in a timely manner.

The ICF campaign budget request also included $32.1 million for the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics (LLE). The committee believes that LLE's Omega laser continues to make important contributions to the ICF program, particularly in light of the delays and technical challenges facing the NIF project, and directs that the Department fund this facility at the requested level.

Laser development

The budget request contained $120.8 million for the inertial confinement fusion (ICF) ignition and high yield margins campaign but included no funds for laser research and development jointly funded by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA).

The committee notes that the high energy laser master plan mandated by section 251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) recommended that DOD and the Department of Energy conclude a memorandum of agreement to conduct a joint high energy laser research program beneficial to both the NNSA and DOD. The committee recommends a

provision, described elsewhere in this report, that would require the NNSA and DOD to conclude such an agreement wherein the costs of peer-reviewed research conducted under the auspices of the agreement would be evenly shared between them.

The committee believes that joint research on high energy lasers can help to meet critical national security challenges, including the need for effective ballistic missile defenses, while simultaneously benefitting stockpile stewardship activities of the NNSA.

Therefore, the recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the ICF ignition and high yield margins campaign budget request for joint DOD–NNSA research on high energy lasers.

Pit manufacturing readiness

The budget request contained $108.0 for the pit manufacturing readiness campaign.

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) lacks a robust capability for the replacement of plutonium pits. The Report of the Panel to Assess the Reliability, Safety, and Security of the United States Nuclear Stockpile expressed concern over "the high degree of uncertainly in the current understanding of the useful life of plutonium pits." The Panel, citing estimates that construction of new plutonium facilities could take 7 to 15 years, urged that conceptual design activities of a pit production facility begin on an expedited basis.

The committee also notes that the pit production facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory is designed for a maximum capacity of about 50 pits per year. The committee recognizes that the rate at which pits may need replacement remains unclear, due to the uncertainties related to pit lifetime and the ultimate size of the stockpile, but the committee understands that this rate is unlikely to allow for replacing stockpile pits in a timely manner. Accordingly, the committee believes conceptual design of a pit production facility should begin promptly as a hedge against the risk that the need for expanded pit production will develop more rapidly than is now anticipated. Given the uncertain demand for pit production, the committee also believes that a scalable design is desirable so that the design can be readily adapted as demand is more precisely defined.

Therefore, the committee recommends $123.0 million for pit manufacturing readiness, an increase of $15.0 million for the initiation of conceptual design work on a pit manufacturing facility. Noting that a science-oriented laboratory is not the best institution for pit production and that industry is better suited to this task, the committee urges the Administrator of the NNSA to maximize industry involvement in the design and manufacture of plutonium pits.

The committee understands that funds appropriated in fiscal year 1999 for pit production readiness were diverted for other uses, have not yet been restored, and may result in a delay of up to two years in the production of the first certifiable pit. The committee strongly urges the Department to initiate a reprogramming to restore these funds as soon as possible.

Tritium readiness

The budget request contained $77.0 million in the tritium readiness campaign, including $58.0 million for commercial light water reactor (CLWR) tritium production and $19.0 million for accelerator production of tritium (APT). It also contained $75.0 million for construction of the tritium extraction facility. The committee believes that congressional and managerial oversight of these activities would be enhanced if funding for these activities were consolidated in the tritium readiness campaign. Therefore, the committee directs this realignment. As realigned, the budget request contained a total of $152.0 million in these activities.

The committee notes that section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) required the Department of Energy to complete preliminary design and engineering development of APT and codified the December 1998 tritium production decision by the Secretary of Energy that designated CLWR technology as the primary tritium production technology but committed to completion of the APT preliminary design. The budget request, however, suspends APT backup design activities and, in so doing, both violates current law and contradicts the Secretary's tritium production decision.

The committee believes that the uncertainty inherent in the CLWR license amendment process requires the precaution of continuing APT design work at a reasonable level. Therefore, the committee recommends $177.0 million in the tritium readiness campaign, an increase of $25.0 million.

Construction projects

The budget request contained $414.2 million for construction and infrastructure improvements. The committee recommends the alignment of most construction projects with their associated campaigns. The committee recommends that the following projects be realigned: the distributed information systems laboratory (01–D–101, $2.3 million), the terascale simulation facility (00–D–103, $5.0 million), the strategic computing complex (00–D–105, $56.0 million), and the joint computational engineering laboratory (00–D–107, $6.7 million) to the defense applications and modeling campaign; the tritium extraction facility (98–D–125, $75.0 million) to the tritium readiness campaign; the dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility (97–D–102, $35.2 million) to the advanced radiography campaign; and the national ignition facility (96–D–111, $74.1 million) to the inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield margins campaign.

The budget request contained $159.8 million for the remaining construction projects. The committee recommends the budget request. The committee believes that many of these projects should also migrate to an associated campaign and encourages the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to do so in subsequent budget requests.

Defense programs requirements process

The committee understands that the nuclear weapons requirements process involves project officer groups responsible for the health of each weapons type, the nuclear weapons requirements

working group, the nuclear weapons council standing and safety committee, and the nuclear weapons council. The membership of each of these groups includes officers and personnel of the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Energy (DOE) and each deals with system or technical requirements at various levels of detail. The committee notes that DOE's 1999 Stockpile Stewardship Program 30-Day Review concluded that coordination between DOD and DOE is inadequate to generate and prioritize nuclear weapons requirements. The review further contended that the Office of Defense Programs (DP) lacks a formal process for assessing these requirements, developing plans to address them, and prioritizing workloads. The committee believes that concerns expressed by the review are legitimate.

The committee also notes that DP has pursued a science-based stockpile stewardship program to sustain the viability of U.S. nuclear weapons in the absence of underground nuclear testing. DP has been developing and acquiring a range of science-based tools for this purpose, and the committee understands that DP must also define and prioritize requirements for these tools. The committee notes that DP has a long history of poor program management, in part attributable to poor program definition and frequently changing program baselines. The committee believes that this history gives rise to legitimate concern that DP also lacks a sufficiently formal and rigorous approach to defining the technical requirements of these science-based tools and prioritizing competing technology programs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2000, a report on the steps being taken to improve requirements processes related to nuclear weapons. The report should include an assessment of coordination between the NNSA and DOD together with actions required to more fully coordinate this process, as well as an assessment of DP's internal processes for developing plans to address nuclear weapons requirements and prioritizing resulting workloads together with any actions required to improve DP's processes. The report should further assess DP's procedures for defining the technical requirements for science-based stewardship tools and prioritizing competing technology programs and steps required to improve these procedures.

Department of Energy Reorganization Issues

The committee notes that title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-65) required the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) by March 1, 2000, and the committee is pleased that the NNSA has been formally established by the Department of Energy (DOE). The committee is also pleased that a nominee for Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration has been forwarded to the Senate by the President.

However, the committee remains concerned about the slow progress of the Department toward full compliance with the law. The Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganiza-

tion expressed, in its report to the committee on February 11, 2000, a number of concerns with the Department's January 2000 implementation plan. These concerns included the Department's placement of DOE officials to serve concurrently in key NNSA positions, the continuation of confused lines of authority within the NNSA, the failure to provide any information on the use of authorities to restructure the NNSA workforce, an overemphasis in the plan on continued DOE control over the NNSA, and the retention of current DOE budget and planning practices.

The committee remains particularly concerned about the placement of DOE officials to serve concurrently in key NNSA positions, a practice known as "dual-hatting." The Secretary of Energy testified to the committee that he would not change this practice, even after an NNSA Administrator is confirmed by the Senate.

The committee notes that the Department, in its written legal opinion in support of this practice, maintains that Congress was explicit and detailed throughout title 32 of Public Law 106-65, but did not explicitly prohibit dual-hatting.

The committee asserts that dual-hatting DOE officials to any positions in NNSA violates a clearly implied prohibition in current law and notes that the entire purpose, structure and legislative history of title 32 of Public Law 106–65 reflect an intent to insulate NNSA and its contractors from the rest of DOE. This intent is apparent in several sections, including: section 3213(a), which established that the Secretary or Deputy Secretary may provide direction to NNSA only through the NNSA Administrator; section 3212(d), which stated that the Administrator may make policies specific to NNSA, subject only to the disapproval of the Secretary; section 3212(c), which established the Administrator as the chief procurement executive for NNSA; sections 3212(b) and 3218, that provide the NNSA Administrator with staff to perform all of the normal administrative functions in running an agency, including budget, personnel, legislative affairs, public affairs, procurement, counterintelligence; section 3217 which established the position of General Counsel within the Administration; and sections 3213(a) and 3213(b), which specifically prohibited DOE officers and employees, other than the Secretary acting through the Administrator, from exercising authority, direction, or control over NNSA employees or NNSA contractor employees. The committee believes that these provisions, in combination, provide compelling evidence of congressional intent to insulate the NNSA from direct control by DOE staff and to prohibit dual-hatting within the NNSA.

The legislative history also clearly indicates that Congress, in mandating the establishment of the NNSA, was attempting to rectify the longstanding bureaucratic confusion and overlap that has plagued DOE. The committee remains concerned that the DOE implementation plan fails to correct these confused lines of authority. The Department as currently organized requires three NNSA facilities to report through non-NNSA operations offices. The committee believes that this arrangement is not compliant with current law. The implementation plan also makes no changes in the role or function of operations offices. The committee believes that the roles and functions of operations offices should be revised to clarify headquarters authorities and streamline NNSA management. Finally,

the committee notes that dual-hatting senior DOE officials to NNSA positions, particularly those that involve overseeing NNSA field operations, will undermine the authority of the Administrator, perpetuate confused lines of authority, and ultimately will make it more difficult to rectify problems in the weapons complex.

The committee also observes that section 3241 of Public Law 106–65 authorized the Administrator of the NNSA to establish up to 300 excepted service positions to fill science, engineering, and technical positions with qualified personnel. The committee notes the Department's lack of appropriate technical expertise to manage complex projects and activities. Thus, the committee was disappointed that a proposal to use this authority was not forwarded as part of the Secretary's January 2000 implementation plan. The committee continues to believe that this authority will be an important tool for the Administrator to reshape the NNSA workforce.

Accordingly, the committee expects the Secretary and the Administrator of the NNSA to reform lines of authority and the roles and functions of operations offices within the NNSA, and to develop management structures that incorporate the use of personnel hired through excepted service authority.

Directed stockpile work

The budget request contained $836.6 million for directed stockpile work.

The committee recommends $856.6 million, an increase of $20.0 million.

Stockpile evaluation

The budget request contained $151.7 million for stockpile evaluation.

The committee notes that the budget request does not adequately support radiographic inspection of nuclear weapons components and assemblies, vacuum chamber inspection activities, testing in the accelerated aging unit, and other stockpile evaluation activities at the Pantex plant. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to support these activities.

The committee also notes that the budget request does not adequately support quality evaluation and certification activities and joint test assemblies at the Y–12 plant. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million for stockpile evaluation at the Y–12 plant.

In total, the committee recommends $162.7 million, an increase of $11.0 million for stockpile evaluation.

Stockpile maintenance

The budget request contained $258.0 million for stockpile maintenance.

The committee notes that the budget request does not adequately support life extension and repairs for the B–61 warhead and other directed stockpile work at the Kansas City plant. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to support these activities.

The committee also notes that the budget request does not adequately support life extension activities for the B–61 and W-76 warheads and other directed stockpile work at the Y–12. The com-

mittee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to support these activities.

In total, the committee recommends $267.0 million, an increase of $9.0 million for stockpile maintenance.

Program direction for defense programs

The budget request contained $224.1 million for program direction for the Office of Defense Programs (DP).

The committee notes federal staffing levels planned for National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) operations offices is the same as the authorized staffing level for fiscal year 2000. The committee also notes that the size of the operations offices and the confusing lines of authority within the Office of Defense Programs were criticized in many independent reports over two decades, most recently by the June 1999 report by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The committee believes that the Administrator of the NNSA should clarify lines of authority and adjust the personnel levels at the operations offices accordingly. Consequently, the committee recommends a reduction of $5.0 million, which corresponds to a five percent reduction in federal staffing at the NNSA operations offices.

The committee also notes that of the funds requested for program direction, $2.2 million would support automatic data processing equipment (ADPE) upgrades at the Oak Ridge and Oakland Operations Offices. These operations offices are part of the Office of Science of the Department of Energy. Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) included Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the Y–12 plant as part of the NNSA and required that these facilities report to the Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs. The committee believes that an organizational structure that entails DP facilities reporting through the Office of Science is both inefficient and inappropriate and does not believe that DP should fund computer upgrades for the Office of Science. Therefore the committee recommends an additional reduction of $2.2 million to program direction.

The committee recommends $216.9 million, a decrease of $7.2 million for program direction for the Office of Defense Programs.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF)

The budget request contained $1,953.6 million in RTBF. The committee recommends $1,366.8 million, including an increase of $35.0 million and a transfer of $621.8 million to campaigns.

The committee understands that the facility costs budgeted in RTBF were not calculated consistently. While the nuclear weapons production plants included all salaries under RTBF, the nuclear weapons laboratories allocated salaries to various ongoing program activities. The committee believes that this inconsistency hinders congressional understanding of overhead costs and project costs and expects the Administrator of the NNSA to develop the NNSA budget for submission by DOE with RTBF funding calculated consistently among all the facilities.

Further, the committee does not believe that projects and activities that present complex scientific and engineering challenges

should be funded in RTBF. Consequently, as described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends funding for the advanced simulation and computing component of RTBF through the defense computing and modeling campaign, and that inertial confinement fusion (ICF) and national ignition facility operations be funded through the ICF and high yield margins campaign.

Operations of facilities

The budget request contained $1,313.4 million for operations of facilities, including $29.1 million for infrastructure costs at the Pantex plant, $39.8 million for infrastructure costs at the Kansas City plant, and $67.3 million for infrastructure costs at the Y–12 plant.

The committee understands that the budget request for infrastructure costs at the nuclear weapons plants represent reductions of 25 percent, 6 percent, and 27 percent at the Y–12, Kansas City, and Pantex plants respectively. The committee is concerned that such reductions are inconsistent with the problems highlighted by the Stockpile Stewardship Program 30-Day Review conducted by the Department of Energy. This review cited studies showing that the historical rate of reinvestment in nuclear weapons facilities is far below industry standards and that the aging infrastructure was not designed to meet current mission requirements or safety standards.

The committee believes that the budget request places insufficient priority on restoring and modernizing infrastructure at the plants, and recommends $49.1 million for infrastructure improvements at Pantex plant, an increase of $20.0 million; $56.8 million for infrastructure improvements and capital equipment at the Kansas City plant, an increase of $17.0 million; and $82.3 million for infrastructure improvements at the Y–12 plant, an increase of $15.0 million.

As described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends realigning $100.8 million from operations of facilities for the National Ignition Facility (NIF) and $43.9 million in other RTBF funds to the inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield margins campaign.

Overall, the committee recommends $1,220.7 million for operations of facilities, a reduction of $92.7 million.

Special projects

The budget request contained $17.0 million for educational activities, including funding for mathematics and science education for local schools near the national weapons laboratories, the Los Alamos County School District, and the Northern New Mexico Educational Enrichment Foundation.

The committee understands the importance of primary and secondary education in mathematics and science but believes that funding of these activities in the Defense Programs account provides no direct benefit to the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration. Consequently, the committee recommends no funds for these activities, a reduction of $17.0 million.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize funds for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2001.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy environmental restoration and waste management activities for fiscal year 2001.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for other defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2001.

Section 3104—Defense Facilities Closure Projects

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy defense facilities closure projects for fiscal year 2001.

Section 3105—Defense Environmental Management Privatization

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy defense environmental management privatization activities for fiscal year 2001.

Section 3106—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for Department of Energy defense nuclear waste disposal activities for fiscal year 2001.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3121—Reprogramming

This section would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in excess of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of $1.0 million above the amount authorized for the program until the Secretary of Energy has notified the congressional defense committees and a period of 60 days has elapsed after the date on which the notification is received.

Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects

This section would limit the initiation of general plant projects if the current estimated cost for any project exceeds $5.0 million and would require the Secretary of Energy to notify the congressional defense committees in the event the estimated cost of any project exceeds $5.0 million and the reasons for the cost variation.

Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects

This section would permit the initiation and continuation of any construction project only if the estimated cost for the project does

not exceed 125 percent of the higher of: (1) the amount authorized for the project; or (2) the most recent total estimated cost presented to Congress as justification for such project. To exceed this limit, the Secretary of Energy must report in detail the reason therefore to the congressional defense committees and the report must be before the committees for 30 legislative days. This section would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under $5.0 million.

Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to transfer funds to other agencies of the government for performance of work for which the funds were authorized and appropriated. The provision would permit the merger of such funds with the funds made available to the agency to which they are transferred.

Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to certify that a conceptual design for a construction project has been completed prior to requesting funding for that project, except in the case of emergencies.

Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities

This section would permit the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design for construction activities utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously to protect the public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

Section 3127—Availability of Funds

This section would require that funds authorized for the various activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration and environmental management activities of the Department of Energy would be available for obligation for three years, and that funding authorized for program direction would be available for obligation for one year.

Section 3128—Authority Relating to Transfer of Defense Environmental Management Funds

This section would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with limited authority to transfer defense environmental management funds from a program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project.

Section 3131—Funding for Termination Costs for Tank Waste Remediation System Environmental Project, Richland, Washington

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Energy from using appropriated funds to establish a reserve for the payment of termination costs of contracts relating to the tank waste remediation

system at Richland, Washington and identifies alternatives to pay for these costs should the need arise to do so.

Section 3132—Enhanced Cooperation Between National Nuclear Security Administration and Ballistic Missile Defense Organization

This section would establish the basis for expanded cooperation between the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The committee continues to believe that ballistic missile defense remains one of the highest defense priorities and that the national laboratories represent a repository of expertise of potentially great value in meeting technology challenges in the ballistic missile defense program.

Section 3133—Required Contents of Future-Years Nuclear Security Program to be Submitted with Fiscal Year 2002 Budget and Limitation on Obligation of Certain Funds Pending Submission of That Program

This section would make certain findings that the budget submission for fiscal year 2001 to Congress does not comply with requirements imposed by sections 3251 and 3253 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65); would establish requirements for the content of the future-years nuclear security program to be submitted annually by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) pursuant to section 3253 of Public Law 106–65; and would prohibit the obligation of more than 50 percent of funds authorized for appropriation for program direction within NNSA until 30 days after the Administrator provides Congress with the required future-years nuclear security program.

Section 3134—Limitation on Obligation of Certain Funds

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for the National Nuclear Security Administration for infrastructure upgrades or maintenance in the readiness of technical base and facilities or construction accounts to be used for any other purpose.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

The budget request contained $18.5 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2000 appropriation for DNFSB was $17.0 million and does not believe there is ample justification to warrant increase of $1.5 million. The Board cites an increased number of Department of Energy facilities to oversee as the basis for their increased budget request. However, most of these new facilities will be in the design, not construction, phase during fiscal year 2001.

Consequently, the committee recommends $17.0 million for the DNFSB, a decrease of $1.5 million.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $17.0 million for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3301—Authorized Uses Of Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $70.5 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2001. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after a notification to Congress.

Section 3302—Use of Excess Titanium Sponge in the National Defense Stockpile to Manufacture Department of Defense Equipment

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer excess titanium sponge contained in the National Defense Stockpile for use in manufacturing equipment to be used by the military services. This transfer authority would be on a non-reimbursable basis, except that the military service requesting the titanium would be responsible for all transportation and related costs. This new transfer authority would not conflict with transfer authorities for titanium contained in section 3305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106).

TITLE XXXIV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Merchant Marine Academy

The budget request contained $37.2 million for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (USMMA). The committee is deeply troubled that the health and safety hazards to the cadets and staff still continue due to the appalling condition of physical plant and infrastructure at the institution. Although the budget request includes an increase of $3.0 million for repairs and capital improvements, this amount is insufficient to begin to buy down the backlog of deferred maintenance and facilities replacement. The committee is concerned that a facilities master plan that would establish and prioritize necessary repairs and improvements is not complete. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $13.9 million to complete development of a facilities master plan and to address the most critical health and safety related repair and capital replacement projects at the USMMA.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001

This section would authorize a total of $148.3 million for fiscal year 2001, an increase of $61.9 million above the budget request, for the Maritime Administration. Of the funds authorized, $94.2 million would be for operations and training programs, $50.0 million would be for the costs as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loan guarantees authorized by Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), and $4.2 million would be for administrative expenses related to providing these loan guarantees.

Section 3402—Extension of Period For Disposal of Obsolete Vessels From the National Reserve Fleet

This section would amend the National Maritime Heritage Act of 1994 to extend by five years, until September 20, 2006, the date by which obsolete vessels from the National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels must be disposed and require the use if overseas scrapping facilities to meet this requirement. In addition, this section would require the Secretary of Transportation to submit to the Congress a plan describing how the required disposals will be completed by the revised date.

Section 3403—Authority to Convey National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessel, GLACIER

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey, at no cost to the government, a surplus National Defense Reserve Fleet vessel, to the Glacier Society for use as a museum.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense proposes the enclosed draft legislation, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes."

This legislative proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for the Second Session of the 106th Congress and is necessary to carry out the President's budget plans for fiscal year 2001. The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

The bill proposes several important initiatives needed for the efficient operation of the Department of Defense. It would contribute to the smooth management of the Department by providing many improvements to the authorities under which we operate.

The Department currently is developing several other legislative proposals, including an initiative regarding the basic allowance for housing for military personnel. We will submit these initiatives in the near future.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS A. DWORKIN,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosures.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, February 28, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is proposed legislation to authorize military construction and related activities of the Department of Defense. It is styled as Division B—Military Construction Authorizations, with the expectation that it will be included in the National Defense authorizations for fiscal year 2001 with that designation. Enactment of this legislation is necessary to carry out the President's budget plan with regard to military housing and property for fiscal year 2001. This legislation is part of the Legislative Program of the Department of Defense for the Second Session of the 106th Congress.

If enacted, this legislation would make several improvements to the efficiency of managing military construction, base housing, and the use of defense lands. These improvements would include extension of authority to conduct our military privatization initiatives, the revision of the limitations on space in housing by grade, the enhancement of the Military Leasing Act, and several other general and specific authorities in the management of our military housing and property.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS A. DWORKIN,
Acting General Counsel.

Enclosures.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 10, 2000 the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4205, as amended, by a vote of 56 to 1.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: According to information provided by Armed Services staff, H.R. 4205, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, includes several provisions that affect laws within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Those provisions are found at section 738 of the bill (improvements

regarding VA–DOD sharing agreements for health services), section 535 of the bill (addition of certain information to markers on graves at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific), and section 2831 of the bill (transfer of jurisdiction of land to VA at Rock Island Arsenal). In order to expedite consideration of H.R. 4205, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs waives the right it would have under the House Rules to seek a referral of the measure to the Committee for consideration of these provisions.

Thank you for your courtesy in bringing these matters to the VA Committee's attention.

Sincerely,

BOB STUMP, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in H.R. 4205, the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act.

H.R. 4205 as reported by the Committee on Armed Services contains many provisions over which the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has jurisdiction and as such would be entitled to a sequential referral. As in previous bills, these generally include all sections that affect the pay, benefits and personnel of the United States Coast Guard, including Section 615, providing for Physicians Assistants for the Coast Guard.

In addition to matters related to pay, benefits and personnel of the Coast Guard, we would also be entitled to a sequential referral of Title XIV, creating a Commission to assess the threat to the United States from electromagnetic pulse attack, Section 2839, regarding a land conveyance for the Charles Melvin Price Support Center in Illinois, and Section 2881, relating to easement authority to leased parkland at the Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4205 and the need for this legislation to move expeditiously. While we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the provisions identified above, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This is of course conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation waives or affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation Committee, that every effort will be made to include any agreements worked out by our staffs as the bill is taken to the Floor and that a copy of this letter and your response will by included in the Committee Report and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House. Our Committee would request to be included as conferees on these provisions, as well.

Thank you for your cooperation in this manner.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 12, 2000 regarding H.R. 4205, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for an opportunity to review the text of H.R. 4205, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, for provisions which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources. These provisions include those dealing with oceanography, environmental review, benefits for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps, historic preservation, public lands, and territories of the United States.

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 4205 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Resources on these provisions, should a conference on H.R. 4205 or a similar measure become necessary.

Once again, it has been a pleasure to work with you and Phil Grone of your staff. I look forward to seeing H.R. 4205 enacted soon as a very suitable monument to your years of distinguished service as Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Wednesday, May 10, 2000, the Committee on Armed Services ordered favorably reported H.R. 4250, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X(k) of the House of Representatives.

The specific provisions within our committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 232, Sense of Congress concerning commitment to deployment of National Missile Defense system; (2) Section 233, Reports on ballistic missile threat posed by North Korea; (3) Section 908, Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation; (4) Section 1201, Support of United Nations-sponsored efforts to inspect and monitor Iraqi weapons activities; (5) Section 1203, Situation in the Balkans; and (6) Title XIII, Cooperative Threat Reduction with States of the Former Soviet Union.

With respect to Section 1204, Limitation on number of military personnel in Colombia, it is my understanding that the Parliamentarians continue to review our jurisdictional claim on this provision. Because of our Committee's strong interest in this provision, which we believe is at the heart of our Committee's jurisdiction regarding decisions governing intervention abroad, we will continue to seek jurisdiction over this provision as we move toward conference committee on H.R. 4250.

Pursuant to Chairman Dreier's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 4250 and your desire to have the bill considered on the House floor next week, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 4025, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001," which contains several items of jurisdictional interest to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Specifically, draft section 651, "participation in the Thrift Savings Plan," would permit the military to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan. I understand that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is expected to score secondary revenue losses of approximately $321 million over 5 years due to this provision. Normally, the Committee on Ways and Means would have a budgetary interest in such legislation. However, I am informed that the statement of managers to accompany the Conference Report for H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 states that "the revenue levels in the Conference Agreement would accommodate the revenue effects from legislation that would permit members of the Armed Forces to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan."

Draft section 724 would directly amend the Medicare law contained in Title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the Tricare Senior Prime Demonstration Project for an additional three years.

Finally, a new draft section would authorize, in consultation with the Commissioner of Customs, a report on the Tethered Aerostat Radar System, used, in part, by the Customs Service to conduct counter-drug detection and interdiction.

Normally, the Committee on Ways and Means would meet to consider such legislation. However, in order to expedite consideration of H.R. 4205, I will not object to the inclusion of these items, and, for this reason, it will not be necessary for the Committee on Ways and Means to meet to consider the legislation.

However, this is only being done with the clear understanding that you have agreed to accept no additional changes on these or any other matters of concern to this Committee during further consideration of this legislation, including during consideration on the House floor and during a conference with the Senate. Finally, this action is being done with the understanding that it will not prejudice the jurisdictional prerogatives of the Committee on Ways and Means on these provisions or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in your Committee Report on the legislation. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation in this matter. With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On May 10, 2000, the Committee on Armed Services ordered reported H.R. 4205, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001. H.R. 4205, as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services,

contains a number of provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. They include:

Section 601, relating to the compensation of uniformed officers of the Public Health Service;

Section 723, relating to Medicare subvention;

Section 724, extending a pilot program;

Section 725, extending a pilot program;

Section 736, relating to biomedical research; and,

Title XIV, creating a commission to study issues related to electromagnetic pulse.

Because of the importance of this matter, I recognize your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner and will waive consideration of the bill by the Commerce Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 4205. In addition, the Committee on Commerce reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Commerce for conferees on H.R. 4205 or related legislation.

I request that you include this letter as a part of your committee's report on H.R. 4205 and as part of the Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY, *Chairman.*

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2001 and the following four years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(c)(3)

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

MAY 12, 2000.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4205, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

The CBO staff contact is Kent Christensen, who can be reached at 226–2840. If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

DAN L. CRIPPEN.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

Summary: H.R. 4205 would authorize appropriations totaling $310 billion for fiscal year 2001 and an estimated $9 billion for 2000 for the military functions of the Department of Defense (DoD) and the Department of Energy. It also would prescribe personnel strengths for each active duty and selected reserve component of the U.S. armed forces. CBO estimates that appropriation of the authorized amounts for 2000 and 2001 would result in additional outlays of $313 billion over the 2000–2005 period. In addition, the bill contains provisions that would raise the costs of discretionary defense programs over the 2002–2005 period by about $8 billion, assuming appropriation of the necessary sums.

The bill contains provisions that would affect direct spending, primarily through demonstration projects in the defense health program. We estimate that the direct spending resulting from provisions of H.R. 4205 would total about $165 million over the 2001–2005 period and $151 million over the 2001–2010 period. The bill

would reduce revenues by about $380 million over the 2001–2005 period and $1.1 billion over the 2001–2010 period as the result of a provision that would allow military personnel to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). Because it would affect direct spending and receipts, the bill would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures.

The bill contains private-sector and intergovernmental mandates; however, the costs of those mandates would not exceed the thresholds specified in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 4205 is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—BUDGETARY IMPACT OF H.R. 4205 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION						
Spending Under Current Law for Defense Programs:						
Budget Authority [1]	289,218	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	282,839	99,278	36,513	15,296	6,707	3,379
Proposed Changes:						
Authorization of Supplemental Appropriations:						
Estimated Authorization Level [2]	9,205	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays [2]	6,953	136	1,470	453	134	28
Authorization of Regular Appropriations:						
Authorization Level	0	310,182	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	199,797	65,795	24,055	9,210	4,525
Subtotal-Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level	9,205	310,182	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	6,953	199,933	67,265	24,508	9,344	4,553
Spending Under H.R. 4205 for Defense Programs:						
Estimated Authorization Level [1, 2]	298,423	310,182	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays [1]	289,792	299,211	103,778	39,804	16,051	7,932
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	27	39	83	21	−5
Estimated Outlays	0	27	39	83	21	−5
CHANGES IN REVENUES						
Change in Income Tax Receipts	0	−10	−61	−82	−105	−125

[1] The 2000 level is the amount appropriated for programs authorized by the bill.

[2] The amounts shown here for the 2000 supplemental are the total amounts in the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act as passed by the House. The outlay estimate includes $4,897 million designated as emergency funding. Excluding emergency funds would lower total outlays in 2001 to $294,314 million.

Note.—Costs of the bill would fall within budget function 050 (national defense), except for certain items noted in the text.

Authorizations of Appropriations

The bill would authorize specific appropriations totaling $310 billion in 2001 (see Table 2) and such sums as may be necessary for supplemental appropriations in 2000. It would also authorize certain payments, which are due to be made in fiscal year 2001, to be paid instead in 2000. Most of those costs would fall within budget function 050 (national defense). H.R. 4205 would also authorize appropriations of $94 million for the Maritime Administration (function 400) and $70 million for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (function 700).

The estimate assumes that the amounts authorized for 2001 will be appropriated by October 1, 2000, and that the authorization of supplemental appropriations would amount to $9 billion, the amount of funding passed by the House in the 2000 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act. (All but $167 million of the supplemental funding is designated as an emergency.) Outlays are estimated based on historical spending patterns.

The bill also contains provisions that would affect various costs, mostly for personnel, that would be covered by the fiscal year 2001 authorization and by authorizations in future years. Table 3 contains estimates of those amounts. In addition to the costs covered by the authorizations in the bill for 2001, these provisions would raise estimated costs by $8 billion over the 2002–2005 period. The following sections describe the provisions identified in Table 3 and provide information about CBO's cost estimates.

Multiyear Procurement Programs. In most cases, purchases of weapon systems are authorized annually, and as a result, DoD negotiates a separate contract for each annual purchase. In a small number of cases, the law permits multiyear procurement; that is, it allows DoD to enter into a contract to buy specified annual quantities of a system for up to five years. In those cases, DoD can negotiate lower prices because its commitment to purchase the weapons gives the contractor an incentive to find more economical ways to manufacture the weapon, including cost-saving investments. Funding would continue to be provided on an annual basis for these multiyear contracts, but potential termination costs would be covered by an initial appropriation.

H.R. 4205 would authorize DoD to enter into new multiyear contracts for three weapons systems: Blackhawk (UH–60L) helicopters, Knighthawk (CH–60S) helicopters, and Bradley fighting vehicles. The Blackhawk and Knighthawk helicopters would be purchased under one contract administered by the Army and covering five years of production beginning in 2002. The contract for the Bradley fighting vehicles would cover three years starting in 2001. H.R. 4205 would also extend the authorization of multiyear procurement of the Arleigh Burke class destroyer by two years through 2005.

TABLE 2.—SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Military Personnel:					
Authorization Level	75,802	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	70,192	4,017	834	303	76
Operation and Maintenance:					
Authorization Level	109,709	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1,220	20,976	4,101	1,972	703
Procurement:					
Authorization Level	62,300	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	14,333	19,883	14,162	5,494	3,222
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:					
Authorization Level	39,309	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	21,513	14,105	2,599	730	192
Military Construction and Family Housing:					
Authorization Level	8,434	0	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—Continued

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Estimated Outlays	2,515	3,050	1,687	686	290
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:					
Authorization Level	12,888	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	8,646	3,589	654	0	0
Other Accounts:					
Authorization Level	1,667	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1,032	228	138	85	62
General Transfer Authority:					
Authorization Level	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	280	−60	−120	−60	−20
Total:					
Authorization Level	310,109	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	199,731	65,788	24,055	9,210	4,525

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 4205 AS ORDERED REPORTED

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Multiyear Procurement:					
Blackhawk and Knighthawk	0	−12	−9	−20	−45
Bradley Fighting Vehicle	−8	−29	−42	0	0
Arleigh Burke Destroyer	153	0	0	−192	−93
Military Endstrengths:					
Department of Defense	−113	−233	−241	−249	−257
Coast Guard Reserve	73	0	0	0	0
Grade Structure	11	22	23	24	25
Compensation and Benefits (DOD):					
Expiring Bonuses and Allowances	358	257	136	105	71
Increases in Special Pays and Bonuses	0	216	204	196	197
Housing Allowances	315	648	952	1,272	1,608
Subsistence Allowances	5	62	114	170	228
Travel and Transportation Allowances	48	49	50	50	51
Involuntary Separation Pay	30	31	32	34	35
Retention Bonus for Critical Skills	12	7	4	4	2
TSP Contributions	1	5	11	18	26
Other Compensation Provisions	9	10	10	10	10
Military Health Care:					
Tricare Pharmacy Benefit	94	320	481	536	595
Tricare Prime Remote	50	52	54	55	57
Copayments Under Tricare Prime	38	39	39	39	40
Reduction of Catastrophic Cap	30	30	31	31	31
Reimbursement for Travel Expenses	15	23	32	33	34
Chiropractic Care	3	10	16	22	29
Patient Safety	20	10	10	5	5
Other Health Care Provisions	7	5	11	6	5
Other Provisions:					
Commissary Surcharge	90	90	90	90	90
Acquisition Workforce Reductions	−7	−63	−65	−68	−70
Tuition Reimbursement (Civilian)	0	6	6	6	6
Bill Total:					
Estimated Authorization Level	1,234	1,555	1,949	2,177	2,680

Notes:—For every item in this table except one, the 2001 impacts are included in the amounts specifically authorized to be appropriated in the bill. Those amounts are shown in Table 2. Only the authorization of endstrength for the Coast Guard Reserve is additive to the amounts in Table 2.

CBO estimates that savings from buying the Blackhawk and Knighthawk helicopters under a multiyear contract would total $86

million or an average of about $22 million a year over the 2002–2005 period. Funding requirements would total just under $2.2 billion instead of the almost $2.3 billion needed under annual contracts. Similarly, CBO estimates that the Army would save $79 million, or about $26 million a year, through 2003 under a multiyear contract for Bradley fighting vehicles, which would cost about $0.9 billion over that period under current law. CBO estimates that extending the Arleigh Burke destroyer multiyear contract would save the Navy an additional $132 million between 2001 and 2005. Those estimates are based on actual savings from multiyear procurement of similar systems and the assumption that annual production will be at the levels planned by the Administration for each of these programs.

Endstrength. The bill would authorize active and reserve endstrengths for 2001 and would lower the minimum endstrength authorization in permanent law. The authorized endstrengths for active-duty personnel and personnel in the selected reserve would total about 1,382,000 and 866,000, respectively. The bill would specifically authorize appropriations of $75.8 billion for military pay and allowances in 2001. The reduction in authorized personnel would decrease costs for salaries and other expenses by $113 million in the first year and about $250 million annually in subsequent years, compared to the authorized strengths for 2000.

Also, the bill would authorize an endstrength of 8,000 in 2001 for the Coast Guard Reserve. This authorization would cost about $73 million and would fall under budget function 400, transportation.

Section 414 would change the grade structure of active duty personnel in support of the reserves. This change would not increase the overall strength, but would result in more promotions. The provision would cost $11 million in 2001 and about $25 million a year in subsequent years.

Compensation and Benefits. H.R. 4205 contains several provisions that would affect military compensation and benefits.

Pay Raises. Section 601 would raise basic pay by 3.7 percent at a total cost of about $1.5 billion in 2001. Because this pay raise would be the same as the one projected under current law and assumed in its baseline projections, CBO estimates no incremental costs.

Expiring Bonuses and Allowances. Several sections would extend for one year DoD's authority to pay certain bonuses and allowances to current personnel. Under current law, these authorities are scheduled to expire in December 2000, or three months into fiscal year 2001. The bill would extend most of those authorities through December 2001. CBO estimates that the cost of these extensions would be as follows:

Payment of reenlistment bonuses for active duty personnel would cost $193 million in 2001 and $111 million in 2002; enlistment bonuses for active duty personnel would cost $65 million in 2001 and $29 million in 2002. (The bill would extend the authority to pay enlistment bonuses only through September 2001);

Various bonuses for the Selected and Ready Reserve would cost $48 million in 2001 and $55 million in 2002;

Special payments for aviators and nuclear-qualified personnel would cost $44 million in 2001 and $47 million in 2002; and

Authorities to make special payments to nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists would cost $8 million in 2001 and $3 million in 2002.

Extension of other authorities, including temporary early retirement authority, special separation benefit, voluntary separation incentive, and certain other contingent benefits would cost $12 million in 2002. (The bill would extend the authorities for three months past their current expiration date of October 1, 2001.)

Most of these changes would result in additional, smaller costs in subsequent years because payments are made in installments.

Increases in Special Pays and Bonuses. Sections 616 through 618 would revise certain eligibility criteria and pay for personnel with special skills. Those provisions would raise maximum pay rates for servicemembers performing career sea duty and certain enlisted personnel performing special duty, including recruiters. In addition, the bill would establish a common enlistment bonus among the services for certain personnel on active duty, by ending the separate authority for the Army and by revising the existing department-wide enlistment bonus. Under section 618, the minimum enlistment period for enlistment bonuses would decrease from four to two years and the critical skill requirement would be eliminated. Authority to pay the enlistment bonuses would expire December 31, 2001. These changes would have no cost in 2001 and cost $216 million in 2002, when the changes would become effective. Costs in subsequent years would total about $200 million annually.

Housing Allowances. Several sections would increase housing allowances for servicemembers within the United States. The combination of these provisions would cost $315 million in 2001 and $4.8 billion over the 2001–2005 period.

Section 604 would revise the calculation of Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) within the United States by no longer requiring that housing allowances be limited to 85 percent of the cost of adequate housing in the United States. DoD plans to gradually increase BAH over 5 years to reach 100 percent of that cost by 2005. Based on that plan, CBO estimates that higher BAH payments would cost $274 million in 2001 and $4.4 billion over the 2001–2005 period.

Section 605 would revise the basis of BAH for enlisted members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–4. BAH rates for enlisted members in these grades are currently based on the cost of a two-bedroom apartment. Section 605 would increase the minimum housing standard to the amount halfway between the current standard and the cost of a two-bedroom townhouse. This change would be effective July 1, 2001. CBO estimates that increasing the minimum housing standard for these enlisted members would cost $10 million in 2001 and $188 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Section 606 would allow the Secretary of Defense to pay BAH to certain enlisted members without dependents in pay grade E–4, who are assigned to sea duty and who sleep aboard ship when it is in port and quarters on base are unavailable. Based on the Navy's plan to implement this authority, and an effective date of October 1, 2001, CBO estimates that paying BAH to these enlisted

members would cost $45 million starting in 2002 and total $186 million over the 2002–2005 period.

Section 610 would earmark $30 million of the amount authorized to be appropriated in 2001 for military pay and allowances to further increase BAH within the United States.

Subsistence Allowances. Sections 602, 603, and 609 would increase subsistence allowances for certain active-duty servicemembers and officers prior to being commissioned. CBO estimates that enactment of these provisions would cost $5 million in 2001 and $579 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Compared to current law, section 602 would allow a speedier elimination of the gap between the Basic Allowance for Subsistence (BAS) paid to enlisted members who eat off-base and the value of subsistence provided to enlisted members who eat in DoD dining facilities. Current law limits the annual growth of regular BAS to 1 percent and allows for a partial allowance to be paid to those receiving an in-kind benefit. Because the partial allowance grows at a faster rate, the gap between the total benefits would eventually close. CBO estimates that the cost to equalize payments to both groups in 2001 and eliminate the 1 percent growth cap would be $35 million in 2002 and would grow to $166 million by 2005.

Section 603 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide a new allowance, through fiscal year 2006, for servicemembers who meet certain eligibility criteria of the Food Stamp program. CBO estimates that, if the Secretary chooses to offer it, this allowance would increase personnel costs by $5 million in fiscal year 2001 and by a total of $59 million over the 2001–2005 period.

To receive the allowance, a servicemember would apply to DoD, providing proof that his or her household income meets the gross income test for the Food Stamp program. The value of the allowance would be the amount needed to make the household ineligible for food stamps, up to a maximum of $500 per month. In determining eligibility and the size of the allowance, DoD would count the value of all housing assistance as income, even if that assistance is delivered in-kind.

Under current law, CBO estimates that about 5,500 servicemembers will participate in the Food Stamp program in 2001. This estimate is based on a recent DoD survey of servicemembers receiving food stamps, adjusted for projected pay raises. Not all of these Food Stamp participants would be eligible for the new allowance when the value of in-kind housing is counted as income. Using data on the distribution of servicemembers by pay grade and family size, CBO expects that about 3,300 current Food Stamp recipients would be eligible for the allowance and that another 800 servicemembers would apply, at an average household cost of $315 per month. CBO assumes that the allowance would be available beginning April 1, 2001, and participation would phase in over the remainder of the fiscal year. Once the allowance is fully phased in, the costs are projected to decrease each year as fewer servicemembers would be eligible for the allowance. The number of eligible members would decline because pay rates are projected to rise faster than the poverty threshold used to determine Food Stamp eligibility.

If this allowance is instituted, it would make an estimated 1,100 servicemembers ineligible for food stamps and reduce costs of the Food Stamp program by an estimated $22 million over the 2001–2005 period. Because the decision to provide the allowance would depend, in part, on future appropriation action, CBO has not shown direct spending savings for this provision.

Section 609 would increase the subsistence allowance paid to members in precommissioning programs, effective October 1, 2001. These members currently receive a monthly allowance of $200. Section 609 would establish a minimum monthly rate of $250 and allow the Secretary of Defense to pay as much as $600. CBO estimates that this increase would cost $12 million in 2002 and $50 million by 2005, when the allowance would approach the $600 limit.

Travel and Transportation Allowances. Section 632 would allow the Secretary of Defense to reimburse members who change duty stations for the fees of mandatory pet quarantine, but limit the compensation amount to $275 per change. CBO estimates that these payments would cost $1 million a year. Section 633 would increase dislocation allowances for enlisted members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–4 by requiring that the Secretary of Defense not differentiate between grades E–1 through E–5 when determining dislocation allowances for enlisted members with dependents. CBO estimates that paying the resulting higher dislocation allowances would cost $6 million in 2001 and $33 million over the 2001–2005 period. Under section 634, the Secretary could reimburse recruiters and other military and civilian employees assigned to certain duties for parking expenses. CBO estimates that that the cost of paying these parking fees would be $41 million in 2001 and $210 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Involuntary Separation Pay. Section 517 would reclassify as involuntary the discharges of reserve officers who are twice passed over for promotion. This would allow these members to receive involuntary separation pay. Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates that approximately 550 reserve officers a year would become eligible for separation pay under this provision. CBO estimates that enactment of section 517 would cost $30 million in 2001 and $162 million over the 2001–2005 period.

New Retention Bonus for Critical Skills. Section 619 would authorize a new retention bonus for military personnel with critical skills who extend their period of duty by at least one additional year. This new bonus could be paid in addition to the current selected reenlistment bonus available to certain enlisted members and certain other compensation provided to officers. The authority to offer this bonus would expire on December 31, 2001. CBO estimates that this new retention bonus would cost $12 million in 2001. Smaller costs would be incurred in subsequent years because payments are made in installments.

TSP Contributions. Under section 651, the Secretary of Defense could make contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) for military personnel in designated occupational specialties who commit to serve on active duty in that specialty for a period of six years. Based on DoD's use of similar authority to award bonuses for enlistment or reenlistment, CBO estimates that the discretionary

costs for the agency contributions to TSP would total $1 million in 2001 and $26 million by 2005, based on an effective date of July 15, 2001.

Other Compensation Provisions. Section 641 would raise reserve retirement pay by increasing the number of days that can be counted in the retirement pay calculation. The military retirement system is financed in part by an annual payment from appropriated funds to the military retirement trust fund, based on an estimate of the system's accruing liabilities. If the bill is enacted, the yearly contribution to the military retirement trust fund (a DoD outlay in budget function 050) would increase to reflect the added liability from the increase in retirement pay. The payment into the trust fund is discretionary because it depends on whether and how much funding is made available each year for military personnel. Using information from DoD, CBO estimates that implementing this bill would increase such payments by $4 million in 2001, $23 million over the 2001–2005 period, and $50 million over the 2001–2010 period, subject to appropriation of the necessary amounts. This provision would also increase outlays from the retirement trust fund. Those costs are discussed under the heading of direct spending.

CBO estimates that increases in allowances paid to officers for purchasing uniforms and equipment would cost $5 million a year under section 608.

Military Health Care. Title VII contains several provisions that would affect DoD health care and benefits. Tricare is the name of DoD's three-part health care program: Tricare Prime is a managed care option; Tricare Extra is a preferred provider program; and Tricare Standard is a fee-for-service program of other participating providers.

Tricare Pharmacy Benefit. Section 721 would allow military beneficiaries age 65 and over to use DoD's National Mail Order Pharmacy (NMOP) and retail networks, and would allow Tricare to pay 75 percent of all pharmacy claims after each beneficiary meets an annual $150 deductible. CBO estimates that this provision would affect about 360,000 individuals who do not currently use DoD for pharmacy benefits, and about 450,000 beneficiaries who are eligible for the NMOP and retail networks but do not have access to the Tricare insurance for reimbursement. Because the program would not take effect until April 1, 2001, the cost in fiscal year 2001 is comparatively low. CBO estimates that providing the Tricare pharmacy benefit to seniors would cost $94 million in 2001 and a little more than $2 billion over the 2001–2005 period.

Tricare Prime Remote. Under current law, members of the armed forces on active duty who live far enough away from a military treatment facility (MTF) are eligible to participate in what DoD calls Tricare Prime Remote. This program allows such personnel to receive care without facing the co-insurance and deductibles that they would otherwise face if they used Tricare Standard. To implement the program, DoD either establishes a network of providers for the active-duty personnel, or it waives the copayments and deductibles when claims are filed under Tricare Standard. In many cases, where the cost of setting up networks is more costly than the cost of waiving such payments, DoD just waives the deductibles and co-insurance.

Section 711 would grant the Tricare Prime Remote benefit to dependents of members of the armed forces on active duty and to other members of the uniformed services (e.g., uniformed members of the Public Health Service) and their dependents. Using data from DoD, CBO estimates that roughly 71,000 people in remote locations already use Tricare Standard or Extra. DoD's only additional cost for those beneficiaries would come from waiving the co-insurance and deductibles. CBO expects that almost 4,000 people who do not currently use Tricare insurance would enroll in Tricare Prime Remote under the bill because of the lower out-of-pocket costs. Those beneficiaries would cost DoD significantly more per person. CBO estimates that establishing Tricare Prime Remote for the 75,000 new beneficiaries would cost $50 million in 2001 and $268 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Copayments Under Tricare Prime. Under current law, beneficiaries who use MTFs do not need to make any copayments, but beneficiaries enrolled in Tricare Prime, the military health care system's managed care option, are required to make copayments whenever they visit a civilian doctor. In 1999, dependents of active-duty personnel who are enrolled in Tricare Prime saw civilian doctors about 2.4 million times. Section 712 would eliminate the requirement for those copayments. (Beneficiaries who use Tricare Standard or Extra would still have to pay the applicable co-insurance amounts for each civilian visit.)

CBO estimates that this change would cost $38 million in 2001 and $195 million over the 2001–2005 period. Reimbursing Tricare insurance providers for lost revenue would compose about 70 percent of DoD's cost. The remaining 30 percent of the estimated cost results because the lack of cost sharing would likely increase the number of visits to civilian doctors.

Reduction of Catastrophic Cap. Under current law, beneficiaries who use Tricare Standard or Extra must pay deductibles and co-insurance up to a cap of $7,500 each year. DoD is responsible for any costs over $7,500. Section 718 would lower this cap from $7,500 to $3,000 per family. CBO estimates that lowering the cap would cost $30 million in 2001 and $153 million over the 2001–2005 period. Using data from the Medical Expense Panel Survey, conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, CBO estimates that about 3 percent of the population has out-of-pocket costs greater than $3,000. Applying this to the DoD population that uses Tricare Standard or Extra yields roughly 14,000 people that would be affected by this provision. Assuming a uniform distribution of expenditures across the range from the new cap ($3,000) to the existing cap ($7,500), CBO estimates that DoD's costs would rise by an average of just under $2,250 per person.

Reimbursement for Travel Expenses. Under current law, when somebody using the military health system is referred to a new doctor or hospital, the costs of traveling to the new location are paid by the individual. Section 717 would require the Secretary of Defense to reimburse reasonable travel expenses for anybody who had to travel more than 100 miles because of a medical referral. CBO estimates that this provision would apply about 50,000 times each year and that in about one-third of those cases, additional expenses would be incurred for individuals who must accompany the

patient. CBO also expects that reimbursements would average about $650 per occurrence, although those costs would rise with inflation. CBO estimates that implementing this proposal would cost $15 million in 2001 and $137 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Chiropractic Care. Section 737 would require DoD to continue providing chiropractic care in 2001 at MTFs where such care is currently provided. The bill would require a five-year phase-in period beginning in 2002 for DoD to provide chiropractic care to all members of the uniformed services. The costs are initially low because of the phase-in period. CBO estimates that the provision would cost $3 million in 2001 and $80 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Patient Safety. Section 733 would require DoD to set up a centralized process for tracking and reporting mistakes in the provision of health care that endangers patient safety. Simple reporting is part of DoD's current effort to improve services, but more complex reporting would likely require substantial investments in information technology. Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates that this provision would cost the department about $50 million over the 2001–2005 period, primarily for the purchase of computer equipment and software support.

Other Health Care Provisions. Title VII also contains several proposals that would cost relatively little over the 2001–2005 period, including some temporary authorities and demonstration projects. CBO estimates that implementing all of these additional health care provisions would cost $7 million in 2001 and $34 million over the 2001–2005 period.

The Congress authorized a demonstration program, called Tricare Senior Supplement, at two sites during a period ending December 2002 where Tricare acts as second-payer to Medicare for those beneficiaries who have enrolled in the program. Enrollment for the demonstration program began in March of 2000. Enrollees must pay a fee and are no longer eligible to use MTFs. Section 724 would extend the demonstration program through the end of calendar year 2003. CBO estimates that this provision would cost $5 million over the 2003–2004 period. Those costs would be discretionary, but extending this demonstration program would also raise Medicare costs because better insurance tends to increase the use of health care. CBO estimates that the Medicare costs of Tricare Senior Supplement would be about $1 million over the 2003–2004 period.

Other health care provisions that would have discretionary budgetary effects are as follows:

Section 715 would prohibit Tricare insurers from requiring prior authorization for specialty medical care if the provider of that specialty care is part of the Tricare network. CBO estimates that this provision would cost $5 million a year.

Section 701 would extend for two years the authority to employ physicians on a contract basis under certain conditions, including at entrance processing stations. CBO estimates that this provision would save $6 million over the two years.

Section 702 would allow all recipients of the Medal of Honor and their dependents to have access to the military health system and would cost less than $500,000 a year.

Section 703 would allow DoD to pay for domiciliary and custodial care for certain Medicare-eligible beneficiaries. CBO estimates that the cost of this proposal would be less than $500,000 a year.

Section 704 would authorize a two-year demonstration program allowing all DoD beneficiaries to use mental health facilities without the need for prior authorization and supervision. CBO estimates that this would cost $6 million over the two years.

Section 705 would authorize a two-year teleradiology demonstration project. CBO estimates the cost would be $4 million, assuming that the sites require new equipment.

Section 720 would allow beneficiaries enrolled in the Tricare retiree dental program to withdraw under special circumstances. CBO estimates that this would cost less than $500,000 a year.

Commissary Surcharge. Subtitle C of title III would make several changes to laws governing DoD's commissaries, and CBO estimates that their combined cost would be about $90 million a year. The commissary system is supported through a mix of appropriated and nonappropriated funding. One source of nonappropriated funds, a surcharge on grocery bills, funds a combination of operating expenses and construction costs. The bill would limit DoD to using the collections from the surcharge for only construction or improvement of commissary stores. Funding from that source that now goes for other purposes would have to be made up with discretionary appropriations. CBO estimates those costs to be about $90 million a year, based on information from DoD.

Reductions in Defense Acquisition Workforce. The bill would limit the size of the acquisition workforce by requiring a reduction of at least 13,000 military and civilian personnel during fiscal year 2001. Because the total number of military personnel is determined by endstrength requirements, CBO assumes that the provision would lead to their transfer to other activities rather than separation from the services. Separations of civilian personnel, who comprise about 80 percent of the acquisition workforce, would account for the remaining reductions. Because these civilian reductions would exceed those expected under current law, CBO estimates savings of $7 million in 2001, $63 million in 2002, and similar amounts in subsequent years. Savings would be relatively small during the first year because the cost of separation payments would offset most of the initial savings in salaries.

Tuition Reimbursement for Civilians. Section 1103 would extend for five years a program to reimburse certain civilians in the acquisition workforce for tuition expenses. Based on recent funding levels for that program, CBO estimates that section 1103 would cost about $6 million a year starting in 2002.

Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI). Section 2803 would extend from 2001 to 2006 special authorities to finance the construction and renovation of military family housing. It would authorize DoD to continue to use direct loans, loan guarantees, long-term leases, rental guarantees, barter, direct government investment, and other financial arrangements to encourage private-sector participation in building military housing. Funding for those activities is contained in the Family Housing Improvement Fund and would consist of direct appropriations to the fund, transfers from other accounts, receipts from property sales and rents, re-

turns on any capital, and other income from operations or transactions connected with the program. The amounts in the fund would be available to acquire housing using the various techniques mentioned above, but the total value of budget authority for all contracts and investments undertaken would be limited to $1 billion.

The bill would not explicitly authorize appropriations for the fund, and based on how the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has treated recent use of the authority, CBO does not estimate any budgetary impact from extending the authorities. However, CBO believes that OMB's current accounting for MHPI initiatives is at odds with government-wide standards for recording obligations and outlays. Those standards call for different treatments depending on the character of the transaction. The OMB accounting treats certain initiatives primarily as matters of credit reform that have relatively little cost in terms of recorded obligations and outlays. In contrast, CBO considers those initiatives as having the characteristics of lease-purchases, which call for recording higher levels of obligations and outlays. The budgetary effect of the Administration's approach (compared to CBO's) is to allow DoD to obligate significantly more federal resources than the $1 billion allocated for such projects.

Government-wide Accounting Principles. Some of the options available for use of the Family Housing Improvement Fund involve up-front commitments of government resources that would be spent over a long period of time. According to standard principles of federal accounting, obligations of the fund should reflect the full amount of the financial liability incurred when the government makes such a commitment. In the case of a long-term capital lease or rental guarantee, for example, obligations should equal the total amount of lease or rental payments over the life of the contract, and appropriations to cover the full amount of such obligations should be available before entering into the lease or guarantee. Some commitments could take the form of lease-purchases, which would require the recording of both obligations and outlays up front. For a direct loan or loan guarantee, obligations should equal the estimated present value of federal transactions with the public, excluding receipts from other federal budget accounts that depend on the availability of future appropriations.

Actual Accounting for Current DoD Projects. To date, DoD has signed contracts for four projects and will soon finalize 12 others. The common thread among the projects so far is that regular appropriations directly finance only a small portion of the construction costs; most costs initially are paid by developers, who borrow funds from private markets. The developers will repay the loans from the government and the private sector using rent received from servicemembers who pay their housing costs with their allowances, which are provided as part of appropriations for military personnel. If rents exceed the servicemembers' housing allowances, DoD can make up the difference. The four projects underway are as follows:

Lackland Air Force Base (AFB), Texas: In exchange for the construction of 420 housing units, the Air Force provided the contractor with a long-term lease of federal land, a direct loan of $11

million, and a guarantee of a private-sector loan ($30 million) against base closure, downsizing, and substantial redeployment of units based at Lackland. The Administration recorded an obligation of $6 million for the transaction.

Fort Carson, Colorado: For construction of 840 units and renovation of 1,800 others, the Army provided a long-term lease of federal land, title to existing housing, and a $220 million loan guarantee against base closure, downsizing, and substantial redeployment. The Administration recorded an obligation of $10 million for the transaction.

Naval Station Everett, Washington: For construction of 185 units and a share of proceeds and equity, the Navy provided an equity investment of $6 million and funds the difference between the rent and the member's housing allowance. Occupants have the right to purchase the units at below-market prices during the last five years of the 10-year partnership. The recorded obligation totaled $9 million from the equity investment ($6 million) and the differential lease payments ($3 million).

Corpus Christi, Texas: In exchange for 404 units of off-base housing and a share of proceeds and equity, the Navy provided an equity investment of $10 million and funds the difference between the rent and the member's housing allowance. The recorded obligation amounted to $19 million from the equity investment ($10 million) and the differential lease payments ($9 million).

Thus, for these four projects DoD obtained about $320 million worth of housing at the expense of $44 million in obligational authority.

MHPI Under Government-wide Accounting Principles. The principles guiding the accounting for programs like the MHPI are defined in the conference report to the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (H. Rept. 105–217, pages 1007–1012). CBO believes that the four listed projects meet the criteria stated in the scorekeeping guidelines for a lease-purchase with substantial government risk. Although current MHPI projects employ tools like direct loans, they are more fundamentally projects that achieve the practical effects of government ownership of the properties. Thus, up-front scoring of obligations and outlays is more appropriate than the methods of credit reform.

In CBO's view, those guidelines require the up-front accounting of obligations and outlays for those four projects and for other similar projects this bill would make possible. First, the construction is occurring on federal land for at least two of the four projects. Second, the private-sector market for the housing will be sharply constrained. On-base housing will probably be restricted to military personnel for security and other such reasons. Off-base housing must first be offered to servicemembers over civilians, and since demand for on-base housing exceeds supply, the practical effect would likely be the same as for a federally constructed facility. Third, although DoD is not providing an open-ended guarantee of third-party financing, it is essentially committing itself to providing tenants. Finally, DoD is providing the developers with significant portions of their up-front equity, including direct loans and cash investments.

In sum, the lease-purchase criteria clearly apply to the two projects on government property (Lackland AFB and Fort Carson). The proper treatment of the other two projects is less clear, but on balance, CBO believes that they too are the equivalent of lease-purchases with substantial government risk because the housing units will be built or renovated for governmental purposes and would be based on a significant financial commitment by the government. On that basis, the true obligations and outlays from current projects are higher than were recorded, as would be the obligations and outlays from future projects if they are recorded the same way.

Table 4 shows how CBO believes these projects should be recorded in the budget, compared to the approach used by the Administration.

TABLE 4.—ILLUSTRATIVE SCORING OF MHPI AUTHORITIES FOR FOUR PROJECTS

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Administration Approach to Scoring:						
Estimated Obligation	44	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	24	7	4	1	1	1
CBO Approach to Scoring:						
Estimated Obligation	320	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	100	160	50	1	1	1

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office based on information from the Department of Defense.

Note: This table illustrates the approach that the Administration uses for recording obligations and outlays for four MHPI projects compared to the approach that CBO believes would be in keeping with government-wide accounting principles. The four projects are family housing initiatives at Lackland AFB, Ft. Carson, Naval Station Everett, and Corpus Christi. For illustrative purposes, we assume the obligations for the four projects occur in 2000 even though actual obligations occurred in other years.

Direct Spending

The bill contains provisions that would affect direct spending primarily through changes to defense health programs. We estimate that the direct spending from provisions of H.R. 4205 would total about $165 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Demonstration of Medicare Subvention. DoD provides health care to almost 350,000 retirees and survivors who are over age 64 and eligible for Medicare. This health care is provided at MTFs on a space-available basis and includes some services that Medicare does not cover, primarily prescription drugs. Under current law, DoD cannot bill Medicare for the cost of providing health care to those beneficiaries over age 64 except in a demonstration project.

The Congress authorized a demonstration project at up to six sites beginning in January 1998 and ending in December 2000. Under that demonstration, DoD provides care to Medicare-eligible beneficiaries and is reimbursed under certain conditions by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA), which administers Medicare. The most important condition is the requirement that DoD maintain a level of effort; any additional care is reimbursable by HCFA up to a cap set in law. This care and reimbursement procedure is known as Medicare subvention. To date, however, HCFA has not reimbursed DoD for any care provided under this program.

Section 725 would extend the demonstration project for three more years, through the end of 2003. In the current demonstration project, enrolled beneficiaries use substantially more care than civilians enrolled in Medicare managed care plans. Because these en-

rollees have a high priority for care in MTFs, Medicare-eligible beneficiaries who now receive space-available care at MTFs and choose not to enroll in the subvention program would not be able to use the MTFs as frequently as they otherwise would. Instead, they would obtain more of their care in the private sector, thus raising costs for the Medicare program because Medicare would be paying for some services that would otherwise be provided at MTFs. CBO estimates that these provisions would cost $20 million in 2001 and $95 million over the 2001–2005 period (see Table 5).

FEHB Demonstration Program. Under current law, military retirees under the age of 65 are eligible to either enroll in DoD's managed care program (Tricare Prime) or use one of its insurance programs (Tricare Standard or Extra). Those who use Tricare Standard or Extra may also seek care at an MTF on a space-available basis. Once retirees turn age 65, they are no longer eligible to use Tricare, though they may continue to seek care at an MTF when space is available. The same eligibility rules apply to survivors, who are primarily widows and widowers.

Section 723 would extend a current demonstration project by three years (through December 2005), increase the number of eligible sites, and allow new or extended enrollment in all sites. The demonstration allows up to 66,000 people to enroll in FEHB at up to 10 sites, though only about 2,000 people are currently enrolled. Because there would be more sites and increased familiarity with the program, CBO estimates that the program would eventually cover a total of about 13,000 people—10,000 in existing sites and 3,000 in new sites under H.R. 4205. Expanding coverage to new sites would cost $18 million over 2001 and 2002, and extending the demonstration project for one more year would cost an additional $63 million over the 2003–2005 period. The government's contribution toward FEHB premiums for beneficiaries under H.R. 4205 would be direct spending because the bill would add an entitlement benefit.

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING FROM HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 4205

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars—					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
DIRECT SPENDING						
Cost Increases in Medicare						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Estimated Budget Authority	195,113	211,518	217,077	234,887	250,997	274,149
Estimated Outlays	195,113	211,518	217,077	234,887	250,997	274,149
Proposed Changes:						
Medicare Subvention:						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	20	30	35	10	0
Estimated Outlays	0	20	30	35	10	0
FEHB Demonstration Project:						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	1	1	4	1	0
Estimated Outlays	0	1	1	4	1	0
Tricare Senior Supplement:						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	0	0	1	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	0	0	1	0	0
Subtotal-Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	21	31	40	11	0
Estimated Outlays	0	21	31	40	11	0

TABLE 5.—ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING FROM HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS IN H.R. 4205—Continued

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars—					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Spending Under H.R. 4205:						
Estimated Budget Authority	195,113	211,539	217,108	234,927	251,008	274,149
Estimated Outlays	195,113	211,539	217,108	234,927	251,008	274,149
Costs of Premium Payments Under FEHB						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Estimated Budget Authority	5,012	5,456	5,906	6,352	6,826	7,338
Estimated Outlays	5,012	5,456	5,906	6,352	6,826	7,338
Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	7	11	48	15	0
Estimated Outlays	0	7	11	48	15	0
Spending Under H.R. 4205:						
Estimated Budget Authority	5,012	5,463	5,917	6,400	6,841	7,338
Estimated Outlays	5,012	5,463	5,917	6,400	6,841	7,338
Total Changes in Direct Spending—Health Care Provisions						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	28	42	88	26	0
Estimated Outlays	0	28	42	88	26	0

In addition, extending the demonstration would tend to raise Medicare costs because better insurance coverage often leads to greater use of health care services. That increase would cost an estimated $7 million over the 2001–2005 period.

Tricare Senior Supplement. This program involves Tricare Standard and Extra in a demonstration project for retirees over age 64 and their dependents. The costs to DoD for those programs are treated as discretionary, but expanding them to cover beneficiaries of Medicare would raise direct spending by $1 million in 2003 (and by less than $500,000 in 2004). Other costs of Tricare Senior Supplement are discussed above with other spending subject to appropriation.

Retirement of Reserve Technicians. The reserves employ a number of civilian federal workers to perform administrative and maintenance tasks. These employees, known as military technicians, are usually required to be members of the reserve units for which they work. Under current law, employees who lose their membership in the reserves and were hired before February 10, 1996, have to retire as soon as they become eligible for an unreduced annuity under one of the civilian retirement programs. Section 518 of the bill would allow these employees to remain in their positions until they become eligible for an unreduced annuity or reach age 60, whichever is later. Technicians who have already been forced to retire and are under age 60 would be able to apply for reinstatement.

Based on information from DoD, CBO estimates that about 500 technicians would be affected by this provision. This includes 400 technicians who, under current law, would retire during the 2001–2005 period, and 100 technicians who have already retired but would be reinstated to their old positions. By allowing these technicians to delay their retirement, CBO estimates this bill would reduce spending on federal retirement benefits (function 600, income security) by $17 million over the 2001–2005 period. Since many technicians would be covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (function 550, health) after their retirement, this

provision would also reduce direct spending in that program by $3 million over the same period.

Retroactive Housing Allowances. Section 604 would authorize retroactive BAH payments to compensate members who received lower BAH during January and February of 2000 compared to the BAH rate they received prior to December 31, 1999. CBO estimates that these retroactive payments would cost $1 million in 2001.

Property Transactions. Title XXVIII contains a variety of provisions that would authorize DoD to convey or lease land to nonfederal entities. These transactions would affect both large and small properties, ranging from about 700 acres at Fort Pickett, Virginia to about two acres at Fort Dix, New Jersey.

Conveyances. Some property that would be conveyed under title XXVIII has been—or soon will be—declared excess by DoD and transferred to the General Services Administration (GSA) for disposal. In some instances, GSA is likely to give the property to state or local governments, and in those cases conveyances would not affect receipts. In other instances, such as the conveyances of about 5 acres containing an Army Reserve Center in Galesburg, Illinois and about 100 acres at Fort Polk, Louisiana, the property would likely be sold under current law. Based on information from DoD, forgone receipts from these conveyances would total less than $500,000.

CBO has not received any information from the Administration on other parcels specified in the bill, some of which are large and potentially worth $1 million or more. Because CBO has no basis for knowing whether these parcels have been or will be declared excess and sold under current law, CBO cannot estimate the extent of any forgone receipts.

Leases. Section 2851 would allow the Navy to receive in-kind consideration for the lease of property at Port Hueneme, California. Under current law, the Navy will receive cash for that lease. CBO estimates that this provision would lower receipts by less than $500,000 annually.

Other Provisions. The following provisions would have an insignificant budgetary impact:

Section 506 would allow retirees receiving Voluntary Separation Incentive (VSI) payments concurrently with retired or retainer pay to give up the VSI payment. Currently, retirement pay is reduced by the amount of VSI payments. The formula for the offset causes retirement pay to be reduced by future VSI payments. Terminating participation in the program would accelerate outlays for military retirement. Based on information from DOD, CBO expects few people would be affected by this provision.

Section 641 would increase reserve retirement pay by giving more credit toward annuities for time spent in training. While CBO estimates this provision would have a substantial effect when today's reservists reach 60 years of age and would begin to collect retirement benefits under this new rule, it would affect few people during the next 10 years.

Section 642 would increase participation in the Reserve Component Survivor Benefit Plan (RCSBP) by requiring certain reservists to obtain spousal consent to waive participation. Spousal consent is already required for reservists over 60 years of age. This provision

would make that requirement effective when the reservist is first notified that he or she has completed the years of service required for retirement eligibility. CBO estimates the provision would create a negligible increase in payments to annuitants.

Revenues

Section 651 would allow members of the uniformed services on active duty and members of the Ready Reserve in any pay status to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). Contributions would be capped at 5.0 percent of basic pay. In addition, servicemembers would be able to contribute income they receive in the form of special or incentive pay to the extent allowable under the Internal Revenue Code. This provision would become effective July 15, 2001, or earlier if certain legislative conditions are met. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the revenue loss caused by deferred income tax payments would total $10 million in 2001 and $1.1 billion over the 2001–2010 period.

Pay-as-you-go considerations

The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The net changes in direct spending that would result from H.R. 4205 are shown in Table 6. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the succeeding four years are counted.

TABLE 6.—ESTIMATED IMPACT OF H.R. 4205 ON DIRECT SPENDING AND RECEIPTS

	By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars—										
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Changes in outlays	0	27	39	83	21	−5	−4	−4	−3	−2	−1
Changes in receipts	0	−10	−61	−82	−105	−125	−135	−144	−153	−162	−171

Intergovernmental and private-sector impact

The bill contains both intergovernmental and private-sector mandates, including one preemption of state law. None of the mandates would impose significant costs; therefore, the thresholds established by UMRA ($55 million for intergovernmental mandates and $109 million for private sector mandates in 2000, adjusted annually for inflation) would not be exceeded.

The bill would give the Secretary of Defense the authority to require recipients of military equipment either to ensure that the equipment is demilitarized or to return the equipment to DoD for demilitarization. The Secretary of Defense could also repossess the equipment under some circumstances. In all of those cases, the requirements would be considered intergovernmental and private-sector mandates because, if the equipment is not returned to DoD for demilitarization, the recipient would have to bear the costs of demilitarizing the equipment. However, this provision would be rarely used because, in most cases, DoD demilitarizes equipment prior to transferring ownership. Consequently, the costs of this mandate would be minimal.

The bill would extend and expand a demonstration project that involves intergovernmental and private sector mandates. Specifically, it would require insurers, under certain circumstances, to issue medigap policies to Medicare enrollees who choose to drop coverage from DoD's Federal Employees Health Benefits demonstration program. The bill would also prohibit insurers from discriminating in the pricing of such policies based on an individual's health status or use of care, or from using coverage exclusions for preexisting conditions as long as any lapse in coverage was no more than 63 days. Those requirements would be intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA. However, because only a small number of people could be affected by these provisions, the direct costs of the mandates would be small.

In addition, the bill contains a mandate affecting only state governments. It would give legal effect to military testamentary instruments regardless of the provisions of state law. (A testamentary instrument is a document intended to take effect after the death of the person who executes it.) This provision would preempt state laws governing the execution of such documents; however, it would impose no costs on those governments.

The bill also would convey lands to state and local entities, provide support for cooperative efforts between the Civil Air Patrol and state and local governments, and authorize funding for assistance to local school districts and agencies.

Estimate Prepared By.—Federal Costs: Military Construction and Other Defense—Kent Christensen, Military and Civilian Personnel—Dawn Regan, Civilian Retirement—Eric Rollins, Food Stamps—Valerie Baxter, Stockpile Sales and Atomic Energy Defense Activities—Raymond Hall, Military Retirement—Sarah Jennings, Health Programs—Sam Papenfuss, Medicare Subvention—Tom Bradley, Multiyear Procurement—Jo Ann Vines, Maritime Administration—Deborah Reis. Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Leo Lex. Impact on the Private Sector: William Thomas.

Estimate Approved By: Robert A. Sunshine, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the estimates as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

With respect to clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee has not received a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight pertaining to the subject matter of H.R. 4205.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

RECORD VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 4205. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 4205 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 56–1, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 5 **Date: 5/10/00**

Armed Forces Staff College Name Change **Offered by: Mr. Skelton**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky			
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh				Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough				Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons				Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **42 Aye** **12 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 31 **Date: 5/10/00**

Repeal of Limitation on Retirement or Dismantlement of Strategic Systems **Offered by: Mr. Allen**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky		X	
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie			
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler		X		Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough		X		Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono		X		Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood		X					

Roll Call Vote Total **17 Aye** **40 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 15 **Date: 5/10/00**

Gun Purchase Preferences **Offered by: Mr. Hostettler**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich		X	
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mr. Scarborough	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson		X	
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **39 Aye** **20 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 1 **Date: 5/10/00**

Service of Female Members on Submarines **Offered by: Mr. Bartlett**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz			
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent				Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen			
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Rodriguez			
Mr. Scarborough	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill		X	
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson		X	
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson		X	
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall		X					
Mr. Sherwood	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **31 Aye 21 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 22 **Date: 5/10/00**

Abortion in Overseas Facilities **Offered by: Ms. Sanchez**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich		X		Mr. Ortiz			
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent				Mr. Reyes			
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen			
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Smith			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez			
Mr. Scarborough				Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons		X		Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood		X					

Roll Call Vote Total **20 Aye 31 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 34 **Date: 5/10/00**

National Guard Assistance for Certain Youth Organizations **Offered by: Mr. Abercrombie**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky			
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy			
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez			
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough				Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons				Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood		X					

Roll Call Vote Total **29 Aye** **23 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 4 **Date: 5/10/00**

Funds for Abortion in Cases of Rape or Incest **Offered by: Mr. Abercrombie**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich		X		Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman		X		Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon				Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Allen			
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Smith			
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough		X		Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones		X		Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley		X		Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X			Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts		X					
Mr. Hayes		X					
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood		X					

Roll Call Vote Total **26 Aye** **29 Nay** **Present**

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
106TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Final Passage of H.R. 4205 **Date: 5/10/00**

Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich	X			Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Chambliss	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Scarborough	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Jones	X			Ms. Tauscher	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Ryun	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Riley	X			Mr. Hill	X		
Mr. Gibbons	X	X		Mr. Thompson	X		
Ms. Bono	X			Mr. Larson	X		
Mr. Pitts	X						
Mr. Hayes	X						
Mr. Kuykendall	X						
Mr. Sherwood							

Roll Call Vote Total **56 Aye** **1 Nay** **Present**

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

* * * * * * *

SEC. 116. BUNKER DEFEAT MUNITION ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Army, in acquiring munitions under the bunker defeat munition weapons acquisition program—

(1) may acquire only those munitions that are designated as "type classified, limited procurement for contingency operations"; and

(2) may not acquire more than [6,000] *8,500* such munitions.

* * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle B—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 816. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON PURCHASE OF FIRE, SECURITY, POLICE, PUBLIC WORKS, AND UTILITY SERVICES FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) DURATION OF PROJECT.—The authority to purchase or receive services under the demonstration project shall expire on September 30, [2000] *2002*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XIII—MATTERS RELATING TO ALLIES AND OTHER NATIONS

Subtitle A—Matters Relating to NATO

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 1306. GEORGE C. MARSHALL EUROPEAN CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES.

[(a) USE OF CONTRIBUTIONS.—Funds received by the United States Government from the Federal Republic of Germany as its fair share of the costs of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies shall be credited to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies. Funds so credited shall be merged with the appropriations to which credited and shall be available for the Center for the same purposes and the same period as the appropriations with which merged.

[(b) WAIVER OF CHARGES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the costs of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies for military officers and civilian officials of cooperation partner states of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council or the Partnership for Peace if the Secretary determines that attendance by such personnel without reimbursement is in the national security interest of the United States.]

* * * * * * *

ARMAMENT RETOOLING AND MANUFACTURING SUPPORT ACT OF 1992

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle H—Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative

* * * * * * *

SEC. 193. ARMAMENT RETOOLING AND MANUFACTURING SUPPORT INITIATIVE.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR INITIATIVE.—During fiscal years 1993 through [2001] *2002*, the Secretary of the Army may carry out a program

to be known as the "Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative" (hereinafter in this subtitle referred to as the "ARMS Initiative").

* * * * * * *

(d) INCLUSION OF MANUFACTURING ARSENALS.—For purposes of this Act, a manufacturing arsenal of the Department of the Army shall be treated as a Government-owned, contractor-operated manufacturing facility of the Department of the Army.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 194. FACILITIES CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of each Government-owned, contractor-operated ammunition manufacturing facility of the Department of the Army that is made available for the ARMS Initiative, the Secretary of the Army may, by contract, authorize the facility contractor—

[(1) to use the facility for one or more years consistent with the purposes of the ARMS Initiative; and]

(1) to use the facility for any period of time that the Secretary determines is appropriate for the accomplishment of, and consistent with, the needs of the Department of the Army and the purposes of the ARMS Initiative; and

(2) to enter into multiyear subcontracts for the commercial use of the facility consistent with such purposes.

* * * * * * *

(c) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT NON-MONETARY CONSIDERATION FOR USE OF FACILITIES.—The Secretary may accept non-monetary consideration in lieu of rental payments for use of a facility under a contract entered into under this section.

TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—General Military Law

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL MILITARY POWERS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 2—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

* * * * * * *

§ 117. Readiness reporting system: establishment; reporting to congressional committees

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) CAPABILITIES.—The readiness reporting system shall measure such factors relating to readiness as the Secretary prescribes, ex-

cept that the system shall include the capability to do each of the following:

(1) Measure, on a monthly basis, the capability of units (both as elements of their respective armed force and as elements of joint forces) to conduct their assigned wartime missions.

* * * * * * *

(7) Measure, on a quarterly basis, the extent to which units of the armed forces remove serviceable parts, supplies, or equipment from one vehicle, vessel, or aircraft in order to render a different vehicle, vessel, or aircraft operational.

* * * * * * *

(e) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—*(1)* The Secretary shall each month submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report in writing containing the results of the most recent joint readiness review or monthly review conducted under subsection (d), including the current information derived from the readiness reporting system. ❚Each such report❚

(2) The monthly report submitted under paragraph (1) that covers the first quarter of the then current fiscal year shall also include a description of the funding proposed in the President's budget for the next fiscal year, and for the subsequent fiscal years covered by the most recent future-years defense program submitted under section 221 of this title, to address each deficiency in readiness identified during the joint readiness review conducted for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

(3) Each report under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form and may, as the Secretary determines necessary, also be submitted in classified form.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 4—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Sec.
131. Office of the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

144. Director of Mission-Essential Software Management.

* * * * * * *

§ 144. Director of Mission-Essential Software Management

(a) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall designate within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics a Director of Mission-Essential Software Management.

(b) The Director of Mission-Essential Software Management shall provide effective oversight of, and shall seek to improve mechanisms for, the management, development, and maintenance of mission-essential software for major defense acquisition programs described in subsection (c).

(c) For purposes of this section, mission-essential software for major defense acquisition programs is software—

(1) that is an integral part of software-intensive major defense acquisition programs; and

(2) that is physically part of, dedicated to, or essential to the mission performance of a weapons system.

(d) The Director of Mission-Essential Software Management shall be responsible for—

(1) reviewing the policies and practices of the military departments and Defense Agencies for developing software described in subsection (c);

(2) reviewing planning and progress in the management of such software; and

(3) recommending goals and plans to improve management with respect to such software.

* * * * * * *

§ 223. Ballistic missile defense programs: program elements

(a) PROGRAM ELEMENTS SPECIFIED.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31), the amount requested for activities of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization shall be set forth in accordance with the following program elements:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(13) Airborne Laser program.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 7—BOARDS, COUNCILS, AND COMMITTEES

* * * * * * *

Sec.
171. Armed Forces Policy Council.

* * * * * * *

184. Regional Centers for Security Studies.

* * * * * * *

§ 184. Regional Centers for Security Studies

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may operate in the Department of Defense regional centers for security studies, each of which is established for a specified geographic region of the world. Any such regional center shall serve as a forum for bilateral and multilateral communication and military and civilian exchanges with nations in the region for which the center is established. A regional center may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, use professional military education, civilian defense education, and related academic and other activities to pursue such communication and exchanges.

(2) After the date of the enactment of this section, a regional center for security studies as described in paragraph (1) may not be established in the Department of Defense until at least 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a notification of the intent of the Secretary to establish the center. The

notification shall contain a description of the mission and functions of the proposed center and a justification for the proposed center.

(b) EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION OF FACULTY.—Section 1595 of this title provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to employ certain civilian personnel at certain Department of Defense regional center for security studies without regard to certain provisions of title 5.

(c) ACCEPTANCE OF FOREIGN GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—Section 2611 of this title provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to accept foreign gifts and donations in order to defray the costs of, or enhance the operations of, certain Department of Defense regional centers for security studies.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives an annual report on the status, objectives, and operations of the Department of Defense regional centers for security studies. Each such report shall include information on international participation in the programs of the centers and on foreign gifts and donations accepted under section 2611 of this title.

(e) PROVISIONS RELATING SPECIFICALLY TO MARSHALL CENTER.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the costs of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies for military officers and civilian officials of cooperation partner states of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council or the Partnership for Peace if the Secretary determines that attendance by such personnel without reimbursement is in the national security interest of the United States. Costs for which reimbursement is waived pursuant to this paragraph shall be paid from appropriations available for the Center.

(2)(A) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may authorize participation by a European or Eurasian nation in Marshall Center programs if the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of State, that such participation is in the national interest of the United States.

(B) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the names of the foreign nations permitted to participate in programs of the Marshall Center during the preceding year under paragraph (1). Each such report shall be prepared by the Secretary with the assistance of the Director of the Marshall Center.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 9—DEFENSE BUDGET MATTERS

* * * * * * *

§ 230. Amounts for declassification of records

The Secretary of Defense shall include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31) specific identification**[**, as a budgetary line item**]**, of the amounts required

to carry out programmed activities during that fiscal year to declassify records pursuant to Executive Order No. 12958 (50 U.S.C. 435 note) or any successor Executive order or to comply with any statutory requirement, or any request, to declassify Government records. *Identification of such amounts in such budget justification materials shall be in a single display that shows the total amount for the Department of Defense and the amount for each military department and Defense Agency.*

* * * * * * *

PART II—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL MILITARY POWERS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 23—MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES AND REPORTS

* * * * * * *

§ 483. Reports on transfers from high-priority readiness appropriations

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—In each report under subsection (a) or (b), the Secretary of Defense shall include for each covered budget activity the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) A detailed explanation of the transfers into, and out of, funds available for that activity during the period covered by the report, *including identification of the sources from which funds were transferred into that activity and identification of the recipients of the funds transferred out of that activity*.

(d) COVERED BUDGET ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term "covered budget activity" means each of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) The Air Operations and Combat Related Operations budget activity groups (known as "subactivities") within the Operating Forces budget activity of the annual Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, appropriation that are designated as follows:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(G) Combat Enforcement Forces.

(H) Combat Communications.

* * * * * * *

[(e) TERMINATION.—The requirements specified in subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate upon the submission of the annual report under subsection (a) covering fiscal year 2000.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 31—ENLISTMENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 517. Authorized daily average: members in pay grades E–8 and E–9

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Whenever under section 527 of this title the President may suspend the operation of any provision of section 523, 525, or 526 of this title, the Secretary of Defense may suspend the operation of any provision of this section. Any such suspension shall, if not sooner ended, end in the manner specified in section 527 for a suspension under that section.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 36—PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE-DUTY LIST

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—SELECTION BOARDS

* * * * * * *

§ 612. Composition of selection boards

(a)(1) Members of selection boards shall be appointed by the Secretary of the military department concerned in accordance with this section. A selection board shall consist of five or more officers [who are on the active-duty list] of the same armed force as the officers under consideration by the board. *Each member of a selection board (except as provided in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)) shall be an officer on the active-duty list.* Each member of a selection board must be serving in a grade higher than the grade of the officers under consideration by the board, except that no member of a board may be serving in a grade below major or lieutenant commander.

* * * * * * *

(3) When reserve officers of an armed force are to be considered by a selection board, the membership of the board shall include at least one reserve officer [of that armed force, with the exact number of reserve officers to be] *of that armed force on active duty (whether or not on the active-duty list). The actual number of reserve officers shall be* determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned, in [his discretion, except that] *the Secretary's discretion. Notwithstanding the first sentence of this paragraph,* in the case of a board which is considering officers in the grade of colonel or brigadier general or, in the case of officers of the Navy, captain or rear admiral (lower half), no reserve officer need be included if there are no reserve officers of that armed force on active duty in the next higher grade who are eligible to serve on the board.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER III—FAILURE OF SELECTION FOR PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT FOR YEARS OF SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 628. Special selection boards

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) REPORTS OF BOARDS.—(1) * * *

(2) The provisions of sections 617(b) and 618 of this title apply to the report and proceedings of a special selection board convened under this section in the same manner as they apply to the report and proceedings of a selection board convened under section 611(a) of this title. However, in the case of a board convened under this section to consider a warrant officer or former warrant officer, the provisions of sections 576(d) and 576(f) of this title (rather than the provisions of [section] *sections* 617(b) and 618 of this title) apply to the report and proceedings of the board in the same manner as they apply to the report and proceedings of a selection board convened under section 573 of this title.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—CONTINUATION ON ACTIVE DUTY AND SELECTIVE EARLY RETIREMENT

* * * * * * *

§ 638a. Modification to rules for continuation on active duty; enhanced authority for selective early retirement and early discharges

(a) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department, during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to take any of the actions set forth in subsection (b) with respect to officers of an armed force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER V—ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND RETIREMENT

* * * * * * *

§ 641. Applicability of chapter

Officers in the following categories are not subject to this chapter (other than section 640 and, in the case of warrant officers, section 628):

(1) Reserve officers—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(D) on the reserve active-status list who are on active duty under section 12301(d) of this title, other than as provided in subparagraph (C), under a call or order to active duty specifying a period of three years or less;

[(D)] *(E)* on active duty to pursue special work;

[(E)] *(F)* ordered to active duty under section 12304 of this title;

[(F)] *(G)* on active duty under section 10(b)(2) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 460(b)(2)) for the administration of the Selective Service System; or

[(G)] *(H)* on full-time National Guard duty.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 39—ACTIVE DUTY

* * * * * * *

§ 691. Permanent end strength levels to support two major regional contingencies

(a) * * *

(b) Unless otherwise provided by law, the number of members of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) on active duty at the end of any fiscal year shall be not less than the following:

(1) For the Army, 480,000.

(2) For the Navy, [371,781] *372,000*.

(3) For the Marine Corps, [172,148] *172,600*.

(4) For the Air Force, [360,877] *357,000*.

* * * * * * *

(e) For a fiscal year for which the active duty end strength authorized by law pursuant to section 115(a)(1)(A) of this title for any of the armed forces is identical to *or greater than* the number applicable to that armed force under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may reduce that number by not more than 0.5 percent.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 40—LEAVE

* * * * * * *

§ 702. Cadets and midshipmen

(a) * * *

(b) INVOLUNTARY LEAVE WITHOUT PAY FOR SUSPENDED ACADEMY CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) A cadet or midshipman placed on involuntary leave under paragraph (1) is not entitled to any pay under [section 230(c)] *section 203(c)* of title 37 for the period of the leave.

* * * * * * *

§ 706. Administration of leave required to be taken pending review of certain court-martial convictions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)[(1)] A member required to take leave under section 876a of this title is not entitled to any right or benefit under chapter 43 of title 38 solely because of employment during the period of such leave.

[(2) Section 974 of this title does not apply to a member required to take leave under section 876a of this title during the period of such leave.]

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 47—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IX—POST-TRIAL PROCEDURE AND REVIEW OF COURTS-MARTIAL

* * * * * * *

§ 874. Art. 74. Remission and suspension

(a) The Secretary concerned and, when designated by him, any Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, Judge Advocate General, or commanding officer may remit or suspend any part or amount of the unexecuted part of any sentence, including all uncollected forfeitures other than a sentence approved by the President. *However, in the case of a sentence of confinement for life without eligibility for parole, after the sentence is ordered executed, the authority of the Secretary concerned under the preceding sentence (1) may not be delegated, and (2) may be exercised only after the service of a period of confinement of not less than 20 years.*

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 53—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

Sec.
1031. Administration of oath.

* * * * * * *

1044d. Military testamentary instruments: requirement for recognition by States.

* * * * * * *

§ 1034. Protected communications; prohibition of retaliatory personnel actions

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) INSPECTOR GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF ALLEGATIONS OF PROHIBITED PERSONNEL ACTIONS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3)(A) An Inspector General receiving an allegation as described in paragraph (1) shall expeditiously determine*, in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (h),* whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an investigation of the allegation.

* * * * * * *

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "Member of Congress" includes any Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress.

(2) The term "Inspector General" means *any of* the following:

(A) The Inspector General of the Department of Defense.

* * * * * * *

[(C) The Inspector General of the Army, in the case of a member of the Army.

[(D) The Naval Inspector General, in the case of a member of the Navy.

[(E) The Inspector General of the Air Force, in the case of a member of the Air Force.

[(F) The Deputy Naval Inspector General for Marine Corps Matters, in the case of a member of the Marine Corps.

[(G) An officer of the armed forces assigned or detailed under regulations of the Secretary concerned to serve as an Inspector General at any command level in one of the armed forces.]

(C) Any officer of the armed forces or employee of the Department of Defense who is assigned or detailed to serve as an Inspector General at any level in the Department of Defense.

* * * * * * *

§ 1044. Legal assistance

(a) Subject to the availability of legal staff resources, the Secretary concerned may provide legal assistance in connection with their personal civil legal affairs to the following persons:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) Members of a reserve component not covered by paragraph (1) or (2), but only during a period, following a release from active duty under a call or order to active duty for more than 29 days under a mobilization authority (as determined by the Secretary of Defense), that is not in excess of twice the length of time served on active duty.

[(4)] *(5)* Dependents of members and former members described in paragraphs (1), (2), [and (3)] *(3), and (4).*

* * * * * * *

§ 1044d. Military testamentary instruments: requirement for recognition by States

(a) TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENTS TO BE GIVEN LEGAL EFFECT.—A military testamentary instrument—

(1) is exempt from any requirement of form, formality, or recording before probate that is provided for testamentary instruments under the laws of a State; and

(2) has the same legal effect as a testamentary instrument prepared and executed in accordance with the laws of the State in which it is presented for probate.

(b) MILITARY TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENTS.—For purposes of this section, a military testamentary instrument is an instrument that is prepared with testamentary intent in accordance with regulations prescribed under this section and that—

(1) is executed in accordance with subsection (c) by (or on behalf of) a person, as a testator, who is eligible for military legal assistance;

(2) makes a disposition of property of the testator; and

(3) takes effect upon the death of the testator.

(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXECUTION OF MILITARY TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENTS.—An instrument is valid as a military testamentary instrument only if—

(1) the instrument is executed by the testator (or, if the testator is unable to execute the instrument personally, the instrument is executed in the presence of, by the direction of, and on behalf of the testator);

(2) the instrument is executed in the presence of a military legal assistance counsel acting as presiding attorney;

(3) the instrument is executed in the presence of at least two disinterested witnesses (in addition to the presiding attorney), each of whom attests to witnessing the testator's execution of the instrument by signing it; and

(4) the instrument is executed in accordance with such additional requirements as may be provided in regulations prescribed under this section.

(d) SELF-PROVING MILITARY TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENTS.—(1) If the document setting forth a military testamentary instrument meets the requirements of paragraph (2), then the signature of a person on the document as the testator, an attesting witness, a notary, or the presiding attorney, together with a written representation of the person's status as such and the person's military grade (if any) or other title, is prima facie evidence of the following:

(A) That the signature is genuine.

(B) That the signatory had the represented status and title at the time of the execution of the will.

(C) That the signature was executed in compliance with the procedures required under the regulations prescribed under subsection (f).

(2) A document setting forth a military testamentary instrument meets the requirements of this paragraph if it includes (or has attached to it), in a form and content required under the regulations prescribed under subsection (f), each of the following:

(A) A certificate, executed by the testator, that includes the testator's acknowledgment of the testamentary instrument.

(B) An affidavit, executed by each witness signing the testamentary instrument, that attests to the circumstances under which the testamentary instrument was executed.

(C) A notarization, including a certificate of any administration of an oath required under the regulations, that is signed by the notary or other official administering the oath.

(e) STATEMENT TO BE INCLUDED.—(1) Under regulations prescribed under this section, each military testamentary instrument shall contain a statement that sets forth the provisions of subsection (a).

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to make inapplicable the provisions of subsection (a) to a testamentary instrument that does not include a statement described in that paragraph.

(f) REGULATIONS.—Regulations for the purposes of this section shall be prescribed jointly by the Secretary of Defense and by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Department of the Navy.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "person eligible for military legal assistance" means a person who is eligible for legal assistance under section 1044 of this title.

(2) The term "military legal assistance counsel" means—

(A) a judge advocate (as defined in section 801(13) of this title); or

(B) a civilian attorney serving as a legal assistance officer under the provisions of section 1044 of this title.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and each possession of the United States.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 55—MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

Sec.
1071. Purpose of this chapter.

* * * * * * *

1074h. Medical and dental care: medal of honor recipients; dependents.
1074i. Reimbursement for certain travel expenses.

* * * * * * *

[1095d. TRICARE program: waiver of certain deductibles.]
1095d. TRICARE program: waiver of certain deductibles; reduction of catastrophic cap.

* * * * * * *

1095f. TRICARE program: referrals for specialty health care.

* * * * * * *

1110. Policies and procedures for immunization program.

* * * * * * *

§ 1074. Medical and dental care for members and certain former members

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) Funds appropriated to a military department*, the Department of Transportation (with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy), or the Department of Health and Human Services (with respect to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Public Health Service)* may be used to provide medical and dental care to persons entitled to such care by law or regulations, including the provision of such care (other than elective private treatment) in private facilities for members of the [armed forces] *uniformed services*. If a private facility or health care provider providing care under this subsection is a health care provider under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services, the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the other administering Secretaries, may by regulation require the private facility or health care provider to provide such care in accordance with the same payment rules (subject to any modifications considered appropriate by the Secretary) as apply under that program.

(2)(A) Subject to such exceptions as the Secretary of Defense considers necessary, coverage for medical care for members of the [armed forces] *uniformed services* under this subsection, and standards with respect to timely access to such care, shall be comparable to coverage for medical care and standards for timely access to such care under the managed care option of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Prime.

* * * * * * *

(C) The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the other administering Secretaries in the administration of this paragraph.

(3)(A) [The Secretary of Defense may not require a member of the armed forces described in subparagraph (B)] *A member of the uniformed services described in subparagraph (B) may not be required* to receive routine primary medical care at a military medical treatment facility.

(B) A member referred to in subparagraph (A) is a member of the [armed forces] *uniformed services* on active duty who is entitled to medical care under this subsection and who—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 1074g. Pharmacy benefits program

(a) PHARMACY BENEFITS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) The Secretary, [as part of the regulations established] *in the regulations prescribed* under subsection (g), may establish cost sharing requirements (which may be established as a percentage or fixed dollar amount) under the pharmacy benefits program for generic, formulary, and nonformulary agents. For nonformulary agents, cost sharing shall be consistent with common industry practice and not in excess of amounts generally comparable to 20 percent for beneficiaries covered by section 1079 of this title or 25 percent for beneficiaries covered by section 1086 of this title.

(7) The Secretary shall establish procedures for eligible covered beneficiaries to receive pharmaceutical agents [not included on the uniform formulary, but,] *that are not included on the uniform formulary but that are* considered to be clinically necessary. Such procedures shall include peer review procedures under which the Secretary may determine that there is a clinical justification for the use of a pharmaceutical agent that is not on the uniform formulary, in which case the pharmaceutical agent shall be provided under the same terms and conditions as an agent on the uniform formulary. Such procedures shall also include an expeditious appeals process for an eligible covered beneficiary, or a network or uniformed provider on behalf of the beneficiary, to establish clinical justification for the use of a pharmaceutical agent that is not on the uniform formulary.

* * * * * * *

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, establish a Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee for the purpose of developing the uniform formulary of pharmaceutical

agents required by subsection (a), reviewing such formulary on a periodic basis, and making additional recommendations regarding the formulary as the committee determines necessary and appropriate. The committee shall include representatives of pharmacies of the uniformed services facilities, contractors responsible for the TRICARE retail pharmacy program, contractors responsible for the national mail-order pharmacy program, providers in facilities of the uniformed services, and TRICARE network providers. Committee members shall have expertise in treating the medical needs of the populations served through such entities and in the range of pharmaceutical and biological medicines available for treating such populations. The committee shall function under procedures established by the Secretary under the regulations required by subsection (g).

* * * * * * *

(d) PROCEDURES.—(1) * * *

(2) [Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall utilize] *Effective not later than April 5, 2000, the Secretary shall use* a modification to the bid price adjustment methodology in the current managed care support contracts to ensure equitable and timely reimbursement to the TRICARE managed care support contractors for pharmaceutical products delivered in the nonmilitary environments. The methodology shall take into account the "at-risk" nature of the contracts as well as managed care support contractor pharmacy costs attributable to changes to pharmacy service or formulary management at military medical treatment facilities, and other military activities and policies that affect costs of pharmacy benefits provided through the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services. The methodology shall also account for military treatment facility costs attributable to the delivery of pharmaceutical products in the military facility environment which were prescribed by a network provider.

* * * * * * *

(e) PHARMACY DATA TRANSACTION SERVICE.—[Not later than April 1, 2000, the] *The* Secretary of Defense shall implement the use of the Pharmacy Data Transaction Service in all fixed facilities of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, *in* the TRICARE retail pharmacy program, and *in* the national mail-order pharmacy program.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—[As used in this section—] *In this section:*

(1) [the] *The* term "eligible covered beneficiary" means a covered beneficiary for whom eligibility to receive pharmacy benefits through the means described in subsection (a)(2)(E) is established under this chapter or another provision of law[; and].

(2) [the] *The* term "pharmaceutical agent" means drugs, biological products, and medical devices under the regulatory authority of the Food and Drug Administration.

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, after consultation with the other administering Secretaries, [promulgate] *prescribe* regulations to carry out this section.

* * * * * * *

§ 1074h. Medical and dental care: medal of honor recipients; dependents

(a) MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS.—A former member of the armed forces who is a Medal of Honor recipient and who is not otherwise entitled to medical and dental benefits under this chapter may, upon request, be given medical and dental care provided by the administering Secretaries in the same manner as if entitled to retired pay.

(b) DEPENDENTS.—A person who is a dependent of a Medal of Honor recipient and who is not otherwise entitled to medical and dental benefits under this chapter may, upon request, be given medical and dental care provided by the administering Secretaries in the same manner as if the Medal of Honor recipient were, or (if deceased) was at the time of death, entitled to retired pay.

(c) DEFINITIONS—In this section:

(1) The term "Medal of Honor recipient" means a member or former member of the armed forces who has been awarded a medal of honor under section 3741, 6241, or 8741 of this title or section 491 of title 14.

(2) The term "dependent" has the meaning given that term in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) of section 1072(2) of this title.

§ 1074i. Reimbursement for certain travel expenses

In any case in which a covered beneficiary is referred by a primary care physician to a specialty care provider who provides services more than 100 miles from the location in which the primary care provider provides services to the covered beneficiary, the Secretary shall provide reimbursement for reasonable travel expenses for the covered beneficiary.

* * * * * * *

§ 1076c. Dental insurance plan: certain retirees and their surviving spouses and other dependents

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) DISENROLLMENT PROCESS FOR TRICARE RETIREE DENTAL PROGRAM.—With respect to the provision of dental care to a retired member of the uniformed services or the dependent of such a member under the TRICARE program, the Secretary of Defense—

(A) shall require that any TRICARE dental insurance contract allow for a period of up to 30 days, beginning on the date of the submission of an application for enrollment by the member or dependent, during which the member or dependent may disenroll;

(B) shall provide for limited circumstances under which disenrollment shall be permitted during the 24-month initial

enrollment period, without jeopardizing the fiscal integrity of the dental program.

(2) The circumstances described in paragraph (1)(B) shall include—

(A) a case in which a retired member or dependent who is also a Federal employee is assigned to a location overseas which prevents utilization of dental benefits in the United States;

(B) a case in which such a member or dependent provides medical documentation with regard to a diagnosis of a serious or terminal illness which precludes the member or dependent from obtaining dental care;

(C) a case in which severe financial hardship would result; and

(D) any other instances which the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) A retired member or dependent described in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall make any initial requests for disenrollment under this subsection to the TRICARE dental insurance contractor; and

(B) may appeal a decision by the contractor, or policies with respect to the provision of dental care to retirees and their dependents under the TRICARE program, to the TRICARE Management Activity.

(4) In a case of an appeal described in paragraph (3)(B) the contractor shall refer all relevant information collected by the contractor to the TRICARE Management Activity.

[(i)**]** *(j)* DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "eligible dependent" means a dependent described in subparagraph (A), (D), or (I) of section 1072(2) of this title.

(2) The term "eligible child dependent" means a dependent described in subparagraph (D) or (I) of section 1072(2) of this title.

(3) The term "retired pay" includes retainer pay.

* * * * * * *

§ 1079. Contracts for medical care for spouses and children: plans

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(17)*(A)* The Secretary of Defense may establish a program for the individual case management of a person covered by this section or section 1086 of this title who has extraordinary medical or psychological disorders and, under such a program, may waive benefit limitations contained in paragraphs (5) and (13) of this subsection or section 1077(b)(1) of this title and authorize the payment for comprehensive home health care services, supplies, and equipment if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is cost-effective and appropriate.

(B) The total amount expended under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year may not exceed $100,000,000.

* * * * * * *

(h)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) To assure access to care for all covered beneficiaries, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the other administering Secretaries, shall designate specific rates for reimbursement for services in certain localities if the Secretary determines that without payment of such rates access to health care services would be severely impaired. Such a determination shall be based on consideration of the number of providers in a locality who provide the services, the number of such providers who are CHAMPUS participating providers, the number of covered beneficiaries under CHAMPUS in the locality, the availability of military providers in the location or a nearby location, and any other factors determined to be relevant by the Secretary.

* * * * * * *

(p)(1) Subject to such exceptions as the Secretary of Defense considers necessary, coverage for medical care under this section for the dependents referred to in subsection (a) of a member of the uniformed services referred to in section 1074(c)(3) of this title who are residing with the member, and standards with respect to timely access to such care, shall be comparable to coverage for medical care and standards for timely access to such care under the managed care option of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Prime.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall enter into arrangements with contractors under the TRICARE program or with other appropriate contractors for the timely and efficient processing of claims under this subsection.

(3) The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the other administering Secretaries in the administration of this subsection.

* * * * * * *

§ 1091. Personal services contracts

(a) AUTHORITY.—(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may also enter into personal services contracts to carry out other health care responsibilities of the Secretary (such as the provision of medical screening examinations at Military Entrance Processing Stations) at locations outside medical treatment facilities, as determined necessary pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may not enter into a contract under this paragraph after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2002*.

* * * * * * *

[§ 1095d. TRICARE program: waiver of certain deductibles]

§ 1095d. TRICARE program: waiver of certain deductibles; reduction of catastrophic cap

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) REDUCTION OF CATASTROPHIC CAP.—The Secretary shall reduce the catastrophic cap for covered beneficiaries under TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra to $3,000.

* * * * * * *

§ 1095f. TRICARE program: referrals for specialty health care

The Secretary of Defense shall provide that no contract for managed care support under the TRICARE program shall require a managed care support contractor to require a primary care provider or specialty care provider to obtain prior authorization before referring a patient to a specialty care provider that is part of the network of health care providers or institutions of the contractor.

* * * * * * *

§ 1097a. TRICARE Prime: automatic enrollments; payment options

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) NO COPAYMENT FOR IMMEDIATE FAMILY.—No copayment shall be charged a member for care provided under TRICARE Prime to a dependent of a member of the uniformed services described in subparagraph (A), (D), or (I) of section 1072(2) of this title.

[(e)] *(f)* DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "TRICARE Prime" means the managed care option of the TRICARE program.

(2) The term "catchment area", with respect to a facility of a uniformed service, means the service area of the facility, as designated under regulations prescribed by the administering Secretaries.

* * * * * * *

§ 1108. Health care coverage through Federal Employees Health Benefits program: demonstration project

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) AREA OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall jointly identify and select the geographic areas in which the demonstration project will be conducted. The Secretary and the Director shall establish at least six, [but not more than ten,] such demonstration areas. [In establishing the areas, the Secretary and Director shall include—

[(1) an area that includes the catchment area of one or more military medical treatment facilities;

[(2) an area that is not located in the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility;

[(3) an area in which there is a Medicare Subvention Demonstration project area under section 1896 of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ggg); and

[(4) not more than one area for each TRICARE region.]

In establishing the areas, the Secretary and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall include an area that includes the catchment area of one or more military medical treatment facilities, an area that is not located in the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility, an area in which there is a Medicare Subvention Demonstration project area under section 1896 of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ggg), and one area for each TRICARE region.

(d) DURATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct the demonstration project during [three] *four* contract years under the Federal Employees Health Benefits program.

(2) Eligible beneficiaries shall, as provided under the agreement pursuant to subsection (a), be permitted to enroll in the demonstration project during an open enrollment period for the year 2000 (conducted in the fall of 1999). The demonstration project shall terminate on [December 31, 2002] *December 31, 2003*.

* * * * * * *

(f) TERM OF ENROLLMENT IN PROJECT.—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the period of enrollment of an eligible beneficiary who enrolls in the demonstration project during the open enrollment period for the year 2000 shall be [three] *four* years unless the beneficiary disenrolls before the termination of the project.

* * * * * * *

(k) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than [December 31, 2002] *December 31, 2003*, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report addressing the same matters required to be addressed under subsection (j)(2). The report shall describe any limitations with respect to the data contained in the report as a result of the size and design of the demonstration project.

(l) APPLICATION OF MEDIGAP PROTECTIONS TO DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ENROLLEES.—(1) * * *

(2) In applying paragraph (1)—

(A) any reference in clause (v) or (vi) of section 1882(s)(3)(B) of such Act to 12 months is deemed a reference to [36] *48* months; and

(B) the notification required under section 1882(s)(3)(D) of such Act shall be provided in a manner specified by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

* * * * * * *

(m) EXPANSION OF COVERAGE FOR RETIREES OVER AGE 65.—(1) Eligible beneficiaries referred to in subsection (b)(1) shall be permitted to enroll, or to extend a previous enrollment entered into under subsection (d)(2), during a period of open enrollment for the year 2003 (conducted in the fall of 2002).

(2) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (f), the period of enrollment, or extension of enrollment, of an eligible beneficiary under paragraph (1) shall be one year unless the beneficiary disenrolls before the termination of the demonstration project.

§ 1109. Organ and tissue donor program

(a) * * *

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—**[**(1)**]** The Secretaries of the military departments shall ensure that—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 1110. Policies and procedures for immunization program

(a) SYSTEM AND PROCEDURES FOR TRACKING SEPARATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of each military department shall establish a system for tracking, recording, and reporting separations of members of the armed forces that result from procedures initiated as a result of a refusal to participate in the anthrax vaccine immunization program.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall consolidate the information recorded under the system described in paragraph (1) and shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate on an annual basis a report on such information. Such reports shall include a description of—

(A) the number of personnel separated, categorized by military department, rank, and active-duty or reserve status; and

(B) any other information determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) EMERGENCY ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) prescribe regulations for the purpose of ensuring that any civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is determined to be an emergency essential employee and who is required to participate in the anthrax vaccination program is notified of the requirement to participate in the program and the consequences of a decision not to participate; and

(2) ensure that any individual who is being considered for a position as such an employee is notified of the obligation to participate in the program before being offered employment in such position.

(c) PROCEDURES FOR MEDICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXEMPTIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish uniform procedures under which members of the armed forces may be exempted from participating in the anthrax vaccination program for either administrative or medical reasons.

(2) The Secretaries of the military departments shall provide for notification of all members of the armed forces of the procedures described in paragraph (1).

(d) SYSTEM FOR MONITORING ADVERSE REACTIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a system for monitoring adverse reactions of members of the armed forces to the anthrax vaccine which shall include the following:

(A) Independent review of Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System reports.

(B) Periodic surveys of personnel to whom the vaccine is administered.

(C) A continuing longitudinal study of a pre-identified group of members of the armed forces (including men and women and members from all services).

(D) Active surveillance of a sample of members to whom the anthrax vaccine has been administered that is sufficient to identify, at the earliest opportunity, any patterns of adverse reactions, the discovery of which might be delayed by reliance solely on the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System.

(2) The Secretary may extend or expand any ongoing or planned study or analysis of trends in adverse reactions of members of the armed forces to the anthrax vaccine in order to meet any of the requirements in paragraph (1).

(3) The Secretary shall establish guidelines under which members of the armed forces who are determined by an independent expert panel to be experiencing unexplained adverse reactions may obtain access to a Department of Defense Center of Excellence treatment facility for expedited treatment and follow up.

(e) VACCINE DEVELOPMENT AND PROCUREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan, including milestones, for modernizing all vaccines used or anticipated to be used as part of the protection strategy for members of the armed forces.

(2) The Secretary—

(A) shall, to the maximum extent possible, be the sole purchaser of a vaccine to immunize members of the armed forces and employees of all Federal agencies;

(B) shall, to the maximum extent possible, procure such a vaccine from more than one manufacturer; and

(C) in any case in which the Secretary determines that sole source procurement of such a vaccine is necessary, may not enter into a contract to purchase such vaccine until 30 days after providing notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the Secretary intends to enter into a sole source contract for the vaccine.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 58—BENEFITS AND SERVICES FOR MEMBERS BEING SEPARATED OR RECENTLY SEPARATED

* * * * * * *

§ 1145. Health benefits

(a) TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE.—(1) For the applicable time period described in paragraph (2), a member of the armed forces who is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001* (and the dependents of the member), shall be entitled to receive—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN SEPARATED MEMBERS NOT OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE.—(1) Consistent with the authority of the Secretary concerned to designate certain classes of persons as eligible to receive health care at a military medical facility, the Secretary concerned should consider authorizing, on an individual basis in cases of hardship, the provision of that care for a member who is separated from the armed forces during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, and is ineligible for transitional health care under subsection (a) or does not obtain a conversion health policy (or a dependent of the member).

* * * * * * *

(e) COAST GUARD.—The provisions of this section shall apply to members of the Coast Guard (and their dependents) involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.* The Secretary of Transportation shall implement this section for the Coast Guard.

§ 1146. Commissary and exchange benefits

The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to allow a member of the armed forces who is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to continue to use commissary and exchange stores during the two-year period beginning on the date of the involuntary separation of the member in the same manner as a member on active duty. The Secretary of Transportation shall implement this provision for Coast Guard members involuntarily separated during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

§ 1147. Use of military family housing

(a) TRANSITION FOR INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED MEMBERS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department may, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, permit individuals who are involuntarily separated during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to continue for not more than 180 days after the date of such separation to reside (along with other members of the individual's household) in military family housing provided or leased by the Department of Defense to such individual as a member of the armed forces.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation may prescribe regulations to permit members of the Coast Guard who are involuntarily separated thereof "during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to continue for not more than 180 days after the date of such separation to reside (along with others of the member's household) in military family housing provided or leased by the Coast Guard to the individual as a member of the armed forces.

* * * * * * *

§ 1150. Affiliation with Guard and Reserve units: waiver of certain limitations

(a) PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN PERSONS.—A person who is separated from the armed forces during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, and who applies to become a member of a National Guard or Reserve unit within one year after the date of such separation shall be given preference over other equally qualified applicants for existing or projected vacancies within the unit to which the member applies.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 59—SEPARATION

* * * * * * *

§ 1174. Separation pay upon involuntary discharge or release from active duty

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) OTHER MEMBERS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) The discharge or release from active duty of an officer under a law or regulation requiring that an officer who has failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade for the second time, or who declines continuation on active duty after such a failure, be discharged or released from active duty shall be considered to be involuntary for purposes of paragraph (1)(A).

§ 1174a. Special separation benefits programs

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned may not conduct a program pursuant to this section after [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*.

* * * * * * *

§ 1175. Voluntary separation incentive

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) After [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, the Secretary may not approve a request.

(e)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3)*(A)* A member who has received the voluntary separation incentive and who qualifies for retired or retainer pay under this title shall have deducted from each payment of such retired or retainer

pay so much of such pay as is based on the service for which he received the voluntary separation incentive until the total amount deducted equals the total amount of voluntary separation incentive received. If the member elected to have a reduction in voluntary separation incentive for any period pursuant to paragraph (2), the deduction required under the preceding sentence shall be reduced accordingly.

(B) If a member is receiving simultaneous voluntary separation incentive payments and retired or retainer pay, the member may elect to terminate the receipt of voluntary separation incentive payments. Any such election is permanent and irrevocable. The rate of monthly recoupment from retired or retainer pay of voluntary separation incentive payments received after such an election shall be reduced by a percentage that is equal to a fraction with a denominator equal to the number of months that the voluntary separation incentive payments were scheduled to be paid and a numerator equal to the number of months that would not be paid as a result of the member's decision to terminate the voluntary separation incentive.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 69—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 1370. Commissioned officers: general rule; exceptions

(a) RULE FOR RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE HELD SATISFACTORILY.—(1) * * *

(2)(A) In order to be eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of this title in a grade above major or lieutenant commander, a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps must have served on active duty in that grade for not less than three years, except that the Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department to reduce such period to a period not less than two years in the case of retirements effective during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

(d) RESERVE OFFICERS.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department to reduce the 3-year period required by paragraph (3)(A) to a period not less than 2 years in the case of retirements effective during the period beginning on October 17, 1998, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.* The number of reserve commissioned officers of an armed force in the same grade for whom a reduction is made during any fiscal year in the period of service-in-grade otherwise required under this paragraph may not exceed the number equal to 2 percent of the strength authorized for that fiscal year for reserve commissioned officers of that armed force in an active status in that grade.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 73—ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN

* * * * * * *

§ 1448. Application of Plan

(a) GENERAL RULES FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PLAN.—

(1) * * *

(2) PARTICIPANTS IN THE PLAN.—The Plan applies to the following persons, who shall be participants in the Plan:

(A) * * *

[(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY PARTICIPANTS.—A person who (i) is eligible to participate in the Plan under paragraph (1)(B), (ii) is married or has a dependent child when he is notified under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay, and (iii) elects to participate in the Plan (and makes a designation under subsection (e)) before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date he receives such notification.]

(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY PARTICIPANTS.—A person who (i) is eligible to participate in the Plan under paragraph (1)(B), and (ii) is married or has a dependent child when he is notified under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay, unless the person elects (with his spouse's concurrence, if required under paragraph (3)) not to participate in the Plan before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which he receives that notification.

A person [described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B) who does not elect to participate in the Plan before the end of the 90-day period referred to in that clause] *who elects under subparagraph (B) not to participate in the Plan* remains eligible, upon reaching 60 years of age and otherwise becoming entitled to retired pay, to participate in the Plan in accordance with eligibility under paragraph (1)(A).

(3) ELECTIONS.—

(A) * * *

(B) SPOUSAL CONSENT FOR CERTAIN ELECTIONS RESPECTING RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—A married person [who elects to provide] *who is eligible to provide* a reserve-component annuity may not without the concurrence of the person's spouse elect—

(i) not to participate in the Plan;

(ii) to designate under subsection (e)(2) the effective date for commencement of annuity payments under the Plan in the event that the member dies before becoming 60 years of age to be the 60th anniversary of the member's birth (rather than the day after the date of the member's death);

[(i)] *(iii)* to provide an annuity for the person's spouse at less than the maximum level; or

[(ii)] *(iv)* to provide an annuity for a dependent child but not for the person's spouse.

(4) IRREVOCABILITY OF ELECTIONS.—

(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—An election under paragraph (2)(A) [not to participate in the Plan] is irrevocable if not revoked before the date on which the person first becomes entitled to retired pay.

(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—An election under paragraph (2)(B) [to participate in the Plan] is irrevocable if not revoked before the end of the 90-day period referred to in that paragraph.

* * * * * * *

(b) INSURABLE INTEREST AND FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE BY PERSONS ALREADY PARTICIPATING IN PLAN.—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ELECTION.—An election under this paragraph is effective as of—

(i) * * *

(ii) in the case of a person required (as described in section 1450(f)(3)(B) of this title) to make the election by reason of a court order or filing the date of which is after October 16, 1998,[,] the first day of the first month which begins after the date of that court order or filing.

* * * * * * *

(e) DESIGNATION FOR COMMENCEMENT OF RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—In any case in which a person electing to participate in the Plan is required to make a designation under this subsection, the person [making such election] shall designate whether, in the event he dies before becoming 60 years of age, the annuity provided shall become effective on—

(1) the day after the date of his death; or

(2) the 60th anniversary of his birth.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 77—POSTHUMOUS COMMISSIONS AND WARRANTS

* * * * * * *

§ 1521. Posthumous commissions

(a) The President may issue, or have issued, an appropriate commission in the name of a member of the armed forces who, after September 8, 1939—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) was officially recommended for appointment or promotion to a commissioned grade [and the recommendation for whose appointment or promotion was approved by the Secretary concerned] but was unable to accept the promotion or appointment because of death in line of duty.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 80—MISCELLANEOUS INVESTIGATION REQUIREMENTS AND OTHER DUTIES

Sec.
1561. Complaints of sexual harassment: investigation by commanding officers.

* * * * * * *

1563. Consideration of proposals for posthumous and honorary promotions and appointments: procedures for review and recommendation.
1564. Military criminal investigations: probable cause required for entry of names of subjects into official investigative reports.
1565. DNA identification information: collection from violent and sexual offenders; use.

* * * * * * *

§ 1563. Consideration of proposals for posthumous and honorary promotions and appointments: procedures for review and recommendation

(a) REVIEW BY SECRETARY CONCERNED.—Upon request of a Member of Congress, the Secretary concerned shall review a proposal for the posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment of a member or former member of the armed forces, or any other person considered qualified, that is not otherwise authorized by law. Based upon such review, the Secretary shall make a determination as to the merits of approving the posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment and the other determinations necessary to comply with subsection (b).

(b) NOTICE OF RESULTS OF REVIEW.—Upon making a determination under subsection (a) as to the merits of approving the posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment, the Secretary concerned shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and to the requesting Member of Congress notice in writing of one of the following:

(1) The posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment does not warrant approval on the merits.

(2) The posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment warrants approval and authorization by law for the promotion or appointment is recommended.

(3) The posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment warrants approval on the merits and has been recommended to the President as an exception to policy.

(4) The posthumous or honorary promotion or appointment warrants approval on the merits and authorization by law for the promotion or appointment is required but is not recommended.

A notice under paragraph (1) or (4) shall be accompanied by a statement of the reasons for the decision of the Secretary.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Member of Congress" means—

(1) a Senator; or

(2) a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress.

§ 1564. Military criminal investigations: probable cause required for entry of names of subjects into official investigative reports

(a) PROBABLE CAUSE REQUIRED FOR "TITLING".—The Secretary of Defense shall require that an employee of a military criminal investigative organization or a member of the armed forces assigned to a military criminal investigative organization, in connection with the investigation of a reported crime, may not designate any person, by name or by any other identifying information, as a suspect in the case in any official investigative report, or in a central index for potential retrieval and analysis by law enforcement organizations, unless there is probable cause to believe that that person committed the crime.

(b) STANDARD FOR REMOVAL OF "TITLING" INFORMATION FROM RECORDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a uniform standard applicable throughout the Department of Defense for removal from an official investigative report of a reported crime, and from any applicable central index, of the name of a person (and any other identifying information about that person) that was entered in the report or index to designate that person as a suspect in the case when it is subsequently determined that there is not probable cause to believe that that person committed the crime.

(c) CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIVE ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term "criminal investigative organization" means any of the following:

(1) The Defense Criminal Investigative Service (or any successor to that service).

(2) The Army Criminal Investigation Command (or any successor to that command).

(3) The Naval Criminal Investigative Service (or any successor to that service).

(4) The Air Force Office of Special Investigations (or any successor to that office).

§ 1565. DNA identification information: collection from violent and sexual offenders; use

(a) COLLECTION OF DNA SAMPLES.—The Secretary concerned shall collect a DNA sample from each member of the armed forces under the Secretary's jurisdiction who is, or has been, convicted of a qualifying military offense (as determined under subsection (e)).

(b) ANALYSIS OF SAMPLES.—The Secretary concerned shall furnish each DNA sample collected under subsection (a) to the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a DNA analysis on each such DNA sample.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "DNA sample" means a tissue, fluid, or other bodily sample of an individual on which a DNA analysis can be carried out.

(2) The term "DNA analysis" means analysis of the deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) identification information in a bodily sample.

(d) USE IN CODIS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall furnish the results of each DNA analysis carried out under subsection (b) to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for use in the Combined DNA Index System (in this section referred to as "CODIS") of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(2) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish procedures providing that if a DNA sample has been collected from a person pursuant to subsection (a), and the Secretary receives notice that each conviction of that person of a qualifying military offense has been overturned, the Secretary shall promptly transmit a notice of that fact to the Director in accordance with section 210304(d) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

(e) QUALIFYING MILITARY OFFENSES.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall determine those violent or sexual offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice that shall be considered for purposes of this section as qualifying military offenses.

(2) An offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is equivalent to a serious violent felony (as that term is defined in section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18), as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Attorney General, shall be considered for purposes of this section as a qualifying military offense.

(f) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement of subsection (a) for a member if CODIS contains a DNA analysis with respect to that member.

(g) REGULATIONS.—This section shall be carried out under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Attorney General. Those regulations shall apply, to the extent practicable, uniformly throughout the armed forces.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 83—CIVILIAN DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—DEFENSE–WIDE INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

§ 1601. Civilian intelligence personnel: general authority to establish excepted positions, appoint personnel, and fix rates of pay

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may—

(1) establish, as positions in the excepted service, such defense intelligence positions [in the intelligence components of

the Department of Defense and the military departments] *in the Department of Defense* as the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the intelligence functions [of those components and departments] *of the Department*, including—

(A) Intelligence Senior Level positions designated under section 1607 of this title; and

(B) positions in the Defense Intelligence Senior Executive Service;

* * * * * * *

§ 1611. Postemployment assistance: certain terminated intelligence employees

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may, in the case of any individual who is a qualified former intelligence employee, use appropriated funds—

(1) to assist that individual in finding and qualifying for employment other than in an [intelligence component of the Department of Defense] *defense intelligence position*;

* * * * * * *

(b) QUALIFIED FORMER INTELLIGENCE EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section, a qualified former intelligence employee is an individual who was employed as a civilian employee of the Department of Defense in a [sensitive position in an intelligence component of the Department of Defense] *sensitive defense intelligence position*—

(1) who has been found to be ineligible for continued access to information designated as "Sensitive Compartmented Information" and employment [with the intelligence component] *in a defense intelligence position*; or

(2) whose employment [with the intelligence component] *in a defense intelligence position* has been terminated.

* * * * * * *

(d) DURATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance may not be provided under this section in the case of any individual after the end of the five-year period beginning on the date of the termination of the employment of the individual with [an intelligence component of the Department of Defense] *in a defense intelligence position*.

* * * * * * *

[(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "intelligence component of the Department of Defense" includes the National Reconnaissance Office and any intelligence component of a military department.]

* * * * * * *

§ 1614. Definitions

In this subchapter:

(1) The term "defense intelligence position" means a civilian position as an intelligence officer or intelligence employee [of an intelligence component of the Department of Defense or of a military department] *of the Department of Defense*.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING AND EDUCATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 102—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

* * * * * * *

§ 2033. Contingent funding increase

If for any fiscal year the amount [appropriated for] *appropriated directly to the Secretary of Defense for* the National Guard Challenge Program under section 509 of title 32 is in excess of $62,500,000, the Secretary of Defense shall (notwithstanding any other provision of law) make the amount in excess of $62,500,000 available for the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program under section 2031 of this title, and such excess amount may not be used for any other purpose.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 105—ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM

* * * * * * *

§ 2130a. Financial assistance: nurse officer candidates

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, executes a written agreement in accordance with subsection (c) to accept an appointment as a nurse officer may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus of not more than $5,000. The bonus shall be paid in periodic installments, as determined by the Secretary concerned at the time the agreement is accepted, except that the first installment may not exceed $2,500.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 108—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCHOOLS

Sec.
2161. Joint Military Intelligence College: academic degrees.
* * * * * * *
2166. Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation.

* * * * * * *

§ 2164. Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ELIGIBILITY OF DEPENDENTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES *AND OTHER PERSONS*.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3)(A) The Secretary may authorize the dependent of an American Red Cross employee described in subparagraph (B) to enroll in an education program provided by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) if the American Red Cross agrees to reimburse the Secretary for the educational services so provided.

(B) An employee referred to in subparagraph (A) is an American Red Cross employee who—

(i) resides in Puerto Rico; and

(ii) performs, on a full-time basis, emergency services on behalf of members of the armed forces.

(C) Amounts received under this paragraph as reimbursement for educational services shall be treated in the same manner as amounts received under subsection (g).

* * * * * * *

§ 2165. National Defense University: component institutions

(a) * * *

(b) COMPONENT INSTITUTIONS.—The National Defense University consists of the following institutions:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The [Armed Forces Staff College] *Joint Forces Staff College*.

* * * * * * *

§ 2166. Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may operate an education and training facility known as the "Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation". The Secretary of Defense may designate the Secretary of the Army as the Department of Defense executive agent for carrying out the responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense under this section.

(b) PURPOSE.—(1) The Institute shall be operated for the purpose of providing education and training to military, law enforcement, and civilian personnel of nations of the Western Hemisphere in defense and security matters.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), defense and security matters include—

(A) professional military education;

(B) leadership development;

(C) counter-drug operations;

(D) peace support operations; and

(E) disaster relief.

(c) CURRICULUM.—The education and training programs provided by the Institute shall include (for each person attending the Institute under subsection (b)) instruction totaling not less than eight hours relating to each of the following subjects:

(1) Human rights.

(2) The rule of law.

(3) Due process.

(4) Civilian control of the military.

(5) The role of the military in a democratic society.

(d) BOARD OF VISITORS.—(1) There is a Board of Visitors for the Institute. The Board shall be composed of members appointed by the Secretary of Defense (or the Secretary of the Army as the Secretary's designee). In selecting members of the Board, the Secretary shall consider recommendations by—

(A) the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(B) the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate;

(C) the Secretary of State;

(D) the commander of the unified command with geographic responsibility for Latin America; and

(E) representatives from academic institutions, religious institutions, and human rights organizations.

(2) Members shall serve for two years and shall meet at least annually.

(3)(A) The Board shall inquire into—

(i) the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Institute that the Board decides to consider; and

(ii) any other matters relating to the Institute that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(B) The Board shall review the curriculum of the Institute to ensure that the curriculum—

(i) complies with applicable United States law and regulations;

(ii) is consistent with United States policy goals toward Latin America and the Caribbean; and

(iii) adheres to current United States doctrine.

(4)(A) Not later than 60 days after its annual meeting, the Board shall submit to the Secretary a written report of its action and of its views and recommendations pertaining to the Institute.

(B) Within 30 days of receipt of the Board's report for any year, the Secretary shall transmit the report, with the Secretary's comments, to Congress.

(5) While performing duties as a member of or adviser to the Board, each member of the Board and each adviser shall be reimbursed for travel expenses under Government travel regulations. Board members shall not be compensated by reason of service on the Board.

(e) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The fixed costs of operating and maintaining the Institute may be paid from funds available for operation and maintenance.

(f) TUITION.—Tuition fees charged for persons who attend the Institute may not include the fixed costs of operating and maintaining the Institute.

* * * * * * *

PART IV—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 131—PLANNING AND COORDINATION

* * * * * * *

§ 2218. National Defense Sealift Fund

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(k) CONTRACTS FOR INCORPORATION OF DEFENSE FEATURES IN COMMERCIAL VESSELS.—(1) The head of an agency may enter into a contract with a company submitting an offer for that company to install and maintain defense features for national defense purposes in one or more commercial vessels owned or controlled by that company in accordance with the purpose for which funds in the National Defense Sealift Fund are available under subsection (c)(1)(C). The head of the agency may enter into such a contract only after the head of the agency makes a determination of the economic soundness of the offer. *As consideration for a contract with the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department under this subsection, the company entering into the contract shall agree with the Secretary to make any vessel covered by the contract available to the Secretary, fully crewed and ready for sea, at any time at any port determined by the Secretary, and for whatever duration the Secretary determines necessary.*

(2) The head of an agency may make advance payments to the contractor under a contract under paragraph (1) in a lump sum, in annual payments, or in a combination thereof for costs associated with the installation and maintenance of the defense features on a vessel covered by the contract, as follows:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) Payments of such sums as the Government would otherwise expend, if the vessel were placed in the Ready Reserve Fleet, for maintaining the vessel in the status designated as 'ROS–4 status' in the Ready Reserve Fleet for 25 years.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 136—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

Sec.
2281. Global Positioning System.
2282. B–2 bomber: annual report on operational status.

* * * * * * *

§ 2282. B–2 bomber: annual report on operational status

Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a

report on the operational status of the B–2 bomber. Each such report shall include the following:

(1) An assessment as to whether the B–2 aircraft has a high probability of being able to perform its intended missions.

(2) Identification of all planned or ongoing development of technologies to enhance B–2 aircraft capabilities for which funds are programmed in the future years defense program and an assessment as to whether those technologies—

(A) are consistent with the Air Force bomber roadmap in effect at the time of the report;

(B) are consistent with the recommendations of the report of the Long-Range Air Power panel established by section 8131 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–56); and

(C) will be sufficient to assure that the B–2 aircraft will have a high probability of being able to perform its intended missions in the future.

(3) Definition of any additional technology development required to assure that the B–2 aircraft will retain a high probability of being able to perform its intended missions and an estimate of the funding required to develop those additional technologies.

(4) An assessment as to whether the technologies identified pursuant to paragraph (2) are adequately funded in the budget request for the next fiscal year and whether funds have been identified throughout the future years defense program to continue those technology developments at an adequate level.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 137—PROCUREMENT GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

Sec.
[2301. Repealed.]

* * * * * * *

[2306b. Multiyear contracts: acquisition of property.]
2306b. Multiyear contracts: acquisition of property or services.

* * * * * * *

§ 2306. Kinds of contracts

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(3) In the event funds are not made available for the continuation of such a contract into a subsequent fiscal year, the contract shall be canceled or terminated, and the costs of cancellation or termination may be paid from—

[(A) appropriations originally available for the performance of the contract concerned;

[(B) appropriations currently available for procurement of the type of services concerned, and not otherwise obligated; or

[(C) funds appropriated for those payments.]

(3) Additional provisions regarding mulityear contracts for the purchase of services are provided in section 2306b of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 2306b. Multiyear contracts: acquisition of property *or services*

(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that funds are otherwise available for obligation, the head of an agency may enter into multiyear contracts **[**for the purchase of property**]** whenever the head of that agency finds each of the following:

(1) * * *

(2) That the minimum need for the property *or services* to be purchased is expected to remain substantially unchanged during the contemplated contract period in terms of production rate, procurement rate, and total quantities.

* * * * * * *

(4) **[**That**]** *In the case of a contract for the purchase of property, that* there is a stable design for the property to be acquired and that the technical risks associated with such property *or services* are not excessive.

* * * * * * *

(f) CANCELLATION OR TERMINATION FOR INSUFFICIENT FUNDING.—In the event funds are not made available for the continuation of a contract made under this section into a subsequent fiscal year, the contract shall be canceled or terminated. The costs of cancellation or termination may be paid from—

(1) appropriations originally available for the performance of the contract concerned;

(2) appropriations currently available for procurement of the type of property *or services* concerned, and not otherwise obligated; or

(3) funds appropriated for those payments.

* * * * * * *

§ 2320. Rights in technical data

(a)(1) * * *

(2) Such regulations shall include the following provisions:

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) Subparagraph (B) does not apply to technical data that—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(iii) is necessary for operation, maintenance, installation, or training (other than detailed manufacturing or process data); or**]**

(iii) is necessary for normal operation (other than detailed manufacturing or processing data), maintenance, installation, or training when such services are to be provided by an entity other than the contractor or its subcontractor;

(iv) is necessary for critical operation, maintenance, installation of deployed equipment, or training, when such services are to be provided by an entity other than the contractor or its subcontractor; or

[(iv)] *(v)* is otherwise publicly available or has been released or disclosed by the contractor or subcontractor without restriction on further release or disclosure.

* * * * * * *

(F) A contractor or subcontractor (or a prospective contractor or subcontractor) may not be required, as a condition of being responsive to a solicitation or as a condition for the award of a contract—

(i) to sell or otherwise relinquish to the United States any rights in technical data except—

(I) rights in technical data described in *clause (i), (ii), (iv), or (v) of* subparagraph (C); [or]

(II) under the conditions described in subparagraph (D); or

(III) under the conditions described in subsection (a)(2)(C)(iii), reaching agreement in negotiations concerning provision of the rights involved may not be required as a condition of being responsive to a solicitation, but may be a condition for the award of a contract; or

* * * * * * *

(H) In a case described in subparagraph (C)(iii), the provision of the rights involved shall be subject to negotiations between the Government and the contractor or contractors involved.

(I) A description of the difference between "normal operation" and "critical operation", as such terms are used in subparagraph (C).

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 141—MISCELLANEOUS PROCUREMENT PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

§ 2401. Requirement for authorization by law of certain contracts relating to vessels and aircraft

(a)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) The Secretary may make a contract described in subsection (a)(1) if—

(A) * * *

(B) before a solicitation for proposals for the contract was issued the Secretary notified the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the [Committees on Appropriations] *Committee on Appropriations* of the House of Rep-

resentatives of the Secretary's intention to issue such a solicitation; and

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 146—CONTRACTING FOR PERFORMANCE OF CIVILIAN COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL TYPE FUNCTIONS

Sec.
2460. Definition of depot-level maintenance and repair.

* * * * * * *

2475. Consolidation of functions or activities and reengineering or restructuring of organizations, functions, or activities: required studies and reports before manpower reductions.

* * * * * * *

§ 2461. Commercial or industrial type functions: required studies and reports before conversion to contractor performance

(a) * * *

(b) NOTIFICATION AND ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS.—(1) Before commencing to analyze a commercial or industrial type function described in subsection (a) for possible change to performance by the private sector, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) * * *

(D) The anticipated length and cost of the analysis*, and a certification that funds are specifically budgeted to pay for the cost of the analysis*.

* * * * * * *

(c) NOTIFICATION OF DECISION.—(1) If, as a result of the completion of the examinations under subsection (b)(3), a decision is made to change the commercial or industrial type function that was the subject of the analysis to performance by the private sector, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing that decision. The report shall contain the following:

(A) The date when the analysis of that commercial or industrial type function for possible change to performance by the private sector was commenced.

[(A)**]** *(B)* An indication that the examinations required under subsection (b)(3) have been completed.

[(B)**]** *(C)* The Secretary's certification that the Government calculation of the cost of performance of the function by Department of Defense civilian employees is based on an estimate of the most cost effective manner for performance of the function by Department of Defense civilian employees.

[(C)**]** *(D)* The Secretary's certification that the examination required by subsection (b)(3)(A) as part of the analysis demonstrates that the performance of the function by the private sector will result in savings to the Government over the life of the contract.

(E) The number of Department of Defense civilian employees who were performing the function when the analysis was commenced and the number of such employees whose employment

was terminated or otherwise adversely affected in implementing the most efficient organization of the function or whose employment will be terminated or otherwise adversely affected by the change to performance of the function by the private sector.

[(D)**]** *(F)* The Secretary's certification that the entire analysis is available for examination.

[(E)**]** *(G)* A schedule for completing the change to performance of the function by the private sector.

* * * * * * *

§ 2475. Consolidation of functions or activities and reengineering or restructuring of organizations, functions, or activities: required studies and reports before manpower reductions

(a) REPORTING AND ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS AS PRECONDITION TO MANPOWER REDUCTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may not initiate manpower reductions at organizations or activities, or within functions, that are commercial, commercial exempt from competition, military essential, or inherently governmental until the Secretary fully complies with the reporting and analysis requirements specified in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) NOTIFICATION AND ELEMENTS OF ANALYSIS.—Before commencing to analyze any commercial, commercial exempt from competition, military essential, or inherently governmental organization, function, or activity for the consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering of military personnel or Department of Defense civilian employees, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(1) The organization, function, or activity to be analyzed for possible consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering.

(2) The location or locations at which military personnel or Department of Defense civilian employees would be affected.

(3) The number of military personnel or Department of Defense civilian employee positions potentially affected.

(4) A description of the organization, function, or activity to be analyzed for possible consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering, including a description of all missions, duties, or military requirements that might be affected.

(5) An examination of the cost incurred by the Department of Defense to perform the function or to operate the organization or activity that will be analyzed.

(6) A certification that a proposed consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering of a commercial, commercial exempt from competition, military essential, or inherently governmental organization, function, or activity is not a result of a decision by an official of a military department or Defense Agency to impose predetermined constraints or limitations on the number of military personnel or Department of Defense civilian employees.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF DECISION.—If, as a result of the completion of an analysis carried out consistent with the requirements of subsection (b), a decision is made to consolidate, restructure, or reengineer an organization, function, or activity, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of

Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a report describing that decision. The report shall contain the following:

(1) The Secretary's certification that the consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering that was analyzed will yield savings to the Department of Defense.

(2) A projection of the savings that will be realized as a result of the consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering, compared with the cost incurred by the Department of Defense to perform the function or to operate the organization or activity prior to such proposed consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering.

(3) A description of all missions, duties, or military requirements that will be affected as a result of the decision to consolidate, restructure, or reengineer the organization, function, or activity that was analyzed.

(4) The Secretary's certification that the consolidation, restructuring or reengineering will not result in any diminution of military readiness.

(5) A schedule for performing the consolidation, restructuring or reengineering.

(6) The Secretary's certification that the entire analysis is available for examination.

(d) DELEGATION.—The responsibility to prepare reports under subsections (b) and (c) may be delegated to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations.

(e) COMMENCEMENT; WAIVER FOR SMALL FUNCTIONS.—(1) The consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering of an organization, function, or activity for which a report is required under subsection (c) shall not begin until at least 45 days after the submission of the report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

(2) Subsection (c) shall not apply to a consolidation, restructuring, or reengineering that will result in the elimination of 10 or fewer military or Department of Defense civilian employee positions.

(f) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report reviewing decisions taken by the Secretary of Defense to consolidate, restructure, or reengineer organizations, functions, or activities during the previous year and assessing the Secretary's compliance with this section. The report shall include a detailed assessment by the Comptroller General of whether the savings projected by the Secretary to result from such decisions are likely to be realized, and whether any decision taken by the Secretary is likely to result in a diminution of military readiness. The report shall also include detailed audits of selected analyses performed by the Secretary.

(g) RELATION TO OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to obviate the requirements set forth in section 1597 of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 147—COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES AND OTHER MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES

Sec.
[2481. Transferred.]

* * * * * * *

[2484. Commissary stores: expenses.]
2484. Commissary stores: use of appropriated funds to cover operating expenses.

* * * * * * *

[§ 2484. Commissary stores: expenses

[(a) Except to the extent authorized in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of a military department and approved by the Secretary of Defense and except as provided in subsection (b), funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to pay, in connection with the operation of any commissary store—

[(1) the cost of purchases (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale) and the cost of maintenance of operating equipment and supplies;

[(2) the actual or estimated cost of utilities furnished by the United States;

[(3) the actual or estimated cost of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of the commissary store; or

[(4) costs incurred in connection with obtaining the face value amount of manufacturer or vendor cents-off discount coupons by the commissary store (or other entity acting on behalf of the commissary store).

[(b) Appropriated funds may be used to pay any costs described in subsection (a) but only to the extent that appropriation accounts used to pay such costs are reimbursed for the payment of such costs, including, in the case of any costs incurred in connection with discount coupons referred to in subsection (a)(4), all fees or moneys received for handling or processing such coupons. The sales prices in commissary stores shall be adjusted to the extent necessary to provide sufficient gross revenues from the sales of such stores to make such reimbursements. Such adjustments shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned and approved by the Secretary of Defense.

[(c) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, utilities may be furnished without cost to a commissary store outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii.

[(d) Transportation outside the United States may be furnished in connection with the operation of commissary stores outside the United States.]

§ 2484. Commissary stores: use of appropriated funds to cover operating expenses

(a) OPERATION OF AGENCY AND SYSTEM.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, the operation of the Defense Commissary Agency and the defense commissary system may be funded using such amounts as are appropriated for such purpose.

(b) OPERATING EXPENSES OF COMMISSARY STORES.—Appropriated funds may be used to cover the expenses of operating commissary stores and central product processing facilities of the defense commissary system. For purposes of this subsection, operating expenses include the following:

(1) Salaries of employees of the United States, host nations, and contractors supporting commissary store operations.

(2) Utilities.

(3) Communications.

(4) Operating supplies and services.

(5) Second destination transportation costs within or outside the United States.

(6) Any cost associated with above-store level management or other indirect support of a commissary store or a central product processing facility, including equipment maintenance and information technology costs.

* * * * * * *

§ 2486. Commissary stores: merchandise that may be sold; uniform surcharges and pricing

(a) * * *

(b) AUTHORIZED COMMISSARY MERCHANDISE CATEGORIES.—Merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores may include items only in the following categories:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(11) Magazines and other periodicals.

[(11)**]** *(12)* Such other merchandise categories as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, except that the Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than March 1 of each year, a report describing—

(A) any addition of, or change in, a merchandise category proposed to be made under this paragraph during the one-year period beginning on that date; and

(B) those additions and changes in merchandise categories actually made during the preceding one-year period.

(c) UNIFORM SALES PRICE SURCHARGE OR ADJUSTMENT.—An adjustment of or surcharge on sales prices in commissary stores under **[**section 2484(b) or**]** *subsection (d) or section* 2685(a) of this title or for any other purpose shall be applied as a uniform percentage of the sales price of all merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores. Effective on November 18, 1997, the uniform percentage shall be equal to five percent and may not be changed except by a law enacted after such date.

(d) SALES PRICE ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish the sales price of each item of merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores at the level that will recoup the actual product cost of the item (consistent with this section and **[**sections 2484 and**]** *section* 2685 of this title).

* * * * * * *

(3) The sales price of merchandise and services sold in, at, or by commissary stores shall be adjusted to cover the following:

(A) The cost of first destination commercial transportation of the merchandise in the United States to the place of sale.

(B) The actual or estimated cost of shrinkage, spoilage, and pilferage of merchandise under the control of commissary stores.

* * * * * * *

(f) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MERCHANDISE.—**[**(1)**]** Notwithstanding the general requirement that merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores be commissary store inventory, the Secretary of Defense may authorize the sale of **[**items in the merchandise categories specified in paragraph (2)**]** *tobacco products* as noncommissary store inventory. Subsections (c) and (d) shall not apply to the pricing of such merchandise items.

[(2) The merchandise categories referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

[(A) Magazines and other periodicals.

[(B) Tobacco products.**]**

* * * * * * *

§ 2488. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: purchase of alcoholic beverages

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) In the case of covered alcoholic beverage purchases of distilled spirits, to determine whether a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department of Defense provides the most economical method of distribution to package stores, the Secretary of Defense shall consider all components of the distribution costs incurred by the nonappropriated fund instrumentality, such as overhead costs (including costs associated with management, logistics, administration, depreciation, and utilities), the costs of carrying inventory, and handling and distribution costs.

[(2) If the use of a private distributor would subject covered alcoholic beverage purchases of distilled spirits to direct or indirect State taxation, a nonappropriated fund instrumentality shall be considered to be the most economical method of distribution regardless of the results of the determination under paragraph (1).**]**

[(3)**]** *(2)* The Secretary shall use the agencies performing audit functions on behalf of the armed forces and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to make determinations under this subsection.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 148—NATIONAL DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE, DEFENSE REINVESTMENT, AND DEFENSE CONVERSION

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS TECHNOLOGY BASE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

§ 2534. Miscellaneous limitations on the procurement of goods other than United States goods

(a) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense may procure any of the following items only if the manufacturer of the item satisfies the requirements of subsection (b):

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) POLYACRYLONITRILE CARBON FIBER.—Polyacrylonitrile carbon fiber in accordance with subpart 225.71 of part 225 of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, as in effect on April 1, 2000.

* * * * * * *

(c) APPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN ITEMS.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(2) VALVES AND MACHINE TOOLS.—(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(C) Subsection (a)(4) and this paragraph shall cease to be effective on October 1, 1996.**]**

(C)(i) Subsection (a)(4)(B), subparagraph (B), and this clause shall cease to be effective on October 1, 1996.

(ii) Subsection (a)(4)(A), subparagraph (A), and this clause shall cease to be effective on October 1, 2003.

[(3) BALL BEARINGS AND ROLLER BEARINGS.—Subsection (a)(5) and this paragraph shall cease to be effective on October 1, 2000.**]**

[(4)**]** *(3)* VESSEL PROPELLERS.—Subsection (a)(3)(A)(iii) and this paragraph shall cease to be effective on February 10, 1998.

(4) POLYACRYLONITRILE CARBON FIBER.—Subsection (a)(6) and this paragraph shall cease to be effective on October 1, 2003.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER VI—DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEES

* * * * * * *

§ 2540c. Fees charged and collected

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.—*(1)* The Secretary of Defense shall charge a fee for each guarantee issued under this subchapter to reflect the additional administrative costs of the Department of Defense that are directly attributable to the administration of the program under this subchapter. Such fees shall be credited to a special account in the Treasury. Amounts in the special account shall be available, to the extent and in amounts provided in appropriations

Acts, for paying the costs of administrative expenses of the Department of Defense that are attributable to the loan guarantee program under this subchapter.

(2)(A) If for any fiscal year amounts in the special account established under paragraph (1) are not available (or are not anticipated to be available) in a sufficient amount for administrative expenses of the Department of Defense for that fiscal year that are directly attributable to the administration of the program under this subchapter, the Secretary may use amounts currently available for operations and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, not to exceed $500,000 in any fiscal year, for those expenses.

(B) The Secretary shall, from funds in the special account established under paragraph (1), replenish operations and maintenance accounts for amounts expended under subparagraph (A) as soon as the Secretary determines practicable.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 153—EXCHANGE OF MATERIAL AND DISPOSAL OF OBSOLETE, SURPLUS, OR UNCLAIMED PROPERTY

Sec.
2571. Interchange of property and services.

* * * * * * *

2573. Significant military equipment: continued authority to require demilitarization after disposal.

* * * * * * *

2582. Military equipment identified on United States munitions list: annual report of public sales.

* * * * * * *

§ 2573. Significant military equipment: continued authority to require demilitarization after disposal

(a) AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE DEMILITARIZATION.—The Secretary of Defense may require any person in possession of significant military equipment formerly owned by the Department of Defense—

(1) to demilitarize the equipment,

(2) to have the equipment demilitarized by a third party; or

(3) to return the equipment to the Government for demilitarization.

(b) COST AND VALIDATION OF DEMILITARIZATION.—When the demilitarization of significant military equipment is carried out by the person in possession of the equipment pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the person shall be solely responsible for all demilitarization costs, and the United States shall have the right to validate that the equipment has been demilitarized.

(c) RETURN OF EQUIPMENT TO GOVERNMENT.—When the Secretary of Defense requires the return of significant military equipment for demilitarization by the Government, the Secretary shall bear all costs to transport and demilitarize the equipment. If the person in possession of the significant military equipment obtained the property in the manner authorized by law or regulation and the Secretary determines that the cost to demilitarize and return the property to the person is prohibitive, the Secretary shall reimburse the person for the purchase cost of the property and for the reason-

able transportation costs incurred by the person to purchase the equipment.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMILITARIZATION STANDARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe by regulation what constitutes demilitarization for each type of significant military equipment.

(e) EXCEPTION FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.—This section does not apply when a person is in possession of significant military equipment formerly owned by the Department of Defense for the purpose of demilitarizing the equipment pursuant to a Government contract.

(f) DEFINITION OF SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—In this section, the term "significant military equipment" means—

(1) an article for which special export controls are warranted under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) because of its capacity for substantial military utility or capability, as identified on the United States Munitions List maintained under section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(2) any other article designated by the Department of Defense as requiring demilitarization before its disposal.

* * * * * * *

§ 2582. Military equipment identified on United States munitions list: annual report of public sales

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare an annual report identifying each public sale conducted by a military department or Defense Agency of military items that are—

(1) identified on the United States Munitions List maintained under section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(2) assigned a demilitarization code of "B" or its equivalent.

(b) ELEMENTS OF REPORT.—(1) A report under this section shall cover all public sales described in subsection (a) that were conducted during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) The report shall specify the following for each sale:

(A) The date of the sale.

(B) The military department or Defense Agency conducting the sale.

(C) The manner in which the sale was conducted.

(D) The military items described in subsection (a) that were sold or offered for sale.

(E) The purchaser of each item.

(F) The stated end-use of each item sold.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Not later than March 31 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate the report required by this section for the preceding fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 155—ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND SERVICES

Sec.
2601. General gift funds.

* * * * * * *

[2611. Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies: acceptance of foreign gifts and donations.]
2611. Regional centers for security studies: acceptance of foreign gifts and donations.

* * * * * * *

[§ 2611. Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies: acceptance of foreign gifts and donations

[(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FOREIGN GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—(1) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may accept, on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Center, foreign gifts or donations in order to defray the costs of, or enhance the operation of, the Asia-Pacific Center.

[(2) In this section, the term "Asia-Pacific Center" means the Department of Defense organization within the United States Pacific Command known as the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.]

§ 2611. Regional centers for security studies: acceptance of foreign gifts and donations

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FOREIGN GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—(1) Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may accept foreign gifts or donations in order to defray the costs of, or enhance the operation of, one of the specified defense regional centers for security studies.

(2) For purposes of this section, a specified defense regional center for security studies is any of the following:

(A) The Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

(B) The George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.

* * * * * * *

(d) CREDITING OF FUNDS.—Funds accepted by the Secretary under subsection (a) shall be credited to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for [the Asia-Pacific Center] *the regional center intended to benefit from the gift or donation of such funds*. Funds so credited shall be merged with the appropriations to which credited and shall be available to [the Asia-Pacific Center] *such regional center* for the same purposes and same period as the appropriations with which merged.

(e) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—If the total amount of funds accepted under subsection (a) in any fiscal year *with respect to a defense regional center for security studies* exceeds $2,000,000, the Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount of those donations for that fiscal year. Any such notice shall list each of the contributors of such amounts and the amount of each contribution in that fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 157—TRANSPORTATION

Sec.
2631. Supplies: preference to United States vessels.

* * * * * * *

2647. Reimbursement for expenses incurred in connection with leave canceled due to contingency operations.

* * * * * * *

§ 2647. Reimbursement for expenses incurred in connection with leave canceled due to contingency operations

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO REIMBURSE.—The Secretary concerned may reimburse a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for travel and related expenses (to the extent not otherwise reimbursable under law) incurred by the member as a result of the cancellation of previously approved leave when the leave is canceled in connection with the member's participation in a contingency operation and the cancellation occurs within 48 hours of the time the leave would have commenced.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to establish the criteria for the applicability of subsection (a).

(c) CONCLUSIVENESS OF SETTLEMENT.—The settlement of an application for reimbursement under subsection (a) is final and conclusive.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 159—REAL PROPERTY; RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY; AND LEASE OF NONEXCESS PROPERTY

* * * * * * *

§ 2661. Miscellaneous administrative provisions relating to real property

(a) *AVAILABILITY OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.*—Appropriations for operation and maintenance of the active forces shall be available for the following:

(1) The repair of facilities.

(2) The installation of equipment in public and private plants.

(b) *GENERAL LEASING AUTHORITY; MAINTENANCE OF DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS.*—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of each military department may provide for the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) PLAN TO ADDRESS MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR BACKLOG.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop, and update annually thereafter, a strategic plan to reduce the backlog in maintenance and repair needs of facilities and infrastructure under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense or a military department. At a minimum, the plan shall include or address the following:

(A) A comprehensive strategy for the repair and revitalization of facilities and infrastructure, or for the demolition and replacement of unusable facilities, carried as backlog by the Secretary concerned.

(B) Measurable goals, over specified time frames, for achieving the objectives of the strategy.

(C) Expected funding for each military department and Defense Agency to carry out the strategy during the period covered by the most recent future-years defense program submitted to Congress pursuant to section 221 of this title.

(D) The cost of the current backlog in maintenance and repair for each military department and Defense Agency, which shall be determined using the standard costs to standard facility categories in the Department of Defense Facilities Cost Factors Handbook, shown both in the aggregate and individually for each major military installation.

(E) The total number of square feet of building space of each military department and Defense Agency to be demolished or proposed for demolition under the plan, shown both in the aggregate and individually for each major military installation.

(F) The initiatives underway to identify facility and infrastructure requirements at military installation to accommodate new and developing weapons systems and to prepare installations to accommodate these systems.

(2) Not later than March 15, 2001, the Secretary shall submit the strategic plan to Congress. The annual updates shall be submitted to Congress each year at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress that year under section 1105(a) of title 31.

* * * * * * *

§ 2662. Real property transactions: reports to congressional committees

(a) GENERAL NOTICE AND WAIT REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of a military department, or his designee, may not enter into any of the following listed transactions by or for the use of that department until after the expiration of 30 days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed transaction is submitted to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives:

(1) An acquisition of fee title to any real property, if the estimated price is more than **[**$200,000**]** *$500,000*.

(2) A lease of any real property to the United States, if the estimated annual rental is more than **[**$200,000**]** *$500,000*.

(3) A lease or license of real property owned by the United States, if the estimated annual fair market rental value of the property is more than **[**$200,000**]** *$500,000*.

(4) A transfer of real property owned by the United States to another Federal agency or another military department or to a State, if the estimated value is more than **[**$200,000**]** *$500,000*.

(5) A report of excess real property owned by the United States to a disposal agency, if the estimated value is more than **[**$200,000**]** *$500,000*.

* * * * * * *

(b) ANNUAL REPORTS ON CERTAIN MINOR TRANSACTIONS.—The Secretary of each military department shall submit annually to the

congressional committees named in subsection (a) a report on transactions described in subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than the simplified acquisition threshold [under section 2304(g) of this title] *specified in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11)),* but not more than [$200,000] *$500,000*.

* * * * * * *

(e) NOTICE AND WAIT REGARDING LEASES OF SPACE FOR DOD BY GSA.—No element of the Department of Defense shall occupy any general purpose space leased for it by the General Services Administration at an annual rental in excess of [$200,000] *$500,000* (excluding the cost of utilities and other operation and maintenance services), if the effect of such occupancy is to increase the total amount of such leased space occupied by all elements of the Department of Defense, until the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a report of the facts concerning the proposed occupancy is submitted to the congressional committees named in subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

§ 2667. Leases: non-excess property of military departments

(a) Whenever the Secretary of a military department considers it advantageous to the United States, he may lease to such lessee and upon such terms as he considers will promote the national defense or be in the public interest, real or personal property that is—

(1) under the control of that department; *and*

[(2) not for the time needed for public use; and]

[(3)] *(2)* not excess property, as defined by section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472).

(b) A lease under subsection (a)—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) may provide, notwithstanding section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b), or any other provision of law, for the [improvement, maintenance, protection, repair, or restoration,] *alteration, repair, or improvement,* by the lessee, of the property leased[, or of the entire unit or installation where a substantial part of it is leased,] as the payment of part or all of the consideration for the lease.

(c)(1) In addition to any in-kind consideration accepted under subsection (b)(5), in-kind consideration accepted with respect to a lease under subsection (b) may include the following:

(A) Maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities under the control of the Secretary concerned.

(B) Provision of facilities for use by the Secretary concerned.

(C) Facilities operation support for the Secretary concerned.

(D) Provision of such other services relating to activities that will occur on the leased property as the Secretary concerned considers appropriate.

(2) In-kind consideration under paragraph (1) may be accepted at any property or facilities under the control of the Secretary concerned that are selected for that purpose by the Secretary concerned.

(3) The Secretary concerned may not accept in-kind consideration during a fiscal year with respect to leases under subsection (a) until the Comptroller General certifies to the Secretary concerned that the total received by the Secretary concerned as money rentals for that fiscal year under such leases is equal to the total money rentals under such leases received by the Secretary concerned during fiscal year 2000.

(4) In the case of a lease for which all or part of the consideration proposed to be accepted by the Secretary concerned under this subsection is in-kind consideration with a value in excess of $500,000, the Secretary concerned may not enter into 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.

(d)(1)(A) * * *

[(B) Sums deposited in a military department's special account pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be available to such military department, as provided in appropriation Acts, as follows:

[(i) 50 percent of such amount shall be available for facility maintenance and repair or environmental restoration at the military installation where the leased property is located.

[(ii) 50 percent of such amount shall be available for facility maintenance and repair and for environmental restoration by the military department concerned.**]**

(B) Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), the amounts deposited in the special account of a military department pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be available to the Secretary of that military department, in such amounts as provided in appropriation Acts, for the following:

(i) Maintenance, protection, alteration, repair, improvement, or restoration (including environmental restoration) of property or facilities.

(ii) Lease of facilities.

(iii) Facilities operation support.

(C) At least 50 percent of the amounts deposited in the special account of a military department under subparagraph (A) by reason of a lease shall be available for activities described in subparagraph (B) only at the military installation where the leased property is located.

(D) The Secretary concerned may not expend under subparagraph (B) an amount in excess of $500,000 at a single installation until 30 days after the date on which a report on the facts of the proposed expenditure is submitted to the congressional defense committees.

* * * * * * *

(3) **[**As part of the request for authorizations of appropriations submitted to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives for each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense**]** *Not later than March 15 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report which* shall include—

(A) an accounting of the receipt and use of all money rentals that were deposited and expended under this subsection during

the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the [request] *report* is made; and

* * * * * * *

(f)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(4) The Secretary concerned may accept under subsection (b)(5) services of a lessee for an entire installation to be closed or realigned under a base closure law, or for any part of such installation, without regard to the requirement in subsection (b)(5) that a substantial part of the installation be leased.]

[(5)] *(4)*(A) Notwithstanding the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the scope of any environmental impact analysis necessary to support an interim lease of property under this subsection shall be limited to the environmental consequences of activities authorized under the proposed lease and the cumulative impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions during the period of the proposed lease.

* * * * * * *

[(h) In this section, the term "base closure law" means each of the following:

[(1) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

[(2) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

[(3) Section 2687 of this title.]

(h) In this section:

(1) The term "congressional defense committees" means:

(A) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(B) The Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term "base closure law" means the following:

(A) Section 2687 of this title.

(B) The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(C) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(3) The term "military installation" has the meaning given such term in section 2687(e)(1) of this title.

[(c)] *(i)* This section does not apply to oil, mineral, or phosphate lands.

* * * * * * *

§ 2685. Adjustment of or surcharge on selling prices in commissary stores to provide funds for construction and improvement of commissary store facilities

(a) ADJUSTMENT OR SURCHARGE AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the [Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense,] *Secretary of Defense* may, for the purposes of this section, provide for an adjustment of, or surcharge on, sales prices of goods and services sold in commissary store facilities.

[(b) USE FOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENT OF FACILITIES.—The Secretary of a military department, under regulations established by him and approved by the Secretary of Defense, may use the proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) to acquire, construct, convert, expand, install, or otherwise improve commissary store facilities at defense installations and for related environmental evaluation and construction costs, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design.]

(b) USE FOR CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, IMPROVEMENT, AND MAINTENANCE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may use the proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) only—

(A) to acquire (including acquisition by lease), construct, convert, expand, improve, repair, maintain, and equip the physical infrastructure of commissary stores and central product processing facilities of the defense commissary system; and

(B) to cover environmental evaluation and construction costs, including surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design, related to activities described in paragraph (1).

(2) In paragraph (1), the term "physical infrastructure" includes real property, utilities, and equipment (installed and free standing and including computer equipment), necessary to provide a complete and usable commissary store or central product processing facility.

(c) ADVANCE OBLIGATION.—The [Secretary of a military department, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and] *Secretary of Defense, with the approval of* the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may obligate anticipated proceeds from the adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) for any use specified in subsection (b) or (d), without regard to fiscal year limitations, if the [Secretary of the military department determines] *Secretary determines* that such obligation is necessary to carry out any use of such adjustments or surcharges specified in subsection (b) or (d).

(d) COOPERATION WITH NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES.—(1) The [Secretary of a military department] *Secretary of Defense* may authorize a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States to enter into a contract for construction of a shopping mall or similar facility for a commissary store and one or more nonappropriated fund instrumentality activities. The Secretary may use the proceeds of adjustments or surcharges authorized by subsection (a) to reimburse the nonappropriated fund instrumentality for the portion of the cost of the contract that is at-

tributable to construction of the commissary store or to pay the contractor directly for that portion of such cost.

* * * * * * *

§ 2688. Utility systems: conveyance authority

(a) * * *

[(b) SELECTION OF CONVEYEE.—If more than one utility or entity referred to in subsection (a) notifies the Secretary concerned of an interest in a conveyance under such subsection, the Secretary shall carry out the conveyance through the use of competitive procedures.]

(b) SELECTION OF CONVEYEE OR AWARDEE.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall comply with the competition requirements of section 2304 of this title in conveying a utility system under this section and in awarding any utility services contract related to the conveyance of the utility system.

(2) A conveyance or award may be made under paragraph (1) only if the Secretary concerned determines that the conveyance or award complies with State laws, regulations, rulings, and policies governing the provision of utility services. Such State laws, regulations, rulings, and policies shall apply to the conveyee or awardee notwithstanding the existence of exclusive federal legislative jurisdiction as to any parcels of land served by the utility system.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 160—ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION

* * * * * * *

§ 2703. Environmental restoration accounts

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(b) OBLIGATION OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS.—Funds authorized for deposit in an account under subsection (a) may be obligated or expended from the account only in order to carry out the environmental restoration functions of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments under this chapter and under any other provision of law. Funds so authorized shall remain available until expended.]

(b) OBLIGATION OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS.—(1) Funds authorized for deposit in an account under subsection (a) may be obligated or expended from the account only—

(A) to carry out the environmental restoration functions of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments under this chapter and under any other provision of law; and

(B) to relocate activities from defense sites, including sites formerly used by the Department of Defense that are released from Federal Government control, at which the Secretary is responsible for environmental restoration functions.

(2) The authority provided by paragraph (1)(B) expires September 30, 2003. Not more than five percent of the funds deposited in an

account under subsection (a) for a fiscal year may be used for activities under paragraph (1)(B).

(3) If relocation assistance under paragraph (1)(B) is to be provided with respect to a site formerly used by the Department of Defense, but now released from Federal Government control, the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned may use only fund transfer mechanisms otherwise available to the Secretary. The Secretary may not provide assistance under such paragraph for permanent relocation from the affected site unless the Secretary determines that permanent relocation is the most cost effective method of dealing with the activities located at the affected site and notifies the Congress of the determination before providing the assistance.

(4) Funds authorized for deposit in an account under subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 169—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

[§ 2826. Limitations on space by pay grade

[(a) In the construction, acquisition, and improvement of military family housing units, the following are the space limitations for the applicable numbers of bedrooms permitted for each pay grade:

[Pay grade	Number of bedrooms	Net floor area (square feet)
O–7 and above	4	2,100
O–6	4	1,700
O–4 and O–5	4	1,550
	3	1,400
O–1 through O–3; W–1 through W–4; and E–7 through E–9	5	1,550
	4	1,450
	3	1,350
	2	950
E–1 through E–6	5	1,550
	4	1,350
	3	1,200
	2	950

[(b) The applicable maximum net floor area prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by 10 percent for the housing unit of an officer holding a special command position (as designated by the Secretary of Defense), for the housing unit of the commanding officer of a military installation, and for the senior noncommissioned officer of a military installation.

[(c) The maximum net floor area prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased in any case by 5 percent if the Secretary concerned determines that the increase is in the best interest of the Government (1) to permit award of a turnkey construction contract to the contractor offering the most satisfactory proposal, or (2) to

permit purchase, lease, or conversion of housing units. An increase in the maximum net floor area of a housing unit under subsection (b) when combined with an increase in the maximum net floor area of such unit under this subsection may not exceed 10 percent of the otherwise applicable limitation prescribed by subsection (a).

[(d) The applicable maximum net floor area prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by 300 square feet for a family housing unit in a location where harsh climatological conditions severely restrict outdoor activity for a significant part of each year, as determined by the Secretary concerned pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The regulations shall apply uniformly to the armed forces.

[(e) In the case of the acquisition by purchase of military family housing units for members of the armed forces in pay grades below pay grade O–6, the applicable maximum net floor area prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by 20 percent if the Secretary concerned determines that the purchase of larger units is cost effective when compared to available units within the space limitations specified in that subsection.

[(f)(1) The Secretary concerned may waive the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to a family housing unit leased in a foreign country if a suitable family housing unit within the applicable maximum net floor area prescribed by such subsection cannot be obtained.

[(2) Subsection (a) does not apply to family housing units in foreign countries constructed or acquired by the Secretary of State for occupancy by members of the armed forces.

[(g) The maximum net floor areas prescribed by this section apply to family housing provided to civilian personnel based upon civilian pay scale comparability with military pay grades, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

[(h) In this section, the term "net floor area" means the total number of square feet of the floor space inside the exterior walls of a structure, excluding the floor area of an unfinished basement, an unfinished attic, a utility space, a garage, a carport, an open or insect-screened porch, a stairwell, and any space used for a solar-energy system.

[(i)(1) The Secretary concerned may waive the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to military family housing units constructed, acquired, or improved during the five-year period beginning on February 10, 1996.

[(2) The total number of military family housing units constructed, acquired, or improved during any fiscal year in the period referred to in paragraph (1) shall be the total number of such units authorized by law for that fiscal year.**]**

§ 2826. Limitations on space by pay grade

In the construction, acquisition, and improvement of military family housing units, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that the room patterns and floor areas are generally comparable to the room patterns and floor areas of similar housing units in the locality concerned.

* * * * * * *

§ 2828. Leasing of military family housing

(a) * * *
(b)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4)*(A)* The Secretary of the Army may lease not more than eight housing units in the vicinity of Miami, Florida, for key and essential personnel, as designated by the Secretary, for the United States Southern Command for which the expenditure for the rental of such units (including the cost of utilities, maintenance, and operation, including security enhancements) exceeds the expenditure limitations in paragraphs (2) and (3). The total amount for all leases under this paragraph may not exceed $280,000 per year, [and no lease on any individual housing unit may exceed $60,000 per year] *and the lease payments shall be made out of annual appropriations for that year. A lease under this paragraph may not exceed five years.*

(B) At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Army shall adjust the maximum amount provided for leases under subparagraph (A) for the previous fiscal year by the percentage (if any) by which the basic allowance for housing under section 403 of title 37 for the Miami metropolitan area during the preceding fiscal year exceeded such basic allowance for housing for the second preceding fiscal year.

(5) At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Secretary concerned shall adjust the maximum lease amount provided for under [paragraphs (2), (3), and (4)] *paragraphs (2) and (3)* for the previous fiscal year by the percentage (if any) by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the preceding fiscal year exceeds such Consumer Price Index for the fiscal year before such preceding fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY HOUSING

* * * * * * *

§ 2885. Expiration of authority

The authority to enter into a contract under this subchapter shall expire on February 10, [2001] *2006*.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle B—Army

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 367—RETIREMENT FOR LENGTH OF SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 3911. Twenty years or more: regular or reserve commissioned officers

(a) * * *

(b) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Army, during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to reduce the requirement under subsection (a) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary of the Army) of not less than eight years.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 369—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * * * *

§ 3961. General rule

(a) The retired grade of a regular commissioned officer of the Army who retires other than for physical disability, and the retired grade of a reserve commissioned officer of the Army who retires other than for physical disability [or for nonregular service under chapter 1223 of this title], is determined under section 1370 of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 373—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Sec.

4021. Army War College and United States Army Command and General Staff College: civilian faculty members.

* * * * * * *

4027. Civilian special agents of the Criminal Investigation Command: authority to execute warrants and make arrests.

* * * * * * *

§ 4027. Civilian special agents of the Criminal Investigation Command: authority to execute warrants and make arrests

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army may authorize any Department of the Army civilian employee described in subsection (b) to have the same authority to execute and serve warrants and other processes issued under the authority of the United States and to make arrests without a warrant as may be authorized under section 1585a of this title for special agents of the Defense Criminal Investigative Service.

(b) AGENTS TO HAVE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) applies to any employee of the Department of the Army who is a special agent of the Army Criminal Investigation Command (or a successor to that command) whose duties include conducting, supervising, or coordinating investigations of criminal activity in programs and operations of the Department of the Army.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under subsection (a) shall be exercised in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General and any other ap-

plicable guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Defense, or the Attorney General.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 407—SCHOOLS AND CAMPS

Sec.
4411. Establishment: purpose.
* * * * * * *
[4415. United States Army School of the Americas.]
* * * * * * *

[§ 4415. United States Army School of the Americas

[(a) The Secretary of the Army may operate the military education and training facility known as the United States Army School of the Americas.

[(b) The School of the Americas shall be operated for the purpose of providing military education and training to military personnel of Central and South American countries and Caribbean countries.

[(c) The fixed costs of operating and maintaining the School of the Americas may be paid from funds available for operation and maintenance of the Army.

[(d) Tuition fees charged for personnel receiving military education and training from the school may not include the fixed costs of operating and maintaining the school.]

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Navy and Marine Corps

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 506—HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS

Sec.
5041. Headquarters, Marine Corps: function; composition.
* * * * * * *
[5045. Chief of Staff; Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of Staff.]
* * * * * * *

§ 5041. Headquarters, Marine Corps: function; composition

(a) * * *

(b) The Headquarters, Marine Corps, is composed of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(3) The Chief of Staff of the Marine Corps.
[(4) The Deputy Chiefs of Staff.
[(5) The Assistant Chiefs of Staff.]
(3) The Deputy Commandants.
[(6)] *(4)* Other members of the Navy and Marine Corps assigned or detailed to the Headquarters, Marine Corps.
[(7)] *(5)* Civilian employees in the Department of the Navy assigned or detailed to the Headquarters, Marine Corps.

* * * * * * *

[§ 5045. Chief of Staff; Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of Staff

[There are in the Headquarters, Marine Corps, a Chief of Staff, not more than five Deputy Chiefs of Staff, and not more than three Assistant Chiefs of Staff, detailed by the Secretary of the Navy from officers on the active-duty list of the Marine Corps.]

§ 5045. Deputy Commandants

There are in the Headquarters Marine Corps, not more than five Deputy Commandants, detailed by the Secretary of the Navy from officers on the active-duty list of the Marine Corps.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 513—BUREAUS; OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL

* * * * * * *

§ 5143. Office of Naval Reserve: appointment of Chief

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) GRADE.—(1) * * *
(2) The Chief of Naval Reserve, while so serving, [has a grade] *has the grade of* rear admiral, without vacating the officer's permanent grade. However, if selected in accordance with section 12505 of this title, he may be appointed in the grade of vice admiral.

* * * * * * *

§ 5144. Office of Marine Forces Reserve: appointment of Commander

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c)

* * * * * * *

(2) The Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, while so serving, [has a grade] *has the grade of* major general, without vacating the officer's permanent grade. However, if selected in accordance with section 12505 of this title, he may be appointed in the grade of lieutenant general.

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 555—ADMINISTRATION

Sec.
6011. Navy Regulations.

* * * * * * *

6035. Female members: congressional review period for assignment to duty on submarines or for reconfiguration of submarines.

§ 6035. Female members: congressional review period for assignment to duty on submarines or for reconfiguration of submarines

(a) No change in the Department of the Navy policy limiting service on submarines to males, as in effect on May 10, 2000, may take effect until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress written notice of the proposed change; and

(2) a period of 120 days of continuous session of Congress expires following the date on which the notice is received.

(b) No funds available to the Department of the Navy may be expended to reconfigure any existing submarine, or to design any new submarine, to accommodate female crew members until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress written notice of the proposed reconfiguration or design; and

(2) a period of 120 days of continuous session of Congress expires following the date on which the notice is received.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) the continuity of a session of Congress is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House of Congress is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of such 120-day period.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 571—VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT

* * * * * * *

§ 6323. Officers: 20 years

(a)(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Navy, during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to reduce the requirement under paragraph (1) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary) of not less than eight years.

* * * * * * *

PART III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 605—UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Sec.
7041. Function.
* * * * * * *
7049. Defense industry civilians: admission to defense product development program.
* * * * * * *

§ 7049. Defense industry civilians: admission to defense product development program

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ADMISSION.—The Secretary of the Navy may permit eligible defense industry employees to receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School in accordance with this section. Any such defense industry employee may only be enrolled in, and may only be provided instruction in, a program leading to a masters's degree in a curriculum related to defense product development. No more than 10 such defense industry employees may be enrolled at any one time. Upon successful completion of the course of instruction in which enrolled, any such defense industry employee may be awarded an appropriate degree under section 7048 of this title.

(b) ELIGIBLE DEFENSE INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section, an eligible defense industry employee is an individual employed by a private firm that is engaged in providing to the Department of Defense significant and substantial defense-related systems, products, or services. A defense industry employee admitted for instruction at the school remains eligible for such instruction only so long at that person remains employed by the same firm.

(c) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.—Defense industry employees may receive instruction at the school during any academic year only if, before the start of that academic year, the Secretary of the Navy determines, and certifies to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, that providing instruction to defense industry employees under this section during that year—

(1) will further the military mission of the school;

(2) will enhance the ability of the Department of Defense and defense-oriented private sector contractors engaged in the design and development of defense systems to reduce the product and project lead times required to bring such systems to initial operational capability; and

(3) will be done on a space-available basis and not require an increase in the size of the faculty of the school, an increase in the course offerings of the school, or an increase in the laboratory facilities or other infrastructure of the school.

(d) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that—

(1) the curriculum for the defense product development program in which defense industry employees may be enrolled under this section is not readily available through other schools

and concentrates on defense product development functions that are conducted by military organizations and defense contractors working in close cooperation; and

(2) the course offerings at the school continue to be determined solely by the needs of the Department of Defense.

(e) TUITION.—The Superintendent of the school shall charge tuition for students enrolled under this section at a rate not less than the rate charged for employees of the United States outside the Department of the Navy.

(f) STANDARDS OF CONDUCT.—While receiving instruction at the school, students enrolled under this section, to the extent practicable, are subject to the same regulations governing academic performance, attendance, norms of behavior, and enrollment as apply to Government civilian employees receiving instruction at the school.

(g) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts received by the school for instruction of students enrolled under this section shall be retained by the school to defray the costs of such instruction. The source, and the disposition, of such funds shall be specifically identified in records of the school.

PART IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 643—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Sec.
7472. Physical examination: employees engaged in hazardous occupations.

* * * * * * *

7451. Special agents of the Naval Criminal Investigative Service: authority to execute warrants and make arrests.

* * * * * * *

§ 7451. Special agents of the Naval Criminal Investigative Service: authority to execute warrants and make arrests

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Navy may authorize any Department of the Navy civilian employee described in subsection (b) to have the same authority to execute and serve warrants and other processes issued under the authority of the United States and to make arrests without a warrant as may be authorized under section 1585a of this title for special agents of the Defense Criminal Investigative Service.

(b) AGENTS TO HAVE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) applies to any employee of the Department of the Navy who is a special agent of the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (or any successor to that service) whose duties include conducting, supervising, or coordinating investigations of criminal activity in programs and operations of the Department of the Navy.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under subsection (a) shall be exercised in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General and any other ap-

plicable guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, or the Attorney General.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Air Force

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 867—RETIREMENT FOR LENGTH OF SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 8911. Twenty years or more: regular or reserve commissioned officers

(a) * * *

(b) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Air Force, during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, to reduce the requirement under subsection (a) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary of the Air Force) of not less than eight years.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 873—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Sec.
9021. Air University: civilian faculty members.

* * * * * * *

9027. Civilian special agents of the Office of Special Investigations: authority to execute warrants and make arrests.

* * * * * * *

§ 9027. Civilian special agents of the Office of Special Investigations: authority to execute warrants and make arrests

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Air Force may authorize any Department of the Air Force civilian employee described in subsection (b) to have the same authority to execute and serve warrants and other processes issued under the authority of the United States and to make arrests without a warrant as may be authorized under section 1585a of this title for special agents of the Defense Criminal Investigative Service.

(b) AGENTS TO HAVE AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) applies to any employee of the Department of the Air Force who is a special agent of the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (or a successor to that office) whose duties include conducting, supervising, or coordinating investigations of criminal activity in programs and operations of the Department of the Air Force.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided under subsection (a) shall be exercised in accordance with

guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General and any other applicable guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of Defense, or the Attorney General.

* * * * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

[CHAPTER 909—CIVIL AIR PATROL

[Sec.
[9441. Status: support by Air Force; employment.
[9442. Assistance by other agencies.

[§ 9441. Status: support by Air Force; employment

[(a) The Civil Air Patrol is a volunteer civilian auxiliary of the Air Force.

[(b) To assist the Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives as set forth in section 40302 of title 36, the Secretary of the Air Force may, under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary of Defense—

[(1) give, lend, or sell to the Civil Air Patrol without regard to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)—

[(A) major items of equipment, including aircraft, motor vehicles, and communication equipment; and

[(B) necessary related supplies and training aids;

that are excess to the military departments;

[(2) permit the use of such services and facilities of the Air Force as he considers to be needed by the Civil Air Patrol to carry out its mission;

[(3) furnish such quantities of fuel and lubricants to the Civil Air Patrol as are needed by it to carry out any mission assigned to it by the Air Force, including unit capability testing missions and training missions;

[(4) establish, maintain, and supply liaison offices of the Air Force at the National, State, and Territorial headquarters, and at not more than eight regional headquarters, of the Civil Air Patrol;

[(5) detail or assign any member of the Air Force or any officer or employee of the Department of the Air Force to any liaison office at the National, State, or Territorial headquarters, and at not more than eight regional headquarters, of the Civil Air Patrol;

[(6) detail any member of the Air Force or any officer or employee of the Department of the Air Force to any unit or installation of the Civil Air Patrol to assist in the training program of the Civil Air Patrol;

[(7) in time of war, or of national emergency declared after May 27, 1954, by Congress or the President, authorize the payment of travel expenses and allowances, in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, to members of the Civil

Air Patrol while carrying out any mission specifically assigned by the Air Force;

[(8) provide funds for the national headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol, including funds for the payment of staff compensation and benefits, administrative expenses, travel, per diem and allowances, rent and utilities, and other operational expenses;

[(9) authorize the payment of aircraft maintenance expenses relating to operational missions, unit capability testing missions, and training missions;

[(10) authorize the payment of expenses of placing into serviceable condition major items of equipment (including aircraft, motor vehicles, and communications equipment) owned by the Civil Air Patrol;

[(11) reimburse the Civil Air Patrol for costs incurred for the purchase of such major items of equipment as the Secretary considers needed by the Civil Air Patrol to carry out its missions; and

[(12) furnish articles of the Air Force uniform to Civil Air Patrol cadets without cost to such cadets.

[(c) The Secretary may use the services of the Civil Air Patrol in fulfilling the noncombat mission of the Department of the Air Force, and for purposes of determining the civil liability of the Civil Air Patrol (or any member thereof) with respect to any act or omission committed by the Civil Air Patrol (or any member thereof) in fulfilling such mission, the Civil Air Patrol shall be deemed to be an instrumentality of the United States.

[(d)(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may authorize the Civil Air Patrol to employ, as administrators and liaison officers, persons retired from service in the Air Force whose qualifications are approved under regulations prescribed by the Secretary and who request such employment.

[(2) A person employed pursuant to paragraph (1) may receive the person's retired pay and an additional amount for such employment that is not more than the difference between the person's retired pay and the pay and allowances the person would be entitled to receive if ordered to active duty in the grade in which the person retired from service in the Air Force. The additional amount shall be paid to the Civil Air Patrol by the Secretary from funds appropriated for that purpose.

[(3) A person employed pursuant to paragraph (1) may not, while so employed, be considered to be on active duty or inactive-duty training for any purpose.

[§ 9442. Assistance by other agencies

[The Secretary of the Air Force may arrange for the use by the Civil Air Patrol of such facilities and services under the jurisdiction of the Secretry of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force considers to be needed by the Civil Air Patrol to carry out its mission. Any such arrangements shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force with the approval of the Secretary of Defense and shall be subject to the

agreement of the other military department or other department or agency of the United States furnishing the facilities or services.]

CHAPTER 909—CIVIL AIR PATROL

Sec.
9441. Status as federally chartered corporation; purposes.
9442. Status as volunteer civilian auxiliary of the Air Force.
9443. Activities not performed as auxiliary of the Air Force.
9444. Activities performed as auxiliary of the Air Force.
9445. Funds appropriated for the Civil Air Patrol.
9446. Miscellaneous personnel authorities.
9447. Board of Governors.
9448. Regulations.

§ 9441. Status as federally chartered corporation; purposes

(a) STATUS.—(1) The Civil Air Patrol is a nonprofit corporation that is federally chartered under section 40301 of title 36.

(2) Except as provided in section 9442(b)(2) of this title, the Civil Air Patrol is not an instrumentality of the Federal Government for any purpose.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Civil Air Patrol are set forth in section 40302 of title 36.

§ 9442. Status as volunteer civilian auxiliary of the Air Force

(a) VOLUNTEER CIVILIAN AUXILIARY.—The Civil Air Patrol is a volunteer civilian auxiliary of the Air Force when the services of the Civil Air Patrol are used by any department or agency in any branch of the Federal Government.

(b) USE BY AIR FORCE.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may use the services of the Civil Air Patrol to fulfill the noncombat programs and missions of the Department of the Air Force.

(2) The Civil Air Patrol shall be deemed to be an instrumentality of the United States with respect to any act or omission of the Civil Air Patrol, including any member of the Civil Air Patrol, in carrying out a mission assigned by the Secretary of the Air Force.

§ 9443. Activities not performed as auxiliary of the Air Force

(a) SUPPORT FOR STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—The Civil Air Patrol may, in its status as a federally chartered nonprofit corporation and not as an auxiliary of the Air Force, provide assistance requested by State or local governmental authorities to perform disaster relief missions and activities, other emergency missions and activities, and nonemergency missions and activities. Missions and activities carried out under this section shall be consistent with the purposes of the Civil Air Patrol.

(b) USE OF FEDERALLY PROVIDED RESOURCES.—(1) To perform any mission or activity authorized under subsection (a), the Civil Air Patrol may use any equipment, supplies, and other resources provided to it by the Air Force or by any other department or agency of the Federal Government or acquired by or for the Civil Air Patrol with appropriated funds, without regard to whether the Civil Air Patrol has reimbursed the Federal Government source for the equipment, supplies, other resources, or funds, as the case may be.

(2) The use of equipment, supplies, or other resources under paragraph (1) is subject to—

(A) the terms and conditions of the applicable agreement entered into under chapter 63 of title 31; and

(B) the laws and regulations that govern the use by nonprofit corporations of federally provided assets or of assets purchased with appropriated funds, as the case may be.

(c) AUTHORITY NOT CONTINGENT ON REIMBURSEMENT.—The authority for the Civil Air Patrol to provide assistance under subsections (a) and (b) is not contingent on the Civil Air Patrol being reimbursed for the cost of providing the assistance. If the Civil Air Patrol requires reimbursement for the provision of assistance under such subsections, the Civil Air Patrol may establish the reimbursement rate at a rate less than the rates charged by private sector sources for equivalent services.

(d) LIABILITY INSURANCE.—The Secretary of the Air Force may provide the Civil Air Patrol with funds for paying the cost of liability insurance for missions and activities carried out under this section.

§ 9444. Activities performed as auxiliary of the Air Force

(a) AIR FORCE SUPPORT FOR ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may furnish to the Civil Air Patrol in accordance with this section any equipment, supplies, and other resources that the Secretary determines necessary to enable the Civil Air Patrol to fulfill the missions assigned by the Secretary to the Civil Air Patrol as an auxiliary of the Air Force.

(b) FORMS OF AIR FORCE SUPPORT.—The Secretary of the Air Force may, under subsection (a)—

(1) give, lend, or sell to the Civil Air Patrol without regard to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.)—

(A) major items of equipment (including aircraft, motor vehicles, computers, and communications equipment) that are excess to the military departments; and

(B) necessary related supplies and training aids that are excess to the military departments;

(2) permit the use, with or without charge, of services and facilities of the Air Force;

(3) furnish supplies (including fuel, lubricants, and other items required for vehicle and aircraft operations) or provide funds for the acquisition of supplies;

(4) establish, maintain, and supply liaison officers of the Air Force at the national, regional, State, and territorial headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol;

(5) detail or assign any member of the Air Force or any officer, employee, or contractor of the Department of the Air Force to any liaison office at the national, regional, State, or territorial headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol;

(6) detail any member of the Air Force or any officer, employee, or contractor of the Department of the Air Force to any unit or installation of the Civil Air Patrol to assist in the training programs of the Civil Air Patrol;

(7) authorize the payment of travel expenses and allowances, at rates not to exceed those paid to employees of the United States under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, to members

of the Civil Air Patrol while the members are carrying out programs or missions specifically assigned by the Air Force;

(8) provide funds for the national headquarters of the Civil Air Patrol, including—

(A) funds for the payment of staff compensation and benefits, administrative expenses, travel, per diem and allowances, rent, utilities, other operational expenses of the national headquarters; and

(B) to the extent considered necessary by the Secretary of the Air Force to fulfill Air Force requirements, funds for the payment of compensation and benefits for key staff at regional, State, or territorial headquarters;

(9) authorize the payment of expenses of placing into serviceable condition, improving, and maintaining equipment (including aircraft, motor vehicles, computers, and communications equipment) owned or leased by the Civil Air Patrol;

(10) provide funds for the lease or purchase of items of equipment that the Secretary determines necessary for the Civil Air Patrol;

(11) support the Civil Air Patrol cadet program by furnishing—

(A) articles of the Air Force uniform to cadets without cost; and

(B) any other support that the Secretary of the Air Force determines is consistent with Air Force missions and objectives; and

(12) provide support, including appropriated funds, for the Civil Air Patrol aerospace education program to the extent that the Secretary of the Air Force determines appropriate for furthering the fulfillment of Air Force missions and objectives.

(c) ASSISTANCE BY OTHER AGENCIES.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may arrange for the use by the Civil Air Patrol of such facilities and services under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the head of any other department or agency of the United States as the Secretary of the Air Force considers to be needed by the Civil Air Patrol to carry out its mission.

(2) An arrangement for use of facilities or services of a military department or other department or agency under this subsection shall be subject to the agreement of the Secretary of the military department or head of the other department or agency, as the case may be.

(3) Each arrangement under this subsection shall be made in accordance with regulations prescribed under section 9448 of this title.

§ 9445. Funds appropriated for the Civil Air Patrol

Funds appropriated for the Civil Air Patrol shall be available only for the exclusive use of the Civil Air Patrol.

§ 9446. Miscellaneous personnel authorities

(a) USE OF RETIRED AIR FORCE PERSONNEL.—(1) Upon the request of a person retired from service in the Air Force, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into a personal services contract with that person providing for the person to serve as an administrator or liaison officer for the Civil Air Patrol. The qualifications of a per-

son to provide the services shall be determined and approved in accordance with regulations prescribed under section 9448 of this title.

(2) To the extent provided in a contract under paragraph (1), a person providing services under the contract may accept services on behalf of the Air Force and commit and obligate appropriated funds as necessary to perform the services.

(3) A person, while providing services under a contract authorized under paragraph (1), may receive the person's retired pay and an additional amount for such services that is not less than the amount equal to the excess of—

(A) the pay and allowances that the person would be entitled to receive if ordered to active duty in the grade in which the person retired from service in the Air Force, over

(B) the amount of the person's retired pay.

(4) A person, while providing services under a contract authorized under paragraph (1), may not be considered to be on active duty or inactive-duty training for any purpose.

(b) USE OF CIVIL AIR PATROL CHAPLAINS.—The Secretary of the Air Force may use the services of Civil Air Patrol chaplains in support of the Air Force active duty and reserve component forces to the extent and under conditions that the Secretary determines appropriate.

§ 9447. Board of Governors

(a) GOVERNING BODY.—The Board of Governors of the Civil Air Patrol is the governing body of the Civil Air Patrol.

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Board of Governors is composed of 11 members as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force, who may be active or retired officers of the Air Force (including reserve components of the Air Force), employees of the United States, or private citizens.

(2) Four members of the Civil Air Patrol, elected from among the members of the Civil Air Patrol in the manner provided in regulations prescribed under section 9448 of this title.

(3) Three members appointed or selected as provided in subsection (c) from among personnel of any Federal Government agencies, public corporations, nonprofit associations, and other organizations that have an interest and expertise in civil aviation and the Civil Air Patrol mission.

(c) APPOINTMENTS FROM INTERESTED ORGANIZATIONS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the members of the Board of Governors referred to in subsection (b)(3) shall be appointed jointly by the Secretary of the Air Force and the National Commander of the Civil Air Patrol.

(2) Any vacancy in the position of a member referred to in paragraph (1) that is not filled under that paragraph within 90 days shall be filled by majority vote of the other members of the Board.

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—(1) The Chairperson of the Board of Governors shall be chosen by the members of the Board of Governors from among the members of the Board eligible for selection under paragraph (2) and shall serve for a term of two years.

(2) The position of Chairperson shall be held on a rotating basis, first by a member of the Board selected from among those appointed

by the Secretary of the Air Force under paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and then by a member of the Board selected from among the members elected by the Civil Air Patrol under paragraph (2) of that subsection. Upon the expiration of the term of a Chairperson selected from among the members referred to in one of those paragraphs, the selection of a successor to that position shall be made from among the members who are referred to in the other paragraph.

(e) POWERS.—(1) The Board of Governors shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), exercise the powers granted under section 40304 of title 36.

(2) Any exercise by the Board of the power to amend the constitution or bylaws of the Civil Air Patrol or to adopt a new constitution or bylaws shall be subject to approval by a majority of the members of the Board.

(3) Neither the Board of Governors nor any other component of the Civil Air Patrol may modify or terminate any requirement or authority set forth in this section.

(f) PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR BREACH OF A FIDUCIARY DUTY.—(1) The Board of Governors shall, subject to paragraph (2), take such action as is necessary to eliminate or limit the personal liability of a member of the Board of Governors to the Civil Air Patrol or to any of its members for monetary damages for a breach of fiduciary duty while serving as a member of the Board.

(2) The Board may not eliminate or limit the liability of a member of the Board of Governors to the Civil Air Patrol or to any of its members for monetary damages for any of the following:

(A) A breach of the member's duty of loyalty to the Civil Air Patrol or its members.

(B) Any act or omission that is not in good faith or that involves intentional misconduct or a knowing violation of law.

(C) Participation in any transaction from which the member directly or indirectly derives an improper personal benefit.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as rendering section 207 or 208 of title 18 inapplicable in any respect to a member of the Board of Governors who is a member of the Air Force on active duty, an officer on a retired list of the Air Force, or an employee of the United States.

(g) PERSONAL LIABILITY FOR BREACH OF A FIDUCIARY DUTY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no member of the Board of Governors or officer of the Civil Air Patrol shall be personally liable for damages for any injury or death or loss or damage of property resulting from a tortious act or omission of an employee or member of the Civil Air Patrol.

(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to a member of the Board of Governors or officer of the Civil Air Patrol for a tortious act or omission in which the member or officer, as the case may be, was personally involved, whether in breach of a civil duty or in commission of a criminal offense.

(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to restrict the applicability of common law protections and rights that a member of the Board of Governors or officer of the Civil Air Patrol may have.

(4) The protections provided under this subsection are in addition to the protections provided under subsection (f).

§ 9448. Regulations

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this chapter.

(b) REQUIRED REGULATIONS.—The regulations shall include the following:

(1) Regulations governing the conduct of the activities of the Civil Air Patrol when it is performing its duties as a volunteer civilian auxiliary of the Air Force under section 9442 of this title.

(2) Regulations for providing support by the Air Force and for arranging assistance by other agencies under section 9444 of this title.

(3) Regulations governing the qualifications of retired Air Force personnel to serve as an administrator or liaison officer for the Civil Air Patrol under a personal services contract entered into under section 9446(a) of this title.

(4) Procedures and requirements for the election of members of the Board of Governors under section 9447(b)(2) of this title.

(c) APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The regulations required by subsection (b)(2) shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Reserve Components

* * * * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1007—ADMINISTRATION OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 10218. Army and Air Force Reserve technicians: conditions for retention; mandatory retirement under civil service laws

(a) SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT OF MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).—(1) An individual employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a military technician (dual status) who after **[**the date of the enactment of this section**]** *October 5, 1999,* loses dual status is subject to paragraph (2) or (3), as the case may be.

(2) If a technician described in paragraph (1) is eligible at the time dual status is lost for an unreduced annuity *and is age 60 or older at that time*, the technician shall be separated not later than 30 days after the date on which dual status is lost.

(3)(A) If a technician described in paragraph (1) is not eligible at the time dual status is lost for an unreduced annuity *or is under*

age 60 at that time, the technician shall be offered the opportunity to—

(i) reapply for, and if qualified be appointed to, a position as a military technician (dual status); or

(ii) apply for a civil service position that is not a technician position.

(B) If such a technician continues employment with the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician, the technician—

(i) shall not be permitted, after [the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection] *October 5, 2000*, to apply for any voluntary personnel action; and

(ii) shall be separated or retired—

(I) in the case of a technician first hired as a military technician (dual status) on or before February 10, 1996, not later than 30 days after becoming eligible for an unreduced annuity *and becoming 60 years of age*; and

* * * * * * *

(b) NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.—(1) An individual who on [the date of the enactment of this section] *October 5, 1999,* is employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician and who on that date is eligible for an unreduced annuity *and is age 60 or older* shall be separated not later than [six months after the date of the enactment of this section] *April 5, 2000*.

(2)(A) An individual who on [the date of the enactment of this section] *October 5, 1999,* is employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician and who on that date is not eligible for an unreduced annuity *or is under age 60* shall be offered the opportunity to—

(i) reapply for, and if qualified be appointed to, a position as a military technician (dual status); or

(ii) apply for a civil service position that is not a technician position.

(B) If such a technician continues employment with the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician, the technician—

(i) shall not be permitted, after [the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this subsection] *October 5, 2000*, to apply for any voluntary personnel action; and

(ii) shall be separated or retired—

(I) in the case of a technician first hired as a technician on or before February 10, 1996, and who on [the date of the enactment of this section] *October 5, 1999,* is a non-dual status technician, not later than 30 days after becoming eligible for an unreduced annuity *and becoming 60 years of age*; and

(II) in the case of a technician first hired as a technician after February 10, 1996, and who on [the date of the enactment of this section] *October 5, 1999,* is a non-dual status technician, not later than one year after the date on which dual status is lost.

(3) An individual employed by the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve as a non-dual status technician who is ineligible for appointment to a military technician (dual status) position, or who decides not to apply for appointment to such a position, or who, [within six months of the date of the enactment of this section] *during the period beginning on October 5, 1999, and ending on April 5, 2000,* is not appointed to such a position, shall for reduction-in-force purposes be in a separate competitive category from employees who are military technicians (dual status).

* * * * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL GENERALLY

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1205—APPOINTMENT OF RESERVE OFFICERS

* * * * * * *

§ 12005. Strength in grade: commissioned officers in grades below brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half) in an active status

(a)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the authorized strength of the Army and the Air Force in reserve commissioned officers in an active status in each grade named in paragraph (2) is as prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively. A vacancy in any grade may be filled by an authorized appointment in any lower grade. *Medical officers and dental officers shall be excluded in computing and determining the authorized strengths under this subsection.*

* * * * * * *

§ 12011. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Whenever under section 527 of this title the President may suspend the operation of any provision of section 523, 525, or 526 of this title, the Secretary of Defense may suspend the operation of any provision of this section. Any such suspension shall, if not sooner ended, end in the manner specified in section 527 for a suspension under that section.

(d) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the Secretary may increase the number of officers serving in any grade for a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) by not more than the percent authorized by the Secretary under section 115(c)(2) of this title.

§ 12012. Authorized strengths: senior enlisted members on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Whenever under section 527 of this title the President may suspend the operation of any provision of section 523, 525, or 526 of this title, the Secretary of Defense may suspend the operation of any provision of this section. Any such suspension shall, if not sooner ended, end in the manner specified in section 527 for a suspension under that section.

(d) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the Secretary may increase the number of enlisted members serving in any grade for a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) by not more than the percent authorized by the Secretary under section 115(c)(2) of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1213—SPECIAL APPOINTMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, DETAILS, AND DUTIES

* * * * * * *

§ 12503. Ready Reserve: funeral honors duty

(a) * * *

(b) SERVICE CREDIT.—A member ordered to funeral honors duty under this section shall be required to perform a minimum of two hours of such duty in order to receive—

(1) service credit under section 12732(a)(2)(E) of this title; and

(2) if authorized by the Secretary concerned, the allowance under section 435 of title 37 *or compensation at the rate prescribed in section 206 of title 37*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1215—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

* * * * * * *

§ 12552. Funeral honors functions at funerals for veterans

Performance by a Reserve of funeral honors functions at the funeral of a veteran (as defined in section 1491(h) of this title) may not be considered to be a period of drill or training, but may be performed as funeral honors duty under section 12503 of this title.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1223—RETIRED PAY FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE

* * * * * * *

§ 12731. Age and service requirements

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) In the case of a person who completes the service requirements of subsection (a)(2) during the period beginning on October 5, 1994, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, the provisions of subsection (a)(3) shall be applied by substituting "the last six years" for "the last eight years".

§ 12731a. Temporary special retirement qualification authority

(a) RETIREMENT WITH AT LEAST 15 YEARS OF SERVICE.—For the purposes of section 12731 of this title, the Secretary concerned may—

(1) during the period described in subsection (b), determine to treat a member of the Selected Reserve of a reserve component of the armed force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary as having met the service requirements of subsection (a)(2) of that section and provide the member with the notification required by subsection (d) of that section if the member—

(A) as of [October 1, 1991] *December 31, 2001*, has completed at least 15, and less than 20, years of service computed under section 12732 of this title; or

(B) after that date and before [October 1, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, completes 15 years of service computed under that section; and

* * * * * * *

§ 12733. Computation of retired pay: computation of years of service

For the purpose of computing the retired pay of a person under this chapter, the person's years of service and any fraction of such a year are computed by dividing 360 into the sum of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) One day for each point credited to the person under clause (B), (C), or (D) of section 12732(a)(2) of this title, [but not more than 60 days in any one year of service before the year of service that includes September 23, 1996, and not more than 75 days in any subsequent year of service.] *but not more than—*

(A) 60 days in any one year of service before the year of service that includes September 23, 1996;

(B) 75 days in the year of service that includes September 23, 1996, and in any subsequent year of service before the year of service that includes the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001; and

(C) 90 days in the year of service that includes the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 and in any subsequent year of service.

* * * * * * *

PART III—PROMOTION AND RETENTION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1409—CONTINUATION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST AND SELECTIVE EARLY REMOVAL

* * * * * * *

§ 14701. Selection of officers for continuation on the reserve active-status list

(a) CONSIDERATION FOR CONTINUATION.—(1) [Upon application, a reserve officer] *A reserve officer* of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who is required to be removed from the reserve active-status list under section 14505, 14506, or 14507 of this title may, subject to the needs of the service and to section 14509 of this title, be considered for continuation on the reserve active-status list by a selection board convened under section 14101(b) of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 14703. Authority to retain chaplains and officers in medical specialties until specified age

(a) RETENTION.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 1407 of this title and except for officers referred to in sections 14503, 14504, 14505, and 14506 of this title and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) the Secretary of the Air Force may, with the officer's consent, retain in an active status any reserve officer who is designated as a medical officer, dental officer, [veterinary officer, Air Force nurse, or chaplain or who is designated as a biomedical sciences officer and is qualified for service as a veterinarian, optometrist, or podiatrist.] *Air Force nurse, Medical Service Corps officer, biomedical sciences officer, or chaplain.*

* * * * * * *

PART IV—TRAINING FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1606—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE

* * * * * * *

§ 16133. Time limitation for use of entitlement

(a) * * *

(b)(1) In the case of a person—

(A) who is separated from the Selected Reserve because of a disability which was not the result of the individual's own willful misconduct incurred on or after the date on which such person became entitled to educational assistance under this chapter; or

(B) who, on or after the date on which such person became entitled to educational assistance under this chapter ceases to be a member of the Selected Reserve during the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, by reason of the inactivation of the person's unit of assignment or by reason of involuntarily ceasing to be designated as a member of the Selected Reserve pursuant to section 10143(a) of this title,

the period for using entitlement prescribed by subsection (a) shall be determined without regard to clause (2) of such subsection.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1609—EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

§ 16302. Education loan repayment program: health professions officers serving in Selected Reserve with wartime critical medical skill shortages

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) The authority provided in this section shall apply only in the case of a person first appointed as a commissioned officer before [January 1, 2001] *January 1, 2002*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1611—OTHER EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Sec.

[16401. Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program: officer candidates pursuing degrees.]

16401. Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program: college tuition assistance program.

[§ 16401. Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program: officer candidates pursuing degrees]

§ 16401. Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program: college tuition assistance program

(a) AUTHORITY FOR [FINANCIAL] *COLLEGE TUITION* ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of the Navy may provide financial assistance to [an eligible enlisted] *a* member of the Marine Corps Reserve for expenses of the member while the member is pursuing on a full-time basis at an institution of higher education a program of education approved by the Secretary that leads to—

(1) a baccalaureate degree in less than five academic years; or

(2) a doctor of jurisprudence or bachelor of laws degree in not more than [three] *four* academic years.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—(1) To be eligible for financial assistance under this section, [an enlisted] *a* member of the Marine Corps Reserve must—

(A) be [an officer candidate in] *a member of* the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program and have successfully completed one six-week (or longer) increment of military training required under that program;

[(B) meet the applicable age requirement specified in paragraph (2);]

[(C)] *(B)* be enrolled on a full-time basis in a program of education referred to in subsection (a) at any institution of higher education; and

[(D)] *(C)* enter into a written agreement with the Secretary described in paragraph [(3)] *(2)*.

[(2)(A) In the case of a member pursuing a baccalaureate degree, the member meets the age requirements of this paragraph if the member will be under 27 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which the member is projected to be eligible for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps through the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program, except that if the member has served on active duty, the member may, on such date, be any age under 30 years that exceeds 27 years by a number of months that is not more than the number of months that the member served on active duty.

[(B) In the case of a member pursuing a doctor of jurisprudence or bachelor of laws degree, the member meets the age requirements of this paragraph if the member will be under 31 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which the member is projected to be eligible for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Marine Corps through the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program, except that if the member has served on active duty, the member may, on such date, be any age under 35 years that exceeds 31 years by a number of months that is not more than the number of months that the member served on active duty.]

[(3)] *(2)* A written agreement referred to in paragraph (1)(D) is an agreement between the member and the Secretary in which the member agrees—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) FAILURE TO COMPLETE PROGRAM.—(1) [A member] *An enlisted member* who receives financial assistance under this section may be ordered to active duty in the Marine Corps by the Secretary to serve in an appropriate enlisted grade for such period as the Secretary prescribes, but not for more than four years, if the member—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

PART V—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 1803—FACILITIES FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS

* * * * * * *

§ 18232. Definitions

In this chapter:

(1) The term "State" means any of the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and each territory and possession of the United States and includes political subdivisions and military units thereof and tax-supported agencies therein.

(2) The term "facility" includes any (A) interest in land, (B) [armory or other structure] *armory, readiness center, or other structure*, and (C) storage or other facility normally needed for the administration and training of any unit of the reserve components of the armed forces.

(3) [The term "armory" means] *The terms "armory" and "readiness center" mean* a structure that houses one or more units of a reserve component and is used for training and administering those units. It includes a structure that is appurtenant to such a structure and houses equipment used for that training and administration.

* * * * * * *

§ 18236. Contributions to States; other use permitted by States

(a) * * *

(b) A contribution made for an armory *or readiness center* under paragraph (4) or (5) of section 18233(a) of this title may not exceed the sum of—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1990 AND 1991

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

PART A—FUNDING AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

[SEC. 112. ANNUAL REPORT ON B–2 BOMBER AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

[(a) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report that sets forth the finding of the Secretary (as of January 1 of such year) on each of the following matters:

[(1) Whether the performance milestones for the B–2 aircraft for the previous fiscal year for both developmental test and evaluation and operational test and evaluation (as contained in the Requirements Correlation Matrix found in the user-defined Operational Requirements Document (as contained in Attachment B to a letter from the Secretary of Defense to Congress dated October 14, 1993)) have been met.

[(2) Whether the B–2 aircraft has a high probability of being able to perform its intended missions.

[(3) Whether any proposed modification to the performance matrix referred to in paragraph (1) will be provided in writing in advance to the committees.

[(4) Whether the cost reduction initiatives established for the B–2 program can be achieved (together with details of the savings to be realized).

[(5) Whether the quality assurance practices and fiscal management controls of the prime contractor and major subcontractors associated with the B–2 program meet or exceed accepted United States Government standards.

[(b) FIRST REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit the first annual report under subsection (a) not later than March 1, 1996.]

* * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

* * * * * * *

PART D—PROVISIONS RELATING TO SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES

* * * * * * *

SEC. 834. TEST PROGRAM FOR NEGOTIATION OF COMPREHENSIVE SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLANS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) TEST PROGRAM PERIOD.—The test program authorized by subsection (a) shall begin on October 1, 1990, unless Congress adopts a resolution disapproving the test program. The test program shall terminate on September 30, 2000.**[.]**

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

PART B—LAND TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 2811. LAND CONVEYANCE AT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO, CALIFORNIA, AND CONSTRUCTION OF FAMILY HOUSING AT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, TUSTIN, CALIFORNIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) through (d), the Secretary of the Navy may—

(1) convey to the County of Orange, California, or its designee, or both, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 77 acres of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of three severable parcels at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California; and

(2) accept monetary consideration for such property and expend it for the construction **[**of additional military family housing units at Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California**]** *and repair of roads, and the development of Aerial Port of Embarkation facilities, at Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar, California*.

* * * * * * *

TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE

CHAPTER 1—ORGANIZATION

§ 115. Funeral honors duty performed as a Federal function

(a) * * *

(b) SERVICE CREDIT.—A member ordered to funeral honors duty under this section shall be required to perform a minimum of two hours of such duty in order to receive—

(1) service credit under section 12732(a)(2)(E) of title 10; and

(2) if authorized by the Secretary concerned, the allowance under section 435 of title 37 *or compensation at the rate prescribed in section 206 of title 37*.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

§ 508. Assistance for certain youth and charitable organizations

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) AUTHORIZED SERVICES.—The services authorized to be provided under subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) * * *

(2) Air transportation in support of Special Olympics *or any other youth or charitable organization designated by the Secretary of Defense*.

* * * * * * *

(d) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—The organizations eligible to receive services under this section are as follows:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(14) Reach For Tomorrow.

[(14)**]** *(15)* Any other youth or charitable organization designated by the Secretary of Defense.

* * * * * * *

§ 509. National Guard Challenge Program of opportunities for civilian youth

(a) * * *

(b) CONDUCT OF THE PROGRAM.—*(1)* The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the conduct of the National Guard Challenge Program in such States as the Secretary considers to be appropriate**[**, except that Federal expenditures under the program may not exceed $62,500,000 for any fiscal year**]**.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the National Guard Challenge Program using funds appropriated directly to the Secretary for the program and nondefense Federal funds made available or transferred to the Secretary by other Federal agencies to support the program. However, the amount of funds appropriated directly to the Secretary of Defense and expended for the program in a fiscal year may not exceed $62,500,000.

* * * * * * *

(m) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out the National Guard Challenge Program. The regulations shall address at a minimum the following:

(1) The terms to be included in the program agreements required by subsection (d).

(2) The qualifications for persons to participate in the program, as required by subsection (e).

(3) The benefits authorized for program participants, as required by subsection (f).

(4) The status of National Guard personnel assigned to duty in support of the program.

(5) The conditions for the use of National Guard facilities and equipment to carry out the program, as required by subsection (h).

(6) The status of program participants, as described in subsection (i).

(7) The procedures to be used by the Secretary when communicating with States about the program.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Defense-Wide Programs

* * * * * * *

SEC. 142. MH–47E/MH–60K HELICOPTER MODIFICATION PROGRAMS.

(a) REQUIRED TESTING.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (a) (2) and (b) of section 2366 of title 10, United States Code, and the requirements of subsection (a) of section 2399 of such title—

(1) operational test and evaluation [and survivability testing] of the MH–60K helicopter under the MH–60K helicopter modification program shall be completed prior to full materiel release of the MH–60K helicopters for operational use; and

(2) operational test and evaluation [and survivability testing] of the MH–47E helicopter under the MH–47E helicopter modification program shall be completed prior to full materiel release of the MH–47E helicopters for operational use.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XLIV—PERSONNEL ADJUSTMENT, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Active Forces Transition Enhancements

* * * * * * *

SEC. 4403. TEMPORARY EARLY RETIREMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(i) ACTIVE FORCE DRAWDOWN PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the active force drawdown period is the period beginning on

the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on [October 1, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

Subtitle B—Guard and Reserve Transition Initiatives

SEC. 4411. FORCE REDUCTION TRANSITION PERIOD DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term "force reduction transition period" means the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 4416. FORCE REDUCTION PERIOD RETIREMENTS.

(a) * * *

(b) TEMPORARY SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—During the period referred to in subsection (c), the Secretary concerned may grant a member of the Selected Reserve under the age of 60 years the annual payments provided for under this section if—

(1) as of October 1, 1991, that member has completed at least 20 years of service computed under section 1332 of title 10, United States Code, or after that date and before [October 1, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, such member completes 20 years of service computed under that section or section 12732;

* * * * * * *

TITLE XLIV—PERSONNEL ADJUSTMENT, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle F—Job Training and Employment and Educational Opportunities

* * * * * * *

SEC. 4463. PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL LEAVE RELATING TO CONTINUING PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) EXPIRATION.—The authority to grant a leave of absence under subsection (a) shall expire on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

CHAPTER 3—BASIC PAY

* * * * * * *

§ 205. Computation: service creditable

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the periods of service of a commissioned officer appointed under section [12209] *12203* of title 10 after receiving financial assistance under section 16401 of such title that are counted under this section may not include a period of service after January 1, 2000, that the officer performed concurrently as [a member] *an enlisted member* of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program and the Marine Corps Reserve, except that service after that date that the officer performed before commissioning (concurrently with the period of service as a member of the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program) as an enlisted member on active duty or as a member of the Selected Reserve may be so counted.

* * * * * * *

§ 209. Members of precommissioning programs

(a) *SENIOR ROTC MEMBERS IN ADVANCED TRAINING.—(1)* Except when on active duty, a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of title 10 is entitled to a [subsistence allowance of $200 a month] *monthly subsistence allowance at a rate prescribed under paragraph (2)* beginning on the day he starts advanced training and ending upon the completion of his instruction under that section, but in no event shall any member receive such pay for more than 30 months.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe by regulation the monthly rates for subsistence allowances provided under this section. The rate may not be less than $250 per month, but may not exceed $600 per month. [Subsistence]

(3) A subsistence allowance under this section may not be considered financial assistance requiring additional service within the meaning of the third sentence of section 6(d)(1) of the Military Selective Act (50 U.S.C App. 456(d)(1)).

(b) *SENIOR ROTC MEMBERS APPOINTED IN RESERVES.*—Except when on active duty, a cadet or midshipman appointed under section 2107 of title 10 is entitled to a monthly subsistence allowance [in the amount provided in subsection (a)] *at a rate prescribed under subsection (a)(2).* A member enrolled in the first two years of a four-year program is entitled to receive subsistence for a maximum of twenty months. A member enrolled in the advanced course is entitled to subsistence as prescribed for a member enrolled under section 2104 of title 10 as prescribed in subsection (a).

(c) *PAY WHILE ATTENDING TRAINING OR PRACTICE CRUISE.*—Each cadet or midshipman in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while he is attending training or practice cruises under chapter 103 of title 10 if the training or cruise is of at least four weeks duration and must be completed before the cadet or midshipman is commissioned, and each applicant for membership in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, while he is attending field training or practice cruises to satisfy the requirements of section 2104(b)(6)(B) of title 10 for admission to advanced training, is

entitled, while so attending, to pay at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies under section 203(c) of this title.

(d) *MEMBERS OF MARINE CORPS OFFICER CANDIDATE PROGRAM.*—Except when serving on active duty, a member who is enrolled in a Marine Corps officer candidate program which requires a baccalaureate degree as a prerequisite to being commissioned as an officer and who is not enrolled in a program established under chapter 103 of title 10 or an academy established under chapter 403, 603, or 903 of title 10 may be paid a subsistence allowance at [the same rate as that prescribed by subsection (a),] *the monthly rate prescribed under subsection (a)(2)* for a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of title 10.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 5—SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Sec.
301. Incentive pay: hazardous duty.
* * * * * * *
309. Special pay: enlistment bonus.
* * * * * * *
323. Special pay: retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skill.

* * * * * * *

§ 301b. Special pay: aviation career officers extending period of active duty

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—An aviation officer described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on January 1, 1989, and ending on [December 31, 2000,] *December 31, 2001,* executes a written agreement to remain on active duty in aviation service for at least one year may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid a retention bonus as provided in this section.

* * * * * * *

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "aviation service" means service performed by an officer (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer) while holding an aeronautical rating or designation or while in training to receive an aeronautical rating or designation.

(2) The term "operational flying duty" has the meaning given such term in [section 301a(a)(6)(A)] *section 301a(a)(6)(B)* of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 302. Special pay: medical officers of the armed forces

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(h) RESERVE MEDICAL OFFICERS SPECIAL PAY.—(1) A reserve medical officer described in paragraph (2) is entitled to special pay at the rate of $450 a month for each month of active duty, *includ-*

ing active duty in the form of annual training, active duty for training, and active duty for special work.

* * * * * * *

§ 302a. Special pay: optometrists

(a) * * *

(b) RETENTION SPECIAL PAY.—(1) Under regulations prescribed under section 303a(a) of this title, [an officer described in paragraph (2) may be paid] *the Secretary concerned may pay an officer described in paragraph (2) a* retention special pay of not more than $6,000 for any twelve-month period during which the officer is not undergoing an internship or initial residency training.

* * * * * * *

§ 302c. Special pay: psychologists and nonphysician health care providers

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) NONPHYSICIAN HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—The Secretary concerned may authorize the payment of special pay at the rates specified in subsection (b) to an officer who—

(1) is an officer in the Medical Services Corps of the Army or Navy, a biomedical sciences officer in the Air Force, an officer in the Army Medical Specialist Corps, an officer of the Nurse Corps of the Army or Navy, an officer of the Air Force designated as a nurse, *an officer in the Coast Guard or Coast Guard Reserve designated as a physician assistant,* or an officer in the Regular or Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service;

* * * * * * *

§ 302d. Special pay: accession bonus for registered nurses

(a) ACCESSION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person who is a registered nurse and who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, executes a written agreement described in subsection (c) to accept a commission as an officer and remain on active duty for a period of not less than four years may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus in an amount determined by the Secretary concerned.

* * * * * * *

§ 302e. Special pay: nurse anesthetists

(a) SPECIAL PAY AUTHORIZED.—(1) An officer described in subsection (b)(1) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for a period of one year or more may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid incentive special pay in an amount not to exceed $15,000 for any 12-month period.

* * * * * * *

(b) COVERED OFFICERS.—(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense may extend the special pay authorized under subsection (a) to officers of the armed forces who serve in a nursing specialty (other than as nurse anesthetists) that—

(A) is designated by [the Secretary] *the Secretary of the military department concerned* as critical to meet requirements (whether such specialty is designated as critical to meet wartime or peacetime requirements); and

* * * * * * *

§ 302f. Special pay: reserve, recalled, or retained health care officers

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR RESERVE MEDICAL OFFICER.—While a reserve medical officer receives a special pay under section 302 of this title by reason of subsection (a), the officer shall not be entitled to special pay under subsection (h) of that section.]

(d) EXCEPTION.—While a reserve medical or dental officer receives a special pay under section 302 or 302b of this title by reason of subsection (a), the officer shall not be entitled to special pay under section 302(h) or 302b(h) of this title.

* * * * * * *

§ 302g. Special pay: Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—No agreement under this section may be entered into after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

§ 305a. Special pay: career sea pay

[(a) Under regulations prescribed by the President, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is also entitled, while on sea duty, to special pay at the applicable rate under subsection (b).

[(b) The monthly rates for special pay under subsection (a) are as follows:

[ENLISTED MEMBERS

Pay grade	Years of sea duty						
	1 or less	Over 1	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 5	Over 6
E–4	$50	$60	$120	$150	$160	$160	$160
E–5	50	60	120	150	170	315	325
E–6	100	100	120	150	170	315	325
E–7	100	100	120	175	190	350	350
E–8	100	100	120	175	190	350	350

[ENLISTED MEMBERS—Continued

Pay grade	Years of sea duty						
	1 or less	Over 1	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 5	Over 6
E–9	100	100	120	175	190	350	350

	Over 7	Over 8	Over 9	Over 10	Over 11	Over 12	Over 13
E–4	$160	$160	$160	$160	$160	$160	$160
E–5	350	350	350	350	350	350	350
E–6	350	350	365	365	365	380	395
E–7	375	390	400	400	410	420	450
E–8	375	390	400	400	410	420	450
E–9	375	390	400	400	410	420	450

	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18
E–4	$160	$160	$160
E–5	350	350	350
E–6	410	425	450
E–7	475	500	500
E–8	475	500	520
E–9	475	520	520

WARRANT OFFICERS

Pay grade	Years of sea duty						
	1 or less	Over 1	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 5	Over 6
W–1	$130	$135	$140	$150	$170	$175	$00
W–2	150	150	150	150	170	260	265
W–3	150	150	150	150	170	270	280
W–4	150	150	150	150	170	290	310
W–5	150	150	150	150	170	290	310

	Over 7	Over 8	Over 9	Over 10	Over 11	Over 12	Over 14
W–1	$250	$270	$300	$325	$325	$340	$360
W–2	265	270	310	340	340	375	400
W–3	285	290	310	350	375	400	425
W–4	310	310	310	350	375	400	450
W–5	310	310	310	350	375	400	450

	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20
W–1	$375	$375	$375
W–2	400	400	400
W–3	425	450	450
W–4	450	500	500
W–5	450	500	500

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Pay grade	Years of sea duty						
	Over 3	Over 4	Over 5	Over 6	Over 7	Over 8	Over 9
O–1	$150	$160	$185	$190	$195	$205	$215
O–2	150	160	185	190	195	205	215
O–3	150	160	185	190	195	205	215
O–4	185	190	200	205	215	220	220
O–5	225	225	225	225	280	245	250
O–6	225	230	230	240	255	265	280
	Over 10	Over 11	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20
O–1	$225	$225	$240	$250	$260	$270	$280
O–2	225	225	240	250	260	270	280
O–3	225	225	240	260	270	280	290
O–4	225	225	240	270	280	290	300
O–5	260	265	265	285	300	315	340
O–6	290	300	310	325	340	355	380

[(c) Under regulations prescribed by the President, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to career sea pay under this section who has served 36 consecutive months of sea duty (other than an enlisted member in a pay grade above E–4 with more than five years of sea duty) is entitled to a career sea pay premium of $100 a month for the thirty-seventh consecutive month and each subsequent consecutive month of sea duty served by such member.**]**

(a) AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL PAY.—A member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is also entitled, while on sea duty, to career sea pay at a monthly rate prescribed by the Secretary concerned, but not to exceed $750 per month.

(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR PREMIUM.—A member of a uniformed service entitled to career sea pay under subsection (a) who has served 36 consecutive months of sea duty is also entitled to a career sea pay premium for the 37th consecutive month and each subsequent consecutive month of sea duty served by the member. The monthly amount of the premium shall be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, but may not exceed $350 per month.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretaries concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Regulations prescribed by the Secretary of a military department shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(d) *DEFINITION OF SEA DUTY.*—(1) In this section, the term "sea duty" means duty performed by a member—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 307. Special pay: special duty assignment pay for enlisted members

(a) An enlisted member who is entitled to basic pay and is performing duties which have been designated under subsection (b) as extremely difficult or as involving an unusual degree of responsibility in a military skill may, in addition to other pay or allowances

to which he is entitled, be paid special duty assignment pay at a monthly rate not to exceed [$275] *$600*. In the case of a member who is serving as a military recruiter and is eligible for special duty assignment pay under this subsection on account of such duty, the Secretary concerned may increase the monthly rate of special duty assignment pay for the member to not more than $375.

* * * * * * *

§ 308. Special pay: reenlistment bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any reenlistment, or voluntary extension of an active-duty reenlistment, in the armed forces entered into after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*.

§ 308a. Special pay: enlistment bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any enlistment or extension of an initial period of active duty in the armed forces made after [December 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001*.

§ 308b. Special pay: reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, reenlists or voluntarily extends his enlistment in a reserve component.

§ 308c. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, enlists in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of an armed force.

* * * * * * *

§ 308d. Special pay: enlisted members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) Additional compensation may not be paid under this section for inactive duty performed after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*.

§ 308e. Special pay: bonus for reserve affiliation agreement

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for a reserve obligation agreement entered into after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

§ 308f. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Army

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) No bonus may be paid under this section with respect to an enlistment in the Army after [December 31, 2000] *September 30, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

§ 308h. Special pay: bonus for reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of enlistment in elements of the Ready Reserve other than the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(g) A bonus may not be paid under this section to any person for a reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of an enlistment after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001.*

§ 308i. Special pay: prior service enlistment bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for an enlistment after [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

§ 309. Special pay: enlistment bonus

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED; BONUS AMOUNT.—A person who enlists in an armed force for a period of at least two years may be paid a bonus in an amount not to exceed $20,000. The bonus may be paid in a single lump sum or in periodic installments.

(b) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) A member of the armed forces who voluntarily, or because of the member's misconduct, does not complete the term of enlistment for which a bonus was paid under this section, or a member who is not technically qualified in the skill for which the bonus was paid, if any (other than a member who is not qualified because of injury, illness, or other impairment not the result of the member's misconduct), shall refund to the United States that percentage of the bonus that the unexpired part of member's enlistment is of the total enlistment period for which the bonus was paid.

(2) An obligation to reimburse the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of an enlistment for which a bonus was paid under this section does not discharge the person receiving the bonus from the debt arising under paragraph (1).

(c) RELATION TO PROHIBITION ON BOUNTIES.—The enlistment bonus authorized by this section is not a bounty for purposes of section 514(a) of title 10.

(d) REGULATIONS.—This section shall be administered under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense and by the Secretary of Transportation for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy.

(e) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any enlistment in the armed forces made before October 1, 2001, or after December 31, 2001.

* * * * * * *

§ 312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active duty

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, execute the required written agreement to remain in active service.

* * * * * * *

§ 312b. Special pay: nuclear career accession bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, have been accepted for training for duty in connection with the supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants.

§ 312c. Special pay: nuclear career annual incentive bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) For the purposes of this section, a "nuclear service year" is any fiscal year beginning before [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*.

* * * * * * *

§ 323. Special pay: retention incentives for members qualified in a critical military skill

(a) RETENTION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—An officer or enlisted member of the armed forces who is serving on active duty and is qualified in a designated critical military skill may be paid a retention bonus as provided in this section if—

(1) in the case of an officer, the member executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for at least one year; or

(2) in the case of an enlisted member, the member reenlists or voluntarily extends the member's enlistment for a period of at least one year.

(b) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL SKILLS.—(1) A designated critical military skill referred to in subsection (a) is a military skill designated as critical by the Secretary of Defense, or by the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

(2) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall notify Congress, in advance, of each military skill to be designated by the Secretary as critical for purposes of this section. The notice shall be submitted at least 90 days before any bonus with regard to that critical skill is offered under subsection (a) and shall include a discussion of the necessity for the bonus, the amount and method of payment of the bonus, and the retention results that the bonus is expected to achieve.

(c) PAYMENT METHODS.—A bonus under this section may be paid in a single lump sum or in periodic installments.

(d) MAXIMUM BONUS AMOUNT.—A member may enter into an agreement under this section, or reenlist or voluntarily extend the member's enlistment, more than once to receive a bonus under this section. However, a member may not receive a total of more than $200,000 in payments under this section.

(e) CERTAIN MEMBERS INELIGIBLE.—A retention bonus may not be provided under subsection (a) to a member of the armed forces who—

(1) has completed more than 25 years of active duty; or

(2) will complete the member's 25th year of active duty before the end of the period of active duty for which the bonus is being offered.

(f) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER INCENTIVES.—A retention bonus paid under this section is in addition to any other pay and allowances to which a member is entitled.

(g) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) If an officer who has entered into a written agreement under subsection (a) fails to complete the total period of active duty specified in the agreement, or an enlisted member who voluntarily or because of misconduct does not complete the term of enlistment for which a bonus was paid under this section, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation with respect to members of the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may require the member to repay the United States, on a pro rata basis and to the extent that the Secretary determines conditions and circumstances warrant, all sums paid under this section.

(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of a written agreement entered into under subsection (a) does not discharge the member from a debt arising under paragraph (2).

(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than February 15 of each year, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) analyzing the effect, during the preceding fiscal year, of the provision of bonuses under this section on the retention of members qualified in the critical military skills for which the bonuses were offered; and

(2) describing the intentions of the Secretary regarding the continued use of the bonus authority during the current and next fiscal years.

(i) TERMINATION OF BONUS AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section with respect to any reenlistment, or voluntary extension of an enlistment, in the armed forces entered into after December 31, 2001, and no agreement under this section may be entered into after that date.

CHAPTER 7—ALLOWANCES

Sec.
401. Definitions.
402. Basic allowance for subsistence.
402a. Supplemental subsistence allowance for low-income members with dependents.

* * * * * * *

411i. Travel and transportation allowances: parking expenses.
435. Funeral honors duty: allowance.
[435] *436.* Per diem allowance for lengthy or numerous deployments.

* * * * * * *

§ 402. Basic allowance for subsistence

(a) * * *

(b) RATES OF ALLOWANCE BASED ON FOOD COSTS.—[(1) The monthly rate of basic allowance for subsistence to be in effect for an enlisted member for a year (beginning on January 1 of that year) shall be the amount that is halfway between the following amounts, which are determined by the Secretary of Agriculture as of October 1 of the preceding year:

[(A) The amount equal to the monthly cost of a moderate-cost food plan for a male in the United States who is between 20 and 50 years of age.

[(B) The amount equal to the monthly cost of a liberal food plan for a male in the United States who is between 20 and 50 years of age.]

(1) The monthly rate of basic allowance for subsistence to be in effect for an enlisted member for a year (beginning on January 1 of that year) shall be equal to the sum of—

(A) the monthly rate of basic allowance for subsistence that was in effect for an enlisted member for the preceding year; plus

(B) the product of the monthly rate under subparagraph (A) and the percentage increase in the monthly cost of a liberal food plan for a male in the United States who is between 20 and 50 years of age over the preceding fiscal year, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture each October 1.

* * * * * * *

§ 402a. Supplemental subsistence allowance for low-income members with dependents

(a) SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary concerned may increase the basic allowance for subsistence to which a member of the armed forces described in subsection (b) is otherwise entitled under section 402 of this title by an amount (in this section referred to as the "supplemental subsistence allowance") designed to remove the member's household from eligibility for benefits under the food stamp program.

(2) The supplemental subsistence allowance may not exceed $500 per month. In establishing the amount of the supplemental subsistence allowance to be paid an eligible member under this paragraph, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount of the basic allowance for housing that the member receives under section 403 of this title or would otherwise receive under such section, in the case of a member who is not entitled to that allowance as a result of assignment to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service.

(3) In the case of a member described in subsection (b) who establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary concerned that the allotment of the member's household under the food stamp program, calculated in the absence of the supplemental subsistence allowance, would exceed the amount established by the Secretary concerned under paragraph (2), the amount of the supplemental subsistence allowance for the member shall be equal to the lesser of the following:

(A) The value of that allotment.

(B) $500.

(b) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—(1) Subject to subsection (d), a member of the armed forces is eligible to receive the supplemental subsistence allowance if the Secretary concerned determines that the member's income, together with the income of the rest of the member's household (if any), is within the highest income standard of eligibility, as then in effect under section 5(c) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(c)) and without regard to paragraph (1) of such section, for participation in the food stamp program.

(2) In determining whether a member meets the eligibility criteria under paragraph (1), the Secretary—

(A) shall not take into consideration the amount of the supplemental subsistence allowance payable under this section; but

(B) shall take into consideration the amount of the basic allowance for housing that the member receives under section 403 of this title or would otherwise receive under such section, in the case of a member who is not entitled to that allowance as a result of assignment to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service.

(c) APPLICATION FOR ALLOWANCE.—To request the supplemental subsistence allowance, a member shall submit an application to the Secretary concerned in such form and containing such information as the Secretary concerned may prescribe. A member applying for the supplemental subsistence allowance shall furnish such evidence regarding the member's satisfaction of the eligibility criteria under subsection (b) as the Secretary concerned may require.

(d) EFFECTIVE PERIOD.—The eligibility of a member to receive the supplemental subsistence allowance terminates upon the occurrence of any of the following events, even though the member continues to meet the eligibility criteria described in subsection (b):

(1) Payment of the supplemental subsistence allowance for 12 consecutive months.

(2) Promotion of the member to a higher grade.

(3) Transfer of the member in a permanent change of station.

(e) REAPPLICATION.—Upon the termination of the effective period of the supplemental subsistence allowance for a member, or in anticipation of the imminent termination of the allowance, a member may reapply for the allowance under subsection (c) if the member continues to meet, or once again meets, the eligibility criteria described in subsection (b).

(f) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than March 1 of each year after 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report specifying the number of members of the armed forces who received, at any time during the preceding year, the supplemental subsistence allowance. In preparing the report, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Secretary of Transportation. No report is required under this subsection after March 1, 2006.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term "Secretary concerned" means the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

(2) The terms "allotment" and "household" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012).

(3) The term "food stamp program" means the program established pursuant to section 4 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2013).

(h) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No supplemental subsistence allowance may be made under this section after September 30, 2006.

§ 403. Basic allowance for housing

(a) * * *

(b) BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall determine the costs of adequate housing in a military housing area in the United States for all members of the uniformed services entitled to a basic allowance for housing in that area. The Secretary shall base the determination upon the costs of adequate housing for civilians with comparable income levels in the same area. *In determining what constitutes adequate housing for members, the Secretary may not differentiate between members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–4.*

[(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the monthly amount of a basic allowance for housing for an area of the United States for a member of a uniformed service is equal to the difference between—

[(A) the monthly cost of adequate housing in that area, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, for members of the

uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member; and

[(B) 15 percent of the national average monthly cost of adequate housing in the United States, as determined by the Secretary, for members of the uniformed services serving in the same pay grade and with the same dependency status as the member.]

[(3) The rates of basic allowance for housing shall be reduced as necessary to comply with this paragraph. The total amount that may be paid for a fiscal year for the basic allowance for housing under this subsection is the product of—

[(A) the total amount authorized to be paid for such allowance for the preceding fiscal year (as adjusted under paragraph (5)); and

[(B) a fraction—

[(i) the numerator of which is the index of the national average monthly cost of housing for June of the preceding fiscal year; and

[(ii) the denominator of which is the index of the national average monthly cost of housing for June of the fiscal year before the preceding fiscal year.]

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing for a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to the allowance in a military housing area in the United States at a rate based upon the costs of adequate housing in the area determined under paragraph (1).

(3) The total amount that may be paid for a fiscal year for the basic allowance for housing under this subsection may not be less than the product of—

(A) the total amount authorized to be paid for such allowance for the preceding fiscal year; and

(B) a fraction—

(i) the numerator of which is the index of the national average monthly cost of housing for June of the preceding fiscal year; and

(ii) the denominator of which is the index of the national average monthly cost of housing for June of the second preceding fiscal year.

* * * * * * *

[(5) In making a determination under paragraph (3) for a fiscal year, the amount authorized to be paid for the preceding fiscal year for the basic allowance for housing shall be adjusted to reflect changes during the year for which the determination is made in the number, grade distribution, geographic distribution in the United States, and dependency status of members of the uniformed services entitled to the allowance from the number of such members during the preceding fiscal year.]

(5) The Secretary shall establish a single monthly rate for members of the uniformed services with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–4 in the same military housing area. The rate shall be consistent with the rates paid to members in pay grades other than pay grades E–1 through E–4 and shall be based on the following:

(A) The average cost of a two-bedroom apartment in that military housing area.

(B) One-half of the difference between the average cost of a two-bedroom townhouse in that area and the amount determined in subparagraph (A).

(6) So long as a member of a uniformed service retains uninterrupted eligibility to receive a basic allowance for housing within an area of the United States, the monthly amount of the allowance for the member may not be reduced as a result of changes in housing costs in the area[, changes in the national average monthly cost of housing,] or the promotion of the member.

* * * * * * *

(f) INELIGIBILITY DURING INITIAL FIELD DUTY OR SEA DUTY.—(1) * * *

(2)(A) * * *

(B) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary may authorize the payment of a basic allowance for housing to a member of a uniformed service without dependents who is serving in pay grade *E–4 or* E–5 and is assigned to sea duty. In prescribing regulations under this subparagraph, the Secretary concerned shall consider the availability of quarters for members serving in pay grade *E–4 or* E–5.

* * * * * * *

(m) MEMBERS PAYING CHILD SUPPORT.—(1) A member of a uniformed service with dependents may not be paid a basic allowance for housing at the with dependents rate solely by reason of the payment of child support by the member if—

(A) * * *

(B) the member is assigned to sea duty, and elects not to occupy assigned quarters for unaccompanied personnel, unless the member is in a pay grade above [E–4] *E–3*.

* * * * * * *

§ 404. Travel and transportation allowances: general

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

(2) In prescribing such conditions and allowances, the Secretaries concerned shall provide that a member who is performing travel under orders away from his designated post of duty and who is authorized a per diem under clause (2) of subsection (d) shall be paid for the meals portion of that per diem in a cash amount at a rate that is not less than the rate established under section 1011(a) of this title for meals sold to members. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to a member on field duty or sea duty (as defined in regulations prescribed under [section 402(e)] *section 403(f)(3)* of this title) or a member of a unit with respect to which the Secretary concerned has determined that unit messing is essential to the accomplishment of the unit's training and readiness.

* * * * * * *

(c)(1) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and as provided in paragraph (2), a member who—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*,

* * * * * * *

(f)(1) * * *

(2)(A) * * *

(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to a member—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(v) who is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*.

* * * * * * *

§ 404a. Travel and transportation allowances: temporary lodging expenses

[(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of a uniformed service who is ordered to make a change of permanent station—

[(1) from any duty station to a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska);

[(2) from a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska) to a duty station outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska; or

[(3) in the case of an enlisted member who is reporting to the member's first permanent duty station, from the member's home of record or initial technical school to that first permanent duty station;

shall be paid or reimbursed for subsistence expenses actually incurred by the member and the member's dependents while occupying temporary quarters incident to that change of permanent station. In the case of a change of permanent station described in paragraph (1) or (3), the period for which such expenses are to be paid or reimbursed may not exceed 10 days. In the case of a change of permanent station described in paragraph (2), the period for which such expenses are to be paid or reimbursed may not exceed five days and such payment or reimbursement may be provided only for expenses incurred before leaving the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska).]

(a) PAYMENT OR REIMBURSEMENT OF SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES.—(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member of a uniformed service who is ordered to make a change of permanent station described in paragraph (2) shall be paid or reimbursed for subsistence expenses of the member and the member's dependents for the period (subject to subsection (c)) for which the member and dependents occupy temporary quarters incident to that change of permanent station.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to the following:

(A) A permanent change of station from any duty station to a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska).

(B) A permanent change of station from a duty station in the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska) to a duty station outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska.

(C) In the case of an enlisted member who is reporting to the member's first permanent duty station, the change from the member's home of record or initial technical school to that first permanent duty station.

(b) PAYMENT IN ADVANCE.—The Secretary concerned may make any payment for subsistence expenses to a member under this section in advance of the member actually incurring the expenses. The amount of an advance payment made to a member shall be computed on the basis of the Secretary's determination of the average number of days that members and their dependents occupy temporary quarters under the circumstances applicable to the member and the member's dependents.

(c) MAXIMUM PAYMENT PERIOD.—(1) In the case of a change of permanent station described in subparagraph (A) or (C) of subsection (a)(2), the period for which subsistence expenses are to be paid or reimbursed under this section may not exceed 10 days.

(2) In the case of a change of permanent station described in subsection (a)(2)(B)—

(A) the period for which such expenses are to be paid or reimbursed under this section may not exceed five days; and

(B) such payment or reimbursement may be provided only for expenses incurred before leaving the United States (other than Hawaii or Alaska).

[(b)**]** *(d) DAILY SUBSISTENCE RATES.*—Regulations prescribed under subsection (a) shall prescribe average daily subsistence rates for purposes of this section for the member and for each dependent. Such rates may not exceed the maximum per diem rates prescribed under section 404(d) of this title for the area where the temporary quarters are located.

[(c)**]** *(e) MAXIMUM DAILY PAYMENT.*—A member may not be paid or reimbursed more that $110 a day under this section.

[§ 405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska

[(a) Without regard to the monetary limitation of this title, the Secretaries concerned may authorize the payment of a per diem, considering all elements of the cost of living to members of the uniformed services under their jurisdiction and their dependents including the cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses, to such a member who is on duty outside of the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska, whether or not he is in a travel status. However, dependents may not be considered in determining the per diem allowance for a member in a travel status.

[(b) Housing cost and allowance may be disregarded in prescribing a station cost of living allowance under this section.**]**

§ 405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska

(a) PER DIEM AUTHORIZED.—Without regard to the monetary limitation of this title, the Secretary concerned may pay a per diem to a member of the uniformed services who is on duty outside of the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska, whether or not the member is in a travel status. The Secretary may pay the per diem in advance of the accrual of the per diem.

(b) DETERMINATION OF PER DIEM.—In determining the per diem to be paid under this section, the Secretary concerned shall consider all elements of the cost of living to members of the uniformed services under the Secretary's jurisdiction and their dependents, including the cost of quarters, subsistence, and other necessary incidental expenses. However, dependents may not be considered in determining the per diem allowance for a member in a travel status.

(c) TREATMENT OF HOUSING COST AND ALLOWANCE.—Housing cost and allowance may be disregarded in prescribing a station cost of living allowance under this section.

§ 406. Travel and transportation allowances: dependents; baggage and household effects

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a member of a uniformed service who is ordered to make a change of permanent station is entitled to transportation in kind, reimbursement therefor, or a monetary allowance in place of the cost of transportation, plus a per diem, for the member's dependents at rates prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, but not more than the rate authorized under section 404(d) of this title. *The Secretary concerned may also reimburse the member for mandatory pet quarantine fees for household pets, but not to exceed $275 per change of station, when the member incurs the fees incident to such change of station.*

(2)(A) * * *

(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to a member—

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

(v) who is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001.*

* * * * * * *

(g)(1) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member who—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) is involuntarily separated from active duty during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*,

* * * * * * *

§ 407. Travel and transportation allowances: dislocation allowance

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE RATES.—(1) The amount of the dislocation allowance to be paid under this section to a member shall be based on the member's pay grade and dependency status at the time the member becomes entitled to the allowance*, except that the Secretary concerned may not differentiate between members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–5* .

(2) The initial rate for the dislocation allowance, for each pay grade and dependency status, shall be equal to the rate in effect for that pay grade and dependency status on December 31, 1997, as adjusted by the average percentage increase in the rates of basic pay for calendar year 1998. Effective on the same date that the monthly rates of basic pay for members are increased for a subsequent calendar year, the Secretary of Defense shall adjust the rates for the dislocation allowance for that calendar year by the percentage equal to the average percentage increase in the rates of basic pay for that calendar year*, except that the Secretary concerned may not differentiate between members with dependents in pay grades E–1 through E–5*.

* * * * * * *

§ 411i. Travel and transportation allowances: parking expenses

(a) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may reimburse a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps described in subsection (b) for expenses incurred by the member in parking a privately owned vehicle being used by the member to commute to the member's place of duty.

(b) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—A member referred to in subsection (a) is a member who is—

(1) assigned to duty as a recruiter for any of the armed forces;

(2) assigned to duty with a military entrance processing facility of the armed forces; or

(3) detailed for instructional and administrative duties at any institution where a unit of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is maintained.

(c) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.—The Secretary of Defense may extend the reimbursement authority provided by subsection (a) to civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose employment responsibilities include performing activities related to the duties specified in subsection (b).

* * * * * * *

§ 414. Personal money allowance

(a) *ALLOWANCE FOR OFFICERS SERVING IN CERTAIN RANKS OR POSITIONS*.—In addition to other pay or allowances authorized by this title, an officer who is entitled to basic pay is entitled to a personal money allowance of—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) *ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS*.—In addition to other pay or allowances authorized by law, an officer who is serving in one of the following positions is entitled to the amount set forth for that position, to be paid annually out of naval appropriations for pay, and to be spent in his discretion for the contingencies of his position—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) ALLOWANCE FOR SENIOR ENLISTED MEMBERS.—In addition to other pay or allowances authorized by this title, a noncommissioned officer is entitled to a personal money allowance of $2,000 a year while serving as 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, or the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard.

* * * * * * *

§ 415. Uniform allowance: officers; initial allowance

(a) Subject to subsection (b), an officer of an armed force is entitled to an initial allowance of not more than **[**$200**]** *$400* as reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

§ 416. Uniform allowance: officers; additional allowances

(a) In addition to the allowance provided by section 415 of this title, a reserve officer of an armed force, an officer of the Army or the Air Force without specification of component, or a regular officer of an armed force appointed under section 2106 or 2107 of title 10 is entitled to not more than **[**$100**]** *$200* as reimbursement for additional uniforms and equipment required on that duty, for each time that the officer enters on active duty for a period of more than 90 days.

* * * * * * *

§ 430. Travel and transportation: dependent children of members stationed overseas

(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service who—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) has a dependent child who is under 23 years of age attending a school in the continental United States **[**for the purpose of obtaining a secondary or undergraduate college education**]** *for the purpose of obtaining a formal education*, may be paid the allowance set forth in subsection (b) if he otherwise qualifies for such allowance.

(b)(1) A member described in subsection (a) may be paid a transportation allowance for each unmarried dependent child, who is

under 23 years of age and is attending a school in the continental United States [for the purpose of obtaining a secondary or undergraduate college education] *for the purpose of obtaining a formal education*, of one annual trip between the school being attended and the member's duty station outside the continental United States and return. The allowance authorized by this section may be transportation in kind or reimbursement therefor, as prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, the transportation authorized by this section may not be paid a member for a child attending a school in the continental United States for the purpose of obtaining a secondary education if the child is eligible to attend a secondary school for dependents that is located at or in the vicinity of the duty station of the member and is operated under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.).

(f) [In this section, the term] *In this section:*

(1) The term "continental United States" means the 48 contiguous States and the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "formal education" means the following:

(A) A secondary education.

(B) An undergraduate college education.

(C) A graduate education pursued on a full-time basis at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)).

(D) Vocational education pursued on a full-time basis at a post-secondary vocational institution (as defined in section 102(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(c))).

* * * * * * *

§ 435. Funeral honors duty: allowance

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(c) FULL COMPENSATION.—Except for expenses reimbursed under subsection (c) of section 12503 of title 10 or subsection (c) of section 115 of title 32, the allowance paid under this section is the only monetary compensation authorized to be paid a member for the performance of funeral honors duty pursuant to such section, regardless of the grade in which the member is serving, and shall constitute payment in full to the member.]

[§ 435.] *§ 436.* Per diem allowance for lengthy or numerous deployments

(a) PER DIEM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall pay a high-deployment per diem allowance to a member of the armed forces under the Secretary's jurisdiction for each day on which the member (1) is deployed, and (2) has, as of that day, been deployed 251 days or more out of the preceding 365 days.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 19—ADMINISTRATION

* * * * * * *

§ 1012. Disbursement and accounting: pay of enlisted members of the National Guard

Amounts appropriated for the pay, under subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 206, section 301(f), [section 402(b)(3)] *section 402(e)*, and section 1002 of this title, of enlisted members of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States for attending regular periods of duty and instruction shall be disbursed and accounted for by the Secretary of Defense. All such disbursements shall be made for 3-month periods for units of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, and on pay rolls prepared and authenticated as prescribed in those regulations.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 503(c) OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

SEC. 503. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES RELATING TO MEMBERS INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department shall exercise the authority provided by section 406 of title 37, United States Code, to provide nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects for a period not longer than one year in the case of individuals who are involuntarily separated during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*.

* * * * * * *

DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION ACT OF 1978

ADMINISTRATION OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION SYSTEM

SEC. 1403. (a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) The Director shall—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) perform such other functions as may be required or delegated by the Secretary of Defense or the [the] Assistant Secretary of Defense designated under subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

SCHOOL SYSTEM FOR DEPENDENTS IN OVERSEAS AREAS

SEC. 1407. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall establish and operate a school system for dependents in overseas areas as part of the defense dependents' education system.

* * * * * * *

(c) CONTINUATION OF ENROLLMENT FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED.—(1) A member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty on September 30, 1990, who is involuntarily separated during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on [September 30, 2001] *December 31, 2001*, and who has a dependent described in paragraph (2) who is enrolled in a school of the defense dependents' education system (or a school for which tuition is provided under subsection (b)) on the date of that separation shall be eligible to enroll or continue the enrollment of that dependent at that school (or another school serving the same community) for the final year of secondary education of that dependent in the same manner as if the member were still on active duty.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 811 OF THE ANTITERRORISM AND EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY ACT OF 1996

SEC. 811. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With funds made available pursuant to subsection (c)—

(1) the Attorney General shall—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(F) increase personnel to support counterterrorism activities; [and]

(2) the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may expand the combined DNA Identification System (CODIS) to include Federal crimes and crimes committed in the District of Columbia[.]*; and*

(3) the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall expand the combined DNA Identification System (CODIS) to include analyses of DNA samples collected from members of the Armed Forces convicted of a qualifying military offense in accordance with section 1563 of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 210304 OF THE VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994

SEC. 210304. INDEX TO FACILITATE LAW ENFORCEMENT EXCHANGE OF DNA IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEX.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation may establish an index of—

(1) DNA identification records of persons convicted of crimes;

(2) analyses of DNA samples recovered from crime scenes;

(3) analyses of DNA samples recovered from unidentified human remains; [and]

(4) analyses of DNA samples voluntarily contributed from relatives of missing persons[.]*; and*

(5) analyses of DNA samples collected from members of the Armed Forces convicted of a qualifying military offense in accordance with section 1563 of title 10, United States Code.

(b) INFORMATION.—The index described in subsection (a) shall include only information on DNA identification records and DNA analyses that are—

(1) * * *

(2) prepared by laboratories, and DNA analysts, that undergo[, at regular intervals of not to exceed 180 days,] *semi-annual* external proficiency testing by a DNA proficiency testing program meeting the standards issued under section 210303; and

* * * * * * *

(d) EXPUNGEMENT OF RECORDS OF MILITARY OFFENDERS.—If the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation receives a notice transmitted under section 1563(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the Director shall promptly expunge from the index described in subsection (a) any DNA analysis furnished under section 1563(d)(1) of such title with respect to the person described in the notice.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

* * * * * * *

SEC. 602. REFORM OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) TRANSITIONAL ENTITLEMENT TO ALLOWANCE.—

(1) ENLISTED MEMBERS.—

(A) TYPES OF ENTITLEMENT.—An enlisted member is entitled to the basic allowance for subsistence, on a daily basis, [of] under one or more of the following circumstances:

(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

SEC. 603. CONSOLIDATION OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS, VARIABLE HOUSING ALLOWANCE, AND OVERSEAS HOUSING ALLOWANCES.

(a) * * *

(b) TRANSITION TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement a plan to incrementally manage the rate of growth of the various components of the basic allowance for housing authorized by section 403 of title 37, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)), during a transition period of not more than [six years] *eight years*. During the transition period, the Secretary may continue to use the authorities provided under sections 403, 403a, 405(b), and 427(a) of title 37, United States Code (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act), but subject to such modifications as the Secretary considers necessary, to provide allowances for members of the uniformed services.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 731. IMPROVEMENTS IN HEALTH CARE COVERAGE AND ACCESS FOR MEMBERS ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN DUTY LOCATIONS FAR FROM SOURCES OF CARE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY FOR MANAGED CARE EXPANSION TO MEMBERS ON ACTIVE DUTY AT CERTAIN REMOTE LOCATIONS.—(1) A member of the [Armed Forces] *uniformed services* described in subsection (c) is entitled to receive care under the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services. In connection with such care, the Secretary of Defense shall waive the obligation of the member to pay a deductible, copayment, or annual fee that would otherwise be applicable under that program for care provided to the members under the program. *A dependent of the member, as described in subparagraph (A), (D), or (I) of section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, who is residing with the member shall have the same entitlement to care and to waiver of charges as the member.*

(2) A member *or dependent of the member, as the case may be,* who is entitled under paragraph (1) to receive health care services under CHAMPUS shall receive such care from a network provider under the TRICARE program if such a provider is available in the service area of the member.

* * * * * * *

(4) The Secretary of Defense shall consult with the other administering Secretaries in the administration of this subsection.

(c) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—A member referred to in subsection (b) is a member of the [Armed Forces] *uniformed services* on active duty who—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) DUTY ASSIGNMENTS COVERED.—A duty assignment referred to in subsection (c)(1) means any of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) Permanent duty as a full-time adviser to a unit of a reserve component of the [Armed Forces] *uniformed services*.

* * * * * * *

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) The terms "uniformed services" and "administering Secretaries" have the meanings given those terms in section 1072 of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 1221. DEFENSE BURDENSHARING.

(a) EFFORTS TO INCREASE ALLIED BURDENSHARING.—The President shall seek to have each nation that has cooperative military relations with the United States (including security agreements, basing arrangements, or mutual participation in multinational military organizations or operations) take one or more of the following actions:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(3) Increase its annual budgetary outlays for foreign assistance (to promote democratization, governmental accountability and transparency, economic stabilization and development, defense economic conversion, respect for the rule of law and internationally recognized human rights, and humanitarian relief efforts)[)] by 10 percent or to provide such foreign assistance at an annual rate that is not less than one percent of its gross domestic product, by September 30, 1999.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

PART B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAY

* * * * * * *

SEC. 614. EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY FOR NURSE ANESTHETISTS TO OTHER NURSING SPECIALTIES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may not implement subsection (b)(2) of section 302e of title 37, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), unless the Secretary submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report—

[(1) justifying the need of the departments for the authority provided in such subsection; and

[(2) describing the manner in which that authority will be implemented.]

* * * * * * *

SEC. 617. RETENTION BONUS FOR OPTOMETRISTS.

(a) * * *

[(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF AMENDMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may not implement subsection (b) of section 302a of title 37, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)), unless the Secretary submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report—

[(1) justifying the need of the military departments for the authority provided in such subsection; and

[(2) describing the manner in which that authority will be implemented.]

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Health Care Services

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. FISCAL YEAR 2000 INCREASE IN MILITARY BASIC PAY AND REFORM OF BASIC PAY RATES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) REFORM OF BASIC PAY RATES.—Effective on July 1, 2000, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS [1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
O–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
O–8	6,594.30	6,810.30	6,953.10	6,993.30	7,171.80
O–7	5,479.50	5,851.80	5,851.80	5,894.40	6,114.60
O–6	4,061.10	4,461.60	4,754.40	4,754.40	4,772.40
O–5	3,248.40	3,813.90	4,077.90	4,127.70	4,291.80
O–4	2,737.80	3,333.90	3,556.20	3,606.00	3,812.40
O–3 [3] ...	2,544.00	2,884.20	3,112.80	3,364.80	3,525.90
O–2 [3] ...	2,218.80	2,527.20	2,910.90	3,009.00	3,071.10
O–1 [3] ...	1,926.30	2,004.90	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
O–10 [2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
O–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
O–8	7,471.50	7,540.80	7,824.60	7,906.20	8,150.10
O–7	6,282.00	6,475.80	6,669.00	6,863.10	7,471.50
O–6	4,976.70	5,004.00	5,004.00	5,169.30	5,791.20
O–5	4,291.80	4,420.80	4,659.30	4,971.90	5,286.00
O–4	3,980.40	4,252.50	4,464.00	4,611.00	4,758.90
O–3 [3] ...	3,702.60	3,850.20	4,040.40	4,139.10	4,139.10
O–2 [3] ...	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10
O–1 [3] ...	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
O–10 [2]	$0.00	$10,655.10	$10,707.60	$10,930.20	$11,318.40
O–9	0.00	9,319.50	9,453.60	9,647.70	9,986.40
O–8	8,503.80	8,830.20	9,048.00	9,048.00	9,048.00
O–7	7,985.40	7,985.40	7,985.40	7,985.40	8,025.60
O–6	6,086.10	6,381.30	6,549.00	6,719.10	7,049.10
O–5	5,436.00	5,583.60	5,751.90	5,751.90	5,751.90
O–4	4,808.70	4,808.70	4,808.70	4,808.70	4,808.70
O–3 [3] ...	4,139.10	4,139.10	4,139.10	4,139.10	4,139.10
O–2 [3] ...	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10	3,071.10
O–1 [3] ...	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10	2,423.10

[1] Notwithstanding the pay rates specified in this table, the actual basic pay for commissioned officers in grades O–7 through O–10 may not exceed the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule and the actual basic pay for all other officers, including warrant officers, may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] Subject to the preceding footnote, while serving as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, basic pay for this grade is calculated to be [$12,441.00] *$12,488.70*, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[3] This table does not apply to commissioned officers in the grade O–1, O–2, or O–3 who have been credited with over 4 years of active duty service as an enlisted member or warrant officer.

* * * * * * *

ENLISTED MEMBERS [1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
E–9 [2] ...	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
E–8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E–7	1,765.80	1,927.80	2,001.00	2,073.00	2,147.70
E–6	1,518.90	1,678.20	1,752.60	1,824.30	1,899.30
E–5	1,332.60	1,494.00	1,566.00	1,640.40	1,714.50
E–4	1,242.90	1,373.10	1,447.20	1,520.10	1,593.90
E–3	1,171.50	1,260.60	1,334.10	1,335.90	1,335.90
E–2	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40
E–1	[3] 1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
E–9 [2] ...	$0.00	$3,015.30	$3,083.40	$3,169.80	$3,271.50
E–8	2,528.40	2,601.60	2,669.70	2,751.60	2,840.10
E–7	2,220.90	2,294.10	2,367.30	2,439.30	2,514.00
E–6	1,973.10	2,047.20	2,118.60	2,191.50	2,244.60
E–5	1,789.50	1,861.50	1,936.20	1,936.20	1,936.20
E–4	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90
E–3	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90
E–2	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40
E–1	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
E–9 [2] ...	$3,373.20	$3,473.40	$3,609.30	$3,744.00	$3,915.90
E–8	2,932.50	3,026.10	3,161.10	3,295.50	3,483.60
E–7	2,588.10	2,660.40	2,787.60	2,926.20	3,134.40
E–6	2,283.30	2,283.30	2,285.70	2,285.70	2,285.70
E–5	1,936.20	1,936.20	1,936.20	1,936.20	1,936.20
E–4	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90	1,593.90
E–3	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90	1,335.90
E–2	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,127.40	1,123.20	1,127.40
E–1	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60	1,005.60

[1] Notwithstanding the pay rates specified in this table, the actual basic pay for enlisted members may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] Subject to the preceding footnote, while serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer 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, basic pay for this grade is [$4,701.00] *$4,719.00*, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[3] In the case of members in the grade E–1 who have served less than 4 months on active duty, basic pay is $930.30.

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Health Care Services

* * * * * * *

SEC. 703. PROVISION OF DOMICILIARY AND CUSTODIAL CARE FOR CERTAIN CHAMPUS BENEFICIARIES.

(a) CONTINUATION OF CARE.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) The Secretary may provide payment for domiciliary or custodial care services provided to an eligible beneficiary for which pay-

ment was discontinued by reason of section 1086(d) of title 10, United States Code, and subsequently reestablished under other legal authority. Such payment is authorized for the period beginning on the date of discontinuation of payment for domiciliary or custodial care services and ending on the date of reestablishment of payment for such services.

* * * * * * *

(e) COST LIMITATION.—The total amount paid for services for eligible beneficiaries under subsection (a) for a fiscal year (together with the costs of administering the authority under that subsection) shall be included in the expenditures limited by section 1079(a)(17)(B) of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 706. HEALTH CARE AT FORMER UNIFORMED SERVICES TREATMENT FACILITIES FOR ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS STATIONED AT CERTAIN REMOTE LOCATIONS.

(a) * * *

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—A member of the [Armed Forces] *uniformed services (as defined in section 1072(1) of title 10, United States Code)* is eligible for health care under subsection (a) if the member is a member described in section 731(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 1811; 10 U.S.C. 1074 note).

* * * * * * *

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Report Requirements and Repeals

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1035. REPORT ON ASSESSMENTS OF READINESS TO EXECUTE THE NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY.

(a) REPORT.—[Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act] *Not later than April 1 each year*, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report in unclassified form assessing the effect of continued operations in the Balkans region on—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—[The] *Each* report under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(d) CONSULTATION.—In preparing [the] *a* report under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the commanders of the unified commands,

the Secretaries of the military departments, and the heads of the combat support agencies and other such entities within the Department of Defense as the Secretary considers necessary.

* * * * * * *

STROM THURMOND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

* * * * * * *

SEC. 503. STREAMLINED SELECTIVE RETENTION PROCESS FOR REGULAR OFFICERS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR DUPLICATIVE BOARD.—Section 1183 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1182(c) of such title is amended by striking out "send the record of *its* proceedings to a board of review convened under section 1183 of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "recommend to the Secretary concerned that the officer not be retained on active duty".

* * * * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 645. RECOVERY, CARE, AND DISPOSITION OF REMAINS OF MEDICALLY RETIRED MEMBER WHO DIES DURING HOSPITALIZATION THAT BEGINS WHILE ON ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE TERMINOLOGY.—Paragraph (1) of such section is amended by striking out ", or [a member] *member* of an armed force without component,".

* * * * * * *

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Health Care Services

SEC. 701. DEPENDENTS' DENTAL PROGRAM.

(a) PREMIUM INCREASE.—*(1)* Section 1076a(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF BENEFITS.—Section 1076a *of such title* is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Health Care Services for Medicare-Eligible Department of Defense Beneficiaries

* * * * * * *

SEC. 722. TRICARE AS SUPPLEMENT TO MEDICARE DEMONSTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary shall commence the demonstration project not later than January 1, 2000, and shall terminate the demonstration project not later than [December 31, 2002] *December 31, 2003*.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 723. IMPLEMENTATION OF REDESIGN OF PHARMACY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than [October 1, 1999] *April 1, 2001*, the Secretary of Defense shall implement, with respect to eligible individuals described in subsection (e) [who reside in an area selected under subsection (f)], the redesign of the pharmacy system under TRICARE (including the mail-order and retail pharmacy benefit under TRICARE) to incorporate "best business practices" of the private sector in providing pharmaceuticals, as developed under the plan described in section 703.

[(b) COLLECTION OF PREMIUMS AND OTHER CHARGES.—The Secretary of Defense may collect from eligible individuals described in subsection (e) who participate in the redesigned pharmacy system any premiums, deductibles, copayments, or other charges that the Secretary would otherwise collect from individuals similar to such individuals.]

(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The same coverage for pharmacy services and the same procedures for cost sharing and reimbursement as are applicable under section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply with respect to the program required by subsection (a).

* * * * * * *

(d) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit two reports on the results of the evaluation under subsection (c), together with the evaluation, to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives. The first report shall be submitted not later than [December 31, 2000] *December 31, 2001*, and the second report shall be submitted not later than [December 31, 2002] *December 31, 2003*.

(e) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—(1) An individual is eligible to participate under this section if the individual is a member or former member of the uniformed services described in section 1074(b) of title 10, United States Code, a dependent of the member described in section 1076(a)(2)(B) or 1076(b) of that title, or a dependent of a member of the uniformed services who died while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, who—

(A) * * *

(B) is entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395c et seq.); *and*

(C) except as provided in paragraph (2), is enrolled in the supplemental medical insurance program under part B of such title XVIII (42 U.S.C. 1395j et seq.)[; and].

[(D) resides in an area selected by the Secretary under subsection (f).]

(2) Paragraph (1)(C) shall not apply in the case of an individual who [at the time of attaining the age of 65 lived within 100 miles of the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility] *before April 1, 2001, has attained the age of 65 and did not enroll in the program described in such paragraph*.

[(f) AREAS OF IMPLEMENTATION.—(1) The Secretary shall carry out the implementation of the redesign of the pharmacy system under TRICARE in two separate areas selected by the Secretary.

[(2) The areas selected by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be as follows:

[(A) One area shall be an area outside the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility in which—

[(i) no eligible organization has a contract in effect under section 1876 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395mm) and no Medicare+Choice organization has a contract in effect under part C of title XVIII of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–21); or

[(ii) the aggregate number of enrollees with an eligible organization with a contract in effect under section 1876 of that Act or with a Medicare+Choice organization with a contract in effect under part C of title XVIII of that Act is less than 2.5 percent of the total number of individuals in the area who are entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of that Act.

[(B) The other area shall be an area outside the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility in which—

[(i) at least one eligible organization has a contract in effect under section 1876 of that Act or one Medicare+Choice organization has a contract in effect under part C of title XVIII of that Act; and

[(ii) the aggregate number of enrollees with an eligible organization with a contract in effect under section 1876 of that Act or with a Medicare+Choice organization with a contract in effect under part C of title XVIII of that Act exceeds 10 percent of the total number of individuals in the area who are entitled to hospital insurance benefits under part A of title XVIII of that Act.]

* * * * * * *

SEC. 724. COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS AND TRICARE PHARMACY REDESIGN.

Not later than March 31, 2003, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report containing a comprehensive comparative analysis of the FEHBP demonstration project conducted under section 1108 of title 10, United States Code (as added by section 721), the TRICARE Senior Supplement under section 722, *the demonstration project conducted under section 1896 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ggg),* and the redesign of the TRICARE pharmacy system under section 723. The comprehensive analysis shall incorporate the findings of the evaluation submitted under section 723(c) and the report submitted under subsection (j) of such section 1108.

* * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

* * * * * * *

SEC. 802. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE UNDER THE PROCUREMENT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 2415 of such title is amended by striking out "Defense Contract [Administrative] *Ad-*

ministration Services" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Defense contract administrative services".

* * * * * * *

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1101. DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY EXPERIMENTAL PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM FOR TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(e) PERIOD OF PROGRAM.—(1) The program authorized under this section shall terminate at the end of the 5-year period referred to in subsection (a).

(2) After the termination of the program—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(C) no period of service may be extended under [subsection (c)(1)] *subsection (c)(2)*.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1896 OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

MEDICARE SUBVENTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR MILITARY RETIREES

SEC. 1896. (a) * * *

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4) DURATION.—The administering Secretaries shall conduct the demonstration project during the [3-year period beginning on January 1, 1998] *period beginning on January 1, 1998, and ending on December 31, 2003*.

* * * * * * *

(6) UTILIZATION REVIEW PROCEDURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop and implement procedures to review utilization of health care services by medicare-eligible military retirees and dependents under this section in order to enable the Secretary of Defense to more effectively manage the use of military medical treatment facilities by such retirees and dependents.

* * * * * * *

(k) EVALUATION AND REPORTS.—

(1) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an evaluation of the demonstration project, and shall submit annual reports on the demonstration project to the administering Secretaries and to

the committees of jurisdiction in the Congress. The first report shall be submitted not later than 12 months after the date on which the demonstration project begins operation, and the final report not later than [3½] *4½* years after that date. The evaluation and reports shall include an assessment, based on the agreement entered into under subsection (b), of the following:

(A) Any savings or costs to the medicare program under this title resulting from the demonstration project.

* * * * * * *

(P) Which interagency funding mechanisms would be most appropriate if the project under this section is made permanent.

(Q) The ability of the Department of Defense to operate an effective and efficient managed care system for medicare beneficiaries.

(R) The ability of the Department of Defense to meet the managed care access and quality of care standards under medicare.

(S) The adequacy of the data systems of the Department of Defense for providing timely, necessary, and accurate information required to properly manage the demonstration project.

SECTION 715 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

SEC. 715. TRAINING IN HEALTH CARE MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION FOR TRICARE LEAD AGENTS.

(a) PROVISION OF TRAINING.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall implement a professional educational program to provide appropriate training in health care management and administration—

(1) to each commander*, deputy commander, and managed care coordinator* of a military medical treatment facility of the Department of Defense *and any other person* who is selected to serve as a lead agent to coordinate the delivery of health care by military and civilian providers under the TRICARE program; and

(2) to appropriate members of the support staff of the treatment facility who will be responsible for daily operation of the TRICARE program.

(b) LIMITATION ON ASSIGNMENT UNTIL COMPLETION OF TRAINING.—No person may be assigned as the commander, deputy commander, or managed care coordinator of a military medical treatment facility or as a TRICARE lead agent or senior member of the staff of a TRICARE lead agent office until the Secretary of the military department concerned submits a certification to the Secretary of Defense that such person has completed the training described in subsection (a).

[(b)] *(c)* REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary

of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the professional educational program implemented pursuant to this section.

SECTION 142 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

SEC. 142. MH–47E/MH–60K HELICOPTER MODIFICATION PROGRAMS.

(a) REQUIRED TESTING.—Notwithstanding the requirements of subsections (a) (2) and (b) of section 2366 of title 10, United States Code, and the requirements of subsection (a) of section 2399 of such title—

(1) operational test and evaluation [and survivability testing] of the MH–60K helicopter under the MH–60K helicopter modification program shall be completed prior to full materiel release of the MH–60K helicopters for operational use; and

(2) operational test and evaluation [and survivability testing] of the MH–47E helicopter under the MH–47E helicopter modification program shall be completed prior to full materiel release of the MH–47E helicopters for operational use.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1994

* * * * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Women in the Service

* * * * * * *

SEC. 542. NOTICE TO CONGRESS OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN COMBAT ASSIGNMENTS TO WHICH FEMALE MEMBERS MAY BE ASSIGNED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Except in a case covered by subsection (b) *or by section 6035 of title 10, United States Code*, whenever the Secretary of Defense proposes to change military personnel policies in order to make available to female members of the Armed Forces assignment to any type of combat unit, class of combat vessel, or type of combat platform that is not open to such assignments, the Secretary shall, not less than 30 days before such change is implemented, transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives notice of the proposed change in personnel policy.

* * * * * * *

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 845. AUTHORITY OF THE DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to carry out projects under subsection (a) shall terminate at the end of [September 30, 1999] *September 30, 2004*.

SECTION 1502 OF THE ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME ACT OF 1991

SEC. 1502. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(7) The term "chief personnel officers" means—

(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(D) the Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower of the Marine Corps.]

(D) the Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps with responsibility for personnel matters.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 403 OF TITLE 36, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 403—CIVIL AIR PATROL

Sec.
40301. Organization.

* * * * * * *

[40303. Membership.]
40303. Membership and governing body.

* * * * * * *

§ 40302. Purposes

The purposes of the corporation are [to—] *as follows:*

(1) *To* provide an organization to—

(A) encourage and aid citizens of the United States in contributing their efforts, services, and resources in developing aviation and in maintaining air supremacy; and

(B) encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare[;].

(2) *To* provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members[;].

(3) *To* encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities[; and].

(4) *To* provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies.

(5) To assist the Department of the Air Force in fulfilling its noncombat programs and missions.

[§ 40303. Membership]

§ 40303. Membership and governing body

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members are as provided in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(b) GOVERNING BODY.—The Civil Air Patrol has a Board of Governors. The composition and responsibilities of the Board of Governors are set forth in section 9447 of title 10.

* * * * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

* * * * * * *

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

* * * * * * *

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

* * * * * * *

SEC. 122. ARLEIGH BURKE CLASS DESTROYER PROGRAM.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) AUTHORITY FOR MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT [OF 18 VESSELS].—The Secretary of the Navy is authorized, pursuant to section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, to enter into multiyear contracts for the procurement of a total of [18 Arleigh Burke class destroyers at a procurement rate of three ships in each of fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003] *Arleigh Burke class* destroyers in accordance with this subsection and subsection (a)(4),

subject to the availability of appropriations for such destroyers. *Vessels authorized under this subsection shall be acquired at a procurement rate of three ships per year in each of fiscal years 1998 through 2001 and up to three ships per year in each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.* A contract for construction of one or more vessels that is entered into in accordance with this subsection shall include a clause that limits the liability of the Government to the contractor for any termination of the contract.

* * * * * * *

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle F—Other Matters

* * * * * * *

SEC. 1065. GEORGE C. MARSHALL EUROPEAN CENTER FOR STRATEGIC SECURITY STUDIES.

[(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FOREIGN GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may, on behalf of the George C. Marshall European Center for Strategic Security Studies (in this section referred to as the "Marshall Center"), accept foreign gifts or donations in order to defray the costs of, or enhance the operation of, the Marshall Center.

[(2) Funds received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be credited to appropriations available for the Department of Defense for the Marshall Center. Funds so credited shall be merged with the appropriations to which credited and shall be available for the Marshall Center for the same purposes and same period as the appropriations with which merged.

[(3) The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress if the total amount of money accepted under paragraph (1) exceeds $2,000,000 in any fiscal year. Any such notice shall list each of the contributors of such amounts and the amount of each contribution in such fiscal year.

[(4) For purposes of this subsection, a foreign gift or donation is a gift or donation of funds, materials (including research materials), property, or services (including lecture services and faculty services) from a foreign government, a foundation or other charitable organization in a foreign country, or an individual in a foreign country.

[(b) MARSHALL CENTER PARTICIPATION BY FOREIGN NATIONS.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may authorize participation by a European or Eurasian nation in Marshall Center programs if the Secretary determines, after consultation with the Secretary of State, that such participation is in the national interest of the United States.

[(2) Not later than January 31 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the names of the foreign nations permitted to participate in programs of the Marshall Center during the preceding year under paragraph (1).

Each such report shall be prepared by the Secretary with the assistance of the Director of the Marshall Center.]

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "Marshall Center Board of Visitors" means the Board of Visitors of the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies

[(c)] *(b)* EXEMPTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF MARSHALL CENTER BOARD OF VISITORS FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—(1) In the case of any person invited to serve without compensation on the Marshall Center Board of Visitors, the Secretary of Defense may waive any requirement for financial disclosure that

---

SECTIONS 305 AND 306 OF H.R. 3425

(As enacted into law by section 1005(a)(5) of P.L. 106–113)

[SEC. 305. Notwithstanding section 3324 of title 31, United States Code, and section 1006(h) of title 37, United States Code, the basic pay and allowances that accrues to members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force for the pay period ending on September 30, 2000, shall be paid, whether by electronic transfer of funds or otherwise, no earlier than October 1, 2000.

[SEC. 306. The pay of any Federal officer or employee that would be payable on September 29, 2000, or September 30, 2000, for the preceding applicable pay period (if not for this section) shall be paid, whether by electronic transfer of funds or otherwise, on October 1, 2000.]

SECTION 1001 OF THE ACT OF NOVEMBER 29, 1999

AN ACT Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

SEC. 1001. PAYGO ADJUSTMENTS. (a) Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report No. 105–217, legislation enacted in this division by reference in the paragraphs after [paragraph 4 of subsection 1000(a)] *paragraph (5) of section 1000(a), and the provisions of titles V, VI, and VII of the legislation enacted in this division by reference in such paragraph (5),* that would have been estimated by the Office of Management and Budget as changing direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 were it included in an Act other than an appropriations Act shall be treated as direct spending or receipts legislation as appropriate, under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, but shall be subject to subsection (b).

* * * * * * *

SECTIONS 8175 AND 8176 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

[SEC. 8175. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense shall make progress payments based on

progress no less than 12 days after receiving a valid billing and the Department of Defense shall make progress payments based on cost no less than 19 days after receiving a valid billing: *Provided,* That this provision shall be effective only with respect to billings received during the last month of the fiscal year.

[SEC. 8176. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Defense shall make adjustments in payment procedures and policies to ensure that payments are made no earlier than one day before the date on which the payments would otherwise be due under any other provision of law: *Provided,* That this provision shall be effective only with respect to invoices received during the last month of the fiscal year.**]**

SECTION 2905 OF THE DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT OF 1990

SEC. 2905. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) * * *

(b) MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4)(A) The Secretary may transfer real property and personal property located at a military installation to be closed or realigned under this part to the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation for purposes of job generation on the installation. *This paragraph also applies to real property at the installation that is initially transferred to another Federal agency as excess property under the authority of this part, but is subsequently determined to be excess to the needs of that agency, if—*

(i) the excess property is adjacent to property that was conveyed to the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation;

(ii) the acreage of the excess property is equal to less than 10 percent of the other acreage conveyed to the redevelopment authority; and

(iii) the property has been screened for further Federal use as provided in section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding subsection (e)(3) of such section.

* * * * * * *

(G) The provisions of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) shall apply to any transfer of real property under this paragraph.

(H)(i) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(G) The provisions of section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) shall apply to any transfer of real property under this paragraph.**]**

* * * * * * *

SECTION 686 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 686. Assignment of members of the armed forces to housing units

(a) * * *

(b) EFFECT OF CERTAIN ASSIGNMENTS ON ENTITLEMENT TO HOUSING ALLOWANCES.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), housing referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered as quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service for purposes of [section 403(b)] *section 403(e)* of title 37.

(2) A member of the armed forces who is assigned in accordance with subsection (a) to a housing unit not owned or leased by the United States shall be entitled to [a basic allowance for quarters under section 403 of title 37, and, if in a high housing cost area, a variable housing allowance under section 403a of that title] *a basic allowance for housing under section 403 of title 37*.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 405 OF THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SEC. 405. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) REFERENCES TO JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT SUBSEQUENT TO REPEAL.—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(6) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993.—

(A) * * *

(B) SECTION 4461.—Section 4461(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (10 U.S.C. 1143 note) is amended by striking "The Job Training Partnership [Act of title] *Act or title*" and inserting "Title".

* * * * * * *

SECTION 224 OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

SEC. 224. COMMUNICATION OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully, having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, instrument, appliance, note, or information involving or incorporating Restricted Data—

a. * * *

b. communicates, transmits, or discloses the same to any individual or person, or attempts or conspires to do any of the foregoing, with reason to believe such data will be utilized to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to any for-

eign nation, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than [$500,000] *$50,000* or imprisonment for not more than ten years, or both.

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * * * *

PART III—EMPLOYEES

* * * * * * *

Subpart B—Employment and Retention

CHAPTER 31—AUTHORITY FOR EMPLOYMENT

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF TEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS ESTABLISHED BY LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER

3161. Temporary organizations established by law or Executive order.

SUBCHAPTER IV—EMPLOYMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF TEMPORARY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ESTABLISHED BY LAW OR EXECUTIVE ORDER

§ 3161. Temporary organizations established by law or Executive order

(a) DEFINITION OF TEMPORARY ORGANIZATION.—For the purposes of this subchapter, the term "temporary organization" means an organization such as a commission, committee, or board that is established by law in the legislative or executive branches, or by Executive order in the executive branch, for a specific period, which shall not exceed 5 years, for the purpose of performing specific projects or studies.

(b) HIRING AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 51, the head of a temporary organization may employ such numbers and types of employees as required to perform the functions required of the temporary organization. Employees may be appointed for a period of 5 years or the life of the temporary organization, whichever is less.

(c) STATUS OF POSITIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.—Positions of employment in a temporary organization are excepted from the competitive service.

(d) COMPENSATION.—(1) The basic pay of an employee of a temporary organization may be set without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 or subchapter III of chapter 53, except that—

(A) basic pay for an executive level position (such as a chairperson, member, or executive or staff director), and, in exceptional cases, for senior staff shall be capped at the maximum rate of basic pay established for the Senior Executive Service under subchapter VIII of chapter 53; and

(B) basic pay for other staff may not exceed the maximum rate of basic pay for GS–15 of the General Schedule.

(2) An employee whose rate of basic pay is set under paragraph (1) shall be entitled to locality-based comparability payments, as provided under section 5304.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—An employee of a temporary organization, whether employed on a full-time or part-time basis, may be entitled to travel and transportation allowances, including per diem allowances, authorized for employees under subchapter I of chapter 57, while traveling away from the regular place of business of the employee in the performance of services for the temporary organization, career-conditional appointment, or the equivalent, who transfers to or converts to an appointment in a temporary organization with the consent of the head of the agency (or the designee of the agency head) in which the employee was serving is entitled to be returned to a position of like seniority, status, and pay (without grade or pay retention) as the former position in the agency from which employed immediately preceding employment with the temporary organization if—

(1) the employee is being separated from the temporary organization for reasons other than misconduct, neglect of duty, or malfeasance; and

(2) the employee applies for return rights not later than 30 days before the end of the employment in the temporary organization, or the termination of the temporary organization, whichever is earlier.

(g) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The head of the temporary organization may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b).

(h) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—(1) The head of a temporary organization may accept volunteer services relating to the duties of the temporary organization without regard to section 1342 of title 31, including service as advisers, experts, members, or in other capacities determined appropriate by the head of the temporary organization. The head of the temporary organization—

(A) shall assure that all persons accepted as volunteers are notified of the scope of the voluntary services accepted;

(B) shall supervise volunteers to the same extent as employees receiving compensation for similar services; and

(C) shall ensure that volunteers have appropriate credentials or are otherwise qualified to perform in the capacities for which they are accepted.

(2) A person providing volunteer services under this subsection shall be considered an employee of the Federal Government for the purposes of chapters 73 and 81, chapter 171 of title 28, chapter 11 of title 18, and part 2635 of title 5 of the Code of Federal regulations.

(i) DETAILEES.—Upon request of the head of the temporary organization, the head of any department or agency of the United States may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, any personnel of the department or agency to the temporary organization to assist in carrying out its duties.

* * * * * * *

CHAPTER 35—RETENTION PREFERENCE, RESTORATION, AND REEMPLOYMENT

* * * * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—RETENTION PREFERENCE

* * * * * * *

§ 3502. Order of retention

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f)(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(5) No authority under paragraph (1) may be exercised after [September 30, 2001] *September 30, 2005*.

* * * * * * *

Subpart C—Employee Performance

CHAPTER 41—TRAINING

* * * * * * *

§ 4107. Restriction on degree training

(a) Except as provided in [subsection (b)] *subsections (b) and (c)* of this section, this chapter does not authorize the selection and assignment of an employee for training, or the payment or reimbursement of the costs of training, for—

(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b)(1) The regulations prescribed under section 4118 of this title shall include provisions under which the head of an agency may provide training, or payment or reimbursement for the costs of any training, not otherwise allowable under [subsection (a)] *subsections (a) or (c)* of this section, if necessary to assist in the recruitment or retention of employees in occupations in which the Government has or anticipates a shortage of qualified personnel, especially in occupations involving critical skills (as defined under such regulations).

* * * * * * *

(c) With respect to an employee of the Department of Defense—

(1) this chapter does not authorize, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the selection and assignment of the employee for training, or the payment or reimbursement of the costs of training, for—

(A) the purpose of providing an opportunity to the employee to obtain an academic degree in order to qualify for appointment to a particular position for which the academic degree is a basic requirement; or

(B) the sole purpose of providing an opportunity to the employee to obtain one or more academic degrees, unless such opportunity is part of a planned, systematic, and co-

ordinated program of professional development endorsed by the Department of Defense; and

(2) any course of post-secondary education delivered through classroom, electronic, or other means shall be administered or conducted by an institution recognized under standards implemented by a national or regional accrediting body, except in a case in which such standards do not exist or would not be appropriate.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 1505 OF THE WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION CONTROL ACT OF 1992

SEC. 1505. INTERNATIONAL NONPROLIFERATION INITIATIVE.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL NONPROLIFERATION ACTIVITIES.—Subject to the limitations and requirements provided in this section, the Secretary of Defense, under the guidance of the President, may provide assistance to support international nonproliferation activities.

* * * * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance under this section terminates at the close of fiscal year [2000] *2001*.

SECTION 1206 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

SEC. 1206. REPORT ON ACCOUNTING FOR UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than [30] *90* days after the date on which a report of the Secretary under subsection (a) is submitted to Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report giving the Comptroller General's assessment of the report and making any recommendations that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXI—ARMY

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(1), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or location	Amount
Alabama	Anniston Army Depot	$3,550,000
* *	* * * *	*
Texas	Fort Bliss	$4,100,000
	Fort Hood	[$32,500,000] *$45,300,000*
* *	* * * *	*
	Total	[$768,781,000] *$781,581,000*

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1998, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of [$2,098,713,000] *$2,111,513,000* as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2101(a), [$609,076,000] *$622,581,000*.

* * * * * * *

SECTION 204 OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS AND BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACT

SEC. 204. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(b) MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.—(1) * * *

* * * * * * *

(4)(A) * * *

* * * * * * *

(E) The Secretary may require any additional terms and conditions in connection with a transfer under this paragraph as such Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States. *This paragraph also applies to real property at the installation that is initially transferred to another Federal agency as excess property under the authority of this title, but is subsequently determined to be excess to the needs of that agency, if—*

(i) the excess property is adjacent to property that was conveyed to the redevelopment authority with respect to the installation;

(ii) the acreage of the excess property is equal to less than 10 percent of the other acreage conveyed to the redevelopment authority; and

(iii) the property has been screened for further Federal use as provided in section 2696 of title 10, United States Code, notwithstanding subsection (e)(2) of such section.

* * * * * * *

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * * * *

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

* * * * * * *

SEC. 2843. AUTHORITY FOR OXNARD HARBOR DISTRICT, PORT HUENEME, CALIFORNIA, TO USE CERTAIN NAVY PROPERTY.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

[(c) RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—The agreement authorized under subsection (a) shall require the District—

[(1) to suspend operations under the agreement in the event Navy contingency operations are conducted at the Center; and

[(2) to use the property covered by the agreement in a manner consistent with Navy operations conducted at the Center.

[(d) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the use of the property covered by the agreement under subsection (a), the District shall pay to the Navy an amount equal to the fair market rental value of the property, as determined by the Secretary taking into consideration the District's use of the property.

[(2) The Secretary may include a provision in the agreement requiring the District—

[(A) to pay the Navy an amount (as determined by the Secretary) to cover the costs of replacing at the Center any facilities vacated by the Navy on account of the agreement or to construct suitable replacement facilities for the Navy; and

[(B) to pay the Navy an amount (as determined by the Secretary) for the costs of relocating Navy operations from the vacated facilities to the replacement facilities.]

(c) RESTRICTIONS ON USE.—The District's use of the property covered by an agreement under subsection (a) is subject to the following conditions:

(1) The District shall suspend operations under the agreement upon notification by the commanding officer of the Center that the property is needed to support mission essential naval vessel support requirements or Navy contingency operations, including combat missions, natural disasters, and humanitarian missions.

(2) The District shall use the property covered by the agreement in a manner consistent with Navy operations at the Center, including cooperating with the Navy for the purpose of assisting the Navy to meet its through-put requirements at the Center for the expeditious movement of military cargo.

(3) The commanding officer of the Center may require the District to remove any of its personal property at the Center that the commanding officer determines may interfere with military operations at the Center. If the District cannot expeditiously remove the property, the commanding officer may provide for the removal of the property at District expense.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the use of the property covered by an agreement under subsection (a), the District shall pay to the Navy an amount that is mutually agreeable to the parties to the agreement, taking into account the nature and extent of the District's use of the property.

The Secretary may accept in-kind consideration under paragraph (1), including consideration in the form of—

(A) the District's maintenance, preservation, improvement, protection, repair, or restoration of all or any portion of the property covered by the agreement;

(B) the construction of new facilities, the modification of existing facilities, or the replacement of facilities vacated by the Navy on account of the agreement; and

(C) covering the cost of relocation of the operations of the Navy from the vacated facilities to the replacement facilities.

(3) All cash consideration received under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established for the Navy under section 2667(d) of title 10, United States Code. The amounts deposited in the special account pursuant to this paragraph shall be available, as provided in appropriation Acts, for general supervision, administration, overhead expenses, and Center operations and for the maintenance preservation, improvement, protection, repair, or restoration of property at the Center.

* * * * * * *

[(f) USE OF PAYMENT.—(1) In such amounts as is provided in advance in appropriation Acts, the Secretary may use amounts paid under subsection (d)(1) to pay for general supervision, administration, and overhead expenses and for improvement, maintenance, repair, construction, or restoration to the port operations area (or to roads and railways serving the area) at the Center.

[(2) In such amounts as is provided in advance in appropriation Acts, the Secretary may use amounts paid under subsection (d)(2) to pay for constructing new facilities, or making modifications to existing facilities, that are necessary to replace facilities vacated by the Navy on account of the agreement under subsection (a) and for relocating operations of the Navy from the vacated facilities to replacement facilities.]

[(g)] *(f)* CONSTRUCTION BY DISTRICT.—The Secretary may authorize the District to demolish existing facilities located on the property covered by the agreement under subsection (a) and, consistent with the restriction specified in subsection (c)(2), construct new facilities on the property for joint use by the District and the Navy.

[(h)] *(g)* ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the agreement authorized under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

* * * * * * *

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 2851. JOINT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTING FOR COMMISSARIES AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY FACILITIES.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(f) EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN LEASED LANDS.—(1) Section 303 of title 49, and section 138 of title 23, United States Code, shall not apply to any approval by the Secretary of Transportation of the use by State Route 241 of parkland within Camp Pendleton that is leased by the State of California, where the lease reserved to the United States the right to establish rights-of-way.

(2) The Agency shall be responsible for the implementation of any measures required by the Secretary of Transportation to mitigate the impact of the Agency's use of parkland within Camp Pendleton for State Route 241. With the exception of those mitigation measures directly related to park functions, the measures shall be located outside the boundaries of Camp Pendleton. The required mitigation measures related to park functions shall be implemented in accordance with the terms of the lease referred to in paragraph (1).

* * * * * * *

SECTION 6 OF THE NATIONAL MARITIME HERITAGE ACT OF 1994

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

(a) * * *

* * * * * * *

(c) DISPOSALS OF VESSELS.—

(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall dispose of all vessels described in paragraph (2)—

(A) by September 30, [2001] *2006*;

(B) in a manner that maximizes the return on the vessels to the United States; [and]

(C) [in accordance with] *subject to subparagraph (D), in accordance with* the plan of the Department of Transportation for disposal of those vessels and requirements under

sections 508 and 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1158, 1160(i))**[.]***; and*

(D) to the maximum extent possible, by scrapping outside of the United States.

* * * * * * *

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to add my voice to those who have taken note of this, Chairman Spence's last markup as chairman of our Committee. I have served in Congress and on the Armed Services Committee since 1983. For all this time, Floyd Spence has been my colleague in Congress and on this committee, and I would be remiss not to note for the record my appreciation for his distinguished service.

Since he was first elected in 1970, and since he served first as a member of the committee and then as Chairman, Floyd Spence has been a tireless advocate for the armed forces. As Chairman, he has always conducted himself with grace, collegiality, and good humor, and has presided over defense authorization bills that have consistently passed with bipartisan support—an all too rare occurrence in Congress over the past several years. I would like to commend our Chairman as we wrap up the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act, and express my admiration for the good work he has done.

The committee's markup of the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act was indeed a bipartisan bill, and I was happy to support it. Nevertheless, I do have concerns with certain elements of the bill, most of which I spoke to during our markup session.

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM

I remain concerned with certain provisions in H.R. 4205 relating to the CTR program. The Chemical Weapons Destruction program request of $35 million is completely eliminated, and use of CTR funds for construction of a fossil fuel energy facility in Russia, a necessary component of the U.S. effort to reduce the production of weapons-usable plutonium, is prohibited.

Progress toward construction of the chemical weapons destruction facility has been slow, and I understand that Russia may not have put forward an effort or funds commensurate with the U.S. level of effort, but the construction of a facility to destroy these dangerous weapons of mass destruction is an important element of our national security strategy. I believe there are better ways to legislate improvements in the chemical weapons de-militarization program than to discontinue funding entirely, and hope that this issue can be addressed in conference with the Senate.

I am also concerned that the committee chose to include a prohibition on the use of CTR funds to construct a fossil fuel plant in Russia. If the United States is to succeed in encouraging Russia to slow its production of weapons-usable plutonium, we must be willing to consider the concomitant need for electricity in Russia's nuclear cities. Their need for electricity is currently met by the nu-

clear reactors whose cores we have previously sought to convert; shutting them down will automatically create a need for new source of energy. For the U.S. to categorically refuse to assist with the construction of the alternative source of energy is counterproductive to our goal of stopping plutonium production.

ARMS CONTROL PROVISIONS

I also have concerns about cuts in funding to the Arms Control Implementation account of the Pentagon, although I appreciate the Committee's willingness to work with me to mitigate the funding limitations that were to be imposed on the Arms Control Implementation programs. I still do not agree with the $11.5 million cut to this important $219 million set of programs, but the most objectionable aspects of the original proposed language—to narrowly target the cuts at specific treaty compliance efforts—has been dropped.

The United States has the responsibility to fully implement all treaties, such as the ABM Treaty and START I. Under the original proposal, funds would have been eliminated from certain START I compliance activities. This could have led to treaty violations. Also, the funds to be deleted from the ABM compliance efforts would have deprived the department of needed resources to be used in conducting studies on ongoing weapon system development programs such as the Airborne Laser. This would needlessly delay these programs and lead to increased costs. While I still support the original budget request for Arms Control Implementation and hope that this full funding level will be agreed to in conference, I think the committee has moved in the right direction in not trying to micro-manage these activities.

AIRBORNE LASER

I appreciate the willingness of Rep. Weldon to address some of my concerns regarding the transfer of the Airborne Laser (ABL) from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO). I had planned to offer an amendment in committee to block the transfer, but given Rep. Weldon's willingness to address some of my concerns and to keep an open mind on the matter, I did not offer the amendment.

The committee believes the transfer will better ensure funding for the ABL program, but I disagree. The BMDO budget is much smaller and less flexible than the Air Force's. Moreover, BMDO has many difficult technical problems to deal with in the next couple of years in developing both a national missile defense and several theater missile defense systems. We are already transferring one challenging program to BMDO, SBIRS-Low. I believe it is unwise to push another program on to BMDO at this time, especially since the ABL deals with a number of very different technologies than the other systems they are presently managing. Let us allow them to remain focused on their core mission.

The Air Force still opposes the transfer. Gen. Michael Ryan, Air Force Chief of Staff, wrote the committee on May 8th, stating that ABL "was born in the Air Force, brought up in the Air Force, and deserves to be fielded by the Air Force." I agree with Gen. Ryan, and although I appreciate Rep. Weldon's good-faith efforts to reach

a compromise, I will continue my efforts to reverse the committee position during the conference on the bill with the Senate.

START I WARHEAD LEVELS

Last year, the committee enacted a provision that prohibits DOD to go below START-I force levels for strategic weapons until START II enters into force. Part of the rationale for this prohibition was to encourage the Russian Duma to ratify START II, which the Duma did this year, eight years after it was negotiated and four years after Senate ratification. Rep. Tom Allen offered an amendment in committee to strike this prohibition and give the DOD flexibility to go below these levels or to have a different mix of forces than the prohibition prescribes. The Allen amendment was permissive in nature and did not mandate reductions. Gen. Henry Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has testified that the Department would like the flexibility to field the most militarily useful and cost-effective force and opposes the prohibition. Unfortunately, the committee rejected the Allen amendment. I believe this is a mistake, and hope the committee will reconsider the issue either on the House floor or in conference with the Senate.

FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM

Although the committee added $4.5 billion to the President's budget request for defense, several requested programs were cut. One of these programs is the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program, ("FUSRAP"). FUSRAP is a program to clean up sites that were contaminated by the Manhattan project and other early atomic energy-related activities by the government. The committee did not authorize FUSRAP, presumably because it does not believe it should be considered a defense activity. As I indicated in a statement in committee, I will keep an open mind on the proper classification of this program. However, simply not authorizing the funding is not the answer. The committee should either work through the Budget Committees to convince the Office of Management and budget to reclassify FUSRAP as a non-defense program, or acknowledge the liability of the U.S. Government for these contaminated sites and authorize their clean up.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 232 of the Chairman's mark is a non-binding "Sense of the Congress" than urges the President to abide by H.R. 4, a bill that states that the policy of the United States is to deploy a limited national missile defense system. I was a co-author of the original House version of this bill, and while I preferred the original version, I supported the final bill as amended by the Senate and signed into law by the President. I consider this "Sense of the Congress" to be unnecessary, as the Administration is following a rational course about deployment and is seeking to modify the ABM Treaty in order to deploy without disrupting our relationship with Russia, but I do not object to it. However, I believe the assertion in this section that "An effective National Missile Defense system is technologically feasible" has yet to be demonstrated.

First, we need to have many more tests of the system currently being developed before we can declare it technologically feasible. Second, this system is to counter a limited strike. It will not be able to defend against a large strike or even the unauthorized launch of a boatload of Russian SSBN's. To say an effective national missile defense system is technologically feasible without any qualification is plainly inaccurate.

JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

Thank you Mr. Chairman for producing a bill that is fair and attempts to balance the military's many legitimate needs with the limited funds under the jurisdiction of this committee. I especially appreciate the efforts of this committee to address health-care issues facing both our active duty and retired veterans. The ramifications of not having quality, accessible and affordable health care are far reaching. In these days of economic prosperity, sustaining an all-voluntary military force is challenging. Add to that a disgruntled population of retired veterans, who have been an important recruitment vehicle in the past, and sustaining appropriate levels of manning becomes nearly impossible. Your willingness to address these difficult issues, in spite of the enormous costs associated with these problems, stands as a testament to all veterans, that this committee takes seriously veterans concerns, and recognizes the role they continue to play in their service to this country.

I applaud the leadership you have provided as this committee determines what our future armed forces should look like. Modernization is difficult when the only question is replacing old equipment with similar new equipment. However, advances in technology and manufacturing cause everyone in defense to revisit how we perform R&D and procurement in a manner that keeps pace with advances in technology. As always, we must provide our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines with modern equipment, ensuring that they continue to succeed on today's battlefield.

I fully support the objectives and provisions of this bill. However, I remain concerned about the military abortion issue. Last year, I introduced an amendment that corrects the disparity that exists concerning access to abortion in cases of pregnancy resulting from rape or incest. Currently, women in the military, both service members and dependents, assigned overseas are not being afforded the same access to medical treatment as we provide in other federal programs. These military women should have the same medical treatment options that are available to women who reside in the United States and in fact, receive fewer health benefits than their male colleagues. This amendment which prevailed at subcommittee during consideration of the FY00 Defense Bill, remained in the bill through full committee and floor consideration. It was dropped, regrettably during the House-Senate conference. I chose not to offer this amendment again this year because there is no reason to think the issue would be resolved differently—neither of the committees has changed since last May. If we are serious about closing the gender gap that exists in the service, this is one of the many issues we will have to resolve.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON H.R. 4205, THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONVEYANCE FOR NON-BRAC FACILITIES

Although the bill as a whole is strong, I would like to call attention to an important measure not included in this bill. This year, I requested that this Committee establish fair procedures for communities that, because of accidents of history, have lost military installations and now cannot take advantage of a new Department of Defense economic development program. Statutory language I proposed to the Committee would allow no cost economic development conveyances for military installations closed outside Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) processes, such as the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant (INAAP), a facility in my district.

Last year, Congress gave BRAC communities a real boost by allowing them to renegotiate special economic development conveyances (EDCs). I believe it is only fair to extend that same consideration to other facilities and their home communities. All communities deserve this opportunity.

We all know losing a military installation can hurt the economy of a community. All communities that lose military installations should be able to reclaim the closed property at minimal expense and use it to create jobs and industry.

In April of last year, the Clinton Administration requested that Congress pass legislation authorizing the Department of Defense to provide no cost EDCs to communities with BRAC installations. There was an important condition attached. The communities have to use their closed bases for economic development and job creation.

Although this Committee did not include the proposal in its Defense Authorization bill, the Senate did. The EDC language remained in the Conference report and passed the Congress in the FY 2000 National Defense Authorization Act. The President subsequently signed it into law. Section 2821(a) of the Act allows no cost conveyance at installations closed or realigned under the base closure laws by amending the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.

Communities are taking advantage of this opportunity. Kelly Air Force Base is a BRAC facility near San Antonio, Texas. It is scheduled to close next year. In March, Secretary Cohen visited Kelly Air Force Base to announce the government had forgiven a debt of $103 million owed by the Greater Kelly Development Authority. That action freed up millions of dollars the community can now use to rebuild the industry lost when the base was ordered closed.

There are non-BRAC installations that close and are conveyed using procedures similar to those allowed for the conveyance of Kelly Air Force Base. These old installations hold the same poten-

tial for economic development and job creation—and the same challenges. Reduced activity at these places has a profound effect on local economies, but last year's legislation does not help non-BRAC installations.

I have such a site in my district, the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant. Although there are 80 rent-paying tenants at INAAP, it is not yet a profitable venture.

Section 2843 of Public Law 105–261, the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act of 1999, provides for conveyance of 4,660 acres of the INAPP to a reuse authority.

This closure and the conveyance are outside of Base Realignment and Closure procedures. Although my predecessor originally pursued no cost conveyance, the language of the legislation calls on the reuse authority to pay, in one lump sum, "fair market value" for the 4,660 acre parcel at INAAP at the end of a 10-year period.

A no cost conveyance for INAAP would free up much needed funds to help the reuse authority in Clark County push ahead with economic development and make the facility more attractive to private industry.

This is one example, but I did not propose this language specifically for my district. Facilities like the Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant in Chattanooga, Tennessee fall into the same category. I want all former military communities to be able to benefit from the fair deal we have already given BRAC communities.

This is a good bill. It strengthens our national defense in numerous, important ways. It boosts benefits for our fighting men and women. But I urge the Committee to help create opportunities for communities that, because of accidents of history, lost military installations but can't take advantage of common sense legislation Congress has already passed. It is nothing more than a simple matter of fairness.

BARON P. HILL.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES JOSEPH R. PITTS AND JOHN M. SPRATT, JR.

ELECTRONIC WARFARE

Electronic warfare (EW) played a key role in the success of Operation Allied Force last year. U.S. jamming aircraft, most notably the Navy's EA–6B Prowler, provided continuous protection of all alliance aircraft penetrating Yugoslav airspace. As a result, only two aircraft were lost in 12,000 sorties, and the sole U.S. loss was directly attributable to lack of EW coverage.

U.S. military supremacy in the twenty-first century promises to be even more dependent upon control of the electromagnetic spectrum than it was in the closing decades of the last century. The Kosovo operation made clear that America's EW aircraft are a low-density/high-demand asset in need of significant enhancements if they are to meet the demand of a new century. Unfortunately, EW requirements have not received focused attention in the Armed Services or the Congress. With this in mind, we formed the EW Working Group last year to encourage awareness of and support for EW capabilities. We have worked and consulted with the Services, Members of Congress, and the defense industry to advance the EW mission and identify key requirements.

We are very pleased that the FY 2001 National Defense Authorization Act contains funding for several important EW priorities, specifically the $23 million in upgrades for the EA–6B Prowler. The procurement of 124 AN/ASW–41 automatic flight control systems will provide automatic speed, attitude, and altitude control capabilities for the Prowler, which will increase mission capability, improve reliability, and reduce maintenance. The Prowler fleet is overcommitted and aging fast, and maintenance is frequently deferred. The Defense Authorization bill will go a long way in restoring our Prowler fleet so that adequate EW airborne jamming support can be provided to our Armed Forces aircraft.

We thank Chairman Spence for his leadership and the Members of the Armed Service Committee for their support for EW assets and capabilities in the Authorization bill. We look forward to working with Members of the Committee in the future to assure that America's EW edge is preserved.

JOSEPH R. PITTS.
JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVES UNDERWOOD, ABERCROMBIE, ORTIZ, ALLEN AND REYES

We are disappointed that the Committee was not able to do more in terms of reviewing the Department of Defense's over reliance on outsourcing, privatization and commercial activities studies. By 2005, the Department of Defense (DoD) expects to compete more than 200,000 jobs with savings pegged at approximately $11.2 billion. These estimates are sheer mathematical conjuring. The Pentagon has long assumed these savings. Indeed the individual services often do not even account for the *cost* of performing the study, which in most cases comes from the O & M accounts. These costs can include the paying of the cost-comparison study itself as well as associated costs for voluntary separation incentive pay, early retirement benefits, and general reductions in forces (RiFs).

The zeal with which the DoD employs to invent savings has evolved into the mythical search for the holy grail. The DoD has invested heavily, both in manpower and funding, in order to implement outsourcing endeavors and conduct public/private competitions, but these efforts may never realize the anticipated savings.

In the coming weeks, the DoD will be announcing their intentions to employ other means to convert work from the public sector to the private sector. In an all but blessed initiative, the DoD has been encouraging the military to look at alternatives to the traditional A–76 competitions, known as strategic sourcing. By their own admissions, the DoD has utilized the A–76 process in lieu of base closure authority to reap fiscal savings. While their arguments may raise some interesting concerns, their premise is completely wrong.

No doubt, the DoD has been hamstrung by declining budgets and increased operational demands. Indeed we appreciate the challenging fiscal position that the DoD must contend with. Nevertheless, it seems ill conceived to purely exploit savings from the hides of the civil service workforce.

The Department has been fostering the notion that they are earnestly devising better methods to perform tasks—the so-called performance-based and results-based assessments. In reality though, there is no accurate means to account for the type of savings that can be reaped from the re-engineering of work tasks. This means that the only verifiable method that the DoD can employ to immediately show savings, is to contract out hundreds of positions. Systemically, this may be creating a serious problem; the military, it seems, is risking short term savings at the expense of long term readiness.

We are not opposed to savings or efficiency. In many instances we recognize the colossal waste in the Pentagon as well as opportunities to improve the methods of operating and maintaining our infrastructure. However, what we are opposed to is when readiness

and strategic forethought take a back seat to fiscal aggressiveness. We need to think hard when many of the military's rising stars earn Meritorious Service Medals or Legion of Merits because they were able to save $300 million by laying off a thousand employees.

It is important to remember that the first duty of the military is to plan, prepare, fight and win our nation's wars. The military is not a business and thus will not always have a balanced spreadsheet. The Department's accountants cannot place a dollar figure on readiness. That is a political and strategic decision that both the Congress and the President must make. We hope that a more prudent and fiscally viable approach to this intractable problem can be brokered out before the Department's civilian workforce readiness erodes any further.

ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.
SILVESTRE REYES.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ.
THOMAS H. ALLEN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We regret the Committee's failure to repeal the statutory prohibition on abortions in overseas military hospitals. If enacted, women stationed overseas would be permitted to use their own funds to obtain abortion services. No federal funds would have been used and health care professionals who are opposed to performing abortions as a matter of conscience or moral principle would not be required to do so.

This is an issue of fundamental fairness. Servicewomen and military dependents stationed abroad do not expect special treatment, only the right to receive the same legally protected medical services that women in the United States receive. We had the opportunity to finally put a stop to the misguided law that has endangered our servicewomen's lives for far too long.

The Department of Defense, American Public Health Association, the American Medical Women's Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America have all indicated their support for the amendment.

If we are to attract the best and brightest of our nation's young people to our Armed Forces we must act to restore this fundamental right. We cannot expect to attain our readiness and recruitment goals when potential soldiers know they will not have the same right to access to health care when they are stationed overseas.

It is our responsibility to restore the right of freedom of choice to women serving overseas in our nation's Armed Forces. Members of the military and their families already give up many freedoms and risk their lives to defend our country. They should not have to sacrifice their privacy, their health or their basic constitutional rights because of a policy with no valid military purpose.

LORETTA SANCHEZ.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
LANE EVANS.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.
THOMAS H. ALLEN.
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER.
MIKE THOMPSON.
ADAM SMITH.
ROBERT E. ANDREWS.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

VIEQUES, PUERTO RICO

In accordance with the Presidential Directives concerning Vieques, Puerto Rico, federal and local law enforcement officers recently removed the peaceful civil demonstrators who had been blocking the Navy's access to the bombing range in Vieques.

As a result of this removal, the Navy has regained control and access to the range. In fact, the U.S. Navy warplanes resumed training on the Atlantic Fleet bombing range in Vieques using air-to-ground inert ordnance.

We are disappointed that the Committee has amended this sensible framework that could disrupt the process already underway, and further polarize all parties involved. The directives ensure the safety of the disfranchised U.S. citizens of Vieques and provide a sensible framework that allows the Navy to continue its training operations.

The year-long peaceful civil disobedience on Vieques evidences the turbulent history between the Navy and the U.S. citizens of Vieques, as well as the overwhelming sentiments of frustration, self worth and neglect by the American citizens of Puerto Rico.

Now that the two parties involved have come to agreement, it is this Committee's responsibility to implement the Presidential Directives. The directives offer the most effective resolution to the Vieques ordeal. Namely to respond to the needs and concerns of the American citizens who live in Vieques while meeting vital National security needs.

The President, the Navy and the Governor of Puerto Rico have all stood by the Presidential Directives. It is now up to the House Armed Services Committee and Congress to guarantee further fulfillment of the Presidential Directives.

Very truly yours,

LORETTA SANCHEZ.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
IKE SKELTON.
ROBERT UNDERWOOD.
ROBERT A. BRADY.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.

○