AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 402

104TH CONGRESS *2d Session*	SENATE	REPORT 104–267

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1745]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 13, 1996.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

Calendar No. 402

104TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT 104–267

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

REPORT

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1745]

ON

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR FOR THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MAY 13, 1996.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
24–426 WASHINGTON : 1996

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(104th Congress, 2d Session)

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina, *Chairman*

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
DAN COATS, Indiana
BOB SMITH, New Hampshire
DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Idaho
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
RICK SANTORUM, Pennsylvania

SAM NUNN, Georgia
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
JOHN GLENN, Ohio
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
CHARLES S. ROBB, Virginia
JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, Connecticut
RICHARD H. BRYAN, Nevada

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

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the bill	1
Committee overview and recommendations	2
Explanation of funding summary	4

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Title I—Procurement	11
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	12
Section 107. Chemical demilitarization program	12
Chemical Demilitarization Program	12
Subtitle B—Army Programs	13
Section 112. Army assistance for chemical demilitarization citizens advisory commissions.	24
Other Army Programs	24
Army aircraft	24
C–XX medium range aircraft	24
AH–64 Apache modifications	24
CH–47 modifications	24
AH–64D attack helicopter	25
OH–58D Kiowa Warrior	25
Aircraft survivability equipment	25
Army missile	25
Javelin medium anti-tank weapon	25
Multiple Launch Rocket System rocket	26
Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) launcher	26
Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)	26
Patriot modifications	27
Stinger missile modifications	27
Avenger modifications	27
TOW modifications	27
Dragon missile	28
Weapons and tracked combat vehicles	28
Bradley fighting vehicle	28
Field artillery ammunition support vehicle (FAASV)	28
Carrier modifications (M113)	28
M109A6 Paladin	29
Field artillery ammunition supply vehicle (FAASV) product improvement program (PIP) to fleet	29
Improved Recovery Vehicle	29
M1 Abrams tank (modifications)	29
Small arms programs	30
Army ammunition	30
Procurement of ammunition—Army	30
Armament retooling and manufacturing support (ARMS)	31
Other army procurement	31
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)	31
Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles (FMTV)	31
Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV)	32
Enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS)	32
SINCGARS family	32
Army communications	32
All source analysis system (ASAS)	33
Forward area air defense (FAAD) ground based sensor	33
Night vision devices	33
Advanced field artillery tactical data system (AFATDS)	34
Total distribution system	34

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Army Programs—Continued
Other army procurement—Continued
Standard integrated command post system 34
Inland petroleum distribution system 34
Construction equipment, items less than $2.0 million 35
Base level communications equipment 35
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 36
Section 121. EA–6B aircraft reactive jammer program 53
Section 122. Penguin missile program 55
Section 123. Nuclear attack submarine programs 56
Section 124. Arleigh Burke class destroyer program 57
Other Navy Programs 59
Navy aircraft 59
AV–8B remanufacture 59
F/A–18C/D 59
MV–22 59
Flight simulators 60
Restoration of E–2C procurement 60
Airborne self-protection jammer (ASPJ) 60
Helicopter crash attenuating seats 61
Vertical replenishment helicopter replacement program 61
P–3 intelligence support 61
P–3C anti-surface warfare improvement program 62
Navy weapons 63
Tomahawk land attack missile 63
Standard missile procurement 64
Navy and Marine Corps ammunition 64
Procurement of ammunition—Marine Corps 64
Navy shipbuilding and conversion 64
Seawolf submarine 64
LPD–17 class amphibious ships 65
Oceanographic survey ship 66
SWATH oceanographic research ship 66
Other Navy procurement 66
WSN–7 inertial navigation system 66
Mine warfare 67
AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar 68
Surface ship torpedo defense 68
Shipboard integrated communications system 69
Challenge Athena 69
Global broadcast 70
Rolling air frame missile launcher for LSD–52 71
Afloat planning system 71
NULKA decoy development 72
Elevated causeway (modular) 72
Oceanographic equipment 73
Marine Corps Procurement 73
Marine Corps Javelin missile 73
AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radar 73
Joint task force deployable communications support 74
Intelligence upgrades 74
Telecommunications infrastructure 74
Marine Corps combat operations centers 75
Marine Corps common end user computer equipment 75
Mobility enhancements 75
Multiple integrated laser engagement system 75
Combat vehicle appended trainer (CVAT) 76
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 77
Section 131. Multiyear contracting authority for the C–17 aircraft program 88
Other Air Force Programs 88
Air Force aircraft 88
B–2 88
F–16 88
C–17 airlift aircraft 89
WC–130J acquisition 89
Joint primary aircraft training system (JPATS) 90

Page

Title I—Procurement—Continued
Other Air Force Programs—Continued
Air Force aircraft—Continued
Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) 91
B–1B bomb modules 91
SR–71 91
AWACS re-engining 92
Satellite communications terminals 92
RC–135 re-engining 92
Rivet Joint technology transfer 92
KC–135 simulators 93
Aircraft budget exhibits 93
Air Force missile 93
Precision guided munitions 93
Space boosters 94
Air Force ammunition 94
Procurement of ammunition—Air Force 94
Other Air Force procurement 95
60K Loader 95
Joint force air component commander situational awareness system 95
Defense-Wide Programs 96
Defense-wide 101
Common automatic recovery system 101
C–130 aircraft modifications 101
Advanced SEAL delivery system 101
Special mission radio system 102
SCAMPI communications system 102
Briefcase multi-mission advanced tactical terminal 102
Procurement of ammunition—Special Operations 102
Other items of interest 103
Individual body armor 103
Procurement of recycled ammunition 103
C–130 remanufacture prototyping 104
Predator UAV leasing 104
National Guard and Reserve procurement reports 105
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 107
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 111
Section 203. Defense nuclear agency 111
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 113
Section 211. Space launch modernization 113
Section 212. Department of Defense Space Architect 113
Section 213. Space-based infrared system program 113
Section 214. Research for advanced submarine technology 114
Section 215. Clementine 2 micro-satellite development program 115
Section 217. (Includes Sections 216 and 217) Defense airborne reconnaissance program 115
Section 218. Cost analysis of F–22 aircraft program 118
Section 219. F–22 aircraft program 119
Section 220. Nonlethal weapons and technologies programs 120
Section 221. Counterproliferation support program 122
Section 222. Federally funded research and development centers and university-affiliated research centers 125
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense 125
Section 231. United States compliance policy regarding development, testing, and deployment of theater missile defense systems 125
Section 232. Prohibition on use of funds to implement an international agreement concerning theater missile defense systems 127
Section 233. Conversion of ABM Treaty to multilateral treaty 127
Section 234. Funding for upper tier theater missile defense systems 127
Section 235. Elimination of requirements for certain items to be included in the annual report on the ballistic missile defense program 128
Subtitle D—Other Matters 128
Section 241. Live-fire survivability testing of F–22 aircraft 128
Section 242. Live-fire survivability testing of V–22 aircraft 128
Subtitle E—National Oceanographic Partnership 128
Section 252. Matters relating to oceanographic partnership 128

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters 131
Army 131
Basic research programs 137
High modulus polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber 137
Hardened materials 137
Liquid propellant technology 137
Military engineering technology 138
Wave net technology 138
Nautilus/Tactical High Energy Laser Program 138
Missile and rocket advanced technology 138
Land mine detection technologies 139
Battle Integration Center 139
Next tank research and development 139
Night vision systems advanced development 140
Combat service support control system (CSSC) 140
Comanche helicopter 140
Javelin medium anti-tank weapon 141
Heavy assault bridge 141
Air defense command, control, & intelligence (C2I) 141
Brilliant Anti-armor Technology (BAT) submunition 142
Longbow development/night vision systems 142
High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility 142
Combat vehicle improvement program 143
Improved Cargo Helicopter 143
Force XXI digitization 143
Air Defense Alerting Device (ADAD) 144
Missile/air defense product improvement program 144
Other missile product improvement programs 144
Force XXI initiatives 145
Navy 146
Continuous wave superconducting radio frequency free electron laser 152
Power electronic building blocks 152
Materials, electronics and computer technology 152
Undersea weapons technology 152
Navy affordability initiative 153
Project M 153
Environmentally compliant torpedo fuel 153
Integrated combat weapons system 154
Research for advanced submarine technology 154
Submarine towed array processing software 157
Aircraft carrier research and development 157
Navy surface combatant 158
Intercooled recuperated gas turbine engine 158
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle 159
Lightweight 155MM howitzer program 159
“Smart Base” technology demonstration 159
Cooperative engagement capability 160
Naval surface fire support 160
Strike missile evaluation 161
Light airborne multi-purpose system helicopter program 162
Joint maritime command information system/Navy tactical command system-afloat 162
Smart Ship initiative 163
Arsenal Ship 163
AQS–20 airborne minehunting sonar 165
Airborne mine detection systems 165
Multi-purpose processor 167
Seawolf shock test 167
Infrared search and track 168
Evolved sea sparrow missile 168
Quick reaction combat capability 168
Fixed distributed system-1 169
RDT&E science and technology management 169
Sea Dragon initiative 169
Nuclear powered ballistic missile submarine security 169
Joint tactical combat training system 170

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation—Continued
Additional Matters—Continued
Navy —Continued
CINCs" technology initiative 170
Medium tactical vehicle remanufacturing 170
GEOSAT follow-on 170
Manufacturing technology (MANTECH) 171
Acquisition center of excellence 172
Air Force 173
Carbon/carbon nosetips 179
Ejection seat development 179
Thermally stable jet fuels 179
High frequency active auroral research program 180
Airborne laser program 180
National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System 180
Joint Advanced Strike Technology Program 181
Hardened and deeply buried target technology demonstration 181
B–1 bomber virtual umbilical device 181
B–1B upgrades 181
Variable Stability In-Flight Simulator Test Aircraft (VISTA) 182
Milstar automated communication management system 182
Global Positioning System 182
Minuteman third stage upgrade 182
Minuteman safety enhanced reentry vehicle 183
Rocket System Launch Program 183
Data links 183
Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS) 184
Blade repair program 184
Defense-Wide 185
Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research (DEPSCoR) 190
Small low-cost interceptor device 190
Hard carbon-based coatings 190
High temperature superconductivity 190
Diamond substrates 191
Joint Department of Defense-Department of Energy munitions 191
Cruise missile defense funding 191
Large millimeter wave telescope 192
Crown royal 193
Thermophotovoltaics 193
Generic logistics R&D technology demonstrations 193
Rapid acquisition of manufactured parts (RAMP) 193
Integrated weapons system database 193
High performance computing modernization 194
Defense dual-use applications program 194
Non-acoustic antisubmarine warfare 195
Fuel cells 196
Commercial technology insertion program 196
Ballistic missile defense funding and programmatic guidance 196
Data review and analysis monitoring aid 203
Advanced SEAL delivery system 203
M4A1 Carbine INOD, Special Operations Command 204
AC–130 aircraft enhancements, Special Operations Command 204
Other Items of Interest 204
Battle group airborne anti-submarine warfare 204
FFG–7 modernization 205
Integrated ship control systems 205
CV–22 207
Parametric airborne dipping sonar 208
National automotive center 208
National Solar Observatory 209
United States-Japan management training 209
Totally integrated munitions enterprise (TIME) 209
Strategic deterrent development capability 210
Post-boost propulsion for strategic delivery systems 210
Chemical-biological defense program 210
Title III—Operation and Maintenance 215

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 245
Section 304. Transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund 245
Section 305. Civil Air Patrol 245
Section 306. SR–71 contingency reconnaissance force 245
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 245
Section 311. Funding for second and third maritime prepositioning ships out of National Defense Sealift Fund 249
Section 312. National Defense Sealift Fund 249
Section 313. Nonlethal weapons capabilities 249
Section 314. Restriction on Coast Guard funding 249
Subtitle C—Depot-Level Activities 249
(Sections 321–330—Department of Defense depot maintenance and repair services) 249
Subtitle D—Environmental Provisions 254
Section 341. Establishment of separate environmental restoration transfer accounts for each military department 254
Section 342. Defense contractors covered by requirement for reports on contractor reimbursement costs for response actions 254
Section 343. Repeal of redundant notification and consultation requirements regarding remedial investigations and feasibility studies at certain installations to be closed under the base closure laws 255
Section 344. Payment of certain stipulated civil penalties 255
Section 345. Authority to withhold listing of Federal facilities on National Priorities List 256
Section 346. Authority to transfer contaminated Federal property before completion of required remedial actions 257
Section 347. Clarification of meaning of uncontaminated property for purposes of transfer by the United States 258
Section 348. Shipboard solid waste control 258
Section 349. Cooperative agreements for the management of cultural resources on military installations 260
Section 350. Report on withdrawal of public lands at El Centro Naval Air Facility, California 260
Section 351. Use of hunting and fishing permit fees collected at closed military reservations 260
Subtitle E—Other Matters 260
Section 361. Firefighting and security-guard functions at facilities leased by the Government 260
Section 362. Authorized use of recruiting funds 261
Section 363. Noncompetitive procurement of brand-name commercial items for resale in commissary stores 261
Section 364. Administration of midshipmen's store and other Naval Academy support activities as nonappropriated fund instrumentalities 261
Section 365. Assistance to committees involved in inauguration of the President 261
Section 366. Department of Defense support for sporting events 262
Section 367. Renovation of building for Defense Finance and Accounting Service Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana 262
Additional Matters of Interest 263
Army 263
Army strategic mobility 263
Ammunition management 263
End Item Materiel Management Program 263
Power Projection C4I 264
Navy 264
Intermediate maintenance 264
Ship depot maintenance 264
Active and reserve component P–3 squadrons 264
Marine Corps 265
Personnel support equipment 265
Corrosion prevention and control 265
Ammunition rework 265
Joint task force headquarters deployable communications support 265

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Additional Matters of Interest—Continued
Marine Corps—Continued
Commandant's warfighting laboratory 266
Air Force 266
AWACS Extend Sentry 266
Air Force depot maintenance 266
Defense-Wide 266
Homeless support initiative 266
Federal Energy Management Program 267
Office of the Secretary of Defense 267
Civilian personnel levels 267
Real property maintenance 267
Operation and maintenance, Special Operations Command 268
Other items of interest 268
United States Army marksmanship units 268
Quality of Life and the Military Traffic Management Command's Re-engineering Personal Property Initiative Pilot Program 269
Aquifer study at Fallon Naval Air Station 270
Exclusion of uncontaminated parcels from the national priorities list 270
Kaho'olawe cleanup 271
Proposed reduction of the current permissible exposure level for manganese 271
Defense Commissary Agency designation as a Performance Based Organization 272
Electronic warfare squadrons 272
Revolving funds 273
Reliability, Maintainability and Sustainability Program (RM&S) 273
Advance billing in Defense Business Operating Fund 273
National defense features 273
National defense reserve fleet 274
Maritime training ship 275
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 277
Subtitle A—Active Forces 277
Section 401. End strengths for active forces 277
Section 402. Temporary flexibility relating to permanent end strength levels 278
Section 403. Authorized strengths for commissioned officers in grades O–4, O–5, and O–6 278
Section 404. Extension of requirement for recommendations regarding appointments to joint 4-star officer positions 278
Section 405. Increase in authorized number of general officers on active duty in the Marine Corps 279
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces .....
Section 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve 279
Section 412. End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves 280
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 280
Section 421. Authorization of appropriations for military personnel 280
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 283
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 283
Section 501. Extension of authority for temporary promotions for certain Navy lieutenants with critical skills 283
Section 502. Exception to baccalaureate degree requirement for appointment in the Naval Reserve in grades above O–2 283
Section 503. Time for award of degrees by unaccredited educational institutions for graduates to be considered educationally qualified for appointment as reserve officers in grade O–3 283
Section 504. Chief Warrant Officer promotions 283
Section 505. Frequency of periodic report on promotion rates of officers currently or formerly serving in joint duty assignments 284
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Reserve Components 284
Section 511. Clarification of definition of active status 284
Section 512. Amendments to Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act provisions 284
Section 513. Repeal of requirement for physical examinations of members of National Guard called into federal service 284

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy—Continued
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Reserve Components—Continued
Section 514. Authority for a Reserve on active duty to waive retirement sanctuary 284
Section 515. Retirement of Reserves disabled by injury or disease incurred or aggravated during overnight stay between inactive duty training periods 285
Section 516. Reserve credit for participation in the Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program 285
Section 517. Report on guard and reserve force structure 285
Subtitle C—Officer Education Programs 285
Section 521. Increased age limit on appointment as a cadet or midshipman in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the service academies 285
Section 522. Demonstration project for instruction and support of Army ROTC units by members of the Army Reserve and National Guard 286
Subtitle D—Other Matters 286
Section 531. Retirement at grade to which selected for promotion when a physical disability is found at any physical examination 286
Section 532. Limitations on recall of retired members to active duty 286
Section 533. Disability coverage for officers granted excess leave for educational purposes 286
Section 534. Uniform policy regarding retention of members who are permanently nonworldwide assignable 287
Section 535. Authority to extend period for enlistment in regular component under the delayed entry program 287
Section 536. Career service reenlistments for members with at least 10 years of service 287
Section 537. Revisions to missing persons authorities 287
Section 538. Inapplicability of Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to the period of limitations for filing claims for corrections of military records 288
Section 539. Medal of honor for certain African-American soldiers who served in World War II 288
Subtitle E—Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service 288
Section 561. Applicability to Public Health Service of prohibition on crediting cadet or midshipmen service at the service academies 288
Section 562. Exception to grade limitations for Public Health Service officers assigned to the Department of Defense 289
Subtitle F—Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization 289
Section 571. Authority to expand law enforcement placement program to include firefighters 289
Section 572. Troops-to-teachers program improvements (Also refer to Section 1122) 289
Subtitle G—Armed Forces Retirement Home 289
Section 582. Acceptance of uncompensated services 290
Section 583. Disposal of real property 290
Section 584. Matters concerning personnel 290
Section 585. Fees for residents 291
Section 586. Authorization of appropriations 291
Other items of interest 292
Legislative fellows from the Department of Defense 292
Relocation assistance programs 293
Review of opportunities for ordering individual reserves to active duty with their consent 293
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 295
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 295
Section 601. Military pay raise for fiscal year 1997 295
Section 602. Rate of cadet and midshipman pay 295
Section 603. Pay of senior noncommissioned officers while hospitalized 295
Section 604. Basic allowance for quarters for members assigned to sea duty 296
Section 605. Uniform applicability of discretion to deny an election not to occupy government quarters 296
Section 606. Family separation allowance for members separated by military orders from spouses who are members 296

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits—Continued
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances—Continued
Section 607. Waiver of time limitations for claim for pay and allowances ... 296
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ... 297
Section 611. Extension of certain bonuses for reserve forces ... 297
Section 612. Extension of certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists ... 297
Section 613. Extension of authority relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays ... 297
Section 614. Increased special pay for dental officers of the armed forces ... 297
Section 615. Retention special pay for Public Health Service optometrists ... 297
Section 616. Special pay for nonphysician health care providers in the Public Health Service ... 298
Section 617. Foreign language proficiency pay for Public Health Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration officers ... 298
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances ... 298
Section 621. Round trip travel allowances for shipping motor vehicles at government expense ... 298
Section 622. Option to store instead of transport a privately-owned vehicle at the expense of the United States ... 298
Section 623. Deferral of travel with travel and transportation allowances in connection with leave between consecutive overseas tours ... 298
Section 624. Funding for transportation of household effects of Public Health Service officers ... 299
Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters ... 299
Section 631. Effective date for military retiree cost-of-living adjustment for Fiscal Year 1998 ... 299
Section 632. Allotment of retired or retainer pay ... 299
Section 633. Cost-of-living increases in SBP contributions to be effective concurrently with payment of related retired pay cost-of-living increases ... 299
Section 634. Annuities for certain military surviving spouses ... 299
Section 635. Adjusted annual income limitation applicable to eligibility for income supplement for certain widows of members of the uniformed services ... 299
Subtitle E—Other Matters ... 300
Section 641. Reimbursement for adoption expenses incurred in adoptions through private placements ... 300
Section 642. Waiver of recoupment of amounts withheld for tax purposes from certain separation pay received by involuntarily separated members and former members of the armed forces ... 300
Other Items of Interest ... 300
Foreign Language Proficiency Pay Qualification ... 300
Special Duty Assignment Pay, Army Special Operations personnel ... 301
Title VII—Health Care Provisions ... 303
Section 701. Implementation of requirement for Selected Reserve dental insurance plan ... 303
Section 702. Dental insurance plan for military retirees and certain dependents ... 303
Section 703. Uniform Composite Health Care System software ... 303
Section 704. Clarification of applicability of CHAMPUS payment rules to private CHAMPUS providers for care provided to enrollees in health care plans of uniformed services treatment facilities ... 304
Section 705. Enhancement of third party collection and secondary payer authorities under CHAMPUS ... 304
Section 706. Codification of authority to credit CHAMPUS collections to program accounts ... 304
Section 707. Comptroller General review of health care activities of the Department of Defense relating to Persian Gulf Illnesses ... 304
Other Items of Interest ... 305
Portability and reciprocity for TRICARE Prime enrollees across regions ... 305
Continuation of support for telemedicine initiatives ... 306
Study of the extension of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) option to military retirees ... 306

Page

Title VII—Health Care Provisions—Continued
Other Items of Interest—Continued
Centers for Prisoners of War Studies 306
Dental readiness 307
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters
Section 801. Procurement technical assistance programs 309
Section 802. Extension of pilot mentor-protégé program 309
Section 803. Modification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects 309
Section 804. Revisions to the program for the assessment of the national defense technology and industrial base 309
Section 805. Procurements to be made from small arms industrial base firms 310
Section 806. Exception to prohibition on procurement of foreign goods 310
Section 807. Treatment of Department of Defense cable television franchise agreements 310
Section 808. Remedies for reprisals against contractor employee whistleblowers 311
Section 809. Implementation of information technology management reform 311
Other Items of Interest 312
Procurement goals for small business concerns owned by women 312
Economy Act transfer regulatory implementation 313
Research projects: transactions other than contracts and grants .. 313
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management 315
Subtitle A—General Matters 315
Section 901. Repeal of reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense 315
Section 902. Codification of requirements relating to continued operation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences .. 315
Section 903. Codification of requirement for United States Army Reserve Command 316
Section 904. Transfer of authority to control transportation systems in time of war 316
Section 905. Executive oversight of defense human intelligence personnel 316
Section 906. Coordination of defense intelligence programs and activities 316
Section 907. Redesignation of Office of Naval Records and History Fund and correction of related references 316
Subtitle B—National Imagery and Mapping Agency 317
(Sections 911–934—Matters relating to National Imagery and Mapping) 317
Title X—General Provisions 321
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 321
Section 1003. Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1996 321
Section 1004. Use of funds transferred to the Coast Guard 321
Section 1005. Use of military-to-military contacts funds for professional military education and training 321
Section 1006. Payment of certain expenses relating to humanitarian and civic assistance 321
Section 1007. Prohibition on expenditure of Department of Defense funds by officials outside the department 322
Section 1008. Prohibition on use of funds for Office of Naval Intelligence representation or related activities 322
Section 1009. Reimbursement of Department of Defense for costs of disaster assistance provided outside the United States 322
Section 1010. Fisher House Trust Fund for the Navy 322
Section 1011. Designation and liability of disbursing and certifying officials for the Coast Guard 323
Section 1012. Authority to suspend or terminate collection actions against deceased members of the Coast Guard 323
Section 1013. Check cashing and exchange transactions with credit unions outside the United States 323
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 323
Section 1021. Authority to transfer naval vessels 323

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards—Continued
Section 1022. Transfer of certain obsolete tugboats of the Navy 324
Section 1023. Repeal of requirement for continuous applicability of contracts for phased maintenance of AE class ships 324
Section 1024. Contract options for LMSR vessels 324
Subtitle C—Counter-Drug Activities .....
(Sections 1031–1033—Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities) ... 325
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Foreign Countries 328
Section 1041. Agreements for exchange of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries 328
Section 1042. Authority for reciprocal exchange of personnel between the United States and foreign countries for flight training 329
Section 1043. Extension of counterproliferation authorities 329
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements 329
Section 1051. Annual report on emerging operational concepts 329
Section 1052. Annual joint warfighting science and technology plan ... 329
Section 1053. Report on military readiness requirements of the Armed Forces 330
Subtitle F—Other Matters 331
Section 1061. Uniform Code of Military Justice amendments 331
Section 1062. Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems 331
Section 1063. Correction of references to Department of Defense organizations 332
Section 1064. Authority of certain members of the Armed Forces to perform notarial or consular acts 332
Section 1065. Training of members of the uniformed services at non-Government facilities 332
Section 1066. Third-party liability to United States for tortious infliction of injury or disease on members of the uniformed services 332
Section 1067. Display of State flags at installations and facilities of the Department of Defense 332
Section 1068. George C Marshall European Center for Strategic Security Studies 333
Section 1069. Authority to award to civilian participants in the defense of Pearl Harbor the congressional medal previously authorized only for military participants in the defense of Pearl Harbor ... 333
Section 1070. Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital, Las Vegas, Nevada 333
Section 1071. Naming of building at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences 333
Other items of interest 333
Support for the Young Marines program 333
Support services at the Port of Haifa 334
U.S.-Asian military-to-military dialogue 334
Implementation of arms control agreements 335
Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel 337
Subtitle A—Personnel Management, Pay and, Allowances 337
Section 1101. Scope of requirement for conversion of military positions to civilian positions 337
Section 1102. Retention of civilian employee positions at military training bases transferred to National Guard 337
Section 1103. Clarification of limitation on furnishing clothing or paying a uniform allowance to enlisted National Guard technicians 337
Section 1104. Travel expenses and health care for civilian employees of the Department of Defense abroad 337
Section 1105. Travel, transportation, and relocation allowances for certain former nonappropriated fund employees 337
Section 1106. Employment and salary practices applicable to Department of Defense overseas teachers 338
Section 1107. Employment and compensation of civilian faculty members at certain Department of Defense schools 338
Section 1108. Reimbursement of Department of Defense domestic dependent school board members for certain expenses 338
Section 1109. Extension of authority for civilian employees of Department of Defense to participate voluntarily in reductions in force 338

Page

Title XI—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel—Continued
Subtitle A—Personnel Management, Pay and, Allowances—Continued
Section 1110. Compensatory time off for overtime work performed by wage-board employees ... 338
Section 1111. Liquidation of restored annual leave that remains unused upon transfer of employee from installation being closed or realigned ... 338
Section 1112. Waiver of requirement for repayment of voluntary separation incentive pay by former Department of Defense employees reemployed by the Government without pay ... 339
Section 1113. Federal holiday observance rules for Department of Defense employees ... 339
Section 1114. Revision of certain travel management authorities ... 339
Subtitle B—Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization ... 339
Section 1121. Pilot programs for defense employees converted to contractor employees due to privatization at closed military installations ... 339
Section 1122. Troops-to-teachers program improvements applied to civilian personnel. (Refer to Section 572) ... 341
Other Items of Interest ... 341
Flexible, compressed and alternative schedules ... 341
Authority to conduct civilian personnel demonstration projects ... 341
Title XII—Federal Charter for the Fleet Reserve Association ... 343
(Sections 1201–1216—Matters relating to the Federal Charter for the Fleet Reserve Association) ... 343

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program ... 375
Section 2503. Redesignation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program ... 375
Title XXVIII—General Provisions ... 377
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes ... 377
Section 2801. Increase in certain thresholds for unspecified minor construction projects ... 377
Section 2802. Clarification of authority to improve military family housing ... 377
Section 2803. Authority to grant easements for rights-of-way ... 377
Subtitle B—Defense Base Closure and Realignment ... 377
Section 2811. Restoration of authority under 1988 base closure law to transfer property and facilities to other entities in the Department of Defense ... 377
Section 2812. Disposition of proceeds from disposal of commissary stores and nonappropriated fund instrumentalities at installations being closed or realigned ... 378
Section 2813. Agreements for services at installations after closure ... 378
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances ... 378
Section 2821. Transfer of lands, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia ... 378
Section 2822. Land transfer, Potomac Annex, District of Columbia ... 379
Section 2823. Land conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Montpelier, Vermont ... 379
Section 2824. Land conveyance, former Naval Reserve Facility, Lewes, Delaware ... 379
Section 2825. Land conveyance, Radar Bomb Scoring Site, Belle Fourche, South Dakota ... 379
Section 2826. Conveyance of primate research complex, Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico ... 380
Section 2827. Demonstration project for installation and operation of electric power distribution system at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio ... 380
Other Items of Interest ... 381
Improvements to military family housing units, Army ... 381
Planning and design, Army ... 381
Report on the Fort Lawton Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center, Seattle, Washington ... 381

Page

Title XXVIII—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances—Continued
Other Items of Interest—Continued
Improvements to military family housing units, Navy 381
Planning and design, Navy 381
Improvements to military family housing units, Air Force 381
Planning and design, Air Force Family Housing Construction 382
Availability of funds for credit to Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund 382
Naval Air Station Sigonella 382
Report on the implementation of the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act 382
Planning and design, Guard and Reserve forces facilities 383

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

Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 385
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 403
Section 3101. Weapons activities 403
Section 3102. Environmental restoration and waste management 404
Section 3103. Other defense activities 405
Section 3104. Defense nuclear waste disposal 407
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 407
Section 3131. Tritium production 407
Section 3132. Modernization and consolidation of tritium recycling facilities 408
Section 3133. Modification of requirements for manufacturing infrastructure for refabrication and certification of nuclear weapons stockpile 408
Section 3134. Limitation on use of funds for certain research and development purposes 408
Section 3135. Accelerated schedule for isolating high-level nuclear waste at the Defense Waste Processing Facility, Savannah River Site 409
Section 3136. Processing of high-level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel rods 409
Section 3137. Fellowship program for development of skills critical to Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex 410
Subtitle D—Other Matters 410
Section 3151. Requirement for annual five-year budget for the national security programs of the Department of Energy 410
Section 3152. Requirements for Department of Energy weapons activities budgets for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997 411
Section 3153. Repeal of requirement relating to accounting procedures for Department of Energy funds 411
Section 3154. Plans for activities to process nuclear materials and clean up nuclear waste at the Savannah River Site 411
Section 3155. Update of report on nuclear test readiness postures 412
Section 3156. Reports on critical difficulties at nuclear weapons laboratories and nuclear weapons production plants 412
Section 3157. Extension of applicability of notice-and-wait requirement regarding proposed cooperation agreements 413
Section 3158. Redesignation of Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program as Defense Nuclear Waste Management Program 413
Section 3159. Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise 413
Section 3160. Sense of Senate regarding reliability and safety of remaining nuclear forces 413
Other items of interest 414
Department of Energy work force reduction plan 414
Accelerating radioactive waste cleanup 415
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 417
Section 3201. Authorization 417
Title XXXIII—National Defense Stockpile .....
Section 3301. Authorized uses of stockpile funds 419
Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum Reserves 421

Page

Title XXXV—Panama Canal Commission 423
Legislative Requirements 425
Departmental Recommendations 425
Committee Action 425
Fiscal Data 426
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 428
Regulatory Impact 428
Changes in Existing Law 428
Additional views of Senator William S. Cohen 429
Additional views of Senator John McCain 433
Additional views of Senator Bob Smith 438
Additional views of Senator Carl Levin 440
Additional views of Senator Edward M. Kennedy 448
Additional views of Senator John Glenn 450
Additional views of Senator Joseph I. Lieberman 454

104TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
104–267

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

MAY 13, 1996.—Ordered to be printed

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

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1745]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the armed forces, and for other purposes, and, recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997;

(2) authorize the personnel end strength for each military active duty component of the armed forces for fiscal year 1997;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 1997;

(4) authorize the annual average military training student loads for the active and reserve components of the armed forces for fiscal year 1997;

(5) impose certain reporting requirements;

(6) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and RDT&E actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

(7) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1997; and

(8) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 1997.

Committee overview and recommendations

As the committee continued to carry out its legislative responsibilities for the 104th Congress pursuant to the Senate's rules and constitutional powers, the Chairman and the Members established priorities to guide the committee through the authorization process for fiscal year 1997.

National security is the federal government's first obligation to its citizens. With this in mind, the committee's top priority was to guarantee our national security and the status of the United States as the world's preeminent military power. Accordingly, the committee approved provisions which provide for: an appropriate balance between near-term readiness and long-term readiness through investments in modernization, infrastructure and research; sufficient end-strengths at all grade levels and policies supporting the recruitment and retention of high quality personnel; fielding of the type and quantity of weapons systems and equipment needed to fight and win decisively with minimal risk to our troops; and ensuring an adequate, safe and reliable nuclear weapons capability.

In order to improve the operation of the Department of Defense (DOD), as well as to adhere to the expected committee budget allocation, the committee sought to eliminate defense spending that does not contribute directly to the national security of the United States. Such efforts included reducing DOD overhead and emphasizing successful demonstrations prior to full-scale procurements. Savings were also realized by accelerating programs, where appropriate, and by limiting new program starts. Fiscal and national security concerns also support the committee's ongoing effort to evaluate U.S. involvement in non-traditional military operations, and its impact on combat readiness, programming and budgeting, personnel retention and our national interests.

As with last year, the committee worked to protect the quality-of-life of our military personnel and their families. Quality-of-life initiatives included provisions designed to provide equitable pay and benefits to military personnel, including a 3.0 percent pay raise to protect against inflation, and the restoration of appropriate levels of funding for the construction and maintenance of troop billets and military family housing.

The committee also remained acutely concerned about military readiness. In particular, the committee ensured that U.S. armed forces remain the preeminent military force in the world by funding a more robust, progressive modernization effort aimed at providing the capabilities needed for future requirements. The committee also directed efforts toward enhancing the utilization and effectiveness of reserve component forces; reducing the backlog in main-

tenance and repair of equipment; providing funds for an appropriate quantity and quality of training; enhancing infrastructure and base operations programs; encouraging efforts by the services to develop new operational capabilities based on emerging technologies; and supporting efforts maintaining adequate stocks of supplies, repair parts, fuel and ammunition.

Finally, and importantly, the committee sought to accelerate development and deployment of missile defense systems to protect U.S. and allied forces against the growing threat of cruise and ballistic missiles. Accordingly, this bill supports expeditious deployment of land- and sea-based theater missile defense systems. The committee also makes clear that the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 does not apply to the theater missile defense systems envisioned by the committee.

The committee was disappointed by the administration's budget request of $254.3 billion for defense spending in fiscal year 1997. The administration's fiscal year 1997 budget request was $18.6 billion less in real terms than the level enacted for fiscal year 1996. Even after the committee added $12.9 billion in additional authorization, the total authorized amount for defense spending in fiscal year 1997 is $5.6 billion less in real terms than defense spending in fiscal year 1996.

The committee has continually expressed its concerns about the effects of decreasing levels of defense spending on our armed forces. In real terms, the fiscal year 1997 defense budget will be at its lowest level since 1950. History has demonstrated that superpower status cannot be sustained cheaply. Nor can it be sustained by budget requests which do not provide for adequate modernization of our forces. The administration's representations regarding future increases in funding for modernization have been contradicted by its actual budget requests; consequently, the administration's commitment to modernization is met with increasing skepticism in the Congress as well as by senior military leaders.

Decreases in defense spending are occurring at the same time our military personnel are being asked to do more and more. If defense funding levels do not increase, the committee fears the increased operational and personnel tempos, coupled with deteriorating readiness, may result in an exodus of high quality, trained personnel and, ultimately, a military crises.

One aspect of the administration's budget request that the committee found encouraging was that it included, for the first time, a request for funds for ongoing contingency operations.

During the past three months, the committee worked in its traditional bipartisan manner, placing the national security interests of the United States and the safety of the American people above other considerations. The National Defense Authorization Bill for 1997 reflects a bipartisan approach to these priorities, and provides a clear basis and direction for U.S. national security policies and programs into the 21st century.

Explanation of funding summary

The administration's budget request for the national defense function of the federal budget for fiscal year 1997 was $254.3 bil-

lion, of which $184.9 billion was for programs which require specific funding authorization.

The committee's authorization recommendation is substantially larger ($267.3 billion in budget authority) than the amount requested. The primary reason for this difference is that the committee authorized an additional $7.7 billion in procurement and $3.7 billion in Research and Development.

The following table summarizes both the direct authorizations and equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 1997 defense programs. The columns relating to the authorization request do not include funding for the following items: military personnel funding; military construction authorizations provided in prior years; and other small portions of the defense budget that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or which do not require an annual authorization. As explained above, funding for military personnel is included in the amounts authorized by the committee, but not in the total funding requested for authorization.

Funding for all programs in the national defense function is reflected in the columns relating to the budget authority request and the total budget authority implication of the authorizations in this bill. The committee recommends funding for national defense programs totalling $267.3 billion in budget authority, which is consistent with the fiscal year 1996 Budget Resolution, an increase of $12.9 billion above the President's budget request.

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

DIVISION A TITLE I PROCUREMENT	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
Aircraft Procurement, Army	970,815	970,815	537,700	1,508,515	1,508,515
Missile Procurement, Army	766,329	766,329	394,500	1,160,829	1,160,829
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,102,014	1,102,014	358,101	1,460,115	1,460,115
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	853,428	853,428	303,300	1,156,728	1,156,728
Other Procurement, Army	2,627,440	2,627,440	671,500	3,298,940	3,298,940
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	5,881,952	5,881,952	1,029,400	6,911,352	6,911,352
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,400,363	1,400,363	112,900	1,513,263	1,513,263
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	0	0	0	0	0
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	4,911,930	4,911,930	1,655,400	6,567,330	6,567,330
Other Procurement, Navy	2,714,195	2,714,195	290,845	3,005,040	3,005,040
Procurement, Marine Corps	555,507	555,507	260,600	816,107	816,107
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	5,779,228	5,779,228	1,224,300	7,003,528	7,003,528
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,733,877	2,733,877	113,300	2,847,177	2,847,177
Other Procurement, Air Force	5,998,819	5,998,819	(118,300)	5,880,519	5,880,519
Procurement, Defense-wide	1,841,212	1,841,212	66,800	1,908,012	1,908,012
Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment	0	0	759,800	759,800	759,800
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army					
Operation & Maintenance	477,947	477,947		477,947	477,947
Procurement	273,600	273,600		273,600	273,600
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	48,300	48,300	3,000	51,300	51,300
Procurement, Defense Health Program	269,470	0		269,470	0
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	2,000	0		2,000	0
Total Procurement	39,208,426	38,936,956	7,663,146	46,871,572	46,600,102

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
TITLE II					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,320,640	4,320,640	637,500	4,958,140	4,958,140
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	7,334,734	7,334,734	1,706,800	9,041,534	9,041,534
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	14,417,456	14,417,456	370,900	14,788,356	14,788,356
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	8,398,836	8,398,836	989,700	9,388,536	9,388,536
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	21,968	21,968	0	21,968	21,968
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	252,038	252,038	0	252,038	252,038
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	34,745,672	34,745,672	3,704,900	38,450,572	38,450,572
TITLE III					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	18,114,479	18,114,479	33,144	18,147,623	18,147,623
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	20,196,197	20,196,197	102,142	20,298,339	20,298,339
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,203,777	2,203,777	75,700	2,279,477	2,279,477
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	17,913,455	17,913,455	39,584	17,953,039	17,953,039
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide	10,156,468	10,156,468	(292,526)	9,863,942	9,863,942
Office of the Inspector General	136,501	138,501		136,501	138,501
Defense Health Program	9,358,288	9,627,758	17,700	9,375,988	9,645,458
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,084,436	1,084,436	10,000	1,094,436	1,094,436
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	843,927	843,927	7,100	851,027	851,027
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	99,667	99,667	10,700	110,367	110,367
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,488,553	1,488,553	5,000	1,493,553	1,493,553
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,208,477	2,208,477	10,000	2,218,477	2,218,477
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	2,654,473	2,654,473	38,000	2,692,473	2,692,473
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	6,797	6,797		6,797	6,797

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
Environmental Restoration, Army	356,916	356,916		356,916	356,916
Environmental Restoration, Navy	302,900	302,900		302,900	302,900
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	414,700	414,700		414,700	414,700
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	258,500	258,500		258,500	258,500
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	642,724	642,724	151,100	793,824	793,824
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	327,900	327,900		327,900	327,900
Overseas Military Investment Recovery	0	1,700		0	1,700
Disposal of DoD Real Property	0	9,740		0	9,740
Lease of DoD Real Property	0	16,825		0	16,825
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Fund	10,000	10,000	(10,000)	0	0
Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	0	10,000		0	10,000
Restoration of Rocky Mountain Arsenal	0	1,000		0	1,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	80,544	80,544	(31,544)	49,000	49,000
National Science Center, Army	0	120		0	120
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	88,859,679	89,170,534	166,100	89,025,779	89,336,634
REVOLVING FUNDS					
Defense Business Operations Fund (DECA)	947,900	947,900		947,900	947,900
National Defense Sealift Fund	963,002	963,002	305,000	1,268,002	1,268,002
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)		(150,000)			(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Sales in Excess of Routine Sales)		(126,000)			(126,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Proposed Sale)		(79,000)			(79,000)
Subtotal Working Capital Funds	1,910,902	1,555,902	305,000	2,215,902	1,860,902
Total Operation and Maintenance & Working Capital Funds	90,770,581	90,726,436	471,100	91,241,681	91,197,536

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
TITLES IV-V-VI-VII					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Total Military Personnel	0	69,782,830	95,600	69,878,430	69,878,430
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
DIVISION B					
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	434,723	434,723	94,975	529,698	529,698
Military Construction, Navy	525,346	525,346	90,290	615,636	615,636
Military Construction, Air Force	603,059	603,059	147,215	750,274	750,274
Military Construction, Defense-wide	812,945	812,945	4,400	817,345	817,345
Military Construction, Army National Guard	7,600	7,600	72,028	79,628	79,628
Military Construction, Air National Guard	75,394	75,394	133,090	208,484	208,484
Military Construction, Army Reserve	48,459	48,459	10,715	59,174	59,174
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	10,983	10,983	21,760	32,743	32,743
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	51,655	51,655	3,115	54,770	54,770
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	2,507,476	2,751,476		2,507,476	2,751,476
NATO Infrastructure	197,000	197,000		197,000	197,000
BRAC Receipts		(244,000)			(244,000)
Total Military Construction	5,274.640	5,274,640	577,588	5,852,228	5,852,228
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	75,013	75,013	27,120	102,133	102,133
Family Housing Support, Army	1,212,466	1,212,466	50,000	1,262,466	1,262,466
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	403,726	403,726	6,490	410,216	410,216

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	1,014,241	1,014,241		1,014,241	1,014,241
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	231,236	231,236	33,802	265,038	265,038
Family Housing Support, Air Force	829,474	829,474		829,474	829,474
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	4,371	4,371		4,371	4,371
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	30,963	30,963		30,963	30,963
Homeowners Assistance Fund	36,181	36,181		36,181	36,181
DoD Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	20,000	20,000		20,000	20,000
Total Family Housing	3,857,671	3,857,671	122,412	3,980,083	3,980,083
DIVISION C					
TITLE XXXI					
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)					
Weapons Activities	3,710,000	3,710,000	239,000	3,949,000	3,949,000
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	5,409,310	5,409,310	198,000	5,607,310	5,607,310
Full Funding for Fixed Assets	182,000	182,000	0	182,000	182,000
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	200,000	200,000	0	200,000	200,000
Other Defense Actitivities	1,548,231	1,548,231	13,000	1,561,231	1,561,231
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,000	17,000	0	17,000	17,000
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	11,066,541	11,066,541	450,000	11,516,541	11,516,541

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

Recapitulation	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
Department of Defense (Division A)	164,724,679	234,341,894	11,934,746	246,442,255	246,276,640
Department of Defense (Division B)	9,132,311	9,132,311	700,000	9,832,311	9,832,311
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund		(150,000)	0	0	(150,000)
Other Funds	0	77,644	20,400	98,044	98,044
Offsetting Receipts	0	(877,799)	0		(877,799)
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	173,856,990	242,524,050	12,655,146	256,372,610	255,179,196
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	11,066,541	11,066,541	450,000	11,516,541	11,516,541
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	39,000	749,400	(157,500)	591,900	591,900
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	184,962,531	254,339,991	12,947,646	268,481,051	267,287,637
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)-OT					264,108,802

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

The committee noted concerns over declining defense procurement budgets in the report to accompany S.1026 (S. Rept. 104–112), and registered concern over the impact of deficient procurement levels on long-term readiness. In hearings last year, senior military leaders repeatedly expressed concerns about the effects of sharply reduced procurement funding on future modernization. Optimistically, they noted the administration's plan to increase procurement modestly to $43.5 billion in fiscal year 1997.

However, when the budget request was announced for fiscal year 1997, the decline in procurement spending continued. In hearings on the fiscal year 1997 budget request witnesses warned of the future effects of cutting modernization.

The committee views with concern the Department of Defense's continuing trend of promising a better future while reducing current resources. Since 1993, the administration has forecast increased funds for procurement for the next year, only to have the amount actually requested for procurement decline again when the budget is submitted.

Admiral William Owens, then Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when testifying on overall defense procurement, described the situation as a "crisis," and said, "We've got to stop promising ourselves and start doing something . . . ." Senior military leaders willingly provided detailed listings of equipment and resources needed by their services, but not included in the administration request.

It is not hard to see why the uniformed services have to resort to making up "wish lists" to equip their services: the administration budget does not provide the resources to equip the forces it says are needed. The defense budget is in its twelfth straight year of decline. The procurement budget is at its lowest level since 1950 with procurement accounts declining 72 percent since 1985. Armed Services Committee hearings have confirmed a shared concern by the service secretaries and chiefs that recapitalization of our forces has continued to be projected further into the future with each succeeding budget since 1993. However, when the committee acts to provide modest modernization increases over the administration's ever declining requests, concerns are expressed about additions for which the Pentagon did not ask. Nothing could be farther from reality; senior military leaders have repeatedly asked for additional resources and the committee has included them in its recommendation.

Last year the committee gave priority to buying basics, investing to achieve savings, and investing in the future. This year the com-

mittee has again adhered to this strategy. The committee's emphasis on acquiring equipment in economic lots and on efficient schedules is evident throughout this report.

Last year's authorization and appropriation bills were repeatedly criticized for making additions not asked for by the Pentagon. While the Department of Defense has not requested additions to its own request, uniformed military leaders have. Through testimony and in written requests, senior military leaders have requested a variety of equipment and programs that were left out of the budget request.

The committee recognizes its critical role in the Senate's responsibilities under the Constitution set out in Article I, Section Eight, "to raise and support Armies, provide and maintain a Navy, and make the rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces." The committee notes the propriety of the Congress's decisions on appropriate force structure, equipment, and policies for the armed services.

To provide for the common defense and national security, the committee urges the Department to provide consistent planning and budgeting for future defense requirements, so as to deter possible adversaries and assure allies that the administration and the Congress are both committed to providing the resources necessary for America's strength, both now and in the future.

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 1997 for which the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 107. Chemical demilitarization program.

The budget request included $931.4 million for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program for operation and maintenance ($477.9 million), procurement ($273.6 million), research and development ($48.3 million) and military construction ($131.6 million).

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to the budget request for research and development to expedite and accelerate the development and fielding of critical advanced sensors that are part of the Army's mobile munitions assessment system.

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIRCRAFT						
	FIXED WING						
1	ARL (TIARA)	0	24,742				24,742
2	C-XX (MEDIUM RANGE) AIRCRAFT	0	-		35,000		35,000
3	GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR (TIARA)	0	1,081				1,081
	ROTARY						
4	TOTAL PACKAGE FIELDING	0	-				-
5	AH-64 ATTACK HELICOPTER (APACHE)	0	-		183,000		183,000
6	UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	28	231,279			28	231,279
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(70,000)				(70,000)
7	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	75,000				75,000
8	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	0	-				-
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
9	GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	0	30,612				30,612
10	AH1F MODS	0	1,099				1,099
11	AH-64 MODS	0	43,287		75,000		118,287
12	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	0	7,802		52,300		60,102
13	C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	0	644				644
14	OH-58 MODS	0	1,147				1,147
15	C-20 AIRCRAFT MODS	0	882				882
16	LONGBOW	0	373,940				373,940
16	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(16,983)				(16,983)
17	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	22,526				22,526
18	UH-1 MODS	0	4,777				4,777
19	UH-60 MODS	0	12,436				12,436
20	KIOWA WARRIOR	0	9,115		158,400		167,515
21	EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	0	13,912				13,912
22	AIRBORNE AVIONICS	0	40,819				40,819
23	ASE MODS	0	4,801				4,801
24	MODIFICATIONS < $2.0M	0	1,790				1,790
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
25	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	51,106				51,106
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
26	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	0	436		34,000		34,436
	OTHER SUPPORT						
27	AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL	0	-				-

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
28	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,449				7,449
29	TRAINING DEVICES	0	7,339				7,339
30	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	24,911				24,911
31	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT (ALSE)	0	6,292				6,292
32	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	8,401				8,401
33	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	2,081				2,081
34	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	0	48,092				48,092
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		970,815		537,700		1,508,515
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	OTHER MISSILES						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
1	HAWK SYSTEM SUMMARY	0	-				-
2	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	0	2,862				2,862
3	AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	0	12,581				12,581
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2,805	357,590			2,805	357,590
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,020	162,104		39,700		201,804
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	0	13,630				13,630
7	MLRS ROCKET	852	24,443	850	17,000	1,702	41,443
8	MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	0	38,039		147,000		185,039
9	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	97	92,816		69,000		161,816
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
	MODIFICATIONS						
10	PATRIOT MODS	0	11,464		12,000		23,464
11	STINGER MODS	0	16,903		22,800		39,703
12	AVENGER MODS	0	-		29,000		29,000
13	ITAS/TOW MODS	0	16		33,000		33,016
14	DRAGON MODS	0	3,181		25,000		28,181
15	MLRS MODS	0	6,416				6,416
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	12,089				12,089
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	0	6,201				6,201
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MISSILES)	0	992				992
19	MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	0	1,533				1,533

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
20	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	0	3,469				3,469
21	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		766,329		394,500		1,160,829
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	0	3,184				3,184
2	BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE FAMILY (MYP)	0	-				-
3	BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	0	134,428		92,700		227,128
4	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	0	573				573
5	BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	0	900				900
6	FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEH	24	34,400	36	50,800	60	85,200
7	ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	0	12,602				12,602
8	ARMORED GUN SYSTEM (AGS)	0	-				-
9	M1 ABRAMS TANK SERIES (MYP)	0	-				-
10	COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	5	48,985			5	48,985
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
11	CARRIER, MOD	0	23,028		20,000		43,028
12	BFVS SERIES (MOD)	0	83,649				83,649
13	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	0	75,000		61,200		136,200
14	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A5 (MOD)	0	130				130
15	FAASV PIP TO FLEET	0	4,727		2,000		6,727
16	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	0	28,641		51,100		79,741
17	HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	0	51,377				51,377
18	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	0	50,217		28,500		78,717
19	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	0	506,637				506,637
19	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(301,481)				(301,481)
20	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	259,330				259,330
21	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $2.0M (TCV-WTCV)	0	1,050				1,050
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
22	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	-				-
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TCV-WTCV)	0	141				141
24	TANK ENGINE INDUSTRIAL BASE	0	-				-
25	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	0	9,328				9,328
26	REGIONAL MAINTENANCE TRAINING SITES-EQUIP	0	1,368				1,368
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
	WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
27	PERSONAL DEFENSE WEAPON (ROLL)	0	-				
28	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119	0	-				

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
29	MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	4,345	11,103		1,000		12,103
30	GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	320	5,199		28,901		34,100
31	MORTAR, 120MM	0	-				-
32	M16 RIFLE	9,982	5,552		1,000		6,552
33	5.56 CARBINE M4	7,704	5,552		900		6,452
	MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHI						
34	M4 CARBINE MODS	0	2,116				2,116
35	SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	0	-				-
36	MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)	0	-		20,000		20,000
37	M16 RIFLE MODS	0	5,531				5,531
38	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	1,428				1,428
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
39	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	-				-
40	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	1,769				1,769
41	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	0	4,315				4,315
42	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	5,091				5,091
43	SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	0	5,845				5,845
44	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES						
45	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	0	20,299				20,299
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,102,014		358,101		1,460,115
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	AMMUNITION						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	0	29,752		1,300		31,052
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	0	3,871		2,100		5,971
3	CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	0	-		3,000		3,000
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	0	3,971				3,971
5	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	0	-		300		300
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	47,176		50,000		97,176
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	0	-		15,000		15,000
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	0	34,428				34,428
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	CTG MORTAR 60MM 1/10 PRAC M766	7	5,019			7	5,019
9a	CTG MORTAR 60MM HE M720		-		12,500		12,500
10	CTG MORTAR 60MM ILLUM M721/M767	14	6,151		7,000		13,151
11	CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	0	-				-
12	CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE XM931	123	49,539			123	49,539

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
13	CTG MORTAR 120MM HE XM933 W/PD FUZE	0	-				-
14	CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	10	19,360			10	19,360
15	CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE XM929 W/MO FUZE	27	30,106			27	30,106
	TANK AMMUNITION						-
16	CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2	23	79,703		12,000		91,703
17	CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	0	-		45,000		45,000
18	CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	89	52,228		2,400		54,628
19	CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	211	115,650		3,200		118,850
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
20	CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	0	-				-
21	CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	6	14,185			6	14,185
22	CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913	0	-				-
23	PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	0	15,053				15,053
24	PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	0	-		55,000		55,000
25	PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	322	60,259		33,500		93,759
	MINES						
26	MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	0	1,930				1,930
27	MINE AT/AP M87 (VOLCANO)	0	-				-
28	WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	261	19,299			261	19,299
	ROCKETS						
29	BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	0	-				-
30	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	0	26,737				26,737
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
31	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	20,220				20,220
32	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	7,654				7,654
33	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	0	10,196				10,196
34	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	0	2,771				2,771
34a	SELECTABLE LIGHTWEIGHT ATTACK MUNITIONS		-		3,000		3,000
	MISCELLANEOUS						
35	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	0	4,921				4,921
36	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	0	3,813				3,813
37	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	0	663				663
38	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	0	5,653				5,653
39	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	0	5,427				5,427
	AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
40	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	38,508				38,508
40a	ARMMENT RETOOLING AND MANUFACTURING SUPPORT (ARMS)		-		58,000		58,000
41	COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT	0	1,061				1,061
42	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	17,622				17,622

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
43	PROVING GROUND MODERNIZATION	0	-				-
44	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	0	31,899				31,899
45	CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	0	88,603				88,603
46	FLEXIBLE MANUFACTURING CENTERS	0	-				-
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		853,428		303,300		1,156,728
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	0	5,159				5,159
2	SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	26	1,911			26	1,911
3	SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	51	4,471			51	4,471
4	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)(MYP)	1,126	96,785		66,000		162,785
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (MYP)	1,603	233,094		5,000		238,094
6	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (MYP)	0	163,343		123,000		286,343
7	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (COMBAT SPT) TACTIC	24	9,240			24	9,240
8	MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM(ESP) (PREV SLEP	0	-				-
9	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	0	2,698				2,698
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TAC VEH)	0	193				193
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
11	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	14	200			14	200
12	GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	0	200				200
13	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	0	200				200
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
14	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	0	1,414				1,414
15	PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	0	622				622
16	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	0	1,927				1,927
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
17	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	0	2,860				2,860
	COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
18	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	0	97,528				97,528
19	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	620	18,632			620	18,632
20	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	12,017	26,288			12,017	26,288
21	GROUND COMMAND POST	0	711				711
22	SMART-T (SPACE)	0	45,427				45,427
23	SCAMP (SPACE)	0	23,555				23,555
24	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	0	5,444				5,444

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM						
25	MSE MOD IN SERVICE	0	9,848				9,848
	COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
26	COMMAND CENTER IMPROVEMENT PROG (CCIP)	0	892				892
27	SOUTHCOM HQ RELOCATION	0	26,984				26,984
28	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	0	20,462				20,462
	COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
29	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS)	0	47,987		20,000		67,987
30	MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE)	0	6,398				6,398
31	SINCGARS FAMILY	0	297,496		43,300		340,796
32	EAC COMMUNICATIONS	0	4,089		40,000		44,089
33	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (EAC COMM)	0	10,041				10,041
34	TAC RADIO	1,000	35,743			1,000	35,743
35	C-E CONTINGENCY/FIELDING EQUIP	0	577				577
	COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
36	JWICS CONNECTIVITY	0	666				666
37	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	0	2,452				2,452
38	CI CONUS BASED LAN	0	725				725
	INFORMATION SECUTITY						
39	TSEC - INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY	0	10,678				10,678
40	TSEC - JCSE EQIP	0	-				-
	COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
41	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	0	6,732				6,732
42	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	0	1,070				1,070
43	ARMY DISN ROUTER	0	2,077				2,077
44	ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	0	473				473
45	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	0	807				807
	COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
46	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	0	24,668				24,668
47	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	0	5,792				5,792
48	LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	0	17,726				17,726
49	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	0	59,901				59,901
	ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
50	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	0	536				536
51	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	0	12,649		(500)		12,149
52	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (INTEL SPT) - TIARA	0	2,151				2,151
	ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
53	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	0	12,297		11,700		23,997

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
54	JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	58	14,010			58	14,010
55	IEW - GND BASE COMMON SENSORS (TIARA)	0	47,091				47,091
56	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONN PROGRAM (DARP)	0	-				-
57	JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	0	85,428				85,428
58	INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	0	3,365				3,365
59	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	4	6,425			4	6,425
60	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	0	-				-
61	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIE	0	1,758				1,758
62	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION	0	-				-
63	TROJAN (TIARA)	0	2,603				2,603
64	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	0	14,452				14,452
65	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (TIARA)	0	516				516
	ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
66	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	0	1,642				1,642
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
67	LT SPEC DIV INTERIM SENSOR (LSDIS)	0	-				-
68	FAAD GBS	16	51,226	36	29,200	52	80,426
69	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	0	111,872		134,100		245,972
70	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS	0	-				-
71	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	0	4,655				4,655
72	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	0	15,114				15,114
73	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR XM-23	233	6,850			223	6,850
74	INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	6	3,144			6	3,144
75	SHF TERM	0	9,134				9,134
	ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
76	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	187	31,569		3,500		35,069
77	FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	0	87				87
78	CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	51	5,813			51	5,813
79	CORPS/THEATER ADP SVC CTR (CTASC)	0	-				-
80	FAAD C2	4	36,761			4	36,761
81	FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	0	2,134				2,134
82	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	0	2,030				2,030
83	LOGTECH	0	4,395		6,000		10,395
84	ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	0	9,833				9,833
85	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	155	19,126			155	19,126
86	STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	0	27,211		30,500		57,711
87	STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	0	26,304		12,700		39,004
	ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
88	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	0	136,386				136,386

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
89	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	0	72,589				72,589
	ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
90	AFRTS	0	359				359
91	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (A/V)	0	2,115				2,115
	ELECT EQUIP-TEST MEAS&DIAG EQUIP (TMDE)						
92	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	0	11,104				11,104
93	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)	0	1,506				1,506
94	TMDE MODERNIZATION (TMOD)	0	8,239				8,239
	ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
95	INSTALLATION C4 UPGRADE (ICU)	0	1,111				1,111
96	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	0	687				687
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
97	COLL PROT EQUIP, NBC TEMPER, TENT M28	0	-				-
98	MASK, PROTECTIVE, NBC M40/M42	0	-				-
99	REMOTE SENSING CHEMICAL AGENT ALARM XM21	0	-				-
100	IMPROVED CHEMICAL AGENT MONITOR	0	-				-
101	AUTO CHEMICAL AGENT ALARM (ACADA), XM22	0	-				-
102	GEN SMK MECH:MTRZD DUAL PURP XM56	66	12,515			66	12,515
103	GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	40	11,587			40	11,587
104	GEN SET, SMOKE, MECH: PUL JET,XM157	118	3,475			118	3,475
105	JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	0	-				-
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
106	RIBBON BRIDGE	0	4,300				4,300
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
107	DISPENSER, MINE M139	0	962				962
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
108	AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITY	0	1,462				1,462
109	CHEM/BIO PROTECTIVE SHELTER	0	-				-
110	SPACE HEATER	258	2,317			258	2,317
111	FORCE PROVIDER	2	11,661			2	11,661
112	REFRIGERATION EQUIPMENT	0	4,297				4,297
113	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CSS-EQ)	0	2,688				2,688
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
114	LAB PETROLEUM MODULAR BASE	0	-				-
115	INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	0	1,064		60,000		61,064
116	HEMTT AVIATION REFUELING SYSTEM	0	-				-
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (POL)	0	5,331				5,331

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
118	FWD AREA WTR POINT SUP SYSTEM	0	-				-
119	SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	0	-				-
120	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WATER EQ)	0	2,970				2,970
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
121	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	0	15,851				15,851
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
122	SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	31	1,687			31	1,687
123	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MAINT EQ)	0	1,339				1,339
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
124	ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	0	-				
125	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	25	6,250			25	6,250
126	DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	20	7,707			20	7,707
127	CRANE, WHEEL MTD, 25T, 3/4 CU YD, RT	21	6,142			21	6,142
128	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CONST EQUIP)	0	382		60,000		60,382
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
129	PUSHER TUG, SMALL	2	6,877			2	6,877
130	FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON	1	14,328			1	14,328
131	CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	0	-				-
132	RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 100 TON	138	14,464			138	14,464
133	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	0	5,728				5,728
	GENERATORS						
134	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	0	13,187				13,187
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
135	TRUCK, FORK LIFT, DE, PT, RT, 50000 LB	0	-				-
136	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARTICULATING SYSTEM	151	15,953			151	15,953
137	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (MHE)	0	2,666				2,666
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
138	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	0	4,714				4,714
139	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	0	82,724				82,724
140	SIMNET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	0	78,400				78,400
141	FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	0	17,390				17,390
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
142	RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	0	13,835				13,835
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	0	7,232				7,232
144	SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)	0	9,555				9,555
145	BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	0	-		27,000		27,000
146	ARMS CONTROL COMPLIANCE	0	-				-

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
147	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	0	14,696				14,696
148	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	0	1,915				1,915
149	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	0	13,549				13,549
150	ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (OTH SPT EQ)	0	-				-
151	OPA INITIAL SPARES	0	-				-
152	TRACTOR VAPOR	0	2,174				2,174
153	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION	0	-				-
154	CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	OPA1						
155	INITIAL SPARES - TSV	0	94				94
	OPA2						
156	INITIAL SPARES - C&E	0	60,503				60,503
	OPA3						
157	INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	0	1,006				1,006
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		2,627,440		671,500		3,298,940

Section 112. Army assistance for chemical demilitarization citizens advisory commissions.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 172 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 to make it consistent with the reassignment of program management. Currently, Section 172 of the Act directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a representative from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics, and Environment) to meet periodically with citizen commissions to hear their concerns regarding the Army chemical agents and munitions disposal program. Responsibility for this program was reassigned last year to the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition).

OTHER ARMY PROGRAMS

Army Aircraft

C–XX medium range aircraft

Last year the committee recommended an increase of $23.0 million for competitive procurement by the Army of four new production C–XX turbofan aircraft, now designated UC–35A. The committee has learned that the contract for the first two aircraft was awarded in January of 1996 and that this contract was funded by fiscal year 1995 funds. The Army has identified the UC–35A as its highest priority fixed-wing program due to the operational efficiencies derived from its modern design. The committee also notes the savings achieved through the competitive procurement of this aircraft.

Understanding the Army's requirement for a total of 35 aircraft, the committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million for competitive procurement by the Army of eight production UC–35A turbofan aircraft.

AH–64 Apache modifications

The budget request included $43.2 million to procure 30 of the originally planned 38 upgrades to the Apache system. The committee is concerned about potential program delays for the Apache Longbow and remains committed to fielding this vital system on schedule. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million to restore the previous upgrade schedule.

CH–47 modifications

The budget request included $7.8 million to procure safety and operational modifications for the CH–47 helicopter fleet. The committee remains concerned about the heavy lift capability for the Army and the ability of an aging fleet to perform this critical mission. Over time, modifications to the existing CH–47 airframe have added significant weight to the aircraft, requiring an upgrade to the current engine configuration. It is expected that the proposed T55–L–714 engine will increase payload capability by up to 3900 pounds and greatly reduce operation and maintenance costs over the life cycle of the new engine. The committee recommends an increase of $52.3 million to begin the upgrade process for the fleet.

AH–64D attack helicopter

The budget request included $373.9 million to procure Longbow systems for the AH–64D Apache helicopter and associated equipment. The committee notes the Army budget does not meet outstanding requirements for Apache Longbow systems and recommends an increase of $130.0 million to procure an additional six new aircraft with training devices. The committee directs the Army to consider future force requirements and budget the resources necessary to procure additional aircraft as soon as possible.

The committee is also concerned that only one Longbow crew trainer will be procured through the current fiscal year 1997 budget. Recognizing the complex nature of the Longbow system, it is imperative that organizations fielding this system have access to these important training devices to ensure they are capable of training the operators who must maintain these critical systems.

The committee recommends an increase of $130.0 million to procure six Longbow aircraft and an additional $53.0 million to procure five training devices for two institutional training facilities.

OH–58D Kiowa Warrior

The budget request included $9.1 million to complete fielding of previously procured Kiowa Warrior systems. The committee notes that budget decrements from fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 1996 have left the Army unable to complete the retrofit of 16 Kiowa Warrior helicopters and believes it important that these final airframes be retrofitted and returned to the field. Even with the completion of this retrofit requirement, the Army will still be short of the number of Kiowa Warrior systems needed to fill essential warfighter requirements. The committee, therefore, recommends $38.4 million to complete outstanding retrofit requirements and an additional $120.0 million to procure an additional 15 aircraft, for a total of $167.5 million.

Aircraft survivability equipment

The budget request included $4.8 million to support aircraft survivability enhancements. The committee supports Army efforts to provide crew warning devices that alert pilots when they have been illuminated by threat defense systems; these devices reduce aircrew vulnerability in a hostile environment. The committee recommends the following increases:

(1) $11.0 million to procure the AV/AVR–2A(V) laser detecting sets needed to protect the attack aviation fleet;

(2) $10.0 million to begin integrating radar deception and jamming devices on Army aircraft in fiscal year 1997; and

(3) $13.0 million to accelerate procurement of installation kits for the advanced threat infrared countermeasure for installation on the Longbow Apache production line.

Army Missile

Javelin medium anti-tank weapon

The budget request included $162.1 million to procure 1,020 Javelin missiles. The committee is concerned about the recent termination of the armored gun system (AS), the retirement of the M551

Sheridan in fiscal year 1997, and the impact that these decisions might have on early-entry forces. The committee, therefore, supports the Army's proposal to accelerate Javelin fielding to the 82nd Airborne Division in order to provide these forces with an effective anti-armor capability.

The committee also recognizes the importance of cost savings and supports Army efforts to maximize the benefits of multi-year contracting for the Javelin system, and supports procurement funding to support achievement of an economic order quantity (EOQ).

The committee recommends an increase of $5.7 million for accelerated production and fielding of command launch units and $34.0 million in procurement funding for EOQ for a total of $201.8 million.

Multiple Launch Rocket System rocket

The budget request included $24.4 million to procure 852 extended range rockets. The committee is concerned about the production dip in fiscal year 1997 and believes sufficient funding should be provided to maintain production stability. The committee recommends an additional $17.0 million in fiscal year 1997 in order to maintain a stable production rate and procure additional rockets.

Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) launcher

The budget request included $38.0 million for program support to fielded launchers. The committee supports the effort to apply lessons learned from Operation Desert Storm and notes an Army Science Board study that recommended the addition of one MLRS firing battery of launchers for each heavy division. The committee believes that this restructuring should begin as soon as possible and recommends an increase of $110.0 million to initiate this process in 1997 and procure four batteries of the six required. The Army is directed to provide resources for the remaining batteries in the fiscal year 1998 budget.

The committee continues to support Army National Guard (ARNG) efforts to convert artillery battalions to MLRS configuration and understands that an additional $37.0 million would refurbish four additional batteries of launchers (36) which could be used to support ARNG modernization.

Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)

The budget request included $92.8 million to procure 97 missiles with spares. The committee supports the Army effort to begin a multiyear procurement for the Block 1A version of the missile in fiscal year 1998 if funding for economic order quantity (EOQ) can be obtained. The multiyear contract would reduce program costs by $63.0 million with a corresponding reduction of $100,000 per missile (10 percent) for those missiles procured in fiscal year 1998 and beyond.

The committee recommends an increase of $69.0 million for EOQ procurement in fiscal year 1997 for a total of $161.8 million.

Patriot modifications

The budget request included $11.5 million to support fielding of anticipated materiel changes to the Patriot weapon system. The committee recognizes critical lessons learned during recent technology demonstrations that highlighted the benefits of digitizing the maintenance portion of battlefield operations. Future Patriot development activities provide the opportunity to develop and insert hardware that would support the fielding of an integrated diagnostic support system (IDSS). The committee is encouraged to note that insertion of IDSS into future Patriot modifications could result in $8.5 million in annual savings and would greatly reduce the need for an intermediate level of maintenance.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million for IDSS development and hardware procurement for a total of $23.5 million.

Stinger missile modifications

The budget request included $16.9 million for missile hardware and software modifications. The committee notes that while the Block I retrofit program is fully funded, the modification pace does not provide an economic production rate that could reduce retrofit costs by $2,200 per unit. The committee also understands that there is an outstanding requirement to modify computer chip modules in gripstocks and circuit cards in fielded missiles in order to capitalize on improvements in accuracy and performance.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.0 million to increase the production rate to an economic level and $15.8 million to support production and installation of new modules in Force Package 1 and 2 platforms for a total of $39.7 million.

Avenger modifications

The budget request included no funding for Avenger modifications in fiscal year 1997. The committee notes that in fiscal year 1998, the Army will begin funding a slew-to-cue (STC) modification to the Avenger system that will increase the overall system effectiveness by 55 percent and will make the system more survivable. By investing in the STC modification in fiscal year 1997, the Department of Defense will save approximately $9.0 million in overall funding.

The committee recommends an increase of $29.0 million for fiscal year 1997.

TOW modifications

The budget request included no funding for tube launched, optically tracked, wire guided (TOW) missile modifications in fiscal year 1997. The committee notes that a low-rate initial production decision is scheduled for June, 1996 for the improved target acquisition system (ITAS) associated with the TOW system. Correspondingly, an acceleration of the ITAS buy with procurement funds in fiscal year 1997 could result in approximately $4.0 million in inflation savings for this activity.

The committee also recognizes and supports the requirement to maintain a continuous source of training missiles and believes that by using a modification of out-of-production missiles in lieu of pro-

curing new training rounds, the Department of Defense can save precious resources.

The committee recommends an additional $26.0 million to accelerate the ITAS buy (for 45 ITAS units), and an additional $7.0 million to procure and install modification kits to support training activities, for a total of $33.0 million.

Dragon missile

The budget request included $3.2 million to support fabrication and application of safety circuits in Dragon missiles. The Army budget only supports the modification of 3,722 Dragon training missiles. The committee is very concerned about soldier safety and the ability of National Guard forces to deploy with viable organic weapon systems. Additionally, the committee understands that significant work has been accomplished to date towards increasing system lethality. The committee understands that development work can be completed for a modest investment this fiscal year and supports that effort. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $25.0 million for a total of $28.2 million to complete required modifications.

Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles

Bradley Fighting Vehicle

The budget request included $134.4 million for the Bradley base sustainment program. The committee notes the budget request supports the procurement of the first low-rate initial production models of the A3 version of the Bradley Fighting Vehicle (BFV). Recognizing the enhanced capabilities of the A3 model as well as the benefit of achieving the low rate initial production requirement faster, the committee recommends an increase of $57.2 million to procure an additional 18 vehicles.

The committee also recommends an increase of $35.5 million to complete a buy of reactive armor tiles for BFV in sufficient quantity to outfit a brigade combat team and to establish a domestic production capability.

The committee, therefore, recommends a total of $227.1 million for the BFV.

Field artillery ammunition support vehicle (FAASV)

The budget request included $34.4 million to procure FAASV systems. The committee believes it is important to support the fielding of complete Paladin artillery systems to the National Guard and, therefore, understands the requirement to procure an additional 36 FAASV systems to be available to support National Guard modernization fielding activities. The committee recommends an increase of $50.8 million to procure 36 FAASV systems that would be available to support fielding of two complete battalion sets to the Army National Guard.

Carrier modifications (M113)

The budget request included $23.0 million to continue modernization of the M113 armored personnel carrier family of vehicles. The committee continues to support steady funding for this

critical upgrade program and recommends an increase of $20.0 million.

M109A6 Paladin

The budget request included $75.0 million for M109A6 Paladin systems. The committee is aware of Army studies that conclude the artillery mission is well-suited for Army National Guard units and continues to be concerned with the rate of modernization of National Guard artillery battalions. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $61.2 million to procure 36 additional Paladin systems that would be available for Army National Guard requirements.

Field artillery ammunition supply vehicle (FAASV) product improvement program (PIP) to fleet

The budget request included $4.7 million to modify FAASV systems with upgraded equipment. One element of the modernized Paladin/FAASV system that has not been funded is the vehicle intercom system for FAASV. The committee understands that an enhanced digital intercom system modification has been made on the Paladin production line with no corresponding modification for FAASV production efforts. This has resulted in incompatible headset connectors between the Paladin system and the associated FAASV vehicle. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to begin the process of providing for commonality between these two systems.

Improved Recovery Vehicle

The budget request included $28.6 million to procure 12 M88A1E1 Hercules recovery vehicles. The committee understands the importance of procuring these vehicles as soon as possible because the older M88A1 lacks necessary horsepower and braking to safely support recovery of the Abrams main battle tank. Additionally, current procurement rates do not provide for the best economic quantity order which would be realized at 36 per year and would achieve savings of 15 percent per vehicle. The committee recommends an increase of $50.1 million to provide resources necessary to procure 36 vehicles in fiscal year 1997 and an additional $1.0 million for associated spares and repair parts.

M1 Abrams tank (modifications)

The budget request included $50.2 million to procure modification kits for the M1 Abrams tank to improve lethality, survivability, and safety. The committee is concerned about operation and maintenance costs for the Abrams fleet and has noted the successful application of external auxiliary power units (EAPU) in reducing the requirement for main engine idling during defensive operations. Demand for the EAPU by soldiers in Bosnia is a significant endorsement for this modification.

Additionally, the committee notes progress toward correcting an established Operation Desert Storm deficiency with the air filtration system on the Abrams. Recognizing the enhancement made by installing the pulse-jet air system (PJAS) to the combat capability

of a unit, the committee supports an acceleration of procurement for these devices.

The committee recommends an increase of $28.5 million to procure 1,000 EAPU's and 100 additional PJAS systems for a total of $78.7 million. The Army is encouraged to ensure future year funding is provided to complete the modifications required for the Abrams fleet.

Small arms programs

In fiscal year 1994, the committee expressed concerns with the overall status of the small arms industrial base. At that time, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to establish a panel, under the auspices of the Army Science Board, to develop a viable plan to preserve critical elements of the small arms industrial base. The panel identified several ways to preserve this base at minimal cost and recommended production of modest quantities of selected arms. In fiscal years 1995 and 1996, the committee again stated its support for the thrust of the panel's recommendations and provided additional funding to support small arms procurement. It has become evident that as procurement funding continues to decline for small arms, the Army must look to other recommendations made by the panel if the small arms base is to remain viable. Thus, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review the original recommendations of the panel and take immediate steps to implement those actions that support sustainment of this critical production base. The committee also recommends increases for fiscal year 1997 for the following programs: $20.0 million to begin procurement of the M240 medium machine gun; $0.9 million to maintain an economical production rate of the M4 carbine; $1.0 million to maintain a stable production rate for the M16 assault rifle and approximately 2,000 additional weapons; $1.0 million to maintain a stable production rate and approximately 384 additional M249 squad automatic weapons; $28.9 million to meet Army requirements and maintain stable production rate for the MK19 automatic grenade launcher.

Army Ammunition

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition that was contained in the President's budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness, for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Army ammunition procurement:

Item:	
Small Arms:	*$ millions*
	$ millions
5.56 mm	1.3
7.62 mm	2.1
9 mm	3.0
20 mm	0.3
25 mm	50.0
30 mm	15.0
Mortar:	
60 mm HE, M720	12.5
60 mm Illum, M721/M767	7.0

	$ millions
Tank:	
120 mm APFSDS–T M829A2	12.0
120 mm HEAT–MP–T M830A1	45.0
120 mm TP–T M831/M831A1	2.4
120 mm TPCSDS–T M865	3.2
Artillery:	
Proj Arty 155MM HE M795	55.0
Proj Arty 155MM SADARM M898	33.5
Other:	
Selectable Lightweight Attack Munitions	3.0
Production Base:	
Armament Retooling & Manufacturing Spt	58.0
Total	303.3

Armament retooling and manufacturing support (ARMS)

The committee authorizes $58.0 million for the continued operation of the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) program. The committee expects these funds to be utilized in the most effective manner to ensure preservation of those facilities most likely to be required to fulfill the military's needs to support the national military strategy. Accordingly, the committee directs the Army to prioritize facility reutilization and provide the committee with a report addressing the Army's efforts to preserve ammunition facilities in the most efficient manner by January 1, 1997. The report should also address the amount of cost savings that have been achieved to date by those facilities receiving ARMS funding.

Other Army Procurement

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)

The budget request included $96.785 million to procure 1,126 HMMWV's. This number reflects a significant reduction from previous years, despite the fact that there remains a valid requirement for these vehicles. The committee understands that the minimum sustaining rate to maintain a viable supply of required vehicles is not achieved by the current budget request.

Additionally, the committee is concerned about the number of uparmored HMMWV's (UAHMMWV) being produced. In light of lessons learned in Bosnia and recognizing the importance of force protection, the committee believes that more UAHMMWV's should be procured. In order to meet the needs of the military services and maintain industrial production capacity at a minimum level, the committee recommends an increase of $41.0 million to support the production base, a total of 2,350 vehicles, and an additional $25.0 million to procure an additional 233 UAHMMWV's, a total procurement of 360 in fiscal year 1997.

Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV)

The budget request included $233.1 million to procure 1,603 trucks based on a common chassis but varied by payload and mission. The committee is pleased to see the Army placing necessary resources to meet the requirements for the medium truck fleet. Despite the increase in truck procurement, there is still a shortfall in funding for required tarp and bow kits to support the initial fielding of the FMTV system. The committee recommends an increase

of $5.0 million to procure the kits necessary to support the fielding plan.

Family of heavy tactical vehicles (FHTV)

The budget request included $163.3 million to procure vehicles necessary to support modern and highly mobile combat units. The committee recognizes that equipment, over time, has become heavier and mobility continues to be a key to success on the battlefield. While the Army has placed more resources into improving capabilities in the heavy lift area, it still is a function that needs improvement. The committee recommends increases in the family of heavy tactical vehicles budget line for the following components of the heavy vehicle fleet: $40.0 million for 80 additional heavy equipment transporters that are necessary for the activation of new transportation units; $50.0 million to buy 167 palletized load systems which can be used to support three truck units in the Army National Guard; and $33.0 million for 126 heavy expanded mobility tactical trucks to meet all Force Package 1 requirements.

Enhanced position location reporting system (EPLRS)

The budget request included $50.5 million to procure this critical battlefield system. The EPLRS provides real-time data distribution and serves to enhance situational awareness. The committee believes that EPLRS enhances combat power and reduces risk. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to procure 485 additional EPLRS units with installation kits, for a total procurement in fiscal year 1997 of 1285 systems.

SINCGARS family

The budget request included $297.5 million to procure 25,616 ground radios, 593 airborne radios, and 13,405 data transfer devices. The committee is pleased to note the funding request was raised to complete the accelerated buyout of single channel ground and airborne radio system (SINCGARS) radios. The committee understands that some prior year funding has been withdrawn by the Department of Defense due to internal budget decisions. These reductions have had an adverse impact on the fielding schedule. The committee believes the original schedule should be maintained and is encouraged to note that an investment of an additional $30.0 million would procure approximately 4,500 radios and save $10.0 million.

Also of interest to the committee is the outstanding requirement to upgrade existing aircraft platforms with modification kits required to install new radios.

The committee therefore recommends the following increases: $30.0 million to procure an additional 4,500 ground-based radios and $13.3 million to procure the kits for installing SINCGARS in aircraft and complete required modifications.

These increases result in a total of $340.8 million for fiscal year 1997.

Army communications

The Army continues to modernize the area common user system (ACUS) and to transition to the warfighter information network

(WIN) to capitalize on advances made in information technology. WIN is the number one command, control, communications, and computer item being addressed in the Army Program Objective Memorandum (POM) for fiscal years 1998–2004, and has received funding increases in recent years. The committee understands that a shortfall exists to continue this work in fiscal year 1997 and believes it is important to continue this work. The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million to develop tactical communications systems further and transition to the WIN modernization effort.

All source analysis system (ASAS)

The budget request included $12.3 million to replace selected, aging Block 1 workstations and to support digitization efforts. The committee recognizes the value to force capabilities by fielding ASAS workstations to tactical echelons below division level. The committee recommends an increase of $9.7 million to field workstations to maneuver brigade and battalion warfighters.

The committee has also noted with great interest the work completed by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in developing the first operational prototype of an intelligence fusion system known as the integrated battlespace intelligence server, or IBIS. This meritorious work would support Army efforts associated with ASAS. The committee directs that this work be integrated into the Army effort and recommends an increase of $2.0 million for PE 604321A to support technological transfer requirements.

Forward area air defense (FAAD) ground based sensor

The budget request included $51.2 million to procure 16 key radar-based sensors for forward deployed Army units. The forward area air defense sensor serves to acquire targets and alert forces of the proximity of fixed wing aircraft, rotary wing aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles and cruise missiles. The committee is aware that the current production rate is at an uneconomical level and prevents this key force protection device from reaching the field as soon as required. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of $29.2 million to allow the program to procure a total of 36 systems with a per unit saving of $900,000.

Night vision devices

The committee is encouraged by the increased attention given this critical area. The budget request for fiscal year 1997 included $111.9 million to continue developing and fielding critical night vision devices that will allow the Army to "own the night" and to field systems to core contingency operations forces. The committee is convinced that these devices will increase battlefield effectiveness and lethality, reduce the risk to our soldiers, and supports an aggressive fielding effort. Therefore, the committee recommends the following increases: $50.0 million to fill the requirement for approximately 1,000 thermal weapon sights (TWS) for Special Operations Forces (SOF); $50.0 million to procure approximately 7,500 night vision goggles (NVG) for critical combat units in the SOF and other light units; $9.1 million for aiming lights, including $4.1 mil-

lion to procure 19,260 AN/PAQ–4B&4C aiming lights to fill the modified infantry basis of issue plan and upgrade existing lights, and $5.0 million to procure 5,100 AN/PEQ–2 illuminator/aiming lights for the Army and 2,500 devices for the Marine Corps; and $25.0 million for initial spares and facilitization of total package fielding for these devices.

The committee encourages the Army to continue research and development in this area to ensure the force is well equipped to fight and win at night.

Advanced field artillery tactical data system (AFATDS)

The budget request included $31.6 million to continue fielding of the AFATDS system to high priority units. The committee has been advised that the successful use of this equipment has resulted in a new requirement to field the battlefield coordination element (BCE) at each corps headquarters. The BCE will provide an interface capability at echelons above corps that gives commanders the capability to orchestrate the deep battle and interface with the fighting corps/division. The committee recommends an increase of $3.5 million to procure the equipment necessary to ensure that the fielding of active Army units is completed by fiscal year 2002, as originally scheduled.

Total distribution system

The budget request included $19.7 million to field equipment supporting Army logistical requirements to distribute, track, and account for supplies and equipment in peace and in war. The committee supports the timely fielding of this equipment and notes the corresponding increase in efficiency and cost savings in managing inventory. This program will enhance logistics operations and should be fielded throughout the Army as soon as practicable. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million to procure the necessary equipment to support fielding requirements.

Standard integrated command post system

The budget request included $26.3 million to procure tents, shelters and kits for command post systems. However, the committee understands that there is a significant shortfall in procuring necessary shelters to house command and control systems that are being fielded. Recognizing the importance of fielding modernized systems as soon as possible, it is clear that this shortfall must be addressed. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $12.7 million to buy the shelters required through fiscal year 1997 and to ensure that fieldings can occur on schedule.

Inland petroleum distribution system

The committee recognizes the importance of improving capabilities of Army logistical systems to support deployment requirements. The committee believes the inland petroleum distribution system will provide a vital resource to a deployed force and recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure the equipment required for this system.

Construction equipment, items less than $2.0 million

The committee continues to support efforts to modernize the equipment associated with engineer organizations to allow these units to perform critical engineer support functions. One of the less glamorous areas that frequently falls short in the prioritization process is heavy equipment. The committee notes an outstanding Army requirement for 20-ton dump trucks and recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure 300 vehicles.

Base level communications equipment

The committee is concerned to note that base communications facilities have not received the modernization resources required to support existing requirements. The committee recommends an increase of $27.0 million to begin modernization of base level communications equipment.

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER	10	302,946	2	78,000	12	380,946
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(20,932)				(20,932)
2	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	22,897				22,897
3	F/A-18C/D (FIGHTER) HORNET	0	-	6	234,000	6	234,000
3	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				-
5	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	12	2,089,571			12	2,089,571
5	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(229,715)				(229,715)
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	294,867				294,867
7	CH/MH-53E (HELICOPTER) SUPER STALLION	0	-				-
7a	CH-53 FLIGHT SIMULATOR				1,000		1,000
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
8	V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	4	547,475	2	281,000	6	828,475
8	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(46,571)				(46,571)
9	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	57,753		70,000		127,753
10	AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	0	-				-
11	SH-60B (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK	0	6,432				6,432
11	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
12	SH-60F CV (ASW HELICOPTER)	0	-				-
13	E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	2	169,225	2	139,000	4	308,225
13	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(41,723)				(41,723)
14	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	20,973				20,973
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
15	T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	12	301,754			12	301,754
15	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(29,002)				(29,002)
16	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	26,353				26,353
17	T-39N SABRELINER	0	-				-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
18	HH-60H (HELICOPTER)	0	-				-
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
19	EA-6 SERIES	0	100,620		73,000		173,620
20	AV-8 SERIES	0	22,852				22,852

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
21	F-14 SERIES	0	231,974				231,974
22	ADVERSARY	0	117				117
23	ES-3 SERIES	0	7,113				7,113
24	F-18 SERIES	0	156,486		50,000		206,486
25	H-46 SERIES	0	35,334				35,334
26	AH-1W SERIES	0	23,950				23,950
27	H-53 SERIES	0	44,567		14,000		58,567
28	SH-60 SERIES	0	47,790		20,000		67,790
29	H-1 SERIES	0	9,339				9,339
30	H-3 SERIES	0	4,860				4,860
31	EP-3 SERIES	0	35,429				35,429
32	P-3 SERIES	0	128,560		69,400		197,960
33	S-3 SERIES	0	36,413				36,413
34	E-2 SERIES	0	23,143				23,143
35	TRAINER A/C SERIES	0	3,652				3,652
36	C-130 SERIES	0	2,967				2,967
37	FEWSG	0	661				661
38	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	0	24,884				24,884
39	E-6 SERIES	0	100,045				100,045
40	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	0	21,061				21,061
41	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	0	12,809				12,809
42	T-45 SERIES	0	5,642				5,642
43	POWER PLANT CHANGES	0	13,633				13,633
44	MISC FLIGHT SAFETY CHANGES	0	199				199
45	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	0	20,069				20,069
46	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	0	87,841				87,841
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
47	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	839,987				839,987
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIE						
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
48	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	313,070				313,070
49	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	14,814				14,814
50	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	16,941				16,941
51	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	11,940				11,940
52	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	8,922				8,922
53	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	1,965				1,965
54	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		5,881,952		1,029,400		6,911,352

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT I	0	-				-
2	TRIDENT II	7	299,827			7	299,827
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(32,335)				(32,335)
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	53,533				53,533
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
4	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	2,124				2,124
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
5	TOMAHAWK	120	88,513		32,000		120,513
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
6	AMRAAM	37	36,091	63	22,000	100	58,091
7	HARPOON	0	-				-
8	JSOW	100	64,426			100	64,426
9	STANDARD MISSILE	127	197,463		40,000		237,463
10	RAM	140	48,663			140	48,663
11	AERIAL TARGETS	0	73,147				73,147
12	DRONES AND DECOYS	0	-				-
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	0	18,044				18,044
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
14	TOMAHAWK MODS	0	-		14,400		14,400
15	SPARROW MODS	0	2,530				2,530
16	SIDEWINDER MODS	0	1,301				1,301
17	HARPOON MODS	0	22,893				22,893
18	STANDARD MISSILES MODS	0	18,540				18,540
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
19	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	34,260				34,260
20	FLEET SATELLITE COMM (MYP) (SPACE)	0	113,242		4,500		117,742
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
21	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	19,126				19,126
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
22	ASW TARGETS	0	5,052				5,052
23	VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC (VLA)	0	-				-

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
24	MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	0	1,761				1,761
25	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	0	63,892				63,892
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
26	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	22,537				22,537
27	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	0	14,820				14,820
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
28	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	2,620				2,620
	OTHER WEAPONS						
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
29	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	0	870				870
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
30	CIWS MODS	0	25,430				25,430
31	5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	0	2,875				2,875
32	MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	0	685				685
33	MODS UNDER $2 MILLION	0	1,607				1,607
	OTHER						
34	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
35	PRIOR YEAR DEFICIENCIES	0	-				-
	OTHER ORDNANCE						
	AIR LAUNCHED ORDNANCE						-
36	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	27,150				27,150
37	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	0	9,433				9,433
38	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	0	5,341				5,341
39	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	11,131				11,131
40	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	0	21,939				21,939
41	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	0	8,172				8,172
42	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	21,980				21,980
43	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	0	580				580
44	JATOS	0	4,166				4,166
	SHIP ORDNANCE						
45	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	0	13,495				13,495
46	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	0	2,738				2,738
47	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	0	4,133				4,133
	OTHER ORDNANCE						
48	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	0	3,126				3,126
49	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	0	10,131				10,131

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
50	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	0	5,840				5,840
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
51	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	47,471				47,471
	TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,400,363		112,900		1,513,263
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORP						
	PROC AMMO, NAVY						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	-				-
2	2.75 INCH ROCKETS	0	-				-
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	0	-				-
4	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	-				-
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	0	-				-
6	AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	0	-				-
7	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	-				-
8	MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	0	-				-
9	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY MATERIAL	0	-				-
10	JATOS	0	-				-
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
11	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	0	-				-
12	CIWS AMMUNITION	0	-				-
13	76MM GUN AMMUNITION	0	-				-
14	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	0	-				-
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
15	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	0	-				-
16	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	0	-				-
17	MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	0	-				-
18	SHIP EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	-				-
	PROC AMMO, MC						
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
19	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
20	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
21	.50 CALIBER	0	-				-
22	40 MM, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
23	60 MM HE M888	0	-				-
24	81 MM HE	0	-				-
25	81 MM SMOKE SCREEN	0	-				-

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
26	81MM ILLUMINATION (M853)	0	-				-
27	120MM TPCSDS-T M865	0	-				-
28	120 MM TP-T M831	0	-				-
31	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
32	9 MM ALL TYPES	0	-				-
33	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
34	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	-				-
35	AMMO MODERNIZATION	0	-				-
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
36	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	0	-				-
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORP		-				-
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	0	-				-
1	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
2	SSN-21	0	699,071		105,000		804,071
2	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
3	NEW SSN	0	-				-
4	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	296,186		701,000		997,186
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	0	237,029				237,029
6	CGN REFUELING OVERHAULS	0	-				-
6	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
7	DDG-51	4	3,483,030			4	3,483,030
7	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(108,337)				(108,337)
8	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	9,379		750,000		759,379
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
9	COMPLETION OF LSD-52	0	-				-
10	LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)	0	-				-
10	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
11	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				-
12	LPD-17	0	-				-
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGR						
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM COS						
13	AE(C)	2	59,665			2	59,665
14	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	0	-	1	54,400	1	54,400

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
14a	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS-SWATH			1	45,000	1	45,000
15	SERVICE CRAFT	0	-				-
16	OUTFITTING	0	91,990				91,990
17	POST DELIVERY	0	141,855				141,855
18	AFS (C)	0	-				-
19	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	2,062				2,062
20	SSN MAIN STEAM CONDENSERS	0	-				-
	TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		4,911,930		1,655,400		6,567,330
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	0	7,898				7,898
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	0	3,445				3,445
3	STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	0	248				248
4	OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	0	7,922				7,922
	GENERATORS						
5	OTHER GENERATORS	0	588				588
	PUMPS						
6	OTHER PUMPS	0	78				78
7	SUBMARINE PUMP RETROFIT KITS	0	-				-
	AIR COMPRESSORS						
8	HIGH PRESSURE AIR COMPRESSORS	0	-				-
	PROPELLERS						
9	SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	0	39,182				39,182
10	OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	0	2,897				2,897
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
11	ELEC SUSPENDED GYRO NAVIGATOR	0	-				-
12	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	0	17,200		10,000		27,200
	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
13	UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	0	11,858				11,858
	PERISCOPES						
14	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	0	32,625				32,625
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
15	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	9,175				9,175
16	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	0	6,924				6,924
17	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	135,216				135,216

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
18	SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	0	3,365				3,365
19	SURFACE SHIP SILENCING EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
20	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	0	9,513				9,513
21	SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	21,217				21,217
22	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	9,229				9,229
23	DSSP EQUIPMENT	0	5,217				5,217
24	MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	0	4,089				4,089
25	HM&E ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	0	35,545				35,545
26	SURFACE IMA	0	2,437				2,437
27	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS	0	192				192
28	MINI/MICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	0	963				963
29	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	-				-
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
30	REACTOR POWER UNITS	0	223,392				223,392
31	REACTOR COMPONENTS	0	185,551				185,551
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
32	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	0	8,662				8,662
33	EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	0	5,181		2,500		7,681
	SMALL BOATS						
34	STANDARD BOATS	0	4,576				4,576
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
35	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	1,464				1,464
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
36	PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES	0	2,930				2,930
37	OPERATING FORCES IPE	0	911				911
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
38	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	0	68,485				68,485
39	FLEET MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	0	-				-
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP RADARS						
40	AN/SPS-40	0	7,663				7,663
41	AN/SPS-48	0	12,847				12,847
42	AN/SPS-49	0	12,136				12,136
43	AN/SYS-()	0	861				861
44	MK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM	0	1,347				1,347
45	RADAR SUPPORT	0	-		16,900		16,900
46	SURFACE ELECTRO-OPTICAL SYSTEM	0	-				-
	SHIP SONARS						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
47	SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	6,888				6,888
48	AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	0	24,674				24,674
49	SSN ACOUSTICS	0	44,134				44,134
50	SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME	0	-				-
51	SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	17,302				17,302
52	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	0	10,669				10,669
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
53	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	0	7,840				7,840
54	SSTD	0	5,701		12,500		18,201
55	ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	0	228				228
56	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	0	34,635				34,635
57	SURTASS	0	10,590				10,590
58	ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	0	10,126				10,126
59	CARRIER ASW MODULE	0	144				144
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
60	AN/SLQ-32	0	6,358				6,358
61	AN/WLR-1	0	173				173
62	AN/WLR-8	0	-				-
63	INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	0	4,671				4,671
64	EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,949				7,949
65	C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	0	556				556
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
66	COMBAT DF	0	10,547				10,547
67	OUTBOARD	0	295				295
68	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTEN	0	38,957				38,957
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
69	AN/WLQ-4	0	4,208				4,208
70	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	0	5,418				5,418
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
71	NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	0	18,220				18,220
72	TACTICAL FLAG COMMAND CENTER	0	23,941		3,500		27,441
73	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	0	32,555				32,555
74	LINK 16 HARDWARE	0	17,808				17,808
75	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	0	22,853		25,845		48,698
76	SHALLOW WATER MCM	0	961				961
77	EMSP (MYP)	0	-				-
78	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	0	4,943				4,943
79	HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS	0	3,239				3,239
80	ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	0	3,363				3,363

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
81	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	4,054				4,054
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
82	OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	1,592				1,592
83	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	28,343				28,343
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
84	MATCALS	0	4,151				4,151
85	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	13,434				13,434
86	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	0	15,990				15,990
87	TACAN	0	2,266				2,266
88	AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	9,722				9,722
89	MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	0	7,217				7,217
90	FACSFAC	0	3,910				3,910
91	ID SYSTEMS	0	4,702				4,702
92	SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	0	-				-
93	TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	0	7,131				7,131
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
94	TADIX-B	0	4,243				4,243
95	NATIONAL IMAGERY SUPPORT	0	-				-
96	NCCS ASHORE	0	6,264				6,264
97	RADIAC	0	3,491				3,491
98	GPETE	0	9,354				9,354
99	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	0	4,951				4,951
100	CALIBRATION STANDARDS	0	2,183				2,183
101	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	0	5,423				5,423
102	SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	0	4,070				4,070
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
103	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	0	8,779		4,500		13,279
104	PORTABLE RADIOS	0	1,433				1,433
105	SINCGARS	0	4,699				4,699
106	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	0	15,006				15,006
107	SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	0	9,560				9,560
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
108	SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	0	4,140				4,140
109	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	0	29,430				29,430
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
110	SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	0	115,837		53,700		169,537
111	SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE)	0	24,653		7,000		31,653
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
112	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	0	1,989				1,989
113	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	0	-				-
114	NSIPS	0	-				-
115	JEDMICS	0	4,216				4,216
116	WWMCCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	0	1,712				1,712
117	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	0	43,315				43,315
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
118	SECURE VOICE SYSTEM	0	15,494				15,494
119	SECURE DATA SYSTEM	0	14,532				14,532
120	KEY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS	0	12,580				12,580
121	CRYPTOGRAPHIC ITEMS UNDER $2 MILL	0	-				-
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
122	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	0	1,308				1,308
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
123	ELECT ENGINEERED MAINTENANCE	0	-				-
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
124	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	0	-				-
	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SONOBUOYS						
125	AN/SSQ-36 (BT)	0	923				923
126	AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	0	22,704		12,200		34,904
126a	SSQ-53E		-		31,800		31,800
127	AN/SSQ-110	0	35,961				35,961
128	AN/SSQ-86 (DLC)	0	-				-
129	SIGNAL, UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS)	0	1,118				1,118
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
130	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	27,793				27,793
131	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	0	1,560				1,560
132	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	0	9,321				9,321
133	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	0	28,975				28,975
134	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	0	17,048				17,048
135	OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	0	737				737
136	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	0	13,811				13,811
137	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	0	13,465		59,700		73,165
138	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	0	15,282				15,282
139	REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	0	933				933
140	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	0	1,590				1,590
141	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,884				7,884

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
142	SAFETY & SURVIVABILITY ITEMS	0					
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
143	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	10,475				10,475
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
144	MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	0	1,879				1,879
145	HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	97				97
146	TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
147	POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
148	AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM	0	341				341
149	ENGAGEMENT SYSTEMS SUPPORT	0	15,054				15,054
150	NATO SEASPARROW	0	4,710				4,710
151	RAM GMLS	0	50,765		5,000		55,765
152	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	0	21,049				21,049
153	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	30,398				30,398
154	SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	75,574		23,000		98,574
155	SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	0	-				-
156	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	0	12,956				12,956
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
157	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	2,104				2,104
158	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	0	130,151				130,151
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
159	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	16,287				16,287
160	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	10,004				10,004
161	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	5,483				5,483
162	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	2,422				2,422
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
163	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	0	6,253		1,000		7,253
164	UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET	0	-				-
165	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	0	15,109		9,000		24,109
166	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES (CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT)	0	4,132				4,132
167	STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	0	1,437				1,437
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
168	FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	5,430				5,430
169	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	0	2,499				2,499
170	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	0	19,668				19,668
171	INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE	0	20,626				20,626
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
172	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0					
173	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	0	47				47
174	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	0	228				228
175	TRAILERS/TRUCK TRACTORS	0	76				76
176	EARTH MOVING EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
177	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	0	62				62
178	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
179	WEIGHT HANDLING EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
180	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	0	3,183		6,700		9,883
181	COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	0	878				878
182	MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	830				830
183	COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	0	338				338
184	OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	0	134				134
185	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	32,281				32,281
186	OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
187	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
188	FORKLIFT TRUCKS	0	3,322				3,322
189	OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	0	2,070				2,070
190	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
191	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	7,488				7,488
192	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	0	56,273				56,273
	PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
	TRAINING DEVICES						
193	SUBMARINE SONAR TRAINERS	0	-				-
194	SURFACE COMBAT SYSTEM TRAINERS	0	-				-
195	SHIP SYSTEM TRAINERS	0	-				-
196	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
197	TRAINING DEVICE MODIFICATIONS	0	-				-
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
198	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
199	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
200	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
201	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
202	ITEMS UNDER $2 MILLION	0	-				-
203	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
203a	OCEANOGRAPHIC SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				6,000		6,000

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
204	NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
205	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
206	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
207	INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE EQUIP	0	-				-
	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM						
208	COMPUTER ACQUISITION PROGRAM	0	-				-
	OTHER						
209	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
210	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	208,828				208,828
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		2,714,195		290,845		3,005,040
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	AMMUNITION						
	AMMUNITION						
1	5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	0	20,425				20,425
2	7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	0	6,493				6,493
3	.50 CALIBER	0	6,052				6,052
4	40 MM, ALL TYPES	0	3,210				3,210
5	60 MM HE M888	0	5,127				5,127
6	81 MM HE	0	1,731				1,731
7	81 MM SMOKE SCREEN	0	2,573				2,573
8	120MM TPCSDS-T M865	0	2,545				2,545
9	120 MM TP-T M831	0	1,723				1,723
10	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	4,807				4,807
11	9 MM ALL TYPES	0	2,793				2,793
12	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	686				686
13	AMMO MODERNIZATION	0	9,118				9,118
13a	155MM CHG. PROP. RED BAG	0	-		24,000		24,000
13b	155MM D864, BASE BLEED				45,000		45,000
13c	FUZE, ET, XM762	0	-		29,000		29,000
	OTHER SUPPORT						
14	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	0	1,601				1,601
	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
15	AAV7A1 PIP	0	14,003				14,003

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
16	LAV PIP	0	8,666				8,666
17	MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	0	480				480
18	ITEMS UNDER $2M (TRKD VEH)	0	96				96
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
19	MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	0	1,114				1,114
20	ITEMS UNDER $2M (ALL OTHER)	0	122				122
	GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
21	HAWK MOD	0	2,780				2,780
22	AAWS-MEDIUM	48	28,214		20,000		48,214
23	PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	0	10,562				10,562
	OTHER SUPPORT						
24	MODIFICATION KITS	0	1,808				1,808
25	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	0	96				96
	COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
	MANPACK RADIOS						
26	MANPACK RADIOS AND EQUIP	0	-				-
	VEHICLE MOUNTED RADIOS AND EQUIPMENT						
27	TSC-96 PIP FLEET SATCOM TERMINAL	0	-				-
	TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE EQUIPMENT						
28	JOINT TACT INFO DIST SYS (CL I)	0	-				-
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
29	AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	0	12,174				12,174
30	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP (TEL)	0	8,559				8,559
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT						
31	SINGLE CHAN GRD & AIR RADIO	0	-				-
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
32	MODIFICATION KITS (TEL)	0	-				-
33	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (TEL)	0	-				-
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
34	POS LOCATING RPTG SYSTEM (PLRS)	0	-				-
35	TACTICAL AIR OPER MODULE (TAOM)	0	-				-
36	ADVANCED TACT AIR COMMAND CENTER	0	-				-
37	MARINE TACTICAL C2	0	-				-
38	MULTI-SERV ADF FIELD ART TACTICAL DATA SYS	0	-				-
39	TACTICAL COMBAT OPERATIONS SYS	0	-				-
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
40	AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	0	30,380		3,800		34,180
41	METEOROLOGICAL SYSTEMS	0	-				-
42	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	26,372		16,300		42,672
43	MOD KITS (INTEL)	0	11,955				11,955
44	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (INTELL)	0	-				
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
45	ELECTRONIC TMDE REPAIR FACILITY	0	-				-
46	MECH TEST TMDE	0	3,028				3,028
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
47	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	0	17,182				17,182
48	ADP EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
49	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	0	11,402				11,402
50	MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	0	7,592				7,592
51	RADIO SYSTEMS	0	52,862				52,862
52	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	16,922				16,922
53	TELE/COMM INFRASTRUCTURE TECH SUPP	0	53,616		36,000		89,616
54	MOD KITS MAGTF C41	0	43,418				43,418
55	ITEMS < $2M MAGTF C41	0	301				301
56	MODIFICATION KITS (OTHER)	0	4,053				4,053
57	ITEMS < $2M (OTHER)	0	2,577				2,577
58	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	0	5,305				5,305
59	MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	0	7,695				7,695
60	TEST CALIB & MAINT SPT	0	-				-
61	MODIFICATION KITS (NONTEL)	0	-				-
62	ITEMS LESS THAN $2M (NONTEL)	0	-				-
	SUPPORT VEHICLES						
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
63	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	88	1,910			88	1,910
64	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	0	7,687				7,687
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
65	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM	0	-				-
66	TRAILERS	0	2,426		28,300		30,726
	OTHER SUPPORT						
67	MODIFICATION KITS	0	1,503				1,503
68	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	0	446				446
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
69	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	0	2,150				2,150
70	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	0	8,477				8,477
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
71	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	-				
72	AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	0	277				277
73	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	5,985				5,985
74	GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	0	5,134				5,134
75	TELEPHONE SYSTEM	0	-				-
76	WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	0	-				-
77	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	3,067				3,067
78	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	1,343				1,343
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
79	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
80	TRAINING DEVICES	0	10,846		58,200		69,046
81	CONTAINER FAMILY	0	7,134				7,134
	OTHER SUPPORT						
82	MODIFICATION KITS	0	1,083				1,083
83	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MIL	0	1,157				1,157
84	DRUG INTERDICTION	0	-				-
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
85	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	42,667				42,667
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
86	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	(3)				(3)
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		555,507		260,600		816,107

Section—121. EA–6B aircraft reactive jammer program.

The committee last year recommended an addition to the budget request of $216.0 million to ensure the Department of Defense (DOD) had the resources to update badly outdated and increasingly important electronic warfare aircraft. The committee's recommendation would have dealt with immediate needs and would have begun a modest program to provide low cost reactive jamming capability.

The committee understands the Department has initiated various projects to halt the deterioration of some of the aircraft and return others to service. However, the Department has informed the committee of its intention to delay development of new receivers or a reactive jamming capability until fiscal year 1999. In view of the resources applied by the Congress to this program in the fiscal year 1996 budget, the committee finds such an approach difficult to understand.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, the conferees noted the inconsistent nature of the Navy's actions regarding tactical electronic warfare (EW) in recent years and voiced deep concern with the Navy's vacillating commitment and support for meaningful upgrades for the EA–6B aircraft. In the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (H. Rept. 104–450), the conferees directed the Secretary of the Navy to:

(1) initiate the EA–6B modifications identified in the report; and

(2) provide the congressional defense committees with:

(a) a program and budget plan for completing the directed modifications;

(b) the Joint Tactical Airborne EW Study (JTAEWS).

The conferees prohibited the Department from obligating more than 75 percent of the procurement funds for F/A–18 aircraft until the Department complied with this guidance.

EA–6B aircraft reactive jammer program

Although funds were authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 1996 to initiate a reactive jammer program for the EA–6B, the Department of Defense chose not to initiate such a program, and elected instead to program funds for such an effort from fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2001.

The committee finds these actions of ignoring congressional direction and refusing to start a modest reactive jamming program unacceptable. The EA–6B is currently using obsolete receivers with technology from the 1960s. The EA–6B is scheduled to be the only airborne standoff jamming capability within DOD. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $55.0 million in PE 060427N to begin at once a program to develop and field a reactive jamming capability in the EA–6B.

It appears to the committee that the Department of the Navy intends to abide by the letter, but not the spirit of the law, particularly regarding reactive jamming capability. The committee received the report required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 simultaneous with the deadline for obligating the funds for the F/A–18 program. This action leads the

committee to believe that the language dealing with this and other important programs will have to be more detailed and explicit. Therefore, the committee feels compelled to recommend a provision that would require the Secretary to: (1) certify obligation of funds for a reactive jamming program; and (2) submit a plan for a complete program to the congressional defense committees before obligation of any funds for other recommended increases the EA–6B program. The provision would also provide that all additional funds listed below be transferred to the Air Force for upgrading and operating EF–111 aircraft, if such certification is not made by June 1, 1997.

The committee notes that the General Accounting Office published a recent report, "Combat Air Power—Funding Priority for Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses May Be Too Low" (GAO–NSIAD–96–128). That report concludes, "DoD's planned actions in the next few years will have a negative impact on SEAD [suppression of enemy air defenses] and may need to be reversed in the future, at much greater expense and effort." The report further suggests that, "DoD, prior to retiring the F–4G and the EF–111, reassess the relative funding priority of SEAD and other elements of combat air power based on their war-fighting and peacetime contributions". The committee agrees that the Secretary of Defense should postpone the retirement of the EF–111 until the Department reassesses these funding priorities.

Band 9/10 ECM transmitters

Last year, the committee recommended an increase to begin procurement of a robust band 9/10 capability upgrade for the EA–6B fleet. The band 9/10 jammer has been identified as among the most immediate of available upgrades. The committee understands that the Navy could acquire up to 49 additional band 9/10 jammers by exercising options on an existing contract. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million to acquire as many band 9/10 jammer pods as can be secured by exercising existing options.

USQ–113 communications jammer

The committee recommends an addition of $11.0 million to acquire an additional 24 units of the USQ–113 communications jammer.

Universal exciter upgrade

In order to operate the EA–6B weapon system effectively in the modern electronic warfare battlefield, the Navy should incorporate sophisticated waveform generators in the aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 060427N to perform laboratory and field tests to develop the required techniques.

Overhead connectivity

EA–6B flight crews are using laptop computers to obtain and process data necessary to conduct operational missions. The committee understands that this approach has been successful in increasing operators' situational awareness to date. The committee

encourages innovative approaches to problem solving and the use of prototype units. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $22.0 million to extend the connectivity capability to more fleet assets.

A summary of recommended increases and their references is provided below:

AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC WARFARE FUNDING

[Dollars in millions]

	Budget Request	Change	Total	Reference
Procurement:				
Band 9/10	.....	40.0	$40.0	APN line 19 OSIP 19–79
USQ–113	.....	11.0	11.0	APN line 19 OSIP 32–85
Overhead connectivity	.....	22.0	22.0	APN line 19 OSIP 32–85
Research & Development:				
Reactive jamming initiative	.....	55.0	55.0	RDT&E, Navy PE 060427N
Universal exciter upgrade	.....	10.0	10.0	RDT&E, Navy PE 060427N
Total	.....	.....	$138.0	

Section 122. Penguin missile program.

The budget request contained no funding for the procurement of *Penguin* anti-ship missiles for carriage aboard battle group helicopters.

The SH–60B and SH–60F helicopters that operate from the fleet's ships were built to conduct antisubmarine warfare. Operation Desert Storm and contingency operations have identified the need to equip these helicopters with an antisurface capability that would permit them to conduct a stand-off engagement of enemy ships. To address this operational shortfall, the Navy signed, in 1990, a multi-year contract with options to purchase up to a quantity of 193 *Penguin* missiles. The basic contract and three of five options were exercised to purchase 101 missiles, leaving a shortfall of 92. The remaining two options were not exercised because of affordability constraints in a period of declining resources. Exercise firings since procurement was terminated have raised the current shortfall to 106 missiles.

The committee has been informed that the contractor has recently offered the Navy an opportunity to satisfy its outstanding requirement through a multi-year procurement at about 55 percent of the unit cost of the initial procurement.

To take full advantage of an opportunity to meet an outstanding requirement for air to surface missiles at a far more affordable price, the committee recommends a provision that would permit the Navy to enter into a contract for multi-year procurement of not more than 106 *Penguin* missiles, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code. The total amount that could be expended would be limited to $84.8 million.

Section 123. Nuclear attack submarine programs.

The budget request included $296.2 million of advance construction and procurement funding for a fiscal year 1998 nuclear attack submarine and $699.1 million for procurement of the third *Seawolf* class submarine, SSN–23. It included no advance construction and procurement funding for the procurement of a second nuclear attack submarine in fiscal year 1999, as called for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and the Navy's six year shipbuilding plan, submitted in conjunction with the budget request.

In fiscal year 1996, Congress authorized and appropriated $100.0 million for advance construction and procurement of a nuclear attack submarine in fiscal year 1999. This funding was in consonance with a plan for competition for the future procurement of nuclear attack submarines that was contained in the Senate bill S. 1026 (S. Rept. 104–112). During the ensuing fiscal year 1996 conference with the House National Security Committee, administration representatives expressed support for the Senate's plan for future competition. However, the budget request did not contain the funding necessary to implement it. This omission has raised serious concerns in the committee's mind about the commitment of the administration to its previously expressed support for competitive procurement of future nuclear attack submarines.

While full implementation of the report, *Report on Nuclear Attack Submarine Procurement and Submarine Technology,* submitted by the Secretary of Defense on March 26, 1996, will clearly be the subject of future interaction between the Department and Congress, it is the committee's view that the administration made an unambiguous commitment last year to construction of a nuclear attack submarine at Newport News Shipbuilding in fiscal year 1999. The funding proposed in the budget request would imply otherwise. The committee's recommendation regarding the future procurement of nuclear attack submarines is designed to clarify the situation.

For future procurement of nuclear attack submarines, the committee recommends a provision that would:

(1) authorize $804.1 million for continued construction of SSN–23 to satisfy the budget request of $699.1 million and also accelerate the last increment of $105.0 million for SSN–23 from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 1997;

(2) authorize $296.2 million for long-lead and advance construction and procurement of a nuclear attack submarine that would be built at Electric Boat, commencing in fiscal year 1998;

(3) authorize $701.0 million for advance construction and procurement for a nuclear attack submarine that would be built at Newport News Shipbuilding, commencing in fiscal year 1999 to satisfy all known long-lead requirements for this submarine;

(4) stipulate that the obligation and expenditure of fiscal year 1997 funds for the fiscal year 1998 and 1999 submarines shall be in accordance with a memorandum of agreement among the Department of the Navy, Newport News Shipbuilding, and Electric Boat, dated April 5, 1996, relating to design data transfer, design improvements, integrated process teams, updated design data base, and other research and development initiatives related to the design of these submarines;

(5) direct that the Secretary of the Navy may enter into contracts with Electric Boat for the fiscal year 1998 submarine only if he also enters into contracts with Newport News Shipbuilding for the fiscal year 1999 submarine;

(6) limit the amount of funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 that can be obligated or expended on SSN–23, the fiscal year 1998 submarine, or the fiscal year 1999 submarine to a total of not more than $100.0 million until the Secretary of Defense makes written certification to Congress of his intention to comply with the plan for future competition for procurement of nuclear attack submarines pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996; and

(7) limit the amount of funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 that can be obligated or expended on SSN–23, the fiscal year 1998 submarine, or the fiscal year 1999 submarine to a total of $100.0 million until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology submits a report in writing to Congress detailing:

(a) his oversight activities as of the date of such report and his future plans for development and improvement of the Department of the Navy's nuclear attack submarine program;

(b) the implementation of, and activities under, the advanced submarine technology program required to be established by the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) by section 131(i) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996; and

(c) a description of all research, development, test and evaluation programs, and other projects within the Department of Defense that are designed to or could, in the opinion of the Under Secretary, contribute to the development and demonstration of advanced submarine technologies that could lead to a more affordable, more capable submarine, and include a discussion of plans for the future involvement of the two shipyards that are responsible for the construction of nuclear attack submarines.

Authorization, in fiscal year 1997, of the funding levels contained in the committee's recommended provision will permit the Navy to order components for the fiscal year 1998 and 1999 submarines in economic quantities and facilitate the transfer of design information from Electric Boat to Newport News Shipbuilding. According to the Navy, the new design-build process being used by the Navy and Electric Boat for the new attack submarine will accelerate completion of its detailed design to a level never achieved for other classes when the contract for the lead submarine, the fiscal year 1998 boat, is awarded. Timely advance procurement and construction funding at the level recommended for the fiscal year 1999 submarine should eliminate much of the schedule and cost risk that could have been expected for a first follow-ship under previous design practice.

Section 124. Arleigh Burke class destroyer program.

The budget request includes $3,384.1 million for the procurement of four *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers and advance procurement for future destroyers of this class.

During hearings associated with the budget request, the committee has learned that the Navy's request for *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers was developed in an effort to comply with a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 that authorized six *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers and authorized the Secretary of the Navy to enter into contracts for three of these ships in fiscal year 1996 and three of them in fiscal year 1997. The funding amount included in the fiscal year 1997 budget request is predicated on reprogramming $104.0 million in fiscal year 1996 to permit the Navy to exercise a contract option for a third ship in fiscal year 1996. The balance of funds needed for this third ship was contained in the fiscal year 1997 budget request. The fiscal year 1997 request also includes full funding for an additional three destroyers. By pursuing this acquisition strategy, the Navy has testified that it can save about $280.0 million on the acquisition of a total of six destroyers in the two fiscal years, 1996 and 1997.

Although the Navy has testified that it is both cost effective and necessary from an industrial base perspective to maintain two building shipyards for production of *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers, the committee has also learned that resource constraints in the Navy's future years defense programs have limited the planned procurement to only two in fiscal year 1998. This quantity would make it extremely difficult to maintain the existing industrial base and would also greatly increase the unit cost of the two fiscal year 1998 destroyers.

Appearing before the committee's seapower subcommittee on March 21, 1996, the Department of the Navy's senior acquisition executive testified that the most cost effective method of procuring additional *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers during the period fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2001 would be by the authorization of 12 ships over the four year period. Such an authorization would permit him to negotiate contracts and contract options that would sustain the industrial base and generate savings of about $1.0 billion for the procurement of these 12 ships.

As a result of information gathered during its hearings, the committee recommends:

(1) authorization of the budget request for *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers;

(2) authorization of $750.0 million above the budget request for advance procurement of *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers in fiscal year 1998 to permit the Navy to plan for and acquire three destroyers in fiscal year 1998;

(3) a provision that would authorize 12 *Arleigh Burke* class destroyers from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2001 to provide a stable procurement program that would allow the Navy to acquire these ships at a substantial cost savings; and

(4) the Secretary of the Navy continue the contract award strategy that he has used in recent years to provide stability and planning continuity for the *Arleigh Burke* class industrial base.

OTHER NAVY PROGRAMS

Navy Aircraft

AV–8B remanufacture

The budget request contained $304.9 million for the remanufacture of 10 AV–8B Harrier aircraft into the Harrier II Plus configuration and for advance procurement for future remanufactures. The planned procurement of 12 remanufactured Harrier aircraft in fiscal year 1997, which was reflected in last year's budget request, was reduced to 10 because of resource constraints. The Harrier II Plus configuration provides day/night/adverse weather improvements to the AV–8B aircraft. Last year the committee recommended the addition of funds to double the administration's request for four such remanufactures in order to procure them at a more cost effective rate.

The committee notes that the same logic that applied last year is equally relevant in fiscal year 1997. A more aggressive near-term buy of remanufactured AV–8B Harrier II's will result in both long-term savings and improved near-term capability. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $68.0 million to procure an additional two aircraft and the necessary integrated logistics support for the AV–8B program that the future years defense program presently defers to fiscal years 1999 and 2000.

F/A–18C/D

The committee understands that the overall inventory objective for the F/A–18C in the Navy's ten active airwings is a minimum of 436 aircraft. However, although the Navy had previously programmed for sufficient numbers of aircraft for its force structure needs, recent Department of Defense budgets have not included the originally programmed quantities.

Realizing the increased combat capabilities of the F–18C over the earlier models, and the need to have modern, capable carrier-based strike aircraft, the committee recommends an increase of $234.0 million for six F/A–18C aircraft, their ancillary equipment, and logistics support.

MV–22

The budget request for the MV–22 Osprey tilt rotor aircraft was $558.7 million to procure four aircraft and associated support equipment.

While the operational requirements document requires the MV–22 program to achieve a fiscal year 1999 initial operating capability (IOC), the budget request only supports an IOC in fiscal year 2001. The committee understands that an increase of $302.0 million for MV–22 procurement would accelerate the acquisition of two aircraft from fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 1997. The program manager believes that this action would result in a cost saving of $32.0 million from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal 2001. The committee has further been informed that there are no technical or programmatic impediments to making an acceleration.

The committee is well aware of the funding history for development of the MV–22 in recent fiscal years. It is clear that the pro-

gram has represented a large block of money that has frequently been used as a source for minor reprogrammings and adjustments to meet new requirements in the Department of Defense. The committee has concluded that these actions have left virtually no margin to the program manager to deal with the normal minor problems that emerge during transition of a major program from the late stages of development into production. A modest increment of additional funding in fiscal year 1997 could well prevent disruptive delays during the first years of low-rate, initial production.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $232.0 million for V–22 procurement to acquire an additional two MV–22 aircraft and $70.0 million for long lead funding to support production in fiscal year 1998 of 12 aircraft. Additionally, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64262N for risk mitigation during the first year of low-rate production.

Flight simulators

The committee supports the maximum use of flight simulators that provide required training while eliminating costs associated with range and ammunition usage. The committee recommends an increase of $60.0 million to procure or upgrade simulators for three systems, as well as to support relocation of fielded systems to collocate them with using units, as follows:

System	*Millions*
V–22	$49.0
AV–8B	10.0
CH–53D	1.0

Restoration of E–2C procurement

The E–2C aircraft is a carrier-based aircraft designed for early warning, interceptor and strike control, as well as other missions. The Navy resumed production in fiscal year 1995, with the intent of purchasing four aircraft per year for a total of 36 aircraft. That planned acquisition rate of E–2Cs has been reduced from four aircraft to two in the budget request for fiscal year 1997. The committee understands that procuring two more E–2C aircraft, which are already in production at the previously programmed rate, would lead to a savings of $13.2 million per aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $139.0 million to acquire a total of four E–2C aircraft in fiscal year 1997.

Airborne self-protection jammer (ASPJ)

The budget request did not include funding to modify F/A–18C/Ds with the AN/ALQ–165, or airborne self-protection jammer (ASPJ), although the ASPJ has performed capably in Bosnia operations. Realizing that the ASPJ system is available at reasonable costs and that the integrated defensive electronic countermeasures (IDECM) system has just begun development, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million to buy 36 ASPJ systems, including aircraft interface units (racks), spares and additional integrated logistic support for three deployed F/A–18C/D squadrons.

Helicopter crash attenuating seats

Section 136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed the initiation of a program to provide crash attenuating troop seats for H–53 helicopters, using commercially developed, energy absorbing seats. As a result of congressional direction, the Department of Defense initiated efforts to define the requirements for a competition for procuring such sets as non-developmental items (NDI).

The committee has been informed that the necessary program definition has been completed and the program is nearing release of the standards needed to begin a full and open competition to procure such seats. The committee understands the program has defined an option to procure 2,400 seats through competitive bids.

The committee is gratified at the Department's progress in launching this important safety initiative. However, the program has evolved out of phase with the budget process, and, accordingly, was not included in the budget request.

The committee recommends an increase of $14.0 million for the competitive procurement of crash attenuating seats for the H–53 helicopter. Should the recommended increase be more than needed for this procurement, the committee directs the Secretary to apply such funds to the definition of needs for other helicopters.

Vertical replenishment helicopter replacement program

The committee understands that the Navy has an urgent requirement to replace its obsolete and costly CH–46 vertical replenishment (VERTREP) helicopter fleet with either a new helicopter or a derivative of an existing helicopter. The committee is also aware that:

(1) based on recent studies, efficiencies could be gained within Naval aviation from the use of a common helicopter airframe; and

(2) Navy planning for modernizing its VERTREP helicopter fleet has progressed to a point that a start in fiscal year 1997 is possible.

The committee has also been informed of an agreement that has been reached between the Army and the Navy to support initiation of the Navy's VERTREP helicopter replacement program through:

(1) the use of engineering change proposals; and

(2) the use of an airframe that would be provided by the Army and a main/tail rotor system that would be provided by the Navy.

When possible, the committee has supported efforts by the services to accelerate programs to achieve efficiencies in procurement and operations. In support of such an initiative, the committee recommends increasing funding by $10.0 million above the budget request to initiate a VERTREP helicopter replacement program in fiscal year 1997.

P–3 intelligence support

The budget request included $17.6 million within the P–3 aircraft modifications line to procure non-developmental, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS), roll-on/roll-off signals intelligence (SIGINT) sensors for use aboard P–3C aircraft. While budget documentation

provides little information on this concept, it appears that the Navy intends to incorporate this capability as an adjunct to its P–3 anti-surface warfare (ASUW) improvement program (AIP).

The committee is concerned that the Navy has not developed an operational concept for employing the SIGINT capability that it proposes to add to the P–3C aircraft. Nor is it clear that the Navy's proposal relates well to the capability already provided by its existing fleet of EP–3 aircraft. It would appear that the Navy is attempting to expand the scope of the P–3 AIP without first providing a sound rationale for doing so. Important questions that should be answered to address the committee's initial concerns would be:

(1) to what degree would P–3C aircraft equipped with such a COTS SIGINT package be interoperable with other SIGINT platforms?

(2) are sufficient specially trained personnel available to support both existing SIGINT systems and this one as well?

The committee recommends against approving the procurement of COTS SIGINT sensors in fiscal year 1997, and that the budget request for P–3 modifications be reduced by $17.6 million.

P–3C anti-surface warfare improvement program

The P–3C anti-surface warfare improvement program (AIP) was begun in fiscal year 1994 to provide a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS)/non-developmental item (NDI) upgrade to the Navy's existing fleet of P–3C aircraft to improve its capability to conduct anti-surface warfare (ASUW), over the horizon (OTH) targeting, and command and control interface with other command centers and fleet units. Prior review of this program by the committee has shown that the P–3C AIP gives the aircraft a much better capability to execute littoral warfare missions at a reasonable price.

Unfortunately, while the nation's operational commanders-in-chief (CINCs) have given the P–3C AIP program strong support, the Navy has consistently short-changed its resources. To meet an operational requirement that calls for the procurement of 68 kits between fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 2001 at an economical procurement rate of 12 kits per year, the Navy has budgeted resources for only one kit in fiscal year 1997. In fiscal year 1996 the Navy budgeted for only seven.

It appears to the committee that the Navy has come, increasingly, to look to Congress to sustain the P–3C AIP. This was the case in fiscal year 1996 when Congress added five kits. Fiscal year 1997 reflects the same behavior to a much greater degree.

The committee recommends an increase of $87.0 million for the procurement of 11 additional P–3C AIP kits in fiscal year 1997. Procurement funding at this level would reduce the unit cost of the kits procured by at least 70 percent and satisfy CINC requirements.

Aside from the merits of the P–3C AIP, the Navy should understand that a principal reason the committee has recommended this increase is to give the Navy an opportunity to evaluate the priority of the P–3C AIP, negotiate with the CINCs as to their requirements, and determine whether it will continue to pursue the P–3C AIP in the future. Budget requests at the rate of one kit per year make no sense to the committee.

While the committee believes that the P–3C AIP has merit, there are many other programs in the requirements queue eager to claim resources. Consequently, the committee wants to make it clear that the committee does not intend to take on the P–3C AIP as a permanent future entitlement.

If the Navy chooses not to request 12 P–3C AIP kits in its fiscal year 1998 budget request, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report, to accompany the budget request, that:

(1) identifies the requirements for the P–3C AIP that the CINCs have provided to the Navy;

(2) discusses any changes to those requirements that may have occurred in conjunction with preparation of the fiscal year 1998 budget request;

(3) provides the Navy's plan, as reflected in the fiscal year 1998 future years defense program, of how the Navy intends to satisfy the CINC requirements; and

(4) provides explicit rationale for any disparity between the Navy plan and the CINC requirements.

Navy Weapons

Tomahawk land attack missile

In both Iraq and Bosnia, the Tomahawk land attack missile (TLAM), once considered primarily a strategic weapons system, has been increasingly used in a tactical role. Tactical use has increased the demand for this missile at a time when budget reductions have reduced procurement below previously planned levels and left a required five year recertification of existing Block IIC missiles unfunded. As a consequence of these deferred certifications, operational commanders have been forced to rely on the practice of crossdecking missiles from returning ships to those that are preparing to deploy. The budget request would procure 120 Block IIIC missiles, contains no funding for remanufacture of existing Block IIC missiles to the Block IIIC configuration, and recertifies only 23 percent of the missiles with maintenance due dates in fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Recertification funding at this level would be inadequate to permit operational commanders to satisfy their deployment loadout requirements after fiscal year 1996.

The committee has also learned that an effort made by Congress last year to accelerate development of the Tomahawk Block IV missile would be thwarted by a substantial reduction in program funding that was made during development of the fiscal year 1997 budget request. Funds needed to continue the effort were diverted to fund ongoing contingency operations.

The committee recommends an increase of $111.8 million above the budget request for the TLAM program. Of this amount, $32.0 million would be for the procurement of new Block IIIC missiles, $14.4 million for remanufacture of Block IIC missiles to the Block IIIC configuration, $40.6 million for the recertification of existing Block IIC missiles, and $29.0 million would be for continued development of the Tomahawk Block IV missile in PE 24229N.

Standard missile procurement

The committee has learned that additional procurement funding for the Navy's Standard missile would resolve valid Navy inventory requirements, produce production efficiencies that would lower missile unit cost, and increase overall stability in the program. The program has been subject to considerable disruption by reprogramming of its fiscal year 1996 funds.

The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million above the budget request for the procurement of additional SM2 Block IV missiles to help rationalize the Standard missile production base and support ballistic missile defense development options.

Navy and Marine Corps Ammunition

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition that was contained in the President's budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness, for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Marine Corps ammunition procurement:

Item	*Millions*
155 mm CHG. Prop. Red Bag	$24.0
155 mm D864, Base Bleed	45.0
Fuze, ET, XM762	29.0
Total	98.0

Navy Shipbuilding and Conversion

Seawolf submarine

Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for the procurement of three *Seawolf* class submarines. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 imposed a cost cap on the total procurement cost associated with these three submarines. The committee has been informed by the Department of the Navy that its current cost projections for the procurement of the SSN–21, the fiscal year 1989 authorized ship, SSN–22, the fiscal year 1991 authorized ship, and SSN–23, the fiscal year 1996 authorized ship, are very close to the cost cap. The committee has also been advised by the Department of the Navy that $278.0 million of class detail design costs were never included under the cost cap for the three submarines. These costs had been allocated to now canceled portions of the *Seawolf* program and were, mistakenly, not included when the cost cap amount was calculated and agreed to between Congress and the Department of the Navy. As a result, these class detail design costs were not treated by Congress or the Department of the Navy as obligations or expenditures for purposes of establishing the cost cap for procurement of SSN–21, SSN–22, and SSN–23.

The committee directs the Navy to continue to include these procurement costs, and all other *Seawolf* related costs, in reports that it provides to Congress on the total cost of the *Seawolf* program. The committee will not look favorably on any additional procurement costs that may emerge and be characterized as not having been included in the cost cap.

LPD–17 class amphibious ships

The budget request contained no funding for procurement of an LPD–17 class amphibious ship.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 authorized and appropriated $938.5 million for procurement of the lead ship of the LPD–17 class. Under the future years defense program, the Navy will request authorization for the next ship of this class in fiscal year 1998.

Because of the emphasis that the committee has placed on reducing pressure on the shipbuilding account by accelerating the procurement of ships in the future years defense program, the committee considered accelerating the LPD–17 class. There is a clear requirement for timely procurement of 12 LPD–17 class ships to join the Navy's 12 amphibious ready groups (ARGs) and resolve current shortfalls in the Navy's ability to provide the 2.5 MEB amphibious lift called for in the Bottom-Up Review.

Tempering acceleration of the LPD–17 class, however, was the committee's knowledge of a long established Navy practice for the construction of a new class of ships. This practice, based on a considerable amount of hard won experience, provides for a single gap year between the authorization of the lead ship of a class and authorization of the second ship of the class. This gap year provides the shipbuilder and the Navy with an opportunity to execute a sufficient amount of the detail design of the lead ship to considerably reduce the risk of schedule slippage and cost growth for the follow-ships. The committee reviewed the production history of a number of ship construction programs over the last twenty years and found that 92 percent of the programs that were pursued without a gap year between lead ship and first follow-ship produced schedule slippage, in several cases in excess of two years, and consequential cost growth in the first follow-ship. In a number of instances, this schedule slippage propagated into subsequent follow-ships as well.

During a hearing on shipbuilding, held in conjunction with the committee's review of the budget request, the Navy expressed some optimism that, with a contract award late in fiscal year 1997, it would be able to avoid the pitfalls that had plagued earlier programs. In evaluating this testimony, however, the committee is also aware that the contract award date for the lead LPD–17 ship has now slipped until late into fiscal year 1996, and may slip more. Consequently, it would appear that the rationale upon which the Navy's testimony was based is no longer valid.

Given past experience with attempts to accelerate a new class of ships before sufficient design work has been completed and the additional consideration that the contract award for LPD–17 will not occur until late in fiscal year 1996, the committee concludes that it would not be prudent to accelerate authorization of the first follow-ship into fiscal year 1997. However, the committee does recommend an increase of $8.0 million in PE 64311N to allow the Navy to pursue a reduced manning initiative for the LPD–17 class. Since contract award for the lead ship may still occur in fiscal year 1997, pursuit of this initiative must begin as early as possible in order for its results to be incorporated in the detail design of the ship.

Oceanographic survey ship

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 authorized and appropriated $15.6 million of advance procurement for an oceanographic survey ship, TAGS–64. The budget request did not contain the additional increment needed to fully fund this ship. The future years defense program would not procure this ship until fiscal year 1999. Procurement of this ship, to satisfy a well documented requirement, through an existing contract option, would result in substantial cost savings. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase to the budget request of $54.4 million to complete procurement of TAGS–64.

SWATH oceanographic research ship

The Navy has well-documented requirements, approaching 240 ship-years of backlog, for additional oceanographic survey work, particularly in the littoral areas of the world. A substantial percentage of these requirements cannot be satisfied by the Navy fleet of seven survey ships that are either in service or under construction. Even if the Navy were to build additional ships for its own use, the Oceanographer of the Navy does not have sufficient operating funds programmed to pay for all of the additional survey work needed to eliminate his backlog.

The committee has reviewed the matter and concluded that the Navy could pursue another approach to getting additional survey work performed. The committee has learned that there are currently five oceanographic research ships that are owned by the Navy and operated by a civilian university or research institute under the supervision of the Chief of Naval Research. One of these oceanographic research ships will soon be retired due to obsolescence. The committee believes that, when this ship is replaced, the Navy and the recipient could enter into an agreement whereby the Navy would provide the university or research institute a vessel, and the university or research institute would schedule and pay for some portion of its year's research work to support Navy oceanographic survey requirements. Such an arrangement could modernize an important capability and also reduce future demand for Navy operation and maintenance funding to pay for ship survey operations.

The committee recommends an increase to the budget request of $45.0 million to provide the additional funding needed to build a small water plane area, twin-hulled (SWATH) oceanographic vessel based on the TAGOS–23 class of surveillance ships. The committee directs the Navy to negotiate a time sharing agreement with the university or institute that will operate it, whereby a certain portion of the ship's annual operating time would be dedicated to meeting the Navy's needs. The Navy should report to the congressional defense committees on its progress in achieving this agreement by December 15, 1997.

Other Navy Procurement

WSN–7 inertial navigation system

The budget request included $11.7 million for procurement of the WSN–7 ring laser inertial navigation system.

The WSN–7 is a passive shipboard navigation system capable of worldwide operations without the need for external position reference information over the course of a 14 day reset interval. The Navy is procuring the WSN–7 as a common system to replace three different inertial navigation systems currently installed on aircraft carriers, surface combatants, and submarines. Accelerated procurement of this highly reliable, easily maintained system could provide substantial maintenance savings.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million above the budget request for the procurement of additional WSN–7 navigation sets. It is estimated that this investment could save $28.7 million in maintenance cost avoidance during the period of the future years defense program from fiscal year 1997 to fiscal year 2001.

Mine warfare

During hearings associated with the fiscal year 1997 budget request the committee explored progress made by the Navy in correcting deficiencies in its mine countermeasures (MCM) capabilities that were revealed during Operation Desert Storm. Mines present an inexpensive and challenging deterrent to amphibious operations in the littoral areas where the Department of the Navy has concentrated its strategic focus since the end of the Cold War. Studies conducted after Operation Desert Storm demonstrated that the Navy's historical approach to allocating resources for MCM has been cyclical. While greater priority has occasionally been given for short periods to this mission when mines prevented execution of an amphibious operation as they did in both Korea and Operation Desert Storm, emphasis has soon waned and funding has been reduced to subsistence levels.

To some degree, this pattern has repeated itself in the recent past. After Operation Desert Storm, Department of the Navy and congressional interest caused MCM resources to increase. The committee has learned, however, that funding for mine warfare and MCM represents only about one percent of the Department's budget request, resulting in an amount that corresponds to historical, subsistence level norms. The amount available to the resource sponsor directly responsible for mine warfare and MCM on the Chief of Naval Operations staff is even less, at only about 0.6 percent.

This return to historical norms has caused many exploratory programs that were initiated with the increased resources allocated after Operation Desert Storm to become starved for lack of funding. Further, a substantial portion of the funding associated with MCM during recent fiscal years has had to be used to address maintenance and reliability problems associated with existing systems or systems coming into service, rather than for improving capabilities.

The committee also learned that, during the past year, the mine warfare resource sponsor has devoted considerable effort to developing a campaign plan that identifies "all the money being spent in the name of mine warfare" and establishes an integrated, prioritized effort to resolve mine warfare shortfalls. This plan, if executed, would address maintenance shortfalls, modernize existing systems, and address capability gaps, in that order. However, be-

cause of the timing associated with the development of this plan relative to the Department's budgeting cycle, virtually all of the highest priority items in the campaign plan are not funded in the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

In summary, the committee has concluded that, while the Navy has improved its operational capabilities within the constraints imposed by existing equipment and resource allocation, much remains to be done to satisfy mission requirements that would be essential elements of a successful amphibious assault. Accordingly the committee recommends an increase in funding of $64.0 million to accelerate several of the Navy's highest priority MCM programs. Specific authorizations in priority order would be:

Item	*Funding (millions)*
SQQ–32/SLQ–48 Spares	$6.3
Integrated Combat Weapons System (ICWS)	17.8
AQS–14A Console Upgrade Procurement	5.7
Very Shallow Water MCM Unit Outfitting	1.5
MCM Battle Space Profiler (BSP)	1.7
Air MCM C4I Upgrades	7.8
EOD C4I Product Improvement	1.0
MK–105 Sled Upgrades	21.2
EOD Full Face Mask	1.0

The committee also recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63782N for completion of the science and technology demonstration program for the beach zone array subsystem of the explosive neutralization program. This subsystem has shown strong promise in the early stages of its development to provide an important contribution toward meeting the full operational requirement for MCM forces to conduct in-stride mine clearance of amphibious assault beach lanes.

AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar

There is no funding in the budget request for the procurement of AN/BPS–16 submarine radar navigation sets or mast assemblies.

The Navy has been procuring a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) variant of the AN/BPS–16 radar navigation set and its associated mast assembly for installation on new construction submarines and on SSN–688 class submarines that will remain in service in the fleet. Procurement of the COTS variant has resulted in a 40 percent savings over a comparable system built to military specifications. The AN/BPS–16 replaces an existing radar system that has proven unreliable in service and is labor intensive to maintain. Procurement of additional AN/BPS–16 radar sets in fiscal year 1997 will avoid a production break and associated start up costs for the procurement of additional radar sets currently included in the future years defense program.

The committee recommends an increase of $16.9 million for the procurement of additional AN/BPS–16 radar sets. This amount would be sufficient to satisfy the inventory objective for radar sets and radar mast assemblies for SSN–688 class submarines.

Surface ship torpedo defense

The budget request contains no funding for the procurement of surface ship torpedo defense (SSTD) kits. These kits include a torpedo alertment processor (TAP), which provides torpedo alert, a

launcher, and a launched expendable acoustic device (LEAD) designed to decoy enemy torpedoes. Both TAP and LEAD are based on low cost, low maintenance, commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) technology. Procurement of SSTD kits is an ongoing program that was funded in fiscal year 1996 and includes future years defense program funding in fiscal year 1998 and beyond. Funding for the program in fiscal year 1997 was eliminated during preparation of the budget request to meet other urgent readiness requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.5 million above the budget request for the procurement of additional SSTD kits for installation on amphibious ships, combat logistic force ships, and an aircraft carrier.

Shipboard integrated communications system

In fiscal year 1996, Congress appropriated $6.3 million to procure a modern interior communications (IC) system for Navy aircraft carriers that can provide seamless interior and exterior connectivity for fleet units. In last year's report to accompany S. 1026 (S. Rept. 104–112), the committee dealt at some length with the apparent stagnation in Navy programs whose stated objective is to provide such a system. Virtually all Navy ships are still forced to rely on technology that was developed during World War II. In the committee's recent experience, the Navy has pursued the development of one poorly conceived alternative after another, producing nothing, while commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) non-developmental systems that are already available languish unused.

In response to committee direction (S. Rept. 104–112) to prepare a report on its plan to replace obsolete IC technology, the Navy produced a cursory response that continues to focus on its need to define a baseline system architecture that could be used to procure a COTS system at some undetermined point in the future. This is essentially the same response that the Navy provided two years ago when the committee first raised the question in a less formal way. The Navy report gives the committee no confidence that the Navy is giving priority to acquisition of an existing system rather than trying to re-invent what is already available.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million above the budget request, specifically for the competitive procurement of an existing integrated communications system that can be installed aboard aircraft carriers and other fleet units without delay. The committee also strongly encourages the Department of the Navy's senior acquisition executive to personally review the Navy's interior communications program and to report his findings, in more detail than is contained in the report he submitted in response to S. Rept. 104–112, no later than January 31, 1997.

Challenge Athena

The budget request included no funding for the Chief of Naval Operation's special project Challenge Athena. This budget decision was made despite a series of favorable reports by the Navy's operational commanders on the very significant contributions that Challenge Athena had made to the success of their operational deployments.

As noted in its report to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (S. Rept 104–112), the committee has followed the progress of several commercial satellite communications (SATCOM) technologies to evaluate how this technology could be best utilized to reduce the load on existing military systems and come closer to the goal of providing near real-time information to the warfighter. One such program, Challenge Athena, offers the technology to provide a communications data rate of greater than 1.554 Mbps. This data rate permits transmission of near real-time imagery for precision targeting and strike, video teleconferencing, telemedicine, and nearly transparent inter-theater communications.

The committee has concluded that the additional capabilities provided by Challenge Athena are of sufficient priority that additional funding is warranted and recommends an increase of $41.7 million above the budget request for Challenge Athena, $14.7 million for procurement and $27.0 million for operation of the system.

Global broadcast

The budget request included $113.2 million for launch services for UHF follow-on (UFO) satellites 8, 9, and 10. These satellites will support UHF, EHF, and global broadcast service (GBS) communications. However, the budget request did not contain funding for the ground and sea-based equipment needed to implement the GBS capability.

The committee has noted a tendency of defense acquisition to focus on procurement of major intelligence gathering and production systems and sophisticated weapons systems while not giving comparable attention to the communications and data links needed to support them. Given the fact that modern warfighting systems are inherently dependent on the transmission of vast amounts of data to realize their full potential, a lack of emphasis on the data links and communications pipelines that feed them is short-sighted. Under present conditions, for example, the existing network of military communications satellites is under great pressure from the growing demands of the nation's warfighters for detailed imagery, intelligence, and tactical information.

A program to address these information demands emerged last year. It would involve the use of satellite direct broadcast technology. This technology is inherent in the design of commercial satellites and can be incorporated as an add-on package to military satellites, such as the UFO series. Suitably equipped commercial and military satellites will be capable of providing high capacity, one-way broadcast transmissions to very small terminals. For the military this capability has become known as the GBS.

Because of its need to provide a wide-band communications capability to ships that are space constrained and widely distributed world-wide, the Navy has been particularly active in seeking to benefit from GBS. The Navy has identified two near-term phases that would first make use of commercial satellites to provide GBS support, then incorporate the capability into its UFO satellite series beginning in fiscal year 1998. However, the transition from concept to a concrete program has progressed at a more rapid pace than the Department of Defense's planning, programming, and

budgeting cycle. As a consequence, while the space segment of GBS has received some measure of funding in the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the ground and afloat segment received none. Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 will ensure that GBS can be included in UFO satellites 8, 9, and 10. It would also procure a sufficient number of ship and shore terminals to provide GBS through the use of commercial satellites to a large cross section of the fleet and the Navy's ashore commanders even sooner.

To ensure that the diverse requirements of the Navy's GBS program progress in a complementary manner, the committee recommends an increase of $50.5 million above the budget request as follows:

(1) $39.0 million for the procurement and installation of shipboard GBS satellite terminals;

(2) $7.0 million for the procurement and installation of shore GBS satellite terminals; and

(3) $4.5 million to provide for launch services for UFO satellites 8, 9, and 10.

Rolling air frame missile launcher for LSD–52

In fiscal year 1996, Congress authorized and appropriated $20.0 million to install the ship self-defense system (SSDS) MK 1 and the rolling airframe missile (RAM) system in LSD–52, an amphibious ship that is now under construction. The committee has learned that $20.0 million would be insufficient to cover both the hardware procurement and ship installation costs. Consequently, the Navy was unable to purchase one of the two RAM launchers needed for a complete equipment suite. Procurement of this launcher in fiscal year 1997, in conjunction with the six launchers already included in the budget request, will lower its unit cost.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million above the budget request for the procurement of one RAM launcher for LSD–52.

Afloat planning system

The budget request contains $1.1 million for the afloat planning system (APS). This amount would be for the installation of systems purchased in prior years.

The APS is being procured for installation in the Navy's aircraft carriers and for rapid deployment, when required, to meet the strike planning needs of a joint task force commander. It complements the planning of Tomahawk land attack missile (TLAM) missions by shore-based cruise missile support activities by giving an afloat or deployed commander the ability to modify existing, pre-planned missions or plan new ones. The committee has learned that a diversion of funds from this program in fiscal year 1996 and lack of funding in fiscal year 1997 threaten to severely disrupt the production line, increasing unit costs dramatically and delaying the introduction of a capability that the Navy states will significantly improve its warfighting capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $23.0 million above the budget request for the procurement and installation of additional APS suites. Information provided to the committee by the Navy indicates that this level of funding would be sufficient for the

Navy to satisfy its full requirement for APS suites and also procure them in a most cost effective manner.

NULKA decoy development

The budget request contains $4.4 million for continued development of the NULKA active countermeasures decoy. It also contains $12.0 million to procure NULKA decoys, launch subsystems, and training systems.

The committee has learned that a modest amount of additional development funding would permit modification of the NULKA decoy to accommodate advanced friendly radars that will soon enter fleet service. An additional increment of procurement funding would permit the purchase of sufficient systems to outfit one deploying battle group and preclude the need for crossdecking of rounds.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 64755N to improve the performance of the NULKA decoy in the presence of friendly emitters and to counter modern threat missiles. The committee also recommends an increase of $9.0 million for procurement of additional NULKA rounds and launch subsystems and for production improvements.

Elevated causeway (modular)

The budget request included no funding for expanding an existing elevated causeway (modular) (ELCAS(M)) prototype from a length of 2,000 feet to the 3,000 feet needed to satisfy logistics-over-the-shore (LOTS) operational requirements.

The committee has learned that expeditionary logistics support of the Marine Corps or a joint service force may often require assault follow-on echelon or other LOTS off-load in a variety of unimproved, adverse beach environments or degraded ports. The ELCAS(M), which the Navy could rapidly install, provides an elevated pier that overcomes high surf conditions, shallow beach gradients, and other hydrographic conditions that inhibit direct shoreside cargo discharge. The Navy has included funding for completion of two ELCAS(M) systems in the future years defense program. However, the Navy would not complete the current ELCAS(M) system until fiscal year 1999 because of budget constraints.

Our armed services have had difficulties in conducting LOTS operations in recent contingency operations, due in large part to challenges that the ELCAS(M) system is designed to overcome. The committee has concluded that acceleration of this program, to provide at least one fully operational system, is warranted. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $6.7 million above the budget request to expand the existing prototype system to a full 3,000 foot operational length, and also to acquire the ancillary support and installation equipment, such as lighting, piling, and safety lines, necessary to make it fully operational.

The committee also understands that the Navy has an operational requirement for an amphibious cargo beaching lighter (or barge) that can operate in sea state 3 (SS3). To meet this requirement, the Navy must be able to assemble floating pontoons into larger sections in sea states reaching and exceeding SS3. The Navy designed the ELCAS(M) system to be able to operate sections of the

system as a lighter in sea states up to SS3. However, the current design for the ELCAS(M) connector system does not allow the Navy to join the sections into larger units in sea states this high.

The Navy budget includes a program to develop and field a system to meet the amphibious cargo beaching lighter requirement that would not begin procurement until fiscal year 2001. The committee understands that the contractor building the ELCAS(M) system has also developed a connector system that could be operated under SS3 conditions. The committee believes that the Navy should evaluate the potential of using this new connector system in conjunction with the current ELCAS(M) sections to meet the amphibious cargo beaching lighter requirement. The committee directs the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on its analysis of this alternative with its submission of the fiscal year 1998 budget request.

Oceanographic equipment

During its review of the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the committee determined that investment funding for oceanographic equipment was reduced significantly in both fiscal year 1996 and in the budget request. Naval oceanography employs equipment such as fathometers, global positioning satellite (GPS) receivers, recording equipment, and side-scan sonars to conduct ocean surveys. These are sensitive units that are used in the Navy's survey vessels or incorporated into travel packs for use by Navy oceanographers onboard foreign ships. They can be easily affected or damaged by rough handling or extended exposure to a marine environment. Replacement on a regular basis is necessary. It would appear that funding in fiscal year 1996 and in the budget request is not sufficient to maintain an adequate replacement program

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million above the budget request to provide additional funding for procurement of oceanographic survey equipment.

Marine Corps Procurement

Marine Corps Javelin missile

The budget request included $28.2 million to begin procurement of the Javelin missile and its associated command launch unit (CLU) for the Marine Corps. This amount, when combined with the amount budgeted for Javelin procurement for the Army, would be insufficient to purchase Javelin missiles at an economic order quantity that would allow them to be procured at a cost effective rate.

The committee understands the need to field the Javelin missile as soon as possible and recommends an increase of $20.0 million to accelerate production, provide an additional 59 missiles and 16 CLUs for the Marine Corps, and procure missiles for the Army and Marine Corps at a cost effective rate.

AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radar

The budget request included $30.4 million to procure upgrades to the Marine Corps AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radar, which is designed to support counter-battery operations.

The Army and the Marine Corps participate jointly in the AN/TPQ–36 Firefinder radar program with the Army as lead service. The Army has developed upgrades to the radar. The budget request contained funding to incorporate those upgrades into the Marine Corps radars.

The committee has been informed that, due to length of service and resultant system modifications, the existing Marine Corps AN/TPQ–36 radars are not standardized. The budget request did not include sufficient funding to standardize the antenna group of these radars when system upgrades are introduced.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.8 million to ensure standardization of Marine Corps AN/TPQ–36 radars after system upgrades have been completed.

Joint task force deployable communications support

The committee supports Marine Corps efforts to enhance its communications support capabilities. The committee recognizes the outstanding requirement for a deployable satellite communications system and recommends an increase of $1.7 million to procure this system for the Marine Corps joint task force headquarters.

Intelligence upgrades

The committee is concerned about the modernization of Marine intelligence support capabilities and notes outstanding requirements in two separate areas: tactical photography and communications intelligence dissemination.

The tactical photography (TACPHOTO) camera system is a state-of-the-art imagery collection device that greatly enhances the real time tactical intelligence products needed by Marine Corps field commanders. The committee recommends an increase of $11.2 million to accelerate the initial operational capability date for this system by one year and to procure all 509 TACPHOTO systems required.

The committee also recommends an increase of $3.4 million to procure three team portable communication intelligence systems (TPCS), which will meet the acquisition objective and provide the Marine air ground task force (MAGTF) commander with a vital intelligence tool.

Telecommunications infrastructure

The budget request contained no funding to upgrade the communications network at the Marine Corps base at Camp Pendleton.

The committee supports ongoing efforts to upgrade existing telecommunications infrastructure at Marine Corps installations. The budget contains funding to support such infrastructure upgrades, but falls short of providing the resources necessary to upgrade Camp Pendleton. Establishing a high speed fiber optic backbone and switching systems at Camp Pendleton would meet existing base requirements and facilitate future expansion to meet new requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $18.8 million to provide a more efficient, state-of-the-art telecommunications infrastructure at Camp Pendleton.

Marine Corps combat operations centers

The Marine Corps has seven deployable combat operations centers (COC) and six fixed command centers (CC). These centers have been baselined with a common configuration, but require additional equipment to provide full interoperability with comparable command centers in the other services.

The committee recommends an increase of $7.4 million above the budget request to upgrade the capability of the Marine Corps COCs and CCs in order to make them fully interoperable with the other services, and to provide the additional data capacity now required by Marine Corps operational units.

Marine Corps common end user computer equipment

The budget request contained no funding for Marine Corps common end user computer equipment (CEUCE).

The Marine Corps CEUCE program procures stand-alone computer work stations to support supply, maintenance, logistics, training, and administrative functions. Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 would permit the Marine Corps to satisfy its inventory objective for this equipment and afford all Marine Corps units the ability to deploy with the same equipment that they use in garrison. The current need to rely on leased or sub-custodied equipment or to perform a function manually would be eliminated.

The committee recommends an increase of $9.8 million above the budget for the procurement of additional Marine Corps CEUCE.

Mobility enhancements

The budget request included $1.3 million to procure 20 M870A2 lowbed trailers and an additional $1.5 million to procure 261 International Standard Organization (ISO) beds for transporting fuel and water for the Marine Corps. The committee supports efforts to improve the mobility of heavy equipment and recommends an increase of $28.3 million for Marine Corps mobility equipment. Of this total:

(1) $5.5 million would be for procurement of additional M870A2 lowbed trailers; and

(2) $22.8 million would be for procurement of ISO beds to buy out the program.

Multiple integrated laser engagement system

The budget request contained no funding for procurement of the multiple integrated laser engagement system (MILES) for the Marine Corps.

The committee is aware of the benefits of employing training devices such as MILES to provide realistic force-on-force training. The committee understands that the Marine Corps intends to begin procurement of MILES in fiscal year 1998 and complete the procurement of 10 reinforced battalion sets by fiscal year 2001. A savings of $7.8 million could be realized if the program were accelerated to fiscal year 1997 and procurement completed in one year.

The committee recommends an increase of $49.0 million to complete procurement of MILES and provide an important training aid to the Marine Corps as soon as possible.

Combat vehicle appended trainer (CVAT)

The committee is concerned that the Marine Corps has not funded the development of new, state-of-the-art, full crew mission simulators for armored vehicle systems. These devices have proven their utility over time and greatly reduce training costs. The committee recommends an increase of $9.2 million to make engineering changes to existing Army systems to meet unique Marine Corps requirements.

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
	STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
1	B-1B (MYP)	0	16,597				16,597
2	B-2A (MYP)	0	105,089				105,089
3	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				
	TACTICAL FORCES						
4	ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER	0	-				-
5	F-15A	4	185,442			4	185,442
6	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				-
7	F-16 C/D (MYP)	4	105,500	4	107,400	8	212,900
8	CBU-89 GATOR INERT	0	-				
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
9	C-17 (MYP)	8	2,141,105	1	194,000	9	2,335,105
9	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(221,800)				(221,800)
10	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	223,500		49,000		272,500
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
11	C-130H	0	-				-
12	C-130J	1	62,890	3	204,500	4	267,390
13	WC-130	0	-				
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
14	JPATS	12	67,135			12	67,135
15	TANKER, TRANSPORT, TRAINER SYSTEM	0	4,454				4,454
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
	HELICOPTERS						
16	HH-60G	8	107,900			8	107,900
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
17	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,611			27	2,611
18	C-20A	2	113,805			2	113,805
19	DRUG INTERDICTION	0	-				-
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
20	E-8B	2	537,824	1	210,000	3	747,824
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(120,040)				(120,040)
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	111,116				111,116
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
22	B-2A	0	6,106				6,106
23	B-1B	0	84,408		56,500		140,908
24	B-52	0	8,782		11,500		20,282
25	F-117	0	29,236				29,236
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
26	A-10	0	35,857				35,857
27	F/RF-4	0	130				130
28	F-15	0	179,318				179,318
29	F-16	0	135,906				135,906
30	EF-111	0	862				862
31	F-111	0	-				-
32	T/AT-37	0	96				96
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
33	C-5	0	54,921				54,921
34	C-9	0	4,091				4,091
35	C-17A	0	41,973				41,973
36	C-21	0	4,936				4,936
37	C-22	0	375				375
38	C-STOL	0	773				773
39	C-137	0	1,118				1,118
40	C-141	0	52,372				52,372
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
41	T-1	0	7,330				7,330
42	T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	0	148				148
43	T-38	0	9,358				9,358
44	T-41 AIRCRAFT	0	24				24
45	T-43	0	1,059				1,059
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
46	KC-10A (ATCA)	0	13,228				13,228
47	C-12	0	1,825				1,825
48	C-18	0	1,083				1,083
49	C-20 MODS	0	1,911				1,911
50	VC-25A MOD	0	1,839				1,839
51	C-130	0	96,353				96,353
52	C-135	0	137,082				137,082
53	E-3	0	287,920				287,920
	AWACS RE ENGINERING		-		109,000		109,000
54	E-4	0	1,010				1,010

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
55	H-1	0	5,410				5,410
56	H-60	0	5,987				5,987
57	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	14,871		21,200		36,071
	OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
58	CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	0	3,000				3,000
	CIVIL RESERVE AIRLIFT FLEET (CRAF)						
59	DARP	0	66,186		182,200		248,386
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
60	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	314,745		36,000		350,745
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIE						
	COMMON AGE						
61	COMMON AGE	0	176,422		63,000		239,422
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
62	F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	0	11,080				11,080
63	F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	0	81,562				81,562
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
64	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL BASE SUPPORT	0	33,144				33,144
65	ENHANCED BOMBER CAPABILITY	0	-				-
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
66	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	56,296				56,296
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
67	MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	210,654				210,654
	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT						
68	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	0	4,571				4,571
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF						
69	CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	DARP						
70	DARP	0	150,742				150,742
	TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		5,779,228		1,244,300		7,023,528
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
	PROC AMMO, AF						
1	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	0	-				-
2	2.75	0	-				

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
3	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180						
4	5.56 MM	0	-				-
5	20MM TRAINING	0	-				-
6	30 MM TRAINING	0	-				-
7	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	0	-				-
8	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	0	-				-
9	SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	0	-				-
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	TIMER ACTUATOR FIN FUZE						
11	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	0	-				-
12	TIMER ACTUATOR FIN FUZE	0	-				-
13	GBU-15	0	-				-
14	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	0	-				-
15	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	0	-				-
16	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	0	-				-
17	CBU-87(COMBINED EFFECTS MUNITIONS)	0	-				-
18	CBU-89 GATOR INERT	0	-				-
19	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000						
20	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	FLARE, IR MJU-7B						
21	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	0	-				-
22	PARACHUTE FLARE LUU-2 B/B	0	-				-
23	MJU-23 FLARE	0	-				-
24	MJU-10B	0	-				-
25	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	0	-				-
26	INITIAL SPARES	0	-				-
27	REPLENISHMENT SPARES	0	-				-
28	MODIFICATIONS	0	-				-
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	FMU-139 FUZE						
30	FMU-139 FUZE	0	-				-
31	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	MUNITIONS UNDISTRIBUTED						
32	M-16 A2 RIFLE	0	-				-
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		-		-		-

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	BALLISTIC MISSILES						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	0	8,300				8,300
	OTHER MISSILES						
	STRATEGIC						
2	HAVE NAP	0	-		39,000		39,000
3	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	0	1,236				1,236
	TACTICAL						
4	GPS AIDED MUNITION	0	-				
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	937	23,010			937	23,010
6	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	0	8,033				8,033
7	AMRAAM	133	116,299	67	23,500	200	139,799
8	AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	0	-	100	40,000	100	40,000
	TARGET DRONES						
9	TARGET DRONES	88	38,040			88	38,040
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
10	NONE	0	5,198				5,198
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER						
11	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	0	149				149
	MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
	CLASS IV						
12	CONVENTIONAL ALCM	0	-		15,000		15,000
13	AIM-9 SIDEWINDER	0	9,451				9,451
14	MM III MODIFICATIONS	0	72,752				72,752
15	AGM-88A HARM	0	-				-
16	MODIFICATIONS UNDER $2.0M	0	128				128
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
17	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	44,590				44,590
	OTHER SUPPORT						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
18	CANCELLED ACCOUNT	0	-				
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	0	-				-
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP) SPACE	3	197,693			3	197,693
20	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(26,558)				(26,558)

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
21	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	27,501				27,501
22	IONDS (MYP) SPACE	0	4,112				4,112
23	SPACE SHUTTLE OPERATIONS SPACE	0	52,500				52,500
23	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
24	SPACE BOOSTERS SPACE	0	489,606		(40,800)		448,806
25	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE SPACE	3	166,556			3	166,556
25	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	(31,195)				(31,195)
26	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	40,238				40,238
27	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPACE	0	27,885				27,885
28	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (MYP) SPACE	0	70,967				70,967
29	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM SPACE	0	22,729				22,729
30	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	4,200				4,200
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
31	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	0	13,990				13,990
32	IONDS (MYP) SPACE	0	-				-
32	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
33	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				-
34	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	0	301,368				301,368
35	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	0	774,800		13,000		787,800
	MUNITIONS & RELATED EQUIPMENT						
	ROCKETS + LAUNCHERS						
36	2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	25,392	10,126			25,392	10,126
37	2.75	25,360	1,795			25,360	1,795
38	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	50				50
	CARTRIDGES						
39	5.56 MM	18,951	7,653			18,951	7,653
40	20MM TRAINING	435	2,404			435	2,404
41	30 MM TRAINING	399	3,160			399	3,160
42	CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	507	1,191			507	1,191
43	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	4,524				4,524
	BOMBS						
44	MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	12,750	6,430			12,750	6,430
45	GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	161	18,417			161	18,417
46	BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	200,000	2,978			200,000	2,978
47	MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	1,500	3,594			1,500	3,594
48	SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	400	131,146		21,600	400	152,746
49	TTU-373A DIGITAL TEST SET	13	5,050			13	5,050
50	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	50				50
	TARGETS						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
51	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	50				50
	OTHER ITEMS						
52	FLARE, IR MJU-7B	878,340	20,018			878,340	20,018
53	MJU-10B	209,472	12,730			209,472	12,730
54	M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	1,020,000	12,791			1,020,000	12,791
55	INITIAL SPARES	0	25				25
56	REPLENISHMENT SPARES	0	2,201				2,201
57	MODIFICATIONS	0	650				650
58	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	3,544				3,544
	FUZES						
59	JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	324	4,125			324	4,125
59a	HARD TARGET SMART FUZES				2,000		2,000
	OTHER WEAPONS						
60	M-16 A2 RIFLE	0	15,524			0	15,524
61	9MM COMPACT PISTOL	131	73			131	73
	TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		2,733,877		113,300		2,847,177
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
1	SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	154	2,127			154	2,127
2	STATION WAGON, 4X2	57	949			57	949
3	BUS, 28 PASSENGER	0	-				-
4	BUS - 32-44 PASSENGER	0	-				-
5	BUSES	91	5,095			91	5,095
6	AMBULANCE, BUS	0	-				-
7	AMBULANCES	4	292			4	292
8	MODULAR AMBULANCE	0	-				-
9	14-23 PASSENGER BUS	0	-				-
10	LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	199	3,510			199	3,510
11	ARMORED SEDAN	1	287			1	287
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						-
12	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	317	6,887			317	6,887
13	TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	257	6,392			257	6,392
14	TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	572	8,678			572	8,678
15	TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	556	9,775			556	9,775
16	TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	419	9,537			419	9,537
17	TRUCK CARRYALL	145	2,989			145	2,989

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
18	TRUCK, CARGO, 2 1/2T, 6X6, M-35	0	-				-
19	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	0	-				-
20	TRUCK TRACTOR, OVER 5T	38	2,713			38	2,713
21	CAP VEHICLES	0	760				760
22	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	10,240				10,240
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
23	TRUCK TANK FUEL R-11	0	-				-
24	HMMWV, ARMORED	38	7,396			38	7,396
25	TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	108	3,120			108	3,120
26	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	4,753				4,753
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
27	HEAVY RESCUE VEHICLE	0	-				-
28	TRUCK PUMPER P-24	0	-				-
29	TRUCK PUMPER P-22	0	-				-
30	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
31	60K A/C LOADER	37	40,296		23,100	37	63,396
32	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	2,133				2,133
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
33	MODIFICATIONS	0	1,849				1,849
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM						
35	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0	-				-
	ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
36	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	0	27,421				27,421
37	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	0	501				501
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
38	INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	0	14,009		6,300		20,309
39	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	1,989				1,989
40	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	0	11,247				11,247
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	-				-
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
42	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	0	21,698				21,698
43	WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST	0	13,944				13,944
44	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	23,382				23,382
45	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	0	3,083				3,083
46	TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	0	5,817				5,817

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
47	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	0	-				-
48	DARP	0	-				-
	SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
49	AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	0	17,791				17,791
50	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	0	10,165				10,165
51	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	4,605				4,605
52	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	0	14,316				14,316
53	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	0	11,364				11,364
54	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	0	9,128				9,128
55	BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	0	22,385				22,385
56	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	0	47,966		2,200		50,166
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
57	INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	0	-				-
58	BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	0	125,741				125,741
59	USCENTCOM	0	2,298				2,298
60	AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG	0	19,173				19,173
61	WIDEBAND SYSTEMS UPGRADE	0	-				-
62	SATELLITE TERMINALS	0	-				-
	DISA PROGRAMS						
63	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM SPACE	0	-				-
64	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PROG SPACE	0	25,939				25,939
65	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	0	3,308				3,308
66	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPAC	0	10,533				10,533
67	NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	0	2,085				2,085
68	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	0	16,144				16,144
69	EASTERN/WESTERN RANGE I&M SPACE	0	102,442				102,442
70	MILSATCOM SPACE	0	52,164				52,164
71	SPACE MODS SPACE	0	23,378				23,378
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
72	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	0	24,075				24,075
73	COMBAT SEARCH & RESCUE (CSAR) RADIO	0	2,858				2,858
74	RADIO EQUIPMENT	0	9,174				9,174
75	TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	0	2,402				2,402
76	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	0	3,958				3,958
77	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	0	-				-
78	CAP COM & ELECT	0	-				-
79	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	9,714				9,714
	MODIFICATIONS						
80	COMM ELECT MODS	0	14,211				14,211

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
	TEST EQUIPMENT						
81	BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	0	13,969				13,969
82	PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	0	1,563				1,563
83	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	12,188				12,188
	PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
84	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	3,645				3,645
85	BREATHING APPARATUS TWO HOUR	0	1,993				1,993
86	UNIVERSAL WATER ACTIVATED REL SYS	0	968				968
87	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEF PROG	0	-				-
88	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	5,819				5,819
	DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
89	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	8,874				8,874
90	BASE MECHANIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
91	AIR TERMINAL MECHANIZATION EQUIP	0	-				-
92	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	5,718				5,718
	ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
93	GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	0	606				606
94	FLOODLIGHTS SET TYPE NF2D	0	-				-
95	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	3,425				3,425
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
96	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
97	NATURAL GAS UTILIZATION EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
98	MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	0	15,268				15,268
99	ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	0	-				-
100	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	0	4,866				4,866
101	PALLET AIR CARGO	4,000	3,562			4,000	3,562
102	NET ASSEMBLY, 108	0	1,939				1,939
103	BLADDERS FUEL	0	1,911				1,911
104	AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	0	2,063				2,063
105	PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	0	6,089				6,089
106	PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCEMENT	0	-				-
107	PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	0	-				-
108	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	0	21,259				21,259
109	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	-				-
110	DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	0	1,948				1,948
111	SPATIAL DISORIENTATION DEMONSTRATOR	0	1,947				1,947
112	AIR CONDITIONERS	0	803				803
113	ITEMS LESS THAN $2,000,000	0	4,971				4,971

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
114	INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	0	64,977		(8,200)		56,777
115	TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	0	1,061				1,061
116	DARP	0	77,074				77,074
117	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	0	4,661,580		(141,700)		4,519,880
118	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	0	176,455				176,455
119	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	1,351				1,351
120	MODIFICATIONS	0	195				195
121	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	13,534				13,534
	SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
122	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	37,051				37,051
	TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		5,998,819		(118,300)		5,880,519

Section 131. Multiyear contracting authority for the C-17 aircraft program.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into one or more multiyear contracts for the procurement of not more than a total of 80 C–17 aircraft. This provision is identical in content to a free standing bill (S. 1710) previously reported out by the committee.

OTHER AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Air Force Aircraft

B–2

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 the Senate Conferees recommended that an increased authorization of $493.0 million for the B–2 be used for components, upgrades, and modifications that would be valuable for the existing fleet of B–2 bombers.

Additionally, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 allowed the relaxation of program caps on the program to allow for any future decision for further production of the B–2. Subsequently, the Department decided to apply the additional funds to refurbishing AV–1, the initial B–2 test air vehicle. The committee notes that the two year effort to refurbish the AV–1 and place it into operational status preserves the option of building additional B–2 bombers without the requirement for additional funds until the refurbishment effort is completed.

Additionally, the committee is aware of controversy surrounding the Heavy Bomber Study required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1995. Consequently, the committee intends to closely monitor the progress and structure of the follow-on study of requirements, which has been appended to the Joint Staff's Deep Attack Weapons Mix Study (DAWMS) to ensure objectivity and that the methodology used is analytically sound, includes no pre-determined conclusions regarding the B–2. To ensure the objectivity, clarity and relevance of the analysis, the committee directs that the regional Commanders in Chief review and comment on the study both for its conclusions with respect to their operational responsibilities, and for the objectivity and soundness of the analysis.

F–16

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 provided for an increase of $159.4 million to acquire six F–16s for the Air Force. The additional aircraft were intended to preserve the Air Force's twenty wing force structure in the years to come by acquiring the aircraft now, while the production line is still active.

The committee notes that the Air Force has budgeted some of its limited procurement resources to acquire four new F–16s in the fiscal year 1997 budget request. While the Air Force had a goal of acquiring six of these aircraft in fiscal year 1997, there are insufficient funds available for the full buy. Realizing that the Air Force has itself made the decision to devote scarce resources to F–16 investments, the committee is persuaded to recommend an increase

of $107.4 million ($97.4 million for procurement and $10.0 million for advanced procurement) for the acquisition of eight F–16s in fiscal year 1997.

C–17 airlift aircraft

The budget request contained $2,142.8 million for procurement of eight C–17 airlift aircraft in fiscal year 1997, and for advance procurement of additional C–17 aircraft in the future. The committee later learned of an offer from the C–17's manufacturer to provide substantial savings in the program to buy an additional 80 aircraft (120 total) if awarded a seven year multi-year contract. Subsequently, the committee held a hearing on the issue to clarify and define the offer and its implications.

The committee reported out a bill, Multiyear Contracting Authority for the C–17 Aircraft Program (S. 1710), to authorize a seven year multi-year procurement of C–17s after the Department of Defense made a strong case in the hearing for such authority.

During that process, an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) was reviewed that indicated further program savings were possible if the seven year program were accelerated into six years. This could be done by acquiring the last five C–17 aircraft, now planned for production in fiscal year 2003, over the next three years. CBO estimated the total program savings that would accrue from such an acceleration to be $300.0 million.

The committee is persuaded by the CBO analysis to authorize an increase of $194.0 million for one additional C–17 aircraft in fiscal year 1997, $49.0 million for advance procurement for an additional two C–17 aircraft in fiscal 1998, and $6.0 million for initial spares.

WC–130J acquisition

The Air Force has informed the committee that the remaining service life of their theater airlift C–130's currently in service is not yet critical, since the first such aircraft will not reach the end of its projected service life until shortly after the turn of the century. However, specialized mission versions of the C–130, such as weather reconnaissance aircraft, could benefit from near-term modernization. Additionally, the committee understands that the Air Force, by conducting training at C–130 operational units as was done for introduction of the C–17 airlifter, will not need to procure a quantity of C–130J aircraft specifically dedicated to the transition to this newer model.

The committee also understands that the Air Force failed to budget for necessary spare parts when the C–130J aircraft authorized last year were procured. Consequently, to ensure proper logistic support of both active and reserve C–130J aircraft, additional funding is necessary in fiscal year 1997.

Based on the above information, the committee recommends a total increase of $204.5 million above the budget request for procurement and conversion of C–130J aircraft, and to procure the support needed for these aircraft and for C–130J aircraft procured in prior years. Of this total:

(1) $142.2 million would be for procurement of three C–130J aircraft in addition to the budget request quantity of four;

(2) $21.0 million would be for conversion of seven of these aircraft to the WC–130J configuration and to provide the specialized support that they will need for weather reconnaissance; and

(3) $41.3 million for logistic support of C–130J aircraft.

To avoid a future mismatch between procurement and support, which occurred in fiscal year 1996 and would have occurred this year without committee intervention, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to create a consolidated support funding line for C–130J's for inclusion in future budget requests. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Air Force to budget for necessary logistic support in future budget requests for C–130J aircraft.

Joint Primary Aircraft Training System (JPATS)

The committee recognizes that the JPATS program has been subjected to a number of delays in executing the program. Last year the committee recognized the opportunity to buy the program more efficiently. Based on projected contract prices, the Air Force determined that the fiscal year 1996 budget request would support purchasing eight aircraft, five more than had been requested in the budget. Rather than authorizing a smaller amount to purchase three aircraft, the Congress decided to authorize and appropriate the requested amount to purchase additional aircraft.

The Department of Defense instead decided to reduce funds available for JPATS and contract for only three aircraft in fiscal year 1996. The Air Force has estimated that accelerating the program to finish it in fiscal year 2004, rather than in fiscal year 2009, could yield an estimated savings of $151.0 million in acquisition costs and $89.0 million in operating costs. The committee is disappointed that the Department chose not to avail itself of the opportunity to achieve greater efficiencies in this program.

The committee understands that $40.5 million is unobligated and available in the Air Force's fiscal year 1995 Aircraft Procurement account for JPATS aircraft. The terms of the JPATS contract permit the government to add or subtract up to three aircraft in any year, while maintaining the current contract prices. Internal Air Force rules would prohibit the JPATS program from using these funds to buy additional aircraft when added to funds from later fiscal years. The committee believes that the Air Force should make an exception to its own rule in this situation. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure those prior year funds are applied to the purchase of additional JPATS aircraft. The Air Force has testified that using these funds would allow the service to buy three more aircraft in both fiscal years 1996 and 1997. Such an action would be in keeping with the committee's initiatives to acquire equipment at more efficient rates to provide overall program savings.

The committee understands that the Air Force has inadvertently made an incorrect allocation in the budget request. The requested amounts and the corrected requirements are displayed in the table below:

TRAINING AIRCRAFT FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

[Dollars in millions]

	Request	Requirement	Change
Procurement—JPATS	$67.1	$69.1	+$2.0
Research and Development:			
Specialized undergraduate pilot training	84.3	82.3	−2.0
JPATS	67.1	55.3	−9.2
T–38	19.8	27.0	+7.2
Total	151.4	151.4	0.0

Therefore, the committee recommends $69.1 million for JPATS procurement, and $82.3 million for specialized undergraduate pilot training research and development, including $55.3 million for the JPATS program and $27.0 million for the T–38 program.

Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS)

The budget request contained $417.8 million for the procurement of two E–8C aircraft, and $111.1 million for advanced procurement for two E–8Cs in fiscal year 1998, and $30.2 million for initial spares. Trainers and support equipment were included in the procurement. Funding in the amount of $207.3 million for follow on development and testing was also requested in PE 64770F.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force has testified that accelerating the procurement of the JSTARS aircraft is the top unfunded priority of the Air Force. The committee understands that accelerating delivery of one JSTARS aircraft will provide significant cost savings/avoidance.

The JSTARS effectiveness has been proven during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and also recently in Bosnia. The battlefield awareness provided by the JSTARS to combat commanders is critical to rapid reaction and operational success. Consequently, the committee is convinced that acceleration of one JSTARS aircraft from fiscal year 2005 to 2001 is a cost-effective way to acquire effective operational capability. The committee recommends an increase of $240.0 million for the procurement of one aircraft, including an additional $30.0 million for initial spares.

B–1B bomb modules

The committee understands that there is an Air Combat Command analysis that validates a continuing need for conventional bomb modules (CBM) in the cluster bomb unit (CBU) configuration. In view of the evolving conventional role for the B–1B, the committee recommends an increase of $56.5 million to procure 34 conventional bomb modules to equip two squadrons of B–1B's. This enhanced capability will increase B–1B strike capability by enabling the B–1B to more fully employ conventional weapons.

SR–71

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 provided $5.0 million for costs associated with the refurbishment of SR–71 aircraft. The budget request for fiscal year 1997 did not include funding for SR–71 modifications. The committee understands

that a prudent modification program can be incorporated into the SR–71 to improve its effectiveness as a hedge until unmanned aerial vehicles become widely available. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million for ELINT system reinstallation, clip in kits, navigation/GPS, and an on board processor and data link study.

AWACS re-engining

The budget request did not include funds for the re-engining of E–3 AWACS aircraft. The E–3 has been tasked worldwide, and considering the aircraft's importance in near-term and long-range operational plans, the committee is persuaded of the need to invest in longevity and sustainability of the aircraft through a re-engining program. Because of the extensive operational use of AWACS, a re-engining would be a cost-effective alternative because of the rapid payback in operating costs, as well as increased capability.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $109.0 million to initiate a program to re-engine E–3 AWACS aircraft, and the committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to budget for the out year requirements for the program in the fiscal year 1998 Program Objective Memorandum and beyond.

Satellite communications terminals

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have mandated that ultra-high frequency (UHF) satellite communications users implement the demand assigned multiple access (DAMA) capability for all users. The Air Force is procuring DAMA ground terminals but has not requested funding for airborne terminals in the budget request. Without these airborne terminals, aircraft will not be able to effectively communicate with other platforms. Accordingly, the committee recommends $21.2 million in aircraft procurement funding to begin procuring these UHF airborne DAMA terminals. The committee understands that additional funds will be required in the out years to complete this effort and directs the Air Force to include sufficient funding in future years budget requests.

RC–135 re-engining

Last year the committee recommended an increase of $79.5 million for re-engining RC–135 aircraft. Providing modern, efficient engines for these heavily used aircraft allowed for a rapid recapture of the investment involved, while avoiding the costs of supporting out of production engines. The committee understands that the Air Force is programming resources for continuation beyond fiscal year 1998 to complete the entire fleet of aircraft.

Under the assumption that the Air Force will program the required funding to complete the program past fiscal year 1997, the committee recommends an increase of $145.2 million to procure engine kits for six aircraft.

Rivet Joint technology transfer

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to the budget request for defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP) to migrate medium wave infrared acquisition technology from the Cobra Ball program to the Rivet Joint RC–135 tactical re-

connaissance fleet. The committee understands that the Air Force is reordering priorities to fund the Rivet Joint technology transfer program in fiscal years 1998 and 1999. Funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 would allow the Air Force to maintain a schedule to field upgraded systems that would enhance theater missile defense surveillance activities beginning in 1997.

KC–135 simulators

The Air Force is currently funding a three phase program to upgrade C–5, KC–10, and KC–135 simulators. If the program were accelerated to attain completion in fiscal year 2001, which is five years early, the Air Force would save from $33.0 million to $52.0 million per year, depending on the amount of simulator training done in lieu of flight training.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million for fiscal year 1997 to allow the Air Force to acquire the remaining nine visual training systems.

Aircraft budget exhibits

The committee is aware of the efforts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) to bring some order to the terminology for aircraft inventory management. The committee believes that this standardization is long overdue. The previous service-unique accounting schemes led to much confusion. The committee also believes that information on the total overall aircraft inventories would be a useful addition to the budget documentation. Such displays would provide detail by the appropriate total active inventory and total inactive inventory categories, as compared to the total inventory requirements approved by the JCS.

The committee believes that such changes could ultimately result in streamlining the budget review process, both for the administration and the Congress. These changes could reduce the amount of time that is now wasted in reviewing the budget by people at all levels manually collating data from different sources, including asking (and answering) questions seeking to clarify factual data.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to implement new aircraft budget exhibits that display the following information for each aircraft type for the period of the Future Years Defense Program:

(1) total overall aircraft inventory;

(2) active aircraft inventory, including primary aircraft inventory (with appropriate subcategories for mission aircraft, training aircraft, dedicated test aircraft, and others), backup aircraft inventory, and attrition/reconstitution reserve;

(3) inactive aircraft inventory, including bailments, drones, foreign military sales or other transfers, leases, loans, maintenance training, reclamation, and storage; and

(4) the JCS approved inventory requirements.

Air Force Missile

Precision guided munitions

Two years ago, the committee directed the Department of Defense (DOD) to conduct a Heavy Bomber Study to define the future

needs for long range bombers. The Heavy Bomber Study strongly endorsed the need for adding precision guided munitions (PGMs) to the inventory. The conclusions from the Heavy Bomber Study, however, provided little insight into the best mix of weapons and capabilities that would be required to support stated military requirements.

Last year, the committee noted the need for DOD to develop a long-term cohesive, joint PGM program. Section 261 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed DOD to develop such a plan. The Department has informed the committee that the analysis necessary to develop this plan will not be complete until later this year. The committee believes that DOD should not wait for another whole year to begin providing additional PGM capability beyond that supported in the budget request.

Accordingly, while awaiting this analysis and the Department's recommendations based on this analysis, the committee recommends an increase of $187.2 million as detailed below:

PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS INITIATIVE

[Dollars in millions]

	Request—		SASC Rec—		Change—		Ref
	($)	Qty	($)	Qty	($)	Qty	
Procurement:							
AGM–142	—	—	39.0	54	39.0	54	MPAF line 2.
CALCM	—	—	15.0	100	15.0	100	MPAF line 12.
AGM–130	—	—	40.0	100	40.0	100	MPAF line 8.
SFW	131.1	400	152.7	500	21.6	100	MPAF line 48.
Hard Target Smart Fuze	—	—	2.0	—	2.0	—	MPAF 59a.
AMRAAM (AF)	116.3	133	139.8	200	23.5	67	MPAF line 7.
AMRAAM (USN)	36.1	37	58.1	100	22.0	63	WPN line 6.
Research and Development:							
SFW P^3I	—	—	19.1	—	19.1	—	RDAF line 142, PE 27320F.
Hard Target Smart Fuze	—	—	5.0	—	5.0	—	RDAF line 81, PE 604604F.
Total	.....	.....	.....	.....	187.2		

Space boosters

The budget request included $489.6 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for space boosters. The committee understands that a portion of the request may not be needed as a result of funding received from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The budget request also appears to contain a larger amount of advance procurement than required. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $40.8 million.

Air Force Ammunition

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition that was contained in the President's budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness, for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Air Force ammunition procurement:

Item	*Millions*
Sensor Fuzed Weapon	$21.6
Hard Target Smart Fuze	2.0
Total	23.6

Other Air Force Procurement

60K Loader

Strategic airlift remains an area of interest and concern to the committee. While the success of the C–17 has been gratifying, the difference between the retirement rate of C–141s and fielding of C–17s has created a gap in capabilities. Additional ground handling equipment, such as the 60K loader, can partially make up shortfalls in lift capacity. The committee understands that accelerated acquisition of 60K loaders through an additional 20 loaders in fiscal year 1997 could reduce Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) costs of these loaders by $27.4 million.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $23.1 million to acquire a total of 57 of the new 60K loaders, with the understanding that the Department of Defense has programmed sufficient funds in the outyears to complete the planned acquisition of 60K loaders.

Joint force air component commander situational awareness system

The committee understands the need for a situational awareness tool to provide joint force commanders with an integrated display from multiple sources focused on dominant battlespace awareness. The joint force air component commander (JFACC) situational awareness system (JSAS) technology demonstration provides this interim capability and will aid in the definition of user requirements for future situational awareness systems. Therefore, the committee recommends a net increase of $9.5 million in fiscal year 1997 for this effort ($6.3 million in Other Procurement, Air Force, and $3.2 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force).

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
1	MOTOR VEHICLES	0	-				-
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	0	136,218				136,218
3	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	0	15,207				15,207
4	ARMED FORCE INFORMATION SERVICE	0	7,897				7,897
5	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	0	1,595				1,595
6	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECRUITY ADMINISTRATION	0	698				698
7	DARP	0	168,867		8,000		176,867
8	CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	0	-				-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
10	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	0	13,746				13,746
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DNA						
11	VEHICLES	0	171				171
12	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	7,700				7,700
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
13	WWMCCS ADP SYSTEMS	0	3,992				3,992
14	MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES	0	20,602				20,602
15	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	0	17,136				17,136
16	CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	0	5,295				5,295
17	JOINT C4ISR	0	4,814				4,814
18	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	0	41,397				41,397
19	PLANS & PROGRAM ANALYSIS SUPPORT CENTER	0	3,300				3,300
20	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	0	293				293
21	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT	0	-				-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
24	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	0	6,673				6,673
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMA						
25	AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
26	VEHICLES	0	59				59
27	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIS						
28	VEHICLES	244	2,996			244	2,996
29	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	0	8,590				8,590
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
30	ITEMS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	0	3,832				3,832
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO						
31	MAJOR EQUIPMENT , DSPO	0	20,025				20,025
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
32	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	0	21,501				21,501
	ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY						
33	VEHICLES	0	95				95
34	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	0	3,191				3,191
	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
35	PATRIOT PAC-3	0	215,378				215,378
36	C4I	0	19,256				19,256
37	HAWK BN/C3 MODS	0	19,379				19,379
38	NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	0	9,160				9,160
	CENTRAL IMAGERY OFFICE						
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
40	RADIO FREQUENCY MOBILE ELECTRONIC TEST SET	0	14,340				14,340
41	SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	0	4,788				4,788
42	SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	0	1,074				1,074
43	MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	0	8,067				8,067
44	AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	0	44,800				44,800
45	C-130 MODIFICATIONS	0	86,677		23,800		110,477
45	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
46	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	-				-
47	HH-53 MODIFICATIONS	0	-				-
48	MH-47/MH-60 MODIFICATIONS	0	-				-
49	OH-6 PROCUREMENT & MODIFICATIONS	0	-				-
50	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	0	13,639				13,639
	SHIPBUILDING						
51	PC,CYCLONE CLASS	0	-				-
52	ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)	0	-		4,400		4,400
53	MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE	0	9,255				9,255
54	SUBMARINE CONVERSION	0	6,027				6,027
54	LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	0	-				-
55	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	0	2,886				2,886
56	MK V SPECIAL OPERATIONS CRAFT (MK V SOC)	0	41,211				41,211
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						-
57	SOF PYRO/DEMO	0	6,161				6,161

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
58	SOF PLATFORM GUN AMMUNITION	0	-				-
59	SOF INDIV WEAPONS AMMUNITION	0	24,379				24,379
59a	SELECTABLE LIGHTWEIGHT ATTACK MUNITIONS		0		5,000		5,000
59b	TIMED RELAY FIRING DEVICES				8,000		8,000
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
60	LIGHT STRIKE VEHICLE	0	-				
61	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS	0	4,833				4,833
62	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	36,134				36,134
63	COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	0	26,617		13,100		39,717
64	SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	0	19,833		4,500		24,333
65	SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	0	10,613				10,613
66	SPECIAL WARFARE EQUIPMENT	0	5,030				5,030
67	DRUG INTERDICTION	0	-				-
68	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	3,030				3,030
69	SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM (SOFPARS)	0	1,876				1,876
70	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	75,221				75,221
71	PSYOP EQUIPMENT	0	7,794				7,794
	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
	CBDP						
72	PROTECTIVE MASK	0	-				-
73	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	0	53,785				53,785
74	DECONTAMINATION	0	252				252
75	IMPROVED CHEM AGENT MONITOR (ICAM)	0	-				-
76	NBC RECON SYS (NBCRS) MODS	0	-				-
77	M17 DECON MODS	0	-				-
78	POCKET RADIAC AN/UDR - 13	0	-				-
79	REMOTE CHEM AGT ALARM (RSCAAL)	0	-				-
80	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	0	60,619				60,619
81	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	0	12,333				12,333
82	CB PROTECTIVE SHELTER (CBPS)	0	-				-
83	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	0	81,237				81,237
84	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PRGM	0	-				-
85	CHME/BIO DEFENSE EQ (AF)	0	-				-
86	CHEM WARFARE DETECTORS	0	-				-
87	CBR EQUIP-SHIPBOARD	0	-				-
999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	399,638				399,638
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		1,841,212		66,800		1,908,012
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		35,000		35,000
	2.5 TON TRUCKS				15,000		15,000
	HEAVY TRUCK MODERNIZATION				30,000		30,000
	HMMWV MAITENANENCE TRUCKS				10,000		10,000
	NAVY RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		16,000		16,000
	F/A 18 UPGRADES				24,000		24,000
	MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		10,000		10,000
	CH-53E				50,000		50,000
	AIR FORCE RESERVE						
	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		10,000		10,000
	C-20G				30,000		30,000
	NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
	ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
5	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		52,000		52,000
	MLRS				30,000		30,000
	COMBAT & SUPPORT SYSTEMS				23,000		23,000
	TACTICAL TRUCKS AND TRAILERS				42,000		42,000
	COMMUNICATIONS/ELECTRONICS				13,000		13,000
	LOGISTICS SERVICE SUPPORT				10,000		10,000
	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT				14,000		14,000
	CHEM/BIO DEFENSE EQUIPMENT				2,000		2,000
	AIRCRAFT EQUIPMENT				21,000		21,000
	INFRASTRUCTURE EQUIPMENT				17,000		17,000
	AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
6	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	0	-		10,000		10,000
	SEAD MISSION UPGRADE				11,400		11,400
	C-130J				284,400		284,400
	DOD						
7	MISC EQUIPMENT	0	-				-
	TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		-		759,800		759,800
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF						

Line No	Title	FY 1997 Qty	FY 1997 Cost	Senate Change Qty	Senate Change Cost	Senate Authorized Qty	Senate Authorized Cost
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E						
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
1	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	0	48,300		3,000		51,300
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC						
	PROCUREMENT						
2	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	0	273,600				273,600
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M						
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
3	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	0	477,947				477,947
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF		799,847		3,000		802,847
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM		269,470				269,470
	PROCUREMENT, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		2,000				2,000

Defense-Wide Procurement

Common automatic recovery system

The committee is encouraged by the actions taken by the Department of the Navy and the Joint Program Office to meet the integration and fielding requirements of the common automatic recovery system (CARS) into the Pioneer unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) system and with the planned initiatives to field CARS in all UAVs. The committee believes that this low cost system will reduce mishaps and improve operational effectiveness. Accordingly, the committee directs the integration of CARS into both the tactical unmanned aerial vehicle (TUAV) and the Predator systems as soon as practicable and recommends an increase of $8.0 million in Procurement, Defense-Wide, Line 7 (DARP).

C–130 aircraft modifications

The U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has an ongoing program to incrementally modify its special mission aircraft to incorporate mature technology and preserve their capability to counter evolving threats. The committee has learned that additional funding in fiscal year 1997 would make possible improvements to USSOCOM's AC–130U gunships and the MC–130H Combat Talon II aircraft that would upgrade display generation units, suppress the infrared signature of aircraft engines, and improve sustainment for certain weapon systems. Funding for these improvements could not be accommodated within the budget request because of resource constraints.

The committee recommends an increase of $23.8 million for survivability and sustainment improvements to the USSOCOM's fleet of AC–130U Gunships and the MC–130H Combat Talon II aircraft.

Advanced SEAL delivery system

The budget request contains no procurement funding for the advanced SEAL delivery system (ASDS) for the special operations forces.

The committee has learned that a changing interpretation of administrative procedures between preparation of the fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997 budget requests caused $4.4 million of advance procurement funding for the ASDS to be deleted from the fiscal year 1997 budget request at the last minute. In fact, initial printed budget justification materials that the committee received from the Department of Defense still included this advance procurement in their tabular displays. The consequence of this cut in funding would be a one year delay in fielding the ASDS system.

To restore the ASDS program to its original schedule, the committee recommends an increase of $4.4 million over the budget request for the procurement of long-lead steel and integrated control and display consoles needed for fabrication of the first production ASDS. The U.S. Special Operations Command estimates that acceleration of this funding from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 1997 will avoid costs of about $10.0 million.

Special mission radio system

The U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has a program to procure a special mission radio system (SMRS). SMRS is needed to satisfy long-range communications requirements of the special forces. The operational requirements document for SMRS was approved in May 1995, and the program is included in the future years defense program. The committee has been informed by USSOCOM that accelerated procurement could save $11.3 million through avoidance of future costs.

The committee recommends an addition of $9.4 million for procurement of the SMRS.

SCAMPI communications system

The budget request contained no funding for procurement of the SCAMPI communications system for the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 would enable USSOCOM to procure the equipment necessary to relocate and modernize three principal SCAMPI hubs to accommodate bandwidth requirements.

The committee recommends an increase of $3.7 million to complete hub relocation for USSOCOM's SCAMPI communications system.

Briefcase multi-mission advanced tactical terminal

The U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) has been engaged in an ongoing program to develop and procure the briefcase multimission advanced tactical terminal (BMATT). This program responds to a validated requirement for BMATT that is contained in an October 1995 joint operational requirements document. Procurement for BMATT is included in the future years defense program. The Special Operations Command has informed the committee that accelerated procurement of this proven, operationally effective system will save $0.5 million and enable the special forces to access, in near-real time, intelligence information that is very important for mission planning and execution.

The committee recommends an addition of $4.5 million to accelerate the procurement of BMATT.

Procurement of ammunition—Special Operations

The committee is concerned with the inadequate funding for ammunition that was contained in the President's budget request. Ammunition is an important contributor to military readiness, for training and in anticipation of conflict. The committee recommends the following adjustments to the budget request for Special Operations Forces ammunition procurement:

Item	*Millions*
Selectable Lightweight Attack Munitions	$5.0
Time Delay Firing Device	8.0
Total	13.0

Other Items of Interest

Individual body armor

The committee is aware that current funding constraints prevent the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) from procuring and issuing a set of individual body armor to each member of special forces units that should use such equipment. Special forces members who deploy for operational missions are required to draw body armor from common stocks and turn it in upon return. The rationale for this system appears to be that:

(1) it would be too expensive to issue an individual set of body armor to each person; and

(2) more advanced equipment cannot be procured because of the cost to replace all equipment at the same time.

The committee has been informed that USSOCOM's current system for management of individual body armor is unpopular among special forces units because SEALs and other individuals are often compelled to use equipment that is heavily soiled from having been worn next to the body by other personnel for long periods of time under demanding circumstances. The committee understands that there is a different system for similar equipment in conventional units, where troops, such as infantrymen, are issued a helmet upon being assigned to the unit for their exclusive use while assigned. Upon completion of a tour of duty with their unit, infantrymen clean their helmets and turn them in for reissue. The committee would support a similar system for individual body armor for special forces.

The committee also notes that the current system appears shortsighted and counterproductive, because the wear and tear from repeated readjustment of the equipment to fit numerous individuals is likely to be greater than if the equipment were used by one person. Also, contrary to USSOCOM's apparent procurement assumption, the committee finds no compelling reason why all individual body armor must be replaced at the same time for special forces personnel. It would seem that advanced equipment could be procured annually, at a rate sufficient to replace older equipment as it wears out.

The committee has learned that the estimated cost of furnishing appropriate special forces with a set of individual body armor is approximately $3.0 million. However, this estimate lacks sufficient precision to merit a specific recommendation by the committee in fiscal year 1997 to implement such a program. Consequently, the committee directs the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command to report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 3, 1997, on the advisability of changing the current system and the associated costs of implementing any proposed changes.

Procurement of recycled ammunition

Until this year, military specifications have required that ammunition purchased by the military be manufactured entirely from new components. This requirement effectively precluded the use of recycled ammunition. While the committee believes that such a prohibition may be appropriate for ammunition which is intended

to be used for war, it appears to be unnecessary for training ammunition.

The committee is aware that there exists in the United States large inventories of small caliber ammunition, most of which is considered unsuitable for use in wartime or even training. Because this ammunition cannot be used for either purpose it is slated for destruction at considerable cost to the Department.

Recently, it has been demonstrated that unserviceable ammunition can be recycled, resulting in ammunition which is serviceable for training purposes. This could be done at half the cost of procuring new ammunition. This development, coupled with legislative relief from the military specifications requirement, has presented the Department of Defense with the opportunity to substantially reduce the overall cost of training ammunition. The Marine Corps has taken the lead in this effort and is currently exploring the procurement of several different types of recycled training ammunition. The committee endorses this practical and innovative approach to providing the resources necessary to training at reduced costs and encourages a broader exploration of such practices.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 1997 a report outlining current ammunition recycling programs in which the Department is exploring or participating, the financial implications of these programs, any safety concerns regarding recycled ammunition, and the reliability of such ammunition.

C–130 remanufacture prototyping

The committee is aware of a proposal to remanufacture aging C–130 aircraft. A prototyping program to design, develop, and produce renewed C–130 aircraft could demonstrate the feasibility of such an approach. Remanufacturing could yield significant improvement in affordability for the Department in modernizing its C–130 fleets throughout the Department of Defense, in both the active and reserve forces of each of the services. A validated remanufacturing process would provide maximum flexibility for the Department in determining its overall C–130 modernization plans.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report no later than March 1, 1997 on the net benefits of pursuing such a program of definition and demonstration of C–130 remanufacture. The report should address, at a minimum: a listing of the C–130 fleets of each service; each service's requirements for C–130s; the Department's present long-range modernization plan for C–130s for both active and reserve forces; and present plans for disposal of replaced C–130s.

Predator UAV leasing

The committee is aware of the successful results of the Predator UAV advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) program, and the role the Predator has played during the crisis in Bosnia. The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) has established a requirement for 16 Predator systems, but fewer than three systems are now available in the inventory.

As a way of providing commanders in the field with additional Predator systems in the most timely fashion, the committee be-

lieves that the Department of Defense should consider the option of leasing a small number of Predator systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 1996 on the feasibility, desirability, cost-effectiveness, and net benefits of proceeding with near-term, full service leasing of the Predator UAV system.

National Guard and Reserve procurement reports

With the demise of the Air Force's follow-on tactical reconnaissance program several years ago, the Air Force found itself relying only on RF–4C aircraft to provide manned tactical reconnaissance capability. When the Air Force Chief of Staff decided to retire all remaining RF–4s, the Air Force decided to use fiscal year 1994 funds authorized and appropriated for the Air National Guard to provide an interim capability on F–16 aircraft. This involved starting a new program to buy a non-developmental system carried in a pod.

Both the statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (H. Rept. 103–357) and the conference report accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (H. Rept. 103–339) required the Department of Defense to report to Congress on how the funds provided in miscellaneous equipment categories would be spent. The list provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs specified how the $50.0 million for the Air National Guard would be spent. That list identified no funding for F–16 pods. The only funding related to F–16s was an item for "220E aircraft engine upgrades."

The committee is unable to find any indication that the Department notified the congressional defense committees before diverting these funds for a new start program. The committee has supported providing the Air Force with a continuing manned reconnaissance capability. However, the committee takes a very dim view of having a service not use normal procedures for notifying the Congress of such funding shifts that involve starting a new program that was neither included in the budget nor approved by the Congress. The committee insists that the Department follow normal reprogramming and notification procedures for funds authorized and appropriated for National Guard and Reserve procurement programs.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

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

Appropriate subcommittees of the full committee conducted hearings and reviewed information on various research and development program requests including: national and theater missile defense programs; Army general purpose programs; new ships and related ship programs; tactical and strategic aircraft and associated systems; counterproliferation programs; command, control and communications programs; science and technology programs; and service efforts to support emerging operational concepts. The committee's research and development priorities were to focus on improving battlefield capabilities to assure continuing U.S. military superiority and to achieve future savings.

Explanation of tables

The tables in this title display items requested by the administration for fiscal year 1997 and the committee's actions in regard to the requested amounts. As in the past, the administration may not exceed the amounts approved by the committee (as set forth in the tables or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in the Department of Defense's budget justification documents) without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures.

Technology and future military operations

On May 5, 1995, the Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology received testimony from Admiral William Owens, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Mr. Andrew Marshall, Director of Net Assessment in the Department of Defense on the emerging outlines of a revolution in military affairs. This fundamental change to the nature of military operations derives from the potential applications of new technologies, especially information technologies, geopolitical changes begun with the end of the Cold War, and organizational changes in the Department of Defense accelerated with the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols reforms in 1986. One working definition of a revolution in military affairs was provided by Dr. Andrew Krepinevich, Director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, during the hearing as follows:

> A military revolution occurs when the application of new technologies to military systems combines with innovative operational concepts and organizational adaptation to alter fundamentally the character of conflict by producing a dis-

continuous leap in the combat potential and effectiveness of armed forces.

During the hearing, Admiral Owens pointed to a number of critical factors that are necessary for potentially revolutionary military capabilities to emerge over the next 20 to 30 years. Admiral Owens recommended focusing technology on creating a "system of systems" for dominance of the battlefield on an ever-larger scale rather than on improving existing capabilities. Key components of the system of systems approach are information technologies for surveillance and communication as well as precision weapons technologies.

Another key element in the quest to achieve revolutionary capabilities is the need to drive this transformation from the top down in a joint warfighting context either through the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. An additional factor often overlooked, but which is exceedingly important, is the creation of a climate within each of the military services which actively fosters bold, innovative thinking about warfighting concepts within the officer corps. The service academies and the war colleges will play a central role in developing or impeding this environment.

Mr. Marshall, Dr. Krepinevich, and Dr. Daniel Goure (Deputy Director, Political-Military Studies, Center for Strategic and International Studies) raised a number of issues with regard to the so-called revolution in military affairs and the manner in which the concepts underlying future warfare are being developed and supported in the Department of Defense. During the hearing, there was disagreement over the pace at which a military revolution may be possible or whether, as Dr. Goure asserted, such a revolution must involve a much greater redefinition of the meaning of power in the international order than is currently under discussion in the Department of Defense. Both witnesses raised concerns about the likelihood that the focus on more traditional operational concepts in the Bottom-Up Review strategic blueprint is driving budget decisions that would sacrifice the development of long-term revolutionary capabilities by funding the near-term requirements embodied in the two-MRC scenario.

On March 15, 1996, the Subcommittee on Acquisition and Technology continued exploring the impact of emerging, potentially revolutionary concepts of future warfare by receiving testimony from representatives of the military services on their current efforts to develop these concepts and to integrate them into their technology investment programs for fiscal year 1997 and beyond. The services have all embarked on efforts to define and support emerging operational concepts. The Army has a relatively mature program through its *Force XXI* process. The Marine Corps, with personal and strong support from the Commandant, General Krulak, has developed an aggressive five-year plan for concept development and experimentation in the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory as part of its *Sea Dragon* process. The Navy, through the CNO-sponsored *Vision 2020* process, is just beginning to focus on operational concepts that will influence the Navy Science and Technology budget in future years. The Air Force is beginning to assess the impact of the Air Force Science Board recommendations in the *New World*

Vistas study, as well as recommendations in a number of other studies, on its Science and Technology investment strategy. In each of the service programs, several common technology themes predominate, however, that are consistent with the concepts under review in the discussion about the potential for a revolution in military affairs. They include: information dominance, precision targeting and delivery, and increased maneuver. Testimony during the hearing also made clear the need for continuing acquisition reform to decrease cycle times for introducing new technologies into the services and for increasing access to technologies being rapidly developed and deployed by the commercial sector.

Major areas of concern

The committee is pleased that each of the services has embarked on a sustained process for developing emerging operational concepts that flow out of current discussions about the impending revolution in military affairs. There are numerous issues that must be addressed in the near term, however, to ensure that emerging operational concepts result in adequately leveraged technologies to guarantee battlefield dominance through the first half of the 21st century.

Jointness

The committee is aware that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is about to complete *Joint Vision 2010*, a document that has the potential to provide a joint guidance overlay for the service efforts to define new operational concepts. To date, however, as each of the services undertakes to define new operational concepts, it is not clear that there is any process above the service level to ensure the necessary coordination and focus of a joint vision. Each of the services appears to be planning new approaches to warfare without involving the other services directly in the process. Each of the services appears to be following different assumptions concerning the threat environment, technology applications, and the future of military power in the emerging international order. There are several programs at the level of the JROC and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure that the joint warfighting requirements in the nearer term are reflected in the programming and budgeting decisions through the Chairman's Program Assessment and the Chairman's Program Recommendations to the Defense Planning Guidance. What is lacking is a process to ensure that the emerging long-term visions of each of the services will be melded into an affordable, coordinated series of operational concepts that will drive the Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan developed in the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

Affordability

The committee is also concerned that affordability issues and present and future defense budget realities are not being considered appropriately in the services" attempts to develop concepts of future warfare. One witness noted in testimony before the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee that, "The greatest challenge we face in this new world order is the constrained budget environment in which we operate." The problem is particularly acute for

the Army and the Marine Corps, which are being called upon to carry out a greater number of missions in an expanding spectrum of operations with less operational and investment funding.

Each of the services programs to define and exploit new operational capabilities focuses to a great extent on deploying new and expensive technologies within many of the traditional roles and missions of the services. It is doubtful whether future defense budgets will support the deployment of such new technological capabilities on the scale proposed by current analyses without a greater focus on affordability initiatives. Too much effort may be expended chasing unachievable operational capabilities, while more revolutionary approaches to joint operations, radical transformations in roles and missions, and fundamental reorganizations remain undeveloped in the service processes.

Incremental versus revolutionary approaches

New technology advances offer a very significant temptation to forego pursuit of longer-term, but less certain, revolutionary capabilities in favor of substantial improvements in existing operational capabilities. Each of the service witnesses at the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee hearing on March 15, 1996 admitted the difficulty of balancing evolutionary and revolutionary approaches to future warfare. Increasing operational demands on the military to support peacekeeping and other non-traditional missions combined with a constrained budget environment serve to strengthen pressures to devote analysis and resources to extend capabilities to meet current operational shortfalls rather than forging revolutionary capabilities. A more aggressive top-down approach across traditional roles and missions is needed to ensure that a potential revolution in military capabilities is not foreclosed by a focus on dramatic but ultimately incremental enhancements to performance of existing platforms and organizations.

Out of phase processes

As the testimony presented at the March 15 Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee revealed, the services are all at very different stages of a process to come to grips with emerging operational concepts. The Army's *Force XXI* process is the most mature with many of the technology priorities reflected in the research and development and procurement portions of the administration's budget request for fiscal year 1997. The Marine Corps has also vigorously pursued efforts to carry out its *Sea Dragon* program with minimal resources. The Navy and Air Force, on the other hand, are both at a relatively early stage in their respective processes with the likelihood that the earliest impact of the current analyses and wargames will not be seen until the fiscal year 1998 Science and Technology budget requests for those services are submitted. This lack of coordination across the services may significantly impede the development of the revolutionary military capabilities that cut across traditional roles and missions.

Initiatives for future operational capabilities

Investment in technology is only one, albeit important, pillar in the development of revolutionary capabilities. The committee has

noted several shortfalls, however, in the fiscal year 1997 request for technology base programs and the associated authority in law for the use of such funds. The committee has recommended a number of initiatives to address these concerns and to ensure that sufficient funding in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation account is available to support continuous effort by the services to pursue revolutionary operational capabilities.

Affordability

The committee has recommended $80.0 million in increases to programs supporting near- and long-term affordability of systems. These recommendations, which are described in more detail below, include increases in funding for manufacturing technology programs in the services, focused affordability initiatives in the Navy, and a number of programs designed to reduce the cost of advanced materials and advanced electronic technologies.

Development of advanced operational concepts

The committee has recommended an increase of $100.0 million for *Force XXI* initiatives to accelerate the acquisition of promising technologies for rapid field testing in the Army's various experiments and demonstration programs under *Force XXI* for potential follow-on acquisition under the Warfighting Rapid Acquisition Program. The committee has also recommended an increase of $40.0 million for the support and acceleration of the Marine Corps *Sea Dragon* technology supporting experiments conducted by the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory. Additionally, the committee has recommended a provision that would extend to the military services the authority currently available to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to use other transactions for prototyping experiments under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994.

Jointness and connectivity

In order to promote a greater degree of jointness in the efforts of each of the services to develop emerging operational concepts, the committee has recommended a provision that would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in his role as Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to review and annually report to Congress on the current service efforts in this area and to describe the methods by which these efforts are being coordinated above the service level. The committee has also recommended a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress the annual Joint Warfighting Science and Technology Plan to ensure that the technology priorities being identified as a result of current experiments and wargames in the services are adequately supported in the request for defense science and technology funding.

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 203. Defense Nuclear Agency.

The budget request included $314.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) for operation and maintenance ($85.1 million),

procurement ($7.9 million) and research and development ($221.3 million). The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million to the DNA budget request. The committee directs that the funds be used: to increase the frequency of nuclear weapons incident field training exercises ($3.0 million for operations and maintenance); to leverage DNA capabilities developed to combat nuclear threats during the Cold War by establishing a counter terrorism technology support program; and to establish a nuclear weapon delivery sustainment program which, in conjunction with the military services, will provide affordable technologies, manufacturing processes, and test and evaluation techniques to maintain nuclear delivery systems over their anticipated extended life cycles ($12.0 million).

Maintaining critical skills necessary to sustain U.S. nuclear strategic forces

As noted during hearings this year and in previous years, the committee remains concerned with the ability of the (DOD) to maintain the core competencies of expertise necessary to sustain its nuclear force, in the absence of nuclear testing, in the foreseeable future. The committee recommends that DOD take additional steps to sustain this expertise within the military services and civilian personnel in the Department.

The President has directed that the future safety and reliability of the nuclear force be maintained through the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program of the Department of Energy. The safety, security, and reliability of the all nuclear weapons systems, to include the delivery system and related command and control and other associated subsystems, is the responsibility of the Department of Defense. In order for DOD to ensure the safety and reliability of its nuclear forces, its military and civilian personnel must maintain their nuclear expertise and core competencies.

In order to retain core competencies and critical scientific and engineering skills of the military services and civilian personnel, it is the committee's understanding that DOD and DOE will archive data, manufacturing processes and test procedures. In the absence of underground nuclear testing, the archival of data is important; however, it cannot assure future nuclear expertise. The committee believes that more immediate action by the Department is needed to retain core competencies and to pass on this knowledge base and critical skills to future nuclear defense-oriented scientists, engineers and weapons systems developers.

The committee understands that DNA, the national laboratories and the military service laboratories have initiated efforts to work together through an alliance to sustain the scientific and engineering skills necessary to maintain our nuclear forces. The committee appreciates the efforts of DNA, Sandia National Laboratories, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and Phillips Laboratory to respond to the critical requirement to maintain core competencies.

The Department shall report to the committee by October 1, 1996 on potential initiatives to retain core competencies that would involve developing key science and technology programs. The report should also identify potential opportunities for conducting cooperative training and education programs between educational institu-

tions, industry, and the Defense Nuclear Weapons School, the national laboratories and the military services. Lastly, the report should identify potential career paths for entry-level engineers and scientists and the funding necessary to sustain a program of this nature.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211. Space launch modernization.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program because of the potential for significant near-term reductions in launch cost and improvements in responsiveness. However, the committee believes that the Department should also begin planning for how it would use a reusable launch vehicle (RLV). Well before we have an operational RLV, the Department of Defense (DOD) will have to rethink its technological and operational approaches to the use of space for meeting communications, reconnaissance, and other military requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63401F to begin the necessary technical and operational developments that will be required for the Department to fully utilize RLV systems once they become operational. The committee notes that the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Space has expressed serious interest in coordinating the efforts within the Department of Defense and between the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) on RLV development and planning. The committee applauds this initiative.

The committee recommends a provision that would not permit the use of DOD funds for RLV in an amount in excess of that dedicated to the program by NASA. The provision also prohibits the obligation of funds authorized for EELV in fiscal year 1997 until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the DOD plans to obligate the funds authorized for RLV in a manner consistent with this Act.

Section 212. Department of Defense Space Architect.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to include the kinetic energy tactical anti-satellite (ASAT) program in the space control architecture that will be developed by the Department's new Space Architect. The provision would prohibit the use of fiscal year 1997 defense funds to support the Space Architect until the Secretary certifies that he will include the ASAT program in the space control architecture and that he has obligated fiscal year 1996 funds and will obligate fiscal year 1997 funds appropriated for the kinetic energy ASAT, consistent with congressional guidance.

Section 213. Space-based infrared system program.

Section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) requires the Secretary of Defense to prepare and submit to Congress a new program baseline for the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) program, including an accelerated schedule for development and deployment of the Space and

Missile Tracking System (SMTS). The committee has been disappointed by the Department's delay in responding to this statutory guidance and reluctance to obligate funds appropriated for SMTS in fiscal year 1996. Due to this lack of responsiveness, the committee recommends a provision that would provide for the conditional transfer of SMTS back to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), where the program had previously resided.

The committee is aware, however, that the Department of the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense have instituted a process that will purportedly bring the Department of Defense into compliance with section 216 (Public Law 104–106). Based on assurances to this effect, the committee has decided to condition the transfer of the SMTS program. If, within 30 days after enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the requirements of section 216 (Public Law 104–106) have been carried out, then the requirement to transfer SMTS to BMDO shall cease to be effective.

The committee notes that the Air Force has informed the committee that the program baseline required by section 216 (Public Law 104–106) is achievable at a reasonable level of risk. The committee has been in regular contact with the Air Force to review in detail draft schedules for the new program baseline. The committee also notes that its desire to foster greater competition in the SMTS program has been endorsed by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Air Force. The committee has been informed by senior Department of Defense officials that the Department's decision to recommend rescission of $51.0 million of the fiscal year 1996 SMTS appropriation was a mistake based on incomplete information, and that the Department is eager to obligate such funds for the purpose for which they were originally authorized and appropriated. Finally, the committee notes that both the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense unofficially recommended an increase of $134.0 million in fiscal year 1997 to enhance competition in the SMTS program and to preserve the option of accelerating the SMTS schedule, consistent with section 216 (Public Law 104–106).

The committee recommends sufficient funding in fiscal year 1997 for the overall SBIRS program to implement the program baseline established in section 216(a) of P.L. 104–106. Since the budget request is deficient for both the space segment high and the space segment low (SMTS), the committee recommends an increase of $134.0 million in PE 63441F to support SMTS acceleration, and an increase of $19.1 million in PE 64441F to restore SBIRS high to the baseline program previously approved by the committee and to preclude a slip in fielding one or both of the overseas relay ground stations supporting the 1999 Defense Support Program consolidation.

Section 214. Research for advanced submarine technology.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. Additional discussion of the rationale for this provision may be found in the section of this report dealing with national defense features.

Section 215. Clementine 2 micro-satellite development program.

In fiscal year 1996, the Air Force Space Command, in conjunction with the Air Force Phillips Laboratory, initiated a Clementine 2 micro-satellite program as a follow-on to the highly successful Clementine 1 mission. The Clementine 2 program will develop, test, and flight-validate a variety of miniaturized spacecraft technologies with applications to a wide number of military and intelligence space programs. By using near-earth asteroids as sensor demonstration targets, the mission will also provide benefits to the civil science community. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million in PE 63401F to continue this effort under the control of the Space Warfare Center, with execution by the Clementine team (Phillips Laboratory, the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory).

The committee also recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized in this Act for the Global Positioning System Block IIF satellite system until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that: (1) funds appropriated for fiscal year 1996 for the Clementine 2 micro-satellite program have been obligated; and (2) the Secretary has made available for obligation funds appropriated for fiscal year 1997 for the Clementine 2 micro-satellite program.

Section 217. Defense airborne reconnaissance program.

The budget request for unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) included $438.6 million for research and development for a variety of reconnaissance programs within the defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP) as listed below:

DARP RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

[Dollars in millions]

Program	Purpose	Amount	Change
Tactical UAV (TUAV)	Provide warfighters with day/night aerial reconnaissance to support combat operations.	$64.6	−12.8
Endurance UAV (EUAV)	Provide wide area reconnaissance support with the following UAV systems: ''Predator'' (Tier II) medium altitude endurance (MAE); ''Global Hawk'' (Tier II+) conventional, high altitude endurance (CONV HAE); and ''Dark Star'' (Tier III−) low observable, high altitude endurance (LO HAE).	176.4	.....
Manned Reconnaissance Program.	Support the entire range of users from tactical to National Command Authority.	28.3	+42.7
Distributed Common Ground System.	Provide a system capable of receiving and processing data from multiple airborne platforms.	55.3	.....
Airborne Reconnaissance Program (ARP).	Respond to evolving threats by funding and coordinating other advanced airborne reconnaissance technologies.	114.0	−6.5
Total		438.6	+23.4

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles

Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Program

The committee applauds the attempts by the Department of Defense to rationalize programs for meeting the requirements of users at the tactical level. The committee believes that the Department

has offered a reasonable plan to move toward a set of systems to meet requirements in the long-term. However, the committee remains concerned about the pressure to proliferate systems to meet particular niche markets. This makes the tactical UAV development program all the more important.

The Department has proposed to manage the tactical UAV program as an advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD). This proposal differs from previous ACTDs, however, in that the budget supports an immediate transition into production of the candidate system that wins the tactical UAV competition.

The committee understands that a request for proposals (RFP) has been released, and contract award is expected within one month of this report. The restructuring of the program and the creation of an ACTD has resulted in an excess of unexpended funds from fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996; accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $12.8 million and encourages the Department to reprogram any remaining funds within the DARP.

The committee notes the success achieved in the Predator ACTD, which has achieved many operational successes in Bosnia. The Predator program is the first ACTD that will "graduate" from development status into production. There has been sufficient time to operationally test the Predator before we committed resources in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) to any major production program. This is in stark contrast to the Hunter UAV program, where production began much too soon. In a rush to production and deployment, the Department now owns multiple Hunter systems that will be stored for potential future use.

This presents both a problem and an opportunity. We will be saddled with a one-of-a-kind system and storage costs. Nevertheless, having the Hunter systems available (and the Pioneer and Predator UAV systems) means that we do not need to rush to production of the tactical UAV. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense not to enter into any limited production for tactical UAVs beyond the number required to conduct the core ACTD program.

Dark Star UAV

The committee is encouraged that the Dark Star UAV has finally achieved first flight. Unfortunately, achieving this milestone was delayed by more than six months from the date estimated by the contractors last year, and the aircraft crashed on its second flight. This is in direct contrast to the pleas that the program was ahead of schedule and could use additional funds in fiscal year 1996 for additional air vehicles. The committee understands that this delay was caused by deficiencies in the avionics system, resulting from software problems. A problem with software has been an all too common problem in other programs and has frequently been a harbinger of even bigger problems later. The committee believes that achieving theater-level support promised by the Dark Star is too important to have this program burdened by the problems deriving from too much production with too little progress in the air. While the specific causes of a recent Dark Star crash are as yet unknown, the committee views with concern the headlong rush to accelerate the program.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision to direct the Department of Defense to refrain from awarding contracts for additional air vehicles beyond the original ACTD proposal, or any other work related to additional air vehicles, as a hedge against further program surprises.

Predator

The Predator UAV, formerly known as the Tier II, has enjoyed significant success in Bosnia operations. The committee understands the Department is interested in procuring a substantial number of Predator systems for future fielding. The Predator was itself an ACTD, as is the Dark Star. Full scale acquisition of Predators will be a benchmark for ACTDs, since no other ACTDs have gone to full production. ACTDs are designed for limited scale demonstrations, rather than as acquisition programs, and are hence free from various acquisition regulations.

The committee is gratified by the Predator's successes, and interested in a comparison of Predator's capabilities versus those of the Tier III– . The committee has frequently noted concern over the number of UAV types and apparent mission overlap between the various programs. Specifically, could the Predator be a substitute for the Tier III– if the Dark Star endured further program setbacks? If Predator can successfully transition to production, it may be a near-term solution while other UAVs are in development. Conversely, if the Predator does not have sufficient capability for future missions, the resources devoted to Predator acquisition might be better used for the developing Dark Star program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision to direct the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO) to withhold Predator acquisition until 60 days after submitting a report that compares the capabilities and costs of the two programs and makes recommendations for the future of the two programs should funding for only one program be available.

Manned Reconnaissance Upgrades

While there have been strides made in UAV's and there are promising developmental programs in progress for sensor integration, the committee notes the gap between fielded UAV's and required capabilities. In order to ensure continuing reconnaissance capacity, the committee recommends close attention be paid to U–2 capabilities, payloads and training now.

SIGINT payloads

Last year the committee recognized the need for incremental upgrades to the SIGINT capabilities of the U–2. Noting the development of the joint airborne SIGINT architecture (JASA) as an important initiative for future intelligence gathering, the committee also acknowledges the need to remain capable in the near-term, while awaiting JASA development.

The committee is aware that the DARO has listed U–2 recapitalization, specifically procurement of two additional Senior Glass payloads, as their top unfunded priority. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $32.7 million to procure and integrate two additional Senior Glass payloads. Also, the committee is

aware of an initiative within the DARO to reprogram excess funds from the cancelled Hunter UAV program which contains additional Senior Glass payloads for the U–2. The committee expects to receive such a request in the near future.

Senior Year electro-optical reconnaissance system (SYERS)

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 recommended an increase in the DARO budget for U–2 sensor upgrades, including the SYERS.

The SYERS provides the U–2 with its only operational real-time imaging system. Following the Gulf War, the DARO initiated a program to enhance SYERS capabilities to provide wide area coverage, geolocation ability, multi-spectral imaging capability, and simultaneous operation with other sensor packages. However, the program has not been funded to completion, leaving a final package upgrade, the U–2000 program, unfunded. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to repackage the SYERS sensor for simultaneous operation with other sensors, and to begin the effort to add geolocation and broad area coverage, and multi spectral capabilities.

U–2 simulator

The committee appreciates the fact that U–2 operational tempo is demanding of both equipment and crews, leaving little opportunity for training new crews or ensuring proficiency in all aspects of operations. The unique nature of the U–2's aerodynamics demands precise flying that can only be perfected through practice. The lack of training time available for the aircraft, as well as the advances now available in simulation at modest cost, combine to suggest the need for simulator training for U–2 crews. The committee is persuaded that training costs could be reduced and safety enhanced through the use of simulation. The committee encourages the Air Force to begin a program to acquire a motion-based flight simulator for U–2 flight crews, and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of U–2 simulation, to include the funding required, realistic completion date, and a net benefit analysis of acquiring a U–2 flight simulator.

Airborne Reconnaissance Program (ARP)

Common data link

The common data link is an effort to define and implement an interoperable command, control, and communications capability. The committee understands that the program has not been able to execute fully in fiscal year 1996, and accordingly recommends a reduction of $6.5 million in the program.

Section 218. Cost analysis of F–22 aircraft program.

The committee notes that F–22 production costs, as reported in the selected acquisition report (SAR), have not changed fundamentally since Milestone II in June 1991. It is unclear how F–22 costs could remain the same despite significant changes in the aircraft's

weight, material mix, and avionics during these crucial development years.

Accordingly, the committee was concerned to learn that the Department intends to move funding for the four pre-production aircraft from the procurement account to research and development, since this change could further delay a new independent life-cycle cost estimate for the F–22 program. The last independent cost estimate occurred at Milestone II in 1991, the last time there were major cost changes to the program.

Neither the Congress nor the Secretary of Defense should have to wait another two to three years, or a total of seven to eight years to review F–22 costs. The committee notes the Air Force leadership appears to share this concern since it has commissioned an F–22 "cost scrub" due in the fall of 1996. While the committee is pleased that the service has decided to review the F–22's costs, the Secretary and the Congress would benefit from the completion of an independent cost analysis of the program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense Cost Analysis Improvement Group (OSD CAIG) to review the program and prepare its own independent estimate of the program, and to report the results of this estimate to the congressional defense committees no later than March 30, 1997, with no more than 92 percent of the funds recommended in fiscal year 1997 for the F–22 program to be spent until the analysis is delivered.

Section 219. F–22 aircraft program.

The budget request included $2,003.0 million for engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) of the F–22.

The committee has repeatedly noted its concerns with concurrency, that is, overlap of production and testing, in the F–22 program. One source of that concern was a Defense Science Board report on concurrency and risk in the F–22 program, dated April 1995, which was prepared in response to committee direction contained in the committee report to accompany S. 2182 (S. Rept. 103–282). The report's summary conclusions were:

(1) The program is very ambitious technically.

(2) For each risk area there are significant achievements that should be demonstrated before release of funding for Lot 2 (12 aircraft) Contract Award.

(3) The engine and passive surveillance avionics are the highest risk areas.

(4) In the event of inadequate progress, the program can be slipped by staying at the 4 aircraft per year rate.

(5) Stretching the program in this way may reduce risk but can create cost, manpower and obsolescence problems.

(6) There is no risk-concurrency reason to introduce such a stretch at this time.

The committee held a hearing again this year on tactical aviation forces modernization and reviewed the F–22 EMD program. During this year's hearings, the Air Force witness testified that he was "comfortable" with the level of concurrency and that he felt the level of risk in the program is acceptable. The witness indicated that the F–22 is an "event driven program that insures that key criteria are met as a prerequisite to production decisions." This

concept has been described as "event-based." Under this approach, the program moves to new steps in research and development or low-rate production contracts only after having demonstrated specific progress in achieving definite objectives (called "exit criteria"). In other words, the program is "promoted" based on demonstrated performance.

During the hearing on tactical aviation, the committee agreed with this approach, but noted that at the Critical Design Review when the F–22 exceeded weight limits, the action taken was to "make a degradation in the envelope and thereby allow the increase in weight."

The committee is concerned that the Department intends to buy 76 aircraft prior to Milestone III, which substantially exceeds the reporting threshold of 10 percent of total program procurement (44, or 10 percent of 442 total aircraft in the program). The committee notes subsection 2400(a) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, which requires that the Secretary of Defense Report on how many items will be procured under low-rate initial production (LRIP) for a system. The Act requires that the Secretary report on his reasons for buying more than 10 percent of the total program under LRIP, if he decides at the Milestone II decision point to do so. That report must be included in the first selected acquisition report (SAR) after having made the decision.

The committee is aware that the F–22 program is in the early stages of EMD, and many event-based decisions are yet to come. Not wanting to make arbitrary cuts in the program or disturb the balance between research and production, which could create cost, manpower and obsolescence problems, the committee believes the Department should provide additional reports to Congress outside the normal budget cycle. Therefore the committee recommends a provision, directing the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to report on upcoming event-based decisions and their criteria, and the outcomes of those decisions with explanations of the decisions made.

Section 220. Nonlethal weapons and technologies programs.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $15.0 million for a joint service research and development program for non-lethal weapons technologies capabilities to be administered by the executive agent. Additionally, the committee recommends authorization of $3.0 million in the operation and maintenance account for the Marine Corps and $2.0 million in the operation and maintenance account for the Army to fulfill immediate procurement needs for non-lethal weapons to correct inventory deficiencies.

The committee also recommends a provision that would limit the use of funds authorized in program element 605130D (foreign comparative testing) and program element 603790D (NATO research and development) until funds authorized for the non-lethal weapons program element authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, and funds authorized for fiscal year 1997, are released to the executive agent of the program. Lastly, the committee is aware that the budget request for fiscal year 1996 also includes funds in the budget request for the Department and separate defense agencies in program elements 603220E and

602715H for research and development of non-lethal weapons technologies. The committee requests that research and development efforts funded by these program elements be coordinated with the executive agent for the non-lethal weapons technology program.

Since 1990, the role of U.S. military forces in peacekeeping and operations other than war has increased dramatically. Examples of operations where U.S. military forces have been deployed include evacuation operations in politically unstable areas, disaster relief, humanitarian assistance in response to internal political upheavals, and peace enforcement and peacekeeping. These deployments, in varied and non-traditional missions, have placed our military forces in potentially dangerous noncombat situations involving civilians and terrorists. The fielding of non-lethal capabilities in Somalia and Haiti, while modest in scope, provided U.S. military forces with increased flexibility in the force continuum, where previously the only options available were either to do nothing or to use deadly force. It is likely that U.S. military forces will continue to be confronted by unorthodox military challenges in the future, and the committee strongly believes that non-lethal capabilities are necessary to manage, contain, and defuse certain volatile and low intensity situations.

The committee sought to ensure that the military services possess the technologies, systems and munitions necessary to perform peacekeeping missions and operations other than war by authorizing $41.0 million in fiscal year 1995. In fiscal year 1996, the Congress directed the Department to centralize funding for non-lethal weapons and technologies, and to assign management of the program to an executive agent, preferably a user of the technologies, such as a military service. This executive agent would be in a position to identify and prioritize service requirements for non-lethal research and development efforts based on operational experience and needs.

In recent testimony before the committee, the Department announced that the Commandant of the Marine Corps, along with the Director of the Commandant's War Fighting Laboratory, had been designated as the executive agent for the Department's non-lethal weapons program. As outlined to the committee, the Marine Corps will coordinate activities of the services, defense agencies and the U.S. Special Operations Command, but would exercise direct control only over the Marine Corps activities. According to DOD, all budgetary oversight and direction for research, development, and procurement of non-lethal weapons technologies would remain the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. The committee is deeply concerned by the Department's decision not to comply with direction provided last year.

Additionally, the committee has learned that $37.2 million authorized last year for the non-lethal weapons technologies program has been withheld from the executive agent by the Department. The committee directs the Department to comply with section 219 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and release funds authorized for the non-lethal weapons technologies to the executive agent for implementation of the program.

Finally, the committee understands that the military services have identified the need for additional funding in fiscal year 1996

to reduce development risk in a number of areas such as kinetics, entanglements and acoustics. Additionally, the committee has learned that the military services have identified $26.0 million in shortfalls in the current non-lethal weapons inventory. The committee recommends that the Department seek to reprogram $26.0 million from funds authorized in fiscal year 1996 for research and development of non-lethal weapons to be used for the procurement of non-lethal weapons to meet inventory deficits.

Section 221. Counterproliferation support program.

The fiscal year 1997 budget request included $93.7 million for the Counterproliferation Support Program to accelerate the development and deployment of essential military counterproliferation technologies and capabilities in the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million to the budget request for the continuation of the Army's tactical antisatellite (ASAT) technologies program.

Proliferation of Space Technology

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 included $30.0 million for the Army's tactical antisatellite technologies program. The committee is concerned with the Department's decision to include the funds authorized and appropriated for the Army's tactical antisatellite technologies program on the rescission list. The Commander in Chief of Space Command has testified before the committee of the importance of space and the inherent advantage of controlling this operational medium for the military. General Ashy testified that, "the use of space and control of this space medium are essential to today's military operations." The committee understands that the Army's Space and Strategic Defense Command did not agree with the decision to rescind the funds authorized for the tactical ASAT program because it believes that the kinetic energy technology will prove to be a vital capability for the future and may have applicability to other programs.

In order to avoid significant delays and increased costs in developing this capability, the Congress directed the Department to build on the Army's tactical antisatellite technology program. However, the Department's decision to include the funds authorized for this program in a rescission package may have caused the program to be delayed by a year, and potentially increased the cost of the program.

The committee directs DOD to release the funds authorized for this program and comply with section 218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

Underground and Deep Underground Structures

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, the Congress recommended that $1.5 million be made available from the counterproliferation support program for the exploration of a "deep digger" concept for hard target characterization. The committee believes that the Department must continue to focus its research and development efforts aggressively on programs to detect and discriminately attack and destroy underground facilities. The "deep digger" concept could possibly address a critical gap in

our armed forces' capabilities. The committee understands that only a small portion of funds has been released to conduct a feasibility study for theoretical validation of the program. Deep digger has the potential for use in a variety of missions because it could be delivered either by ground forces or by aircraft. The committee directs the Department to release the remainder of fiscal year 1996 funds and recommends that $3.0 million of the funds authorized for the counterproliferation support program in fiscal year 1996 be made available for the continuation of the proof of principle concept and for the design and testing of a prototype.

Chemical and Biological Detection

The committee recommends that the Department continue to place increased emphasis in this area. The potential use of biological agents continues to be a powerful threat to national security. The committee continues to believe that bolder research and development efforts are needed and strongly recommends that the program manager for the chemical and biological defense program, as well as the program manager for the counterproliferation support program, take a more proactive position on working closely with universities and industry, and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), to take advantage of technologies that show potential for biological detection. In particular, the committee endorses efforts undertaken by DARPA to conduct research on unique means of detecting biological agents, such as upconverting phosphors.

The committee supports the Department's efforts to support programs that improve our ability to detect and identify chemical agent production and storage facilities. The committee understands that $7.9 million from funds authorized in fiscal year 1996 for the counterproliferation support program were used to support an effort known as SAFEGUARD that employs ultra-spectral imaging to detect trace amounts of chemical agent. The committee recommends that the Department provide a similar level of support for this program in fiscal year 1997.

With regard to chemical and biological research conducted by DARPA, the committee directs DARPA to consult and coordinate more closely with the executive agent for the chemical-biological defense program. Likewise, the committee emphasizes its concern that both the chemical-biological defense program and the counterproliferation support program work closely with DARPA to leverage all existing technologies and capabilities to their fullest extent.

Emergency preparedness and response

The administration has placed a high priority on preventing and combating the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In particular, considerable concern has arisen regarding the potential terrorist use of chemical or biological agents as a result of the nerve agent attack last year in Japan. Following the end of the Cold War, the committee expressed its concerns about these potential threats through a number of legislative provisions. In fiscal year 1994, the committee included a provision expressing its concerns and directing that the President direct the Departments of Defense and En-

ergy, and other appropriate federal agencies, to report to Congress on their plans and programs to respond to the potential use of chemical, biological, nuclear or radiological agents or weapons against civilian populations. Recently, administration witnesses have testified to the Congress that there is a coordinated effort within the government to manage the consequences of the terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) against the United States. Despite these assurances, the committee remains concerned that interagency conflicts are impacting the government's ability to assess the threat, identify the available capabilities and develop and implement procedures for responding to these threats. The committee understands that the President signed a Presidential Decision Directive in June 1995, outlining the interagency process and directing lead agency responsibilities to support the requirements of responding to the terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction both here in the United States and overseas. Further, the committee understands that the directive includes a requirement for coordination of crisis response and consequence management, with DOD providing response assistance to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) for crisis response and providing support to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for consequence management.

The committee believes that greater efforts are necessary to prevent the terrorist use of WMD, and in particular, the use of chemical or biological agents against the United States, and to prepare the necessary response. Despite the June 1995 presidential directive, the committee is not sure that a coherent plan exists to establish the lines of authority between the various federal agencies and departments, as well as the state and local authorities, to prepare properly for this threat.

The committee recommends authorization of $5.0 million, in defense-wide operations and maintenance, for a comprehensive assessment to address the responsibilities and potential contributions of each federal agency and department.

The committee directs the Department to comply with section 379 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, to report to the committee on the Department's plans and programs to respond to the terrorist use of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons and agents.

Mission planning and analysis

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction will remain an enduring national security concern and challenge for the longterm. To address this challenge, the committee believes that U.S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) mission planning analysis must be a permanent element of U.S. defense capabilities. The committee recommends that $4.0 million from funds authorized for the Air Force operation and maintenance account be made available for USSTRATCOM mission planning and analysis. The committee further recommends that USSTRATCOM mission planning and analysis be included as an element of the future years defense program beginning in fiscal year 1998.

Joint DOD/FBI training program

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 included authority and funding for a training program to be carried out jointly by DOD and the FBI to assist law enforcement agencies in Central Europe, the Baltic countries and the former Soviet Union, and to improve their efforts to deter the possible proliferation and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. The committee is disturbed by the lack of progress in this area by the Department, and concerned about the Department's reluctance to carry out direction provided by Congress, which could possibly prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The committee understands that only a small portion of the funds have been used to establish a joint DOD/FBI working relationship to date. The committee believes that both DOD and the FBI have had more than enough time to work out the formal interagency working relationship and directs the Department to provide the report required by section 1504(e)(B)(3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995.

Transfer authority

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Department of Defense to transfer up to $50.0 million from fiscal year 1997 defense-wide research and development accounts for counterproliferation support activities that are determined by the Counterproliferation Review Committee to be necessary and in the national security interests.

Section 222. Federally funded research and development centers and university-affiliated research centers.

The committee has a continuing interest in the efforts by the Department of Defense to more effectively manage the work being conducted for the Department by the federally-funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDC's) and the University-affiliated Research Centers (UARC's). The committee recommends a provision that would impose a combined ceiling on the funding that may be provided to both categories of institutions in fiscal year 1997 at the same level as that imposed for fiscal year 1996. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense allocate the ceiling between the two categories of institutions on the same basis as the allocation for fiscal year 1996. The committee continues to believe that a high priority should be placed on ensuring robust support for the work of the FFRDC's conducting studies and analyses in the portion of the funding ceiling allocated to the FFRDC's.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 231. United States compliance policy regarding development, testing, and deployment of theater missile defense systems.

For the last 24 years, since the ABM Treaty entered into force, the United States has lived with a broad set of legal obligations regarding the development, testing, and deployment of theater missile defense (TMD) systems and other non-anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems. Under article VI(a) of the ABM Treaty, the United

States undertakes "not to give missiles, launchers, or radars, other than ABM interceptor missiles, ABM launchers, or ABM radars, capabilities to counter strategic ballistic missiles or their elements in flight trajectory, and not to test them in an ABM mode." Pursuant to these obligations, the United States has promulgated a unilateral compliance policy and specific compliance standards by which all non-ABM systems are evaluated for treaty compliance. There has never been any doubt that this unilateral activity is a sovereign right and obligation.

As strategic and technological circumstances have changed, so have U.S. compliance standards. For at least five years, it has been clear that the United States must again update its compliance standards to accommodate new strategic and technological circumstances. On this point there has been very little disagreement, virtually none between Congress and the Executive Branch. There has also been basic agreement on what the new standard should be. The debate has been over the form that this new compliance standard should assume and whether the United States must also assume new obligations under the ABM Treaty regarding TMD systems. The administration has attempted to codify the new compliance standard in what amounts to a new treaty, while Russia has attempted to impose new TMD–related restrictions regarding basic ABM treaty obligations. Both of these approaches depart dramatically from past practice and are legally unnecessary.

The committee believes that the United States must unilaterally update its own internal compliance standards, as has been done in the past. This would not entail a new interpretation of the treaty or a change in our basic legal obligations under the treaty. For purposes of article VI(a) the United States simply needs to provide a current definition of a "strategic ballistic missile" and establish criteria for judging whether non-ABM systems have been given capabilities to counter such missiles or have been tested against them. This standard exists today and has existed since the administration officially proposed it at the Standing Consultative Commission in November 1993.

The committee recommends a provision that would codify this so-called "demonstrated capabilities" standard. Such a codification would clarify U.S. compliance policy for the Department of Defense and other interested parties. It would add a large measure of stability to critical U.S. TMD systems, including the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system and the Navy Upper Tier system. Specifically, the new standard would state that until a TMD system is tested against a ballistic missile that exceeds a range of 3,500 kilometers or a velocity of 5 kilometers per second it will not be judged to have been given capabilities to counter a strategic ballistic missile or to have been tested in an ABM mode. In practical terms, this means that the United States would never be able to gain any confidence that its TMD systems possessed operationally relevant ABM capabilities. The compliance policy language recommended by the committee is identical to sense of Congress language contained in section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106), which itself was derived from the administration's own expressed position.

Section 232. Prohibition on use of funds to implement an international agreement concerning theater missile defense systems.

Section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) prohibited the use of fiscal year 1996 funds by the Department of Defense to implement a so-called theater missile defense (TMD) demarcation agreement unless such agreement was consistent with the so-called "demonstrated capabilities" standard, was approved in a statute, or was approved through the treaty-making powers under the Constitution. This means that any agreement would have to be approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress, by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, or be consistent with a pre-approved standard. Unfortunately, subsequent to enactment of Public Law 104–106, Congress was informed that the "pre-approved" approach would likely be employed even for an agreement, or elements of an agreement, that has been viewed by Congress as beyond the pre-approved definition.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision modeled on section 235 (Public Law 104–106) that would prohibit the use of funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to implement any TMD demarcation agreement unless approved in statute or pursuant to the treaty making power under the Constitution.

Section 233. Conversion of ABM Treaty to multilateral treaty.

The committee is aware that the Executive Branch is engaged in negotiations to change the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty from a bilateral treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union to a multilateral treaty that includes several of the independent states of the former Soviet Union. The committee believes that such a change would constitute a substantive change requiring Senate advice and consent. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would specify that the United States shall not be bound by any international agreement entered into by the President that would add one or more countries as signatories to the ABM Treaty or would otherwise convert the treaty from a bilateral treaty to a multilateral treaty, unless the agreement is entered pursuant to the treaty making power under the Constitution.

Section 234. Funding for upper tier theater missile defense systems.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funds for the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system and the Navy Upper Tier theater missile defense (TMD) system. The provision would also prohibit the use of funds during fiscal year 1997 by the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology for official representation activities until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that: (1) fiscal year 1997 funds for THAAD and Navy Upper Tier have been made available for obligation; and (2) the Navy Upper Tier system has been included in the core TMD program.

Section 235. Elimination of requirements for certain items to be included in the annual report on the ballistic missile defense program.

Section 224(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 established a reporting requirement for the Strategic Defense Initiative. With the changed focus of this program, several of the reporting requirements are no longer valid. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would update the requirement for the annual ballistic missile defense report to Congress.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 241. Live-fire survivability testing of F–22 aircraft.

Section 254 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 directed the Secretary of Defense to request the National Research Council (NRC) to study the desirability of waiving live fire tests for the F–22. Subsequently, the NRC recommended a waiver of the requirement for full-up, full-scale live fire tests for the F–22, saying that such tests would be impractical and would offer low benefits for the costs. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision to authorize a retroactive waiver for full-up, full-scale live fire tests for the F–22 program.

Section 242. Live-fire survivability testing of V–22 aircraft.

Section 2366 of title 10, United States Code, requires realistic survivability testing of systems before they proceed beyond low-rate initial production. Such testing may be waived by the Secretary of Defense if a certification is made to Congress that the tests would be unreasonably expensive and impractical.

The V–22 proceeded beyond low-rate initial production before enactment of the legislation requiring live fire testing. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision to allow the Secretary of Defense retroactive waiver authority for the V–22 program, and also requires alternative survivability test requirements.

SUBTITLE E—NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC PARTNERSHIP

Section 252. National Oceanographic Partnership Program.

The committee believes that a strong national oceanography program is essential not only for long-term national security, but for other areas of national interest as well. For several years the committee has expressed concern that a window of opportunity currently exists to obtain access to littoral waters previously closed for oceanographic survey during the Cold War.

The committee remains concerned that instead of taking advantage of this situation, the nation's oceanographic capabilities are being reduced rather than increased. While the basic science budget of the federal government has increased over the last 14 years, the percentage of the budget devoted to ocean research has declined steadily over the same period.

The committee's concern for the relative importance of oceanographic survey and research is based on the value of this informa-

tion to the warfighter. Oceanographic survey data is essential for successful littoral operations, whether in support of amphibious landings, submarine operations in shallow littoral regions or in application of data on currents, water temperature or bottom characteristics which affect sound propagation in such areas. In addition, many advanced weapon systems in use today require accurate and timely environmental data to strike military targets effectively. In each instance, oceanographic survey and research data contribute directly to the successful conduct of these military operations. By staying on the leading edge of oceanography and leveraging national oceanography programs, naval forces can better use the ocean environment to military advantage.

The committee recommends a provision to establish a National Oceanographic Partnership program for the purpose of leveraging all U.S. oceanographic efforts in the Navy, in industry and in academia to benefit national security. The committee finds that it is important that the components of the oceanography community within the United States, including the Navy, industry and academia maintain a close working relationship to meet our national goals and provide new capabilities. The program therefore provides for the establishment of a National Ocean Research Leadership Council, chaired by the Secretary of the Navy or his designee and composed of representatives of federal agencies, industry and academia, to coordinate national oceanography programs, partnerships and facilities. In order to revitalize the current oceanography program and capitalize on past investments in infrastructure and equipment, the committee also recommends an increase of $13.0 million in the Navy's Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology program (PE 62435N) for support of the National Oceanography Partnership Act to be allocated as follows:

$0.5 million for the establishment and operation of the National Ocean Research Leadership Council;

$5.0 million for the conduct of a partnership program among the Navy, university research groups and other federal data users in support of the goals outlined in the program. Such partnerships shall be established using merit-based competitive procedures and shall require cost-sharing by non-federal participants on at least a one-for-one basis.

$2.0 million for the creation of a Federal Ocean Data and Remote Sensing Center to ensure a centralized database for all sensor information (classified and unclassified) for ocean analysis and modeling by federal agencies and federally-sponsored researchers. Site selection shall be determined by the council using merit-based competitive procedures.

$2.0 million for the establishment of a National Littoral Warfighting Laboratory to coordinate Navy modeling and oceanographic analysis in support of unique and emerging littoral warfare requirements. Site selection shall be determined by the council using all applicable merit-based competitive procedures.

$1.0 million for the continued operation in fiscal year 1997 of the government-industry MEDEA Ocean Panel.

$2.5 million for the establishment and support of education and training programs in support of military and civilian

oceanography education with at-sea training and experience on Navy and university oceanographic survey and research ships. Participation in such programs shall be determined using a merit-based selection process.

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
ACCOUNT	0	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY**			
0601101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,701		14,701
0601102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	141,682	(15,000)	126,682
0601104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	47,288		47,288
0602104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE	2,131		2,131
0602105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	10,841	12,000	22,841
0602120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	23,608		23,608
0602122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	8,152		8,152
0602211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	24,683		24,683
0602270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	15,845		15,845
0602303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	20,295		20,295
0602308A	11	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	21,134		21,134
0602601A	12	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	34,834		34,834
0602618A	13	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	31,166		31,166
0602622A	14	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	2,343		2,343
0602623A	15	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,593		4,593
0602624A	16	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	25,611	20,000	45,611
0602705A	17	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	20,922		20,922
0602709A	18	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	16,994		16,994
0602712A	19	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	6,029		6,029
0602716A	20	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	14,072		14,072
0602720A	21	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	19,457		19,457
0602782A	22	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	15,307		15,307
0602783A	23	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	6,638		6,638
0602784A	24	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	37,898	1,000	38,898
0602785A	25	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	9,528		9,528
0602786A	26	LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	17,808		17,808
0602787A	27	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	55,490		55,490
0602788A	28	TRACTOR FLOP	-		-
0602789A	29	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	2,226		2,226
0603001A	30	LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,210		23,210
0603002A	31	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	11,601		11,601
0603003A	32	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	41,478	1,000	42,478
0603004A	33	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	19,759		19,759
0603005A	34	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	31,552		31,552

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,120	4,000	27,120
0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,500		4,500
	36a	NAUTILUS/THEL		50,000	50,000
0603009A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	17,176	10,000	27,176
0603012A	38	TRACTOR HOLE	-		-
0603013A	39	TRACTOR DIRT	3,335		3,335
0603017A	40	TRACTOR RED	5,125	3,500	8,625
0603020A	41	TRACTOR ROSE	5,078	2,700	7,778
0603105A	42	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	2,919		2,919
0603122A	43	TRACTOR HIP	-		-
0603238A	44	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	40,258		40,258
0603270A	45	EW TECHNOLOGY	6,794		6,794
0603313A	46	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	90,037	10,000	100,037
0603322A	47	TRACTOR CAGE	8,851		8,851
0603606A	48	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,196	16,100	31,296
0603607A	49	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,243		5,243
0603654A	50	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	18,173		18,173
0603710A	51	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	32,597		32,597
0603734A	52	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,664		20,664
0603759A	53	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE AND SMOKE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603771A	54	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603772A	55	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	22,099		22,099
0603018A	56	TRACTOR TREAD	2,409		2,409
0603019A	57	TRACTOR DUMP	-	13,600	13,600
0603308A	58	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	2,884	27,000	29,884
0603619A	59	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	16,464		16,464
0603627A	60	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	6,380		6,380
0603639A	61	ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE	48,221		48,221
0603640A	62	ARTILLERY PROPELLANT DEVELOPMENT	18,450		18,450
0603645A	63	ARMORED SYSTEM MODERNIZATION - ADV DEV	-	12,000	12,000
0603647A	64	TRACTOR DIRT	-		-
0603649A	65	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603653A	66	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	9,639		9,639
0603713A	67	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	23,822		23,822
0603730A	68	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	-		-

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603745A	69	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	2,025		2,025
0603747A	70	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,680		6,680
0603760A	71	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603766A	72	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	26,060		26,060
0603774A	73	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	2,829	2,000	4,829
0603790A	74	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,963		9,963
0603801A	75	AVIATION - ADV DEV	8,385		8,385
0603802A	76	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	-		-
0603804A	77	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	7,592		7,592
0603805A	78	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	13,140	3,300	16,440
0603806A	79	NBC DEFENSE SYSTEM-ADV DEV	-		-
0603807A	80	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	10,211		10,211
0603851A	81	TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	3,124		3,124
0603854A	82	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	258,771		258,771
0603856A	83	SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	8,080		8,080
0603889A	84	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	-		-
0604201A	85	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	15,008		15,008
0604220A	86	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	1,154		1,154
0604223A	87	COMANCHE	288,644	100,000	388,644
0604270A	88	EW DEVELOPMENT	69,474		69,474
0604315A	89	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	-		-
0604321A	90	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	36,200	2,000	38,200
0604325A	91	FOLLOW-ON TO TOW	5,596		5,596
0604328A	92	TRACTOR CAGE	1,561		1,561
0604604A	93	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-		-
0604609A	94	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	-		-
0604611A	95	JAVELIN	1,643	4,500	6,143
0604619A	96	LANDMINE WARFARE	17,609		17,609
0604622A	97	FANILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	-		-
0604633A	98	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	5,549		5,549
0604640A	99	ADVANCED COMMAND AND CONTROL VEHICLE (AC2V)	6,649		6,649
0604641A	100	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	2,884		2,884
0604642A	101	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	-		-
0604645A	102	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.	6,726		6,726
0604649A	103	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	35,410	12,300	47,710

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0604710A	104	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	33,637	15,000	48,637
0604713A	105	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	78,063		78,063
0604715A	106	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	42,865		42,865
0604716A	107	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	7,369		7,369
0604739A	108	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	4,867		4,867
0604740A	109	TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ENG DEV	-		-
0604741A	110	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	20,516	61,800	82,316
0604746A	111	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	2,793		2,793
0604760A	112	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	15,966		15,966
0604766A	113	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	15,758		15,758
0604768A	114	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	180,407	9,800	190,207
0604770A	115	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	9,857		9,857
0604778A	116	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	437		437
0604780A	117	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT)	26,713		26,713
0604801A	118	AVIATION - ENG DEV	5,518		5,518
0604802A	119	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	20,468		20,468
0604804A	120	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,330		20,330
0604805A	121	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	9,796		9,796
0604806A	122	NBC DEFENSE SYSTEM-ENG DEV	-		-
0604807A	123	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	4,794		4,794
0604808A	124	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	19,731		19,731
0604814A	125	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	10,149		10,149
0604816A	126	LONGBOW - ENG DEV	5,872	12,000	17,872
0604817A	127	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	16,783		16,783
0604818A	128	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	16,429		16,429
0604820A	129	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0604823A	130	FIREFINDER	551		551
0604256A	131	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	11,627		11,627
0604258A	132	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,129		10,129
0604759A	133	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	41,725		41,725
0605103A	134	RAND ARROYO CENTER	21,763		21,763
0605104A	135	LOS ALAMOS MESON PHYSICS FACILITY	-		-
0605301A	136	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	136,864		136,864
0605502A	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605601A	138	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	133,012		133,012

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0605602A	139	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	22,413		22,413
0605604A	140	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	31,343		31,343
0605605A	141	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	2,967	21,700	24,667
0605606A	142	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	2,905		2,905
0605702A	143	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,484		6,484
0605706A	144	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	14,428		14,428
0605709A	145	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	7,347		7,347
0605710A	146	JOINT NUCLEAR BIOLOGICAL CHEMICAL TEST, ASSESSMENT AND SURVIVABILITY	-		-
0605712A	147	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	50,906		50,906
0605801A	148	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	61,092		61,092
0605802A	149	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,566		1,566
0605803A	150	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	16,921		16,921
0605805A	151	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	2,282		2,282
0605810A	152	RDT&E SUPPORT FOR NONDEVELOPMENTAL ITEMS	-		-
0605853A	153	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	1,759		1,759
0605854A	154	POLLUTION PREVENTION	13,894		13,894
0605856A	155	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	53,911		53,911
0605876A	156	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	4,319		4,319
0605878A	157	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	66,047		66,047
0605879A	158	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E	92,390		92,390
0605896A	159	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	216,649		216,649
0605898A	160	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	4,801		4,801
0909999A	161	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0603778A	162	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	64,271		64,271
0102419A	163	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	38,940		38,940
0203726A	164	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	39,497		39,497
0203735A	165	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	197,796	10,000	207,796
0203740A	166	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	29,082		29,082
0203744A	167	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	194	22,700	22,894
0203752A	168	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,947		2,947
0203758A	169	DIGITIZATION	110,180	24,000	134,180
0203801A	170	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	30,959	55,000	85,959
0203802A	171	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	6,199	13,500	19,699
0203806A	172	TRACTOR RUT	3,179		3,179
0203808A	173	TRACTOR CARD	6,933		6,933

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0208010A	174	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	18,693		18,693
0208053A	175	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	2,124		2,124
0301359A	176	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	10,185		10,185
0303140A	177	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	3,161		3,161
0303142A	178	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	40,677		40,677
0303150A	179	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	19,804		19,804
0305128A	180	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	487		487
		FORCE XXI		100,000	100,000
0708045A	181	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	16,842		16,842
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY	4,320,640	637,500	4,958,140

Basic research programs

The committee notes the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to maintain level funding for the basic research programs in the Department of Defense and the services. The committee also notes the increases in the administration budget for similar activities conducted by the civilian agencies. The committee supports robust funding for this important component of the Department of Defense science and technology program but is concerned that reductions in the applied research and advanced technology development programs may have the effect of causing an imbalance in the defense technology base programs. Therefore, the committee recommends the following reductions in the basic research accounts without prejudice to fund shortfalls in applied research and advanced technology development programs:

PE 61102A −$15.0 million
PE 61153N −$10.0 million
PE 61102F −$ 8.0 million
PE 61103D −$10.0 million.

High modulus polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber

Polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber is a critical composite material used in the Theater High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile component. In order to complete a multi-year program to develop at least two domestic sources for this material, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62105A to complete this effort in fiscal year 1997. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Hardened materials

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in the Army's Materials Technology program (PE 62105A) for the continued development of hardened materials to be used on high performance missile systems. This technology has the potential to reduce significantly the weight and cost of missiles and to allow for the development of advanced integrated missile structures. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Liquid propellant technology

Until March 1996, the Army had pursued liquid propellant (LP) gun technology as the only technology approach for the Crusader program. At that time, the Army shifted its efforts to solid propellant technology. Congress recognized that the LP gun had strong potential as a "leap ahead" technology which Secretary Perry testified is crucial to the Department's modernization efforts, but also recognized that LP technology was a higher risk approach and, therefore, insisted on the backup solid propellant program. Now, Congress agrees with the Army that LP technology should be a backup to solid propellant because of the potential for this leap

ahead technology if further work can resolve outstanding technical issues outlined by the Army Science Board review of the liquid propellant technology program. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 62624A for a program to address material compatibility, ignition, and ballistic control issues, and to provide operational models validated by actual testing of the liquid propellant gun.

Military engineering technology

Funding for cold regions research has declined significantly in the past four years as a result of reductions in the overall Army research and development program. In light of the current needs of the Army for research into construction and civil engineering to support recent and unplanned operations in cold climates and winter conditions in Bosnia and elsewhere, the committee recommends an increase of $1.0 million to accelerate activities in applied research in project AT42 of the Army's military engineering technology program (PE 62784A).

Wave net technology

The committee continues to support the Army's efforts to enhance command, control, and communications for the digital battlefield by applying emerging technologies. The committee understands that, in connection with evaluating various technologies to enhance its battlefield digitization efforts, the Army may be interested in examining wave net technology which has the potential to reduce costs, increase bandwidth utilization, and provide increased command and control capability. The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to PE 63006A for continued development and testing of wave net technology for possible application to the Army's digitization initiatives.

Nautilus/Tactical High Energy Laser Program

The committee continues to support the joint Army-Israeli Ministry of Defense Nautilus testing program to assess the potential of high energy lasers to meet tactical threats. The highlight of the test series was the intercept in February of an operational short range rocket. This success has paved the way for a Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL) Rapid Acquisition Demonstrator Program. The Army has identified this program as a potential shortfall in the fiscal year 1997 budget request. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $50.0 million to a new program element to support the Nautilus/Tactical High Energy Laser Program and the associated design verification testing. The committee understands that the government of Israel is prepared to devote significant resources to this effort and the committee urges the administration to seek a rapid conclusion of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) on the THEL program with Israel. The committee fully expects that additional funding to implement such an MOA will be included in future Army budget requests.

Missile and rocket advanced technology

The budget request included $90.0 million to develop missile technologies. The committee is encouraged by developments associ-

ated with the extended range (ER) Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) and looks forward to the program beginning engineering and manufacturing development in fiscal year 1998. The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million in fiscal year 1997 in PE 603313A to support completion of a thorough risk reduction program for guidance package integration and believes that this will ensure that Army artillery deficiencies will be addressed with production of the new ER rocket system.

Land mine detection technologies

The committee supports the budget request for $15.2 million to continue vital research in land mine detection technologies. The recent deployment to Bosnia highlighted the need for a system or systems that will detect and classify land mines quickly, accurately, and effectively.

Although various DOD agencies have spent considerable resources to develop and demonstrate vehicular detection systems, no single system or technology has been found adequate for mission requirements. The DOD effort has been diffused by allowing several agencies and the services to conduct essentially independent research and development without coordinating, cooperating, or sharing results with other agencies.

The decisions to form the Army Countermine Task Force and the Bosnia Technology Integration Cell are positive steps to move the focus of effort toward practical applications. Task force efforts have shown that the most promising systems are those which integrate multiple detection technologies simultaneously. These systems also have the capability to mark mine locations accurately in real time, electronically archive data, and transmit the data to remote sites.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.1 million in PE 603606A to accelerate the demonstration and deployment of a prototype vehicular mounted mine detection system (VMMD) that incorporates the capabilities described above. Funds should be used to deploy systems incorporating proven or otherwise demonstrated state-of-the-art technologies.

The committee also recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 603606A to continue development of navigation aids and improvements to permit detection systems to operate at convoy speeds and display data in real time.

Battle Integration Center

The committee is aware of the importance of the missile defense Battle Integration Center (BIC) in accomplishing the integration of the Army's theater missile defense program. The BIC has been a critical participant in numerous exercises and experiments in fiscal year 1996 and has supported combat material developers with a synthetic battlefield environment. The committee recommends an increase of $27.0 million in PE 63308A to continue this important capability.

Next tank research and development

The committee notes the Army's plan to upgrade 998 M1 tanks to the M1A2 configuration. Under the current schedule, the Army will complete this program in fiscal year 2002. These upgrades,

when added to new production and earlier systems, will result in a total inventory of 1,079 M1A2 tanks.

The Army has been struggling with a decision on the modernization of tank forces beyond fielding tank number 1,079. The committee understands that the Army's approach to modernizing armored systems, particularly as it relates to tanks, has been evolving since the restructuring of the armored systems modernization (ASM) program several years ago. Now it appears that the approach has evolved to one of doing very little to prepare for the end of the current program.

The committee believes that there are many questions surrounding what the program for tank number 1,080 should be, or whether there should be any tank number 1,080 at all. The committee notes that the Army has been pursuing a number of developmental efforts that could contribute to upgrading the armored force and could be candidate systems for tank number 1,080. However, unless the Army conducts the proper planning and investigations now, it could be faced with a range of unpalatable choices, including suboptimization or inefficient catch up programs.

Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $12.0 million to establish a new program element to: conduct a requirements analysis to establish a basis for deciding what system or mix of systems supports the best operational concept for defeating the evolving threat; develop conceptual approaches for integrating emerging technologies into a set of improvements that could be fielded in a new tank or in an upgraded main battle tank program; develop a set of requirements for the concepts selected by this analysis; and begin virtual prototyping activities that could lead to fielding a revolutionary main battle tank system within 20 years.

Night vision systems advanced development

The committee encourages the increased attention being placed on this critical area. The budget request for fiscal year 1997 included $2.8 million to continue work toward developing critical night vision devices that will ensure the Army "owns the night." The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 603774A for research and $15.0 million for engineering, for a total of $19.8 million.

Combat service support control system (CSSC)

The budget request included $13.1 million to develop the combat service support node of the Army tactical command and control system (ATCCS). The committee understands that the development effort for the link to brigade and below weapon system platforms has not been funded and this is a critical, although unresourced, requirement for the Task Force XXI experiment. The committee recommends an increase of $3.3 million in PE 603805A to develop this critical link to ensure commanders have a near real-time link to logistical, medical, and personnel information.

Comanche helicopter

The budget request included $288.6 million for continued research and development work associated with the RAH–66 Comanche helicopter. The committee actively supports the Comanche pro-

gram and was encouraged to note the successful completion of the first flight. The committee continues to be concerned about the funding profile for the Comanche system as it is currently based on minimum funding levels that, while executable, create both near-and long-term inefficiencies. Related to the Comanche program milestones is concern about the age of the current scout and attack helicopter fleet, the associated high operation and maintenance costs, and decreasing overall system effectiveness. Clearly, the Army needs to pursue Comanche aggressively and make every effort to accelerate the initial operating capability date for this program. The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in PE 604223A to maintain a funding level consistent with that of fiscal year 1996 and to posture the program for early deployment options.

Javelin medium anti-tank weapon

The budget request included $1.6 million to continue developmental work for the Javelin missile system. The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 604611A to further develop the alternate main charge warhead, start baseline integration tests, and evaluate the missile design to optimize warhead performance.

Heavy assault bridge

The budget request included $35.4 million to conduct developmental work necessary to support engineer requirements for the heavy assault bridge. The committee is encouraged by efforts to develop and field this item, and notes that additional early design work would reduce per unit costs by approximately $250,000 and further reduce operation and maintenance costs by five to ten percent. The committee believes that further work should be done to assess new bridging materials to make future bridges stronger and lighter. The committee directs the Army to evaluate potential new bridging materials and technologies and report to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 1997, on the findings of this evaluation and make recommendations on how new materials might be incorporated in future bridging systems. The committee supports Army efforts to reduce program costs and recommends an increase of $12.3 million in PE 604649A to design heavy assault bridge-unique line replaceable units and software integration requirements.

Air defense command, control, & intelligence (C2I)

The budget request included $20.5 million to begin fielding a new air defense tactical operations center for air defense artillery brigade headquarters. This new C2I center would provide current software and communications equipment and begin retiring the AN/TSQ–73 that utilizes 1960's technology.

Air and missile defense continues to be a major concern both to this committee and to the Department of Defense and it is imperative that new C2I systems be developed to support fielding of new air and missile defense systems.

The committee notes the successful development and use of a state-of-the-art Force Projection Tactical Operation Center

(FPTOC) that effectively integrates theater missile defense activities and provides a deploying theater level (contingency) commander with a vital tool to protect a deployed force. Successful use of the FPTOC in exercises such as Roving Sands, Bright Star, and Internal Look has proven the utility of this new missile defense command, control and intelligence concept at both theater and joint task force levels.

The committee believes that the Army, as the developer of this element, has underfunded this promising concept and should review service priorities and provide a baseline level of funding to maintain and further develop the capabilities of this system. Force protection is a battlefield imperative that must be a focal point while making key resourcing decisions. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $46.0 million for PE 604741 to field the new brigade tactical operations center to each of the five air defense brigades and replace the aging AN/TSQ–73 system. The committee also recommends an increase of $15.8 million to develop a second FPTOC system, providing the ability to support two separate deployments at the same time and to provide for necessary technical enhancements to both systems.

Brilliant Anti-armor Technology (BAT) submunition

The budget request included $180.4 million to continue equipment materiel development of the BAT system. The committee is concerned that recent funding decrements to this program from within the Department of Defense, coupled with initial technical problems, have put the program in the position of delaying initiation of the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) Block II flight test program. In light of recent successful tests for the BAT submunition, it is imperative that the schedule be maintained and costly delays to both the BAT program as well as the Block II missile program be avoided. The committee recommends an increase of $9.8 million in PE 604768A to complete scheduled engineering and manufacturing development activities on time.

Longbow development/night vision systems

The committee is concerned about the current state-of-the-art night vision system currently fielded on the Apache helicopter system in light of developing technologies that would greatly enhance the warfighting abilities of this aircraft and crew. The committee believes it important for the Army to develop and field the second generation forward looking, Infrared capability for all Apache systems. Benefits of the new technology include increased situational awareness, improved pilot cues for decision making, and reduced cockpit workload, reduced stress and fatigue. The committee believes the Army should begin work immediately to develop this capability and recommends the following increases for the program elements: $2.0 million for PE 603774A NV Sys Adv Dev; $5.0 million for PE 604710A Apache A Kit EMD; $5.0 million for PE 604816A Apache B Kit EMD.

High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility

The committee continues to support the operation of the High Energy Laser Systems Test Facility (HELSTF) as the central test

facility to support the nation's high energy laser development. The committee is disappointed with the $2.9 million request for HELSTF (PE 65605A), which would be insufficient to support Army plans to restructure the facility. This facility supports the Mid-Infrared Advanced Chemical Laser (MIRACL) program and test programs such as Nautilus, Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL) and the Air Force Airborne Laser. The committee reiterates the view that it does not make sense to shut down the MIRACL when prior legislative constraints on testing the laser against objects in space have finally been lifted. The committee also notes that the Air Force Science Board's New World Vistas study has recently recommended a ground-based directed energy approach to space control. The committee recommends an increase of $21.7 million for the continued operation and upgrade of the facility.

Combat vehicle improvement program

The budget request included $197.8 million to support development efforts for a wide variety of combat vehicle systems. The committee supports these efforts and notes the progress made in developing the High Performance Crew Station Information System for the M1 Abrams tank. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to accelerate important work on display technology and place this capability in the hands of the warfighter as soon as possible.

Improved cargo helicopter

The Army's heavy lift CH–47D Chinook helicopter fleet will begin to reach the end of its programmed life around the turn of the century. It is clear to the committee that a renewed effort is necessary to develop a more comprehensive improvement of the Chinook helicopter to support operations until a replacement system is fielded in the year 2020. The committee recognizes that the original Chinook helicopters will soon be 40 years old and believes that a remanufacturing program must be started soon. This will ensure an Improved Cargo Helicopter (ICH) is fielded in time to preclude degradation in heavy lift capabilities as operation and maintenance costs will otherwise become a heavy burden on constrained resources. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $22.7 million to support technology demonstrations and risk reduction efforts for programmatic development of the ICH program.

Force XXI digitization

The committee continues to support Army efforts to digitize the future battlefield and awaits the results of the brigade task force experiment early next year. The committee understands that additional funding is required to support further development of message/information protocols and to complete procurement of applique equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million to ensure a successful evaluation of Force XXI technologies.

Air defense alerting device (ADAD)

The committee notes progress made to evaluate the Air Defense Alerting Device (ADAD) on potential applications to support passive target acquisition support for forward deployed forces. Testing activities at both Fort Greely, Alaska and Fort Bliss, Texas will assess the value added and utility of the ADAD system to air defense teams, characterize performance of the sensor in different environments, and determine the capabilities of the device against the target set of concern to the Army. The committee supports the robust test schedule and expects the Army to report the results in fiscal year 1997.

Missile/air defense product improvement program

The committee recommended an additional $35.0 million to the fiscal year 1996 budget request to address the cruise missile threat and develop alternatives based on potential modifications to PAC–1 Patriot missiles. The committee recognizes that the cruise missile threat is growing and requires the immediate attention of developmental efforts to ensure that Army forces are protected. The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million in PE 23801A for fiscal year 1997 to complete this analysis and provide the results to the Army for consideration.

The committee also supports Army efforts to evaluate the Starstreak missile alongside the Stinger missile as potential candidates for the air-to-air missile system required for the Apache helicopter. Noted is the outstanding funding requirement for $15.0 million in PE 23801A to support completion of the Army effort to conduct a robust test of both missiles, along with a corresponding cost-effectiveness analysis addressing the full integration of each system on the Apache helicopter.

The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $40.0 million to support Patriot cruise missile seeker development and an additional $15.0 million to complete evaluation of the Starstreak missile.

Other missile product improvement programs

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to ensure that missiles are insensitive to bullet and fragment impacts and endorses efforts to promote crew survivability. The committee understands that developmental work is necessary to provide an insensitive rocket motor for the laser Hellfire missile. Also, there is an outstanding funding requirement for $4.5 million to complete this effort.

The committee also notes that additional work is required to complete an effort that began last year to certify and test the Hydra-70 missile for use on the Apache attack helicopter. This key effort will determine the best solution for the missile requirement established for these attack aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million to develop and qualify an insensitive rocket motor as well as to support minor software improvements for the Hellfire missile and an additional $9.0 million to complete the evaluation of the Hydra-70 missile, for a total increase of $13.5 million.

Force XXI initiatives

The Army has made great progress in developing its vision for the 21st century. The committee supports the Army's effort to establish a viable process by which this vision can evolve over time as technology changes.

Recent testimony and demonstrations by the Army clearly establish the success of the work that has been accomplished in only a few short years. The committee strongly supports the Army effort to establish a mechanism by which new technologies can be acquired, tested, and evaluated for future applications through the Force XXI Initiatives process. The current acquisition system is slow, and while acquisition reform initiatives are underway, this process cannot keep pace with the rate of change associated with new technologies.

The committee, therefore, recommends $100.0 million for a new program element, to be established by the Army, to support the Force XXI Initiatives process that will allow the Army to conduct a timely evaluation of new equipment and technology. The Army is expected to subject programs with promising preliminary results to normal reviews and evaluations required by law, prior to transitioning into production any program tested with these funds. The committee directs the Army to report quarterly on the obligation of funds provided for the Force XXI Initiatives program, and more frequently if there are significant successes or failures in this experimentation program. The committee expects the Army to budget for necessary resources in future year activities.

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
ACCOUNT	0	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY**			
0601152N	1	IN-HOUSE INDEPENDENT LABORATORY RESEARCH	15,309		15,309
0601153N	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	371,904	(10,000)	361,904
0602111N	3	SURFACE/AEROSPACE SURVEILLANCE AND WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	26,312	9,000	35,312
0602121N	4	SURFACE SHIP TECHNOLOGY	35,591	6,000	41,591
0602122N	5	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	20,578		20,578
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	17,093		17,093
0602232N	7	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	56,159		56,159
0602233N	8	READINESS, TRAINING, AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	40,828		40,828
0602234N	9	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	75,886	5,000	80,886
0602270N	10	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	22,454		22,454
0602314N	11	UNDERSEA SURVEILLANCE WEAPON TECHNOLOGY	49,580		49,580
0602315N	12	MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	40,534		40,534
0602435N	13	OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	44,559	13,000	57,559
0602633N	14	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	33,891	6,000	39,891
0603217N	15	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,315	7,500	36,815
0603238N	16	PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE	55,560		55,560
0603270N	17	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	15,085		15,085
0603508N	18	SHIP PROPULSION SYSTEM	28,557	8,000	36,557
0603640M	19	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	24,212		24,212
0603706N	20	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	37,342		37,342
0603707N	21	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	19,273		19,273
0603712N	22	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	19,970	25,000	44,970
0603747N	23	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,583	5,000	48,583
0603771N	24	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603782N	25	SHALLOW WATER MCM DEMOS	42,753	3,000	45,753
0603792N	26	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	104,424		104,424
0603794N	27	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,268		29,268
0603207N	28	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	16,519		16,519
0603208N	29	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	2,405		2,405
0603216N	30	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	6,313		6,313
0603254N	31	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,473	2,500	21,973
0603261N	32	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	24,085		24,085
0603382N	33	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	3,858		3,858
0603451N	34	TACTICAL SPACE OPERATIONS	-		-

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603502N	35	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	86,995	12,000	98,995
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,149	48,000	67,149
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	5,772		5,772
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,745	52,000	64,745
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	9,948		9,948
0603514N	40	SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY	5,749		5,749
0603525N	41	PILOT FISH	93,910		93,910
0603528N	42	NON-ACOUSTIC ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE (ASW)	-		-
0603536N	43	RETRACT JUNIPER	10,398		10,398
0603542N	44	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	2,886		2,886
0603553N	45	SURFACE ASW	3,964		3,964
0603561N	46	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	26,400	60,000	86,400
0603562N	47	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,578		4,578
0603563N	48	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	13,807		13,807
0603564N	49	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	12,942	25,000	37,942
0603570N	50	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	131,965		131,965
0603573N	51	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	59,773	19,000	78,773
0603576N	52	CHALK EAGLE	149,679		149,679
0603582N	53	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	3,879		3,879
0603609N	54	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	26,490		26,490
0603610N	55	ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT (MK-50)	1,329		1,329
0603611M	56	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	40,106	20,000	60,106
0603612M	57	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	592		592
0603635M	58	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	44,891	4,000	48,891
0603654N	59	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	4,639		4,639
0603709N	60	ADVANCED MARINE BIOLOGICAL SYSTEM	-		-
0603711N	61	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	3,398		3,398
0603713N	62	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	8,606		8,606
0603721N	63	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	48,401		48,401
0603724N	64	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	3,080		3,080
0603725N	65	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,239		2,239
0603734N	66	CHALK CORAL	77,675		77,675
0603746N	67	RETRACT MAPLE	83,809	10,000	93,809
0603748N	68	LINK PLUMERIA	26,433		26,433
0603751N	69	RETRACT ELM	24,993		24,993

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603755N	70	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	216,486	63,000	279,486
0603763N	71	WARFARE SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE AND ENGINEERING	-		-
0603785N	72	COMBAT SYSTEMS OCEANOGRAPHIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	13,650		13,650
0603787N	73	SPECIAL PROCESSES	82,764		82,764
0603790N	74	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,933		9,933
0603795N	75	GUN WEAPON SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY	42,204	27,000	69,204
0603800N	76	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	246,833	13,000	259,833
0604707N	77	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	5,212		5,212
0603266N	78	AH-1T COMPOSITE ROTOR BLADE (H)	73,080		73,080
0604212N	79	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	40,132	11,000	51,132
0604214N	80	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	16,874		16,874
0604215N	81	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	24,698		24,698
0604217N	82	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	4,979		4,979
0604218N	83	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,631		5,631
0604221N	84	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,074		2,074
0604231N	85	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	26,989	19,500	46,489
0604261N	86	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	12,141	2,500	14,641
0604262N	87	V-22A	576,792	20,000	596,792
0604264N	88	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,089	5,000	16,089
0604265N	89	AIR LAUNCHED SATURATION SYSTEM (ALSS)	-		-
0604270N	90	EW DEVELOPMENT	78,748	65,000	143,748
0604301N	91	MK 92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM UPGRADE	-		-
0604307N	92	AEGIS COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	89,279	21,900	111,179
0604310N	93	ARSENAL SHIP	25,000	147,000	172,000
0604311N	94	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	4,272	8,000	12,272
0604312N	95	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	-		-
0604366N	96	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,637		1,637
0604372N	97	NEW THREAT UPGRADE	-		-
0604373N	98	AIRBORNE MCM	14,522	16,000	30,522
0604503N	99	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	61,395		61,395
0604504N	100	AIR CONTROL	10,750		10,750
0604507N	101	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	3,718		3,718
0604512N	102	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	6,571		6,571
0604516N	103	SHIP SURVIVABILITY	6,832		6,832
0604518N	104	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	10,280		10,280

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0604524N	105	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	18,952		18,952
0604558N	106	NEW DESIGN SSN	394,000	15,200	409,200
0604561N	107	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	91,931	26,000	117,931
0604562N	108	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	22,899		22,899
0604567N	109	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	7,221		7,221
0604574N	110	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	5,237		5,237
0604601N	111	MINE DEVELOPMENT	2,505		2,505
0604603N	112	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	22,322		22,322
0604610N	113	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	15,019		15,019
0604612M	114	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	5,742		5,742
0604618N	115	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	35,130		35,130
0604654N	116	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,346		7,346
0604703N	117	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,013		1,013
0604710N	118	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	1,983		1,983
0604719M	119	MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	-		-
0604721N	120	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	3,704		3,704
0604727N	121	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	86,266		86,266
0604755N	122	SHIP SELF DEFENSE	134,677	37,000	171,677
0604761N	123	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	-		-
0604771N	124	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	3,148		3,148
0604777N	125	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	46,885		46,885
0604784N	126	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	35,194	202,000	237,194
0604256N	127	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,536		23,536
0604258N	128	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	31,120		31,120
0604759N	129	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,612		40,612
0605152N	130	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	7,174		7,174
0605154N	131	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	42,251		42,251
0605155N	132	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,998		2,998
0605502N	133	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605804N	134	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	1,725		1,725
0605853N	135	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	20,905		20,905
0605856N	136	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,059		2,059
0605861N	137	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	58,348	2,500	60,848
0605862N	138	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	6,196		6,196
0605863N	139	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	50,348		50,348

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0605864N	140	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	242,891		242,891
0605865N	141	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	5,999		5,999
0605866N	142	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,868		2,868
0605867N	143	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONAISSANCE SUPPORT	11,986		11,986
0605871M	144	MARINE CORPS TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES	-		-
0605873M	145	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	7,424	40,000	47,424
0909999N	146	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0101221N	147	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	41,790		41,790
0101224N	148	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	21,340	5,500	26,840
0101226N	149	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	7,917		7,917
0101402N	150	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	-		-
0204136N	151	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	425,333		425,333
0204152N	152	E-2 SQUADRONS	65,025		65,025
0204163N	153	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	20,013		20,013
0204229N	154	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	136,364	29,000	165,364
0204311N	155	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	14,033		14,033
0204413N	156	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	1,548		1,548
0204571N	157	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	34,906	9,000	43,906
0204575N	158	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	1,651		1,651
0205601N	159	HARM IMPROVEMENT	3,348		3,348
0205604N	160	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	37,302		37,302
0205620N	161	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	4,901		4,901
0205632N	162	MK-48 ADCAP	12,772		12,772
0205633N	163	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	53,512		53,512
0205658N	164	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	5,067	10,000	15,067
0205667N	165	F-14 UPGRADE	9,879		9,879
0205675N	166	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	55,876		55,876
0206313M	167	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	56,687		56,687
0206623M	168	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	7,280		7,280
0206624M	169	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	5,211	3,000	8,211
0206625M	170	MARINE CORPS INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONICS WARFARE SYSTEMS	-		-
0206626M	171	MARINE CORPS COMMAND/CONTROL/COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	-		-
0207161N	172	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	58,415		58,415
0207163N	173	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,274		2,274
0303109N	176	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	38,257		38,257

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0303140N	177	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	26,936		26,936
0305160N	180	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	1,195	20,000	21,195
0305927N	181	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	706		706
0708011N	182	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	35,526	30,000	65,526
		JOINT SERVICE NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGIES PROGRAM	-	15,000	15,000
		ACQUISITION CENTER OF EXCELLENCE		8,000	8,000
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	501,598	505,700	1,007,298
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY	7,334,734	1,706,800	9,041,534

Continuous wave superconducting radio frequency free electron laser

The committee recommends an increase of $9.0 million in PE 62111N for the continuation of the continuous wave superconducting radio frequency free electron laser program within the Office of the Secretary of the Navy. The committee understands that there will be significant cost sharing between the Commonwealth of Virginia and the private sector in this effort. The committee encourages the Department of Energy to build on the Navy project to meet the needs of material scientists in universities and industry.

Power electronic building blocks

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in PE 62121N to continue the development of the power electronics building block technology for the rapid switching and control of high power electrical systems. The committee urges that the increase be used for development of virtual prototyping tools that can be used to visualize and evaluate the performance of new reconfigurable ship electric power systems that can survive battle damage and component failures. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where applicable.

Materials, electronics and computer technology

The committee is aware of the Navy's efforts to address materials development in support of aviation platform affordability, supportability, and mission performance. A primary concern that should be addressed by the recently established materials competency center is the qualification of new materials, new processes, and second sources. The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 62234N to address new materials processes such as resin transfer molding and the establishment of second sources for carbon fibers and prepreg systems. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under the program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Undersea weapons technology

The committee is concerned that recent budget trends have slowed research activities devoted to countering emerging undersea threats from quiet submarines and modern torpedoes increasingly available in the world market. The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million in the Navy's Undersea Weapons Technology program (PE 62633N) for the acceleration of technology leading to the development of a quick reaction anti-submarine/anti-torpedo weapon for close-range engagements and for the protection of surface ships and submarines from torpedo attack. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program, and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Navy affordability initiative

The committee commends the Navy for undertaking tangible efforts to address affordability concerns in its science and technology program. To accelerate this initiative further as part of a broader affordability thrust, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in the Navy Air Systems and Weapons Technology program (PE 63217N) to support affordability technologies prioritized under the Navy's new affordability criteria. The committee expects that any necessary follow-on funding for the initiatives undertaken with the increase provided by the committee will be included in the Navy budget request for fiscal year 1998.

Project M

The budget request contained no funding for Project M, a technology program for the active control of machinery platforms.

In fiscal year 1996, Congress authorized and appropriated $7.0 million in PE 63569E to continue the transfer of Project M technology from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency to the Navy. The program has been focused on the demonstration of active control of machinery raft structural dynamics and magnetic levitation using rafts that represent future submarine engine room structures. The research has been significant because it has showed that large scale implementation of active control for complex structures is possible. Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 would permit realistic testing of high fidelity quarter scale physical models that will provide quantitative performance data and other critical information that can be used to define the scope of applications for this technology in future submarine or surface ship designs. There is also potential for the expanded use of this technology in a broad spectrum of other military, space, and commercial applications where quieting of systems and subsystems is important.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million above the budget request in PE 63508N for the continued development of Project M. The committee also directs that the Secretary of the Navy submit a report, no later than March 1, 1997, that provides a detailed assessment of:

(1) the current status of the Project M program;

(2) the Secretary's plans for continued development of the Project M technology;

(3) future milestones for the maturing of the technology;

(4) the Navy's plan for incorporating Project M technology into the design of its next generation of nuclear attack submarine; and

(5) funding included in the future years defense program to satisfy this plan.

Environmentally compliant torpedo fuel

The budget request contained $2.8 million for project R2267 in PE 63747N. This project develops and demonstrates advanced undersea weapons component prototypes for insertion into current undersea weapons to upgrade their capabilities. At present, the project is focused on the development of a simulation based design and an iterative build-test-build process. Specific efforts for fiscal

year 1997 would address an environmentally compliant fuel alternative to the OTTO fuel currently used in undersea weapons, advanced broadband homing system techniques, and algorithms to make U.S. undersea weapons countermeasure resistant. Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 could accelerate the environmentally compliant fuel alternative by up to two years.

To accelerate the environmentally compliant fuel alternative by up to two years, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million above the budget request in PE 63747N.

Integrated combat weapons system

The budget request contained no funding for an initiative to resolve operational shortcomings and unnecessarily high maintenance costs associated with the current version of the integrated combat weapons system (ICWS) that is installed on Navy mine countermeasures (MCM) ships.

The committee has learned that the Navy has included funding in its future years defense program in fiscal year 1998 to upgrade the ICWS to a Block I configuration, making maximum use of commercial off-the-shelf technology. This upgrade will improve the reliability and maintainability of the ICWS and help to address one of the Navy's most critical operational shortcomings, its MCM capability, in a cost-effective manner.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million above the budget request in PE 63502N to accelerate the ICWS Block I program from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 1997.

Research for advanced submarine technology

As directed in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Defense submitted a report to Congress on March 26, 1966 on the subject of nuclear attack submarine procurement and submarine technology. The report indicates that, historically, submarine technology development, maturation, and transition have been performed on a cyclical basis. A technology cycle has begun as a complement to the requirement to design a new class of submarine. Funding for technology development has then been dramatically increased to mature new technologies for inclusion in the new class design. However, as this surge of funding has occurred, a promising technology that could not mature in time for inclusion in the new design was set aside and given little or no funding support. Once a firm set of new technologies for the new design has been determined, funding for advanced submarine technology has fallen precipitously to subsistence levels and generally remained there during serial submarine production.

This cyclical approach was generally successful when there was continuity or overlap of multiple submarine class designs or design upgrades, following each other in a steady progression. Blocks of technology were generally available when the time for a new design arrived. However, a logical consequence of the decrease in the number of new classes being designed and in the submarine building rate during the past few years has been that some promising and potentially leap-ahead technologies have lain fallow for years; acknowledged, but not pursued.

The Secretary's report concludes that the transition from the high production rate of submarines that occurred during the Cold War to the currently projected low production rate, coupled with an exponential increase in the rate of technology turnover, necessitates a different approach to submarine technology development and transition. The report recommends changing from an approach that is cyclical in nature to an active, steady state approach.

An independent submarine technology assessment panel, convened by the Secretary of the Navy to assist the Secretary of Defense in preparing his report, reviewed all promising submarine technologies, including foreign technology. The recommendations of this panel contributed greatly to the final form of the Secretary of Defense's report. In particular, the panel highlighted the discontinuous nature and low risk bias of submarine technology development that has occurred in the past because of its spiky focus on class designs. The panel pointed out that the subsistence level of core funding available between the new acquisition platform spikes has generally been insufficient to allow revolutionary options to be pursued. The panel's report also observes that:

(1) the flow of information between members of the technical community and within the requirements and acquisition communities of the Department of the Navy is at best inconsistent and sometimes nonexistent;

(2) shipyards are more involved in design activities than in the past, but are not involved, as the aerospace industry is, in all aspects of technology planning and development, which inhibits early consideration of the intricacies of submarine construction in the integration of technology; and

(3) funding and organizational constraints have led to a limited and inconsistent use of world class test facilities and risk reduction activities to evaluate potential technologies and develop them for inclusion in future submarine modifications or new designs.

The submarine technology assessment panel made several recommendations that are also included in the Secretary of Defense's report:

(1) proceed with the New Attack Submarine but commit to continuous evolution;

(2) define a single product manager for all attack submarines, who is responsible for acquisition, life cycle support and technology maturation/insertion;

(3) establish a significant, stable, and continuing R&D program, under the single product manager, that supports and matures major advances, reflects technology base opportunities, and responds to future missions;

(4) address the maturation of technologies associated with hydrodynamics, alternative sail designs, advanced arrays, electric drive, external weapons, and active controls and mounts; and

(5) ensure that the technology base community understands the performance need identified by the product manager, involves the shipyards as performers of technology development, performs utility analysis before pursuing evolutionary improve-

ments, and has the courage to pursue potentially revolutionary technologies.

The committee believes that the Secretary's report makes a very good case for changing the way the Department of the Navy organizes itself to pursue advanced submarine technology and funds that effort. However, preliminary discussions with the Department have revealed little enthusiasm on the Department's part for change. The committee understands that resistance to change is not unusual in a large bureaucracy. Recent experience with the time it took, at least three years, for the Department to come to grips with the need to reduce its infrastructure to accommodate the reality of declining budgets is a case in point. Consequently, the committee has concluded that it will be necessary to encourage the Department to focus on implementation of the recommendations included in the Secretary of Defense's report to derive any lasting benefit from it. Because the committee senses a desire by other elements in Congress to take a more directive approach towards this organizational issue, the committee strongly recommends that the Secretary of the Navy and other senior leaders in the Department take it up as a matter of priority.

Based on the findings of the Secretary of Defense's report and the Department of the Navy's independent submarine technology assessment panel, the committee has concluded that a different approach to funding for advanced submarine technology research is warranted. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million above the budget request for the pursuit of advanced submarine technology at a moderate level of investment, $60.0 million for PE 63561N, and $40.0 million for PE 63504N. The Navy is directed to use these funds to carry out the high priority development efforts identified in the Secretary of Defense's report to Congress, emphasizing advanced hydrodynamic and hydroacoustic research, using advanced modeling that is validated, when appropriate, by the use of large scale models before insertion into the final design.

The committee emphasizes that this recommended funding increase is for the purpose of developing advanced technologies that can be incrementally incorporated into the design of the next generation of nuclear attack submarine, now commonly referred to as the New SSN or New Attack Submarine, as they mature. Older designs, such as the SSN–688 class or Seawolf class, may ultimately benefit from such research, but the committee would strongly object to any effort on the part of the Navy to use this recommended increase to resolve funding shortfalls in existing programs or to pursue new ones whose sole purpose is to improve the combat systems or sensors of these older designs.

To provide an opportunity for continuing interaction with the Navy on advanced submarine technology, the committee also directs that the Secretary of the Navy deliver to the congressional defense committees as early as possible, but no later than February 15, 1997, a plan that addresses in detail:

(1) the immediate organizational changes that he has put in place to provide for a robust and continuing submarine technology program, including a far more effective and equitable

involvement of industry and the shipyards that are involved in submarine design or construction;

(2) additional organizational changes he contemplates for the future, and his timeline for implementing them; and

(3) how funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 will be expended, what specific funding profile is required to pursue his plan at a moderate level of investment in the future, and what promising technologies will be pursued with such future funding.

Submarine towed array processing software

The Navy has informed the committee of preliminary technical analysis that indicates that significant gains in towed array performance are possible through improved signal processing. While this research is being sponsored as a submarine technology initiative, its objective, developing algorithms and associated software that could be hosted on any open architecture system, could benefit a broad spectrum of related antisubmarine warfare (ASW) programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63504N to improve the overall performance of both sonar and combat control systems by the improvement of their ASW acoustic processing.

Aircraft carrier research and development

The Navy's future years defense program currently plans to request authorization for an aircraft carrier, CVN–77, in fiscal year 2002. The Navy has described CVN–77 as a transitional carrier that would be nuclear powered but would incorporate design improvements that could lead to a more revolutionary design for the carrier-after-next, CV(X). CV(X) would follow CVN–77 by about four years.

The design service life of aircraft carriers will permit these two ships to remain active until well into the second half of the next century. The Navy has testified to its strong desire to incorporate evolutionary technologies into CVN–77 and far more dramatic advances into CV(X). Incorporating such improvements into the baseline design would eliminate the need for expensive future modifications. However, the budget request includes only $6.0 million to pursue these technologies.

While the committee has not yet reviewed the development program for aircraft carrier technology in the same detail as its evaluation of the Navy's submarine technology program, discussed elsewhere in this report, it would appear that the Navy has not allocated sufficient resources to mature promising technologies in sufficient time for their incorporation into the design of either CVN–77 or CV(X). It would further appear that the same organizational problems that have inhibited the development of submarine technology are also present for this program.

To ensure that promising technologies, such as an advance aircraft launch system, advanced armor concepts, integrated topside design, advanced computing plant architecture, internal and external command and control architecture, and modeling and simulation tool development, are pursued in sufficient time for inclusion

in the base design of CVN–77, if possible, and CV(X), the committee recommends an increase of $52.0 million above the budget request in PE 63512N.

Navy surface combatant

The Navy is developing a new generation of surface combatant (SC–21) that would enter procurement after the turn of the century as a replacement for the DDG–51 class destroyer. However, the competition for scarce resources associated with preparation of the budget request has reduced funding for the SC–21 program to subsistence levels. Additional funding in fiscal year 1997 would permit the Navy to provide focus for the SC–21 program and accomplish a number of important objectives that would lead to its orderly development, such as:

(1) accelerate reduced manning engineering analysis with industry and fleet input;

(2) conduct ship mission and task functional analysis;

(3) accelerate critical technology transition by industry;

(4) facilitate early industry participation in Navy led integrated process teams; and

(5) provide earlier automated documentation to support program requirements and acquisition reform.

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63564N to increase funding for the SC–21 program to a level that could provide for an orderly development and transition to procurement after the turn of the century.

Intercooled recuperated gas turbine engine

The budget request contained $34.1 million in PE 63573N for continued development of the intercooled recuperated (ICR) gas turbine engine.

In order to improve production efficiencies and support the testing program, the committee has supported a plan to develop a test facility for the ICR engine at the Navy's land-based test site. This facility would be used to conduct the second 500 hour engine test for the ICR engine. Such testing would reduce program risk and allow an earlier start of production testing to support a planned decision in January 1997 on when to introduce the ICR engine into new construction DDG–51 class destroyers. No funding for this initiative was included in the budget request.

Additionally, no funding has been included in the budget request for at-sea testing of the ICR engine. At-sea testing of the LM–2500 gas turbine, currently in widespread use as a main propulsion gas turbine, provided valuable lessons learned when gas turbine technology was first introduced into the fleet over twenty years ago. It is to be expected that similar benefits would be derived from similar testing of the ICR engine.

The committee recommends an increase of $19.0 million to the budget request in PE 63573N for the ICR engine. Of this amount:

(1) $12.5 million would be to establish an ICR test facility at the Navy's existing land-based test site; and

(2) $6.5 million would be for at-sea testing of the ICR engine.

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The committee supports the accelerated development of the advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV) as one of the Marine Corps" highest priority programs. The AAAV will be critical to future ship-to-shore operations from the stand-off distances envisioned by the Department of the Navy's doctrine for operational maneuver from the sea. It will greatly enhance the maneuver capabilities of deploying Marines by providing them with much greater flexibility as to the time and place of an amphibious assault and for subsequent maneuver ashore.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 63611M to procure an additional prototype for testing and evaluation, to accelerate testing activities now scheduled for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and to preserve the option to enter production a year earlier than currently planned.

Lightweight 155MM howitzer program

The committee notes the joint effort of the Marine Corps and the Army to develop a lightweight 155mm howitzer for light forces. The committee has been supportive of ongoing developments for current and future self-propelled howitzer systems and desires that these technologies also be applied to the lightweight howitzer.

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63635M to incorporate new technologies into the Marine Corps lightweight 155mm howitzer and its associated training devices.

"Smart Base" technology demonstration

The committee agrees with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's program assessment concerning the Multi-Technology Automated Reader Card (MARC), providing total visibility during war or contingency operations, as well as providing efficiencies in peacetime services and training. The committee believes that the use of leading edge commercial technologies like the MARC or "smart card" to reduce infrastructure costs is beneficial to the nation, and enables better use of the limited resources to support national security. Full exploitation of state-of-the-art technology would provide significant benefits and efficiencies associated with installation overhead management costs. A "Smart Base" technology demonstration would capitalize on such technologies and allow information exchange with federal agencies, and state and local governments, as well as with the commercial sector.

The committee believes a "Smart Base" technology demonstration should be conducted simultaneously at an industrial site to determine usefulness with regard to ship operations and maintenance, and at an operational base to provide base business applications including security, travel, education, medical, personnel, finance and food services. This technology demonstration should be integrated into the civilian sector where appropriate. Site selection shall be limited to one industrial activity and one operational activity. Each selection should use merit-based competitive procedures and be predicated on size and scope to confine the demonstration to a manageable and measurable model.

In executing the program, the committee instructs the Department of the Navy to minimize costs by seeking cost sharing part-

nerships with other federal agencies, and state and local governments, as well as commercial activities. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million to the Navy's Environmental Quality and Logistics program (PE 63712N) for this "Smart Base" technology demonstration.

Cooperative engagement capability

The budget request contained $164.5 million in PE 63755N and $9.9 million in PE 24152N for continued development of the Navy's cooperative engagement capability (CEC).

CEC is designed to enhance the warfighting capabilities of ships and aircraft by combining the data derived from various sensors into a single common representation that is available with the same positional accuracy to all participating ships. The Navy reports that a challenging cruise missile defense exercise, which relied heavily on CEC position information, was held earlier this year in Hawaii. The exercise involved over-the-horizon detection, tracking, and engagement of a variety of difficult targets. The Navy currently projects that initial operational capability of the system will be achieved by September 1996. During testimony at this year's defense posture hearing, the Secretary of Defense singled out CEC as a program of high priority that he chose to accelerate because of its great potential for linking units from more than one service together and greatly increasing their warfighting ability.

Despite relatively robust funding for CEC in this year's budget request, it contains no funding to pursue joint service integration efforts that were begun last year. Successful consummation of these efforts, in consonance with the Navy's baseline program, could greatly leverage the capability of the services to conduct joint operations and provide ballistic missile defense. Another area not addressed by the budget request, an issue raised in committee hearings this year, is reported interference between CEC and other data links currently in use in the fleet.

The committee recommends an increase of $63.0 million above the budget request for CEC in PE 63755N to permit continued pursuit of a number of promising efforts, including CEC integration with AWACS and national sensors, and to accelerate development of an airborne capability for the system. Of this amount, $8.0 million would be available to address the issue of CEC interference with other fleet data links, particularly the link installed on the SH–60B. The committee also directs that the Secretary of the Navy prepare a detailed report, for submission no later than March 15, 1997, on issues that surfaced during committee hearings this year:

(1) progress made in resolving the issue of spectrum interference as a result of the reallocation under title VI of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993 of the spectrum in which CEC operates; and

(2) steps that the Secretary has taken to address and resolve harmful interference between CEC and other fleet weapons systems and data links.

Naval surface fire support

The budget request included $42.2 million for gun weapons system technology. Of this amount, $20.2 million is for the continued

development of a 5-inch extended range guided munition (ERGM) round. The Navy is developing this round to address a gap in its ability to provide accurate naval surface fire support (NSFS) during an amphibious assault at the ranges dictated by current requirements. Of the $20.2 million, no funds have been budgeted for risk mitigation in the development of a GPS/INS guidance unit for the projectile, the component judged to have the greatest technical risk.

The committee has learned that a modest increment of additional funding for risk mitigation in fiscal year 1997 could have very high leverage in successfully completing development of the GPS/INS guidance unit on schedule. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million above the budget request in PE 63795N for risk mitigation in development of the 5-inch ERGM. Consistent with direction provided in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, the committee also recommends an increase of $0.4 million above the budget request to support the retention of two *Iowa* class battleships on the naval register in an inactive status until the Navy is able to replace their potential NSFS capability.

Strike missile evaluation

As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Navy is pursuing the development of an arsenal ship as a means of providing flexible response and early massive firepower in the event of a crisis. To fully realize the capabilities that the Navy envisions for the arsenal ship, the Navy must pursue parallel development of a long range strike missile that is capable of hard target penetration. There are at least two potential candidates for this mission, a sea-based variant of the Army's ATACMs missile and a Standard strike missile variant. The Navy has previously conducted an at-sea test of the ATACMs missile variant but not of the Standard missile variant.

There are additional uses that the Navy might be able to make of older variants of the Standard missile if they could be proven satisfactory for those purposes. Examples include use as a ballistic missile defense target and as a supersonic sea skimming missile. If it proves feasible to use its existing inventory of older Standard missiles in such roles with only limited modifications, the Navy could make very cost effective use of this inventory and take advantage of a logistics support infrastructure that is already in place.

The Navy has informed the committee that additional funding in fiscal year 1997 could be used to conduct a complete Standard missile variant demonstration. This demonstration would not only test a variant for the joint land attack mission, but also as a theater ballistic missile target and a supersonic sea skimming missile variant.

The committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million above the budget request in PE 63795N to evaluate the potential of the Standard missile to satisfy multiple mission requirements, including a specially configured long range strike variant that could be employed by the arsenal ship, when developed, or other Navy surface combatants equipped with a vertical launch capability.

Light airborne multi-purpose system helicopter program

The Navy has embarked on a program to convert its existing fleet of light airborne multi-purpose system (LAMPS) helicopters from the SH–60B configuration to the SH–60R configuration. It is planned that other Navy H–60 series helicopters, such as the HH–60, a search and rescue variant, and the SH–60F, an ASW variant with a dipping sonar, will also eventually be converted to the SH–60R configuration. However, the Navy's helicopter master plan, under which these conversions are included, has been in a constant state of flux for at least the past two years and, in the committee's opinion, has lacked the focus needed to properly compete for resources as the defense budget, particularly the acquisition portion, has declined in recent years.

The committee has learned that the LAMPS SH–60B to SH–60R development program is seriously short of resources. Since fiscal year 1995, it has gone through requirements restructuring, contractual rebaselining, efforts at cost reduction through acquisition reform initiatives, contractor investment, and an increasing contractor inventory of accrued cost that has not been paid. While the Navy and contractor team has maintained technical progress towards the planned fiscal year 2001 initial operational capability (IOC) date, the funding level contained in the fiscal year 1997 budget request would be insufficient to sustain this effort. Since the program was originally structured to permit conversion to the SH–60R configuration to occur during scheduled depot maintenance or service life extension overhauls, the delay in program development that would result from the fiscal year 1997 budget request would likely also cause a substantial increase in conversion costs and might render the program unaffordable.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.8 million in PE 64212N to restore funds that were removed from the SH–60R development program during preparation of the fiscal year 1997 budget request. This additional funding will support a critical design review in fiscal year 1997 and maintain the program's progress toward a fiscal year 2001 IOC. The committee also recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the procurement of additional SH–60B upgrade kits to replace funds that were removed from the program to pay for F–14 digital flight control improvements.

Joint maritime command information system/Navy tactical command system-afloat

The budget request included $43.7 million for development and procurement associated with the Navy tactical command system afloat (NTCS–A) and the joint maritime command information system (JMCIS).

NTCS–A is the primary command, control, and intelligence (C2I) system in the fleet. It is installed in over 240 ships and is fielded on a series of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) based tactical computers. It also forms the architectural basis for the Joint Chiefs of Staff's global command and control system (GCCS). NTCS–A provides a common standard in order to integrate individual subsystems into a common operating environment, the JMCIS. New, user-specific software applications for individual weapons and com-

munications systems must be developed with an interface that is compliant with NTCS–A. The Navy has also embarked on a major effort to ensure that legacy systems that are not presently compliant with NTCS–A are adapted to it as quickly as possible. While the Navy considers this effort of great importance to its ability to realize the full fighting potential of its fleet units, competing demands for resources in a constrained budget environment have slowed the development of NTCS–A/JMCIS.

The committee recommends an increase of $23.0 million above the budget request to field the following additional capabilities for JMCIS/NTCS–A:

(1) development of integrated two-way Link 16 processing capability in JMCIS software;

(2) incorporation of the Air Force's contingency theater automated planning system (CTAPS) into JMCIS;

(3) upgrading to permit data exchange between the joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) and the Navy's afloat planning system (APS);

(4) fielding of the afloat automated sanitization system, commonly known as Radiant Mercury; and

(5) development of the tools and architecture to allow users to selectively request, filter, and process supporting databases without being overwhelmed by unneeded data.

Of the amount recommended, $19.5 million would be for research and development in PE 64231N and $3.5 million would be for procurement.

Smart Ship initiative

The budget request included no funding for the Navy's Smart Ship initiative. This initiative, developed too late for inclusion in the budget request, will be managed at fleet level and is designed to demonstrate that crew workload for a surface combatant ship can be reduced via technology and changes to existing policies and procedures. The lessons derived from it are expected to have a direct, cost saving impact on the designs for future ships, such as the arsenal ship and the Navy's next generation of surface combatant, the SC–21. It may also produce modification proposals that could be cost effectively incorporated into existing fleet units to lower operating and support costs.

The committee has concluded that Smart Ship has considerable potential for reducing the operating costs of the Navy's fleet units with no loss in operational effectiveness. If Smart Ship's objectives are realized, it could also assist the Navy in making more future resources available for recapitalization.

The committee recommends an increase of $31.3 million above the budget request to accelerate the Smart Ship initiative. Of this amount, $21.9 million would be for PE 64307N. The balance of $9.4 million would be added to the Navy's operating account.

Arsenal Ship

The Navy budget request contained $25.0 million for development of an arsenal ship.

During the past year, the Department of the Navy has developed a new concept for an arsenal ship. Key elements of the concept include:

(1) providing approximately 500 vertical launch system (VLS) cells, with the capability to launch Navy and joint weapons to support the land campaign;

(2) integrating the combat system with cooperative engagement capability to provide for off-board control of weapons;

(3) incorporating the flexibility to include ship design features for survivability and self defense at a later date;

(4) minimizing ownership costs; and

(5) limiting crew size to no more than 50.

The arsenal ship concept could satisfy the basic joint naval requirements to provide the theater commander with: (1) massive firepower, (2) long-range strike, and (3) flexible targeting of that firepower. The arsenal ship program may also support theater air defense by providing hundreds of VLS cells for air defense missiles.

The Navy has testified that it will emphasize simplicity of design for the arsenal ship. In an innovative approach to exploring the arsenal ship concept, the Navy has signed a memorandum of agreement (MOA) with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for conducting a joint development program. The objective of the MOA is to:

(1) produce an operational demonstrator that could be converted to a fleet asset at a future date;

(2) incorporate cost as an independent variable;

(3) share the cost of the first demonstrator between the Navy and DARPA;

(4) spend no more than $520.0 million on the first demonstrator;

(5) use exclusively off-the-shelf systems; and

(6) create a joint arsenal ship advanced technology demonstrator office to manage the effort.

The committee explored this arsenal ship concept for the first time at a hearing on March 12, 1996. Based on its initial review, the committee believes that the concept shows promise for providing both flexible response and early massive firepower in the event of a crisis.

The committee understands that the program is in the earliest of conceptual stages. However, there are a number of questions that must be addressed concerning integration of the arsenal ship with other existing and developmental weapons systems, and concerning other possible missions that have evolved since the memorandum of agreement was signed. Relevant matters for resolution as development proceeds include:

(1) how will the arsenal ship system and its operational employment concept satisfy the basic objectives of providing accurate, long-range strike and flexible targeting?

(2) does the Navy have, or is it planning to develop, the right kinds of weapons systems that would provide an effective antiarmor capability at ranges consistent with long range strike?

(3) has the Navy identified what modifications to existing vertical launchers may be necessary to accommodate the Army tactical missile system (ATACMS)?

(4) how will the Navy integrate the arsenal ship into existing or planned surveillance and targeting systems, such as JSTARs, to tap into sensor-to-shooter links that provide accurate real-time targeting for long-range weapons?

(5) to what extent might the arsenal ship system be able to provide a shore fire support capability, a potential additional mission that is not mentioned in the developmental objectives of the MOA?

(6) what self-defense systems might be necessary to meet the operational objectives set for the ship? and

(7) what is the view of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) regarding the need for additional sea-based, long-range, precision surface fire support in the form of an arsenal ship?

Based on its initial evaluation, the committee supports the Navy's concept for an arsenal ship. However, the committee believes that the questions listed above are all valid and must be addressed as part of the development program. The arsenal ship concept should be developed as a weapons system, not just as a ship.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $147.0 million in PE 64310N to accelerate development of the arsenal ship weapons system and to accelerate finding answers to the questions that would allow the Navy to develop a system, not just a ship. The committee expects the Navy to address this matter in the preparation of its fiscal year 1998 budget and be prepared to discuss its various developmental and resource implications before the request is submitted.

AQS–20 airborne minehunting sonar

The Navy has been developing a new airborne minehunting sonar, the AQS–20. Because of funding constraints, the Navy has been forced to reduce previously planned funding for the program in this year's budget request. This reduction will delay production of the system by one or perhaps two years.

As the committee learned during hearings this year, there are still many mine countermeasures (MCM) requirements that remain unmet. Funding emphasis for MCM that occurred in the wake of Operation Desert Storm has returned to historical subsistence level norms. Yet, effective MCM capabilities that extend from deep water to the landing beach, and across it, remain essential elements of a successful amphibious assault. The AQS–20 minehunting sonar system, which will be towed by an MH–53E helicopter, has been designed to double the coverage rate of the existing AQS–14 and have a much better ability to detect bottom mines. When combined with improvements in position accuracy available from GPS, the AQS–20 has the potential to make airborne mine countermeasures an extremely effective MCM system.

The committee recommends an increase of $6.0 million above the budget request in PE 64373N to procure additional test articles in preparation for operational testing of the AQS–20 sonar.

Airborne mine detection systems

In testimony on its mine warfare programs this year, the Navy emphasized a long-term objective of providing an organic mine

countermeasures (MCM) capability to the active fleet that will permit it to respond immediately to mine threats until specialized MCM units can arrive on the scene. However, progress in fielding specific systems to satisfy this objective remains slow. The committee is particularly concerned with the Navy's lack of progress in developing an organic capability, within its aircraft carrier battle groups (CVBGs) and amphibious ready groups (ARGs), to conduct minehunting by use of an airborne laser mine detection system (ALMDS). The ALMDS program is developing a light detection and ranging (LIDAR) sensor for use by fleet aircraft to detect and classify shallow water moored and floating contact mines.

The committee is aware of existing systems that could be candidates for a solution to the ALMDS requirement, specifically Magic Lantern and ATD–111. Although a limited contingency capability composed of three Magic Lantern systems that are resident in the Navy Reserve SH–2G helicopters currently exists, the committee believes that such a capability should also be resident in its active CVBGs and ARGs.

Accordingly, the Committee directs the Navy to conduct a competitive evaluation field test, during fiscal year 1997, of the two candidate technologies represented by Magic Lantern and ATD–111, for the purpose of identifying a single system that can be procured and integrated into active duty Navy fleet aircraft to provide them with an organic MCM capability. This assessment should include a quantitative determination of each system's performance with respect to detection and classification of moored and floating mines, area coverage, false alarm rates, potential for multi-mission capability, system availability, and capability for integration and carriage aboard the SH–60 series active fleet helicopters. The committee further directs that this competitive evaluation be conducted as soon as practicable, but no later than July 1, 1997. The Secretary of the Navy shall report results to the congressional defense committees no later than August 1, 1997.

To support this competitive evaluation for an ALMDS system, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 64373N to prepare these two systems for the competition, to conduct the competitive assessment, and to prepare the required report. Of this amount:

(1) $3.0 million would be available to prepare ATD–111 for the competition;

(2) $5.0 million would be available to prepare Magic Lantern for the competition; and

(3) $2.0 million would be available to organize and conduct the competition, analyze data, and prepare the required report.

Upon completion of this assessment, the Navy shall develop a plan to procure a sufficient number of the winning systems to provide the active Navy forces with a satisfactory contingency ALMDS capability. To begin this procurement, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million above the budget request. The Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit this plan to the congressional defense committees in conjunction with the fiscal year 1998 budget request and to include funding in the fiscal year 1998 budget request to continue execution of the plan.

Multi-purpose processor

In designing its next generation of nuclear attack submarine (New SSN) the Navy has shifted its emphasis from the design of a combat system to the design of a fully open architecture command, control, communications and intelligence (C3I) system based on commercial electronics. This approach will integrate the functions of the combat system, previously based on closed architecture, proprietary designs, with those of other sensors and communications equipment that formerly stood apart. The Navy's approach will permit the system to evolve more easily and rapidly incorporate new technology as it develops.

The committee has been informed that, as part of its effort to establish an open architecture C3I design for the New SSN, the Navy has developed a multi-purpose processor (MPP) based on commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) technology through a small business innovative research program (SBIR). The Navy has also informed the committee that the technology provided by the MPP permits investments in complex software to be easily transported to other programs. Inherent in the MPP's design is a capability to rapidly introduce COTS technology to other fleet systems that contain military specification equipment that performs a comparable function. MPP removes the requirement for highly specialized or proprietary processors and replaces them with a processor that is adaptable across a wide range of applications with relatively low risk. As an example, the Navy has chosen to use the MPP as an integral part of an effort to insert COTS technology into acoustic processing on its SSN–688 class submarines.

The committee recommends an increase of $15.2 million in PE 64558N to mature MPP transportable software technology for use in research and development programs, and to improve the performance of Navy towed and hull mounted arrays.

***Seawolf* shock test**

The first *Seawolf* submarine, SSN–21, is in the final stages of construction and is scheduled for delivery to the Navy in late fiscal year 1996. The budget request contains $2.5 million for shock testing of *Seawolf* components and an additional $43.2 million for shock testing of SSN–21.

The committee has learned that the Navy has come to the conclusion that additional testing of *Seawolf* components, particularly for the very complex weapons delivery system, would establish very useful benchmark data for predicting the ability of these components to resist battle damage.

The committee recommends an increase of $26.0 million in PE 64561N to provide for shock testing of *Seawolf* components not covered by the budget request as follows:

(1) $20.0 million for shock testing of the *Seawolf* weapons delivery system and other important components;

(2) $4.0 million for modeling and analysis to allow components to be analyzed for shock test hardness; and

(3) $2.0 million to complete the shock testing and qualification of *Seawolf* components that are tested using methods other than submersible test vehicles.

Infrared search and track

The budget request included $3.9 million for the continued development of the infrared search and track (IRST) weapons system.

IRST is a program designed to develop a passive shipboard infrared sensor that continuously scans the horizon and automatically detects and tracks sea-skimming anti-ship cruise missiles. It has potential to be a valuable complement to various active radars that experience difficulty maintaining a solid track on sea-skimming targets. Subsistence level funding, at the level implied by the budget request, would force the IRST program to pursue a two phase approach that would produce a substantial delay in completing development of the system.

To eliminate a substantial portion of the delays in the IRST program that the budget request would produce, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million above the budget request in PE 64755N.

Evolved seasparrow missile

The budget request contains $39.5 million for continued development of the evolved seasparrow missile (ESSM).

The ESSM is being developed to incorporate missile kinematic and ordnance improvements to the RIM–7P missile to provide ships with the capability to counter modern supersonic maneuvering anti-ship cruise missiles. The committee has learned that additional funding within the baseline program could help to ensure earlier fleet introduction for both Aegis and non-Aegis ships, thus avoiding the need for separate and expensive product improvement and backfit programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million above the budget request in PE 64755N to:

(1) modify the safe and arming device of the RIM–7P to ensure safe separation from the firing ship;

(2) additional simulation capability that will better reflect the improved missile design and the environmental conditions that the missile will encounter within its flight envelope; and

(3) an S-band link to support the missile's employment by Aegis ships.

Quick reaction combat capability

The budget request included $29.5 million for continued development of the quick reaction combat capability (QRCC) for ship self defense.

The recent introduction of the ship self-defense system (SSDS) and the advanced combat direction system (ACDS) Block 1, when combined with the capability that the cooperative engagement capability (CEC) will provide when its development is complete, give great promise for equipping the fleet with a much better capability to defend itself against advanced cruise missiles. The Navy is concurrently developing the QRCC to fully integrate the employment of these systems.

The committee has been informed that additional funding for QRCC in fiscal year 1997 will provide engineering analysis needed to unify SSDS, ACDS, and CEC into a lower cost equipment set and accelerate its fleet introduction. Long-term savings in equip-

ment procurement and maintenance costs and reduced shore-based infrastructure appear likely as a consequence.

The committee recommends an increase of $17.0 million above the budget request in PE 64755N to:

(1) accelerate engineering of the LHD amphibious assault ship self-defense system;

(2) integrate ACDS with CEC; and

(3) improve tracking equipment at the Navy's Wallops Island engineering test site and aboard its self-defense test ship.

Fixed distributed system-1

The budget request contained no funding for improving the capabilities of the Navy's fixed distributed system-1 (FDS–1), a modern surveillance system that can detect even the most modern threat submarines. The committee has learned that additional enhancements in this system could significantly improve its surveillance coverage.

The committee recommends an increase of $202.0 million above the budget request in PE 64784N to complete enhancements to FDS–1.

RDT&E science and technology management

The committee recommends a transfer of $2.5 million from PE 63217N to PE 65861N to support continuing efforts in the Office of Naval Research to integrate the Navy's science and technology programs.

Sea Dragon initiative

As noted elsewhere in the report, the committee supports the various efforts of the services to develop emerging operational concepts made possible by new technologies and the requirement to perform a broader spectrum of operations in the post-Cold War era. Responses by the Marine Corps Commandant to questions during a hearing before the Acquisition and Technology Subcommittee suggest that current efforts in the Marine Corps to develop new operational concepts are not being adequately funded in the budget request. As part of a broader effort to support the development of advanced operational capabilities by the services, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million in the Marine Corps Program-wide Support program (PE 65873M) for technology supporting experiments in the first advanced warfighting experiment, known as Hunter Warrior, being conducted by the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory. This increase is also intended to support technology enhancements for follow-on limited objective experiments in fiscal year 1997. The committee intends to base future support of the Marine Corps Sea Dragon process on the demonstrated ability of the Marine Corps to adequately budget for the rapid fielding of new technologies supported by the results of the Sea Dragon experiments.

Nuclear powered ballistic missile submarine security

The budget request included $14.0 million for the Navy's nuclear powered ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) security program. The purpose of this funding is to develop all relevant technologies, on

a continuing basis, to ensure the long-term survivability of the present fleet ballistic missile submarine force.

There are a number of promising technologies that would not be addressed at the level of funding in the budget request. The committee recommends an increase of $5.5 million in PE 11224N to explore several promising technologies such as forward scatter barrier, low frequency active sonar, radar detection, and light detection and ranging (LIDAR) buoy detection.

Joint tactical combat training system

The Navy and the Air Force are developing the joint tactical combat training system (JTCTS) to provide proficiency training, tactics development, and readiness assessment for Navy fleet and Air Force operational units. The system will provide realistic training environments for joint air and sea-based forces. The system is also tied to a Department of Defense modeling and simulation initiative that is being pursued to reduce the cost of training department-wide.

The committee has learned that funding for the JTCTS in the budget request is unbalanced with respect to its development timeline and milestone dates. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64735F and $9.0 million in PE 24571N to restore balance to the JTCTS development effort.

CINCs' technology initiative

The committee continues to support efforts by the services and defense agencies to transition rapidly selected technologies from the defense research and development establishment into the hands of the services for use in military operations. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in the Navy Science Assistance program (PE 25658N) for the continuation of the Commander in Chiefs' technology initiative established by Congress last year. The committee expects that funding in future years for this initiative will be included in the Navy budget request.

Medium tactical vehicle remanufacturing

The committee continues to support the medium tactical vehicle remanufacturing (MTVR) program needed to enhance aging cargo trucks to meet Marine Corps mobility requirements. The current program supports two contractors through the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase. The committee understands that, if a third contractor could remain in the competition for the MTVR through the completion of EMD, significant savings could result when the program enters its procurement phase.

The committee recommends an additional $3.0 million in PE 26624M to retain a third contractor during the EMD phase of the MTVR program.

GEOSAT follow-on

The Navy has been conducting a research and development effort for a space-borne sensor to determine wind speed and direction. The Navy has budgeted funds for a wind speed and direction sensor that was intended to take advantage of the opportunity to launch on the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP)

Block VI spacecraft in the fiscal year 2000–2004 time frame. Now that DMSP Block VI has been merged with the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS), the committee recommends that the Navy meet its requirements for both radar altimetry and wind data by building a second GEOSAT Follow-On (GFO–2) that would also include a new wind sensor payload in fiscal years 2001–2002. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 35160N to begin this effort.

Manufacturing technology (MANTECH)

The committee is disappointed at the continued underfunding of the manufacturing technology programs of the services and the Department of Defense. This underfunding persists despite recent policies and congressional approaches that should have resulted in greater support for these programs in the budget request for fiscal year 1997. The Department of Defense has announced a policy of making the affordability of future systems a key priority in the programming for research and development efforts. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996, there was virtually no directed funding in the increases provided for these programs by Congress, allowing the Department of Defense and the services greater flexibility in funding priority requirements under this program.

There is a growing consensus that affordability of current and future platforms and subsystems will be an essential factor if the United States is to deploy sufficient quantities of the most technologically-advanced weapons systems in the 21st century. The committee commends the Navy for its aggressive attempt to tie the activities of its manufacturing centers of excellence with the needs of the systems program managers. As part of a broader thrust to address current and future affordability concerns, the committee recommends the following general increases in the services manufacturing technology programs:

$30.0 million in PE 78011N
$20.0 million in PE 78011F

The committee expects that managers of manufacturing technology programs will pursue aggressively the requirement in section 2525 of title 10, United States Code, regarding costsharing on 25 percent of such programs. The committee urges that the process for establishing cost sharing in such programs be the subject of formal rule-making procedures in the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that whereas there has been considerable focus on four of five MANTECH thrust areas (composites, metals, electronics, and advanced industrial practices), there has been less focus on the fifth thrust area, manufacturing and engineering systems (M&ES). This lack of focus exists despite the fact that improvements in the M&ES area could significantly reduce manufacturing costs and cycle times.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current and planned MANTECH programs in the services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense to determine whether there is an identifiable shortfall in the M&ES component of the MANTECH program. The committee directs the Secretary to consider different

approaches for addressing any perceived program shortfalls, including the establishment, on a competitive cost shared basis, of a Manufacturing Systems Center of Excellence. The committee directs the Secretary to provide by November 1, 1996 a report to the defense congressional committees on the findings of the review and on any plan to address the program shortfalls identified in the review.

Acquisition center of excellence

As noted elsewhere in this report, recent approaches to acquisition streamlining have revealed the importance of continuous reform if the services are to achieve the capability of deploying new technology broadly and in an affordable manner. Congress has enacted two major pieces of acquisition reform legislation since 1994, but a prerequisite for success is the ability of the services and the Department of Defense to change the traditional procurement culture internally. In order to support efforts by the services to reform the acquisition culture, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million for the establishment of an acquisition center of excellence in the Navy. The committee expects that the Navy will provide follow-on funding for this effort in fiscal year 1998 and beyond as part of the budget requested for each fiscal year. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit to the congressional defense committees, no later than June 15, 1997, a report on progress made toward establishing the center as well as toward the development of performance measures for judging the effectiveness of the center in acting as an agent of reform of the acquisition process in the Navy and elsewhere in the Department of Defense.

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
ACCOUNT	0	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF**			
0601102F	1	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	234,475	(8,000)	226,475
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	72,360		72,360
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	65,080		65,080
0602202F	4	ARMSTRONG LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	87,103		87,103
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	74,906	3,000	77,906
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE AVIONICS	71,261		71,261
0602205F	7	PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION	-		-
0602206F	8	CIVIL ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	-		-
0602269F	9	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	7,471		7,471
0602601F	10	PHILLIPS LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	121,107	7,500	128,607
0602602F	11	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	42,573		42,573
0602702F	12	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	96,615		96,615
0603106F	13	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	18,254		18,254
0603108F	14	INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS	18,232		18,232
0603112F	15	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	23,803		23,803
0603202F	16	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	28,318		28,318
0603203F	17	ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AEROSPACE VEHICLES	28,691		28,691
0603205F	18	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	8,433		8,433
0603211F	19	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	10,423		10,423
0603216F	20	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	38,264		38,264
0603227F	21	PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	7,761		7,761
0603231F	22	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	17,969	5,000	22,969
0603238F	23	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY	2,293		2,293
0603245F	24	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	6,423		6,423
0603250F	25	LINCOLN LABORATORY	-		-
0603253F	26	ADVANCED AVIONICS INTEGRATION	15,488		15,488
0603270F	27	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	25,202		25,202
0603302F	28	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	15,740		15,740
0603311F	29	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	2,828		2,828
0603401F	30	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	39,637	75,000	114,637
0603410F	31	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	2,914		2,914
0603428F	32	SPACE SUBSYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603601F	33	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	24,885		24,885
0603605F	34	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	41,895		41,895

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603707F	35	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	3,406		3,406
0603723F	36	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	7,885		7,885
0603726F	37	C3I SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	8,777		8,777
0603728F	38	ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	8,509		8,509
0603771F	39	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603789F	40	C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,895		10,895
0305176F	41	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	9,596		9,596
0603260F	42	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,878		4,878
0603307F	43	AIR BASE OPERABILITY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603319F	44	AIRBORNE LASER TECHNOLOGY	56,828		56,828
0603402F	45	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (SPACE)	-		-
0603430F	46	ADVANCED MILSATCOM (SPACE)	31,643		31,643
0603432F	47	POLAR ADJUNCT (SPACE)	62,387		62,387
0603434F	48	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYS (SPACE)	34,024	(15,000)	19,024
0603438F	49	SATELLITE SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY	-		-
0603441F	50	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL	120,151	134,000	254,151
0603617F	51	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	4,378		4,378
0603742F	52	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	4,225		4,225
0603790F	53	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (H)	10,233		10,233
0603800F	54	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	263,836		263,836
0603851F	55	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	30,644	19,100	49,744
0603852F	56	C-130J - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603853F	57	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)- DEM/VAL	44,457		44,457
0603854F	58	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE	45,000		45,000
0603855F	59	SPACE ARCHITECT OFFICE	15,000		15,000
0604201F	60	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	18,620		18,620
0604218F	61	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP)	705		705
0604222F	62	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	4,788		4,788
0604226F	63	B-1B	220,932	48,000	268,932
0604227F	64	TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,439		4,439
0604231F	65	C-17 PROGRAM	-		-
0604233F	66	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	84,291		84,291
0604237F	67	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT	-	1,400	1,400
0604239F	68	F-22 EMD	2,002,959		2,002,959
0604240F	69	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	528,454		528,454

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0604243F	70	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT	4,940		4,940
0604249F	71	NIGHT/PRECISION ATTACK	-		-
0604268F	72	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	-		-
0604270F	73	EW DEVELOPMENT	104,423		104,423
0604321F	74	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM -EMD	1,943		1,943
0604441F	75	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - EMD	173,290	19,100	192,390
0604479F	76	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	700,278	20,000	720,278
0604480F	77	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)	37,142	7,100	44,242
0604600F	78	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	56,229		56,229
0604601F	79	CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	-		-
0604602F	80	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	3,642		3,642
0604604F	81	SUBMUNITIONS	4,873	5,000	9,873
0604609F	82	R&M MATURATION/TECHNOLOGY INSERTION	-		-
0604617F	83	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	2,926		2,926
0604618F	84	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	38,636		38,636
0604703F	85	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	5,977		5,977
0604704F	86	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0604706F	87	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	4,363		4,363
0604708F	88	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,736		2,736
0604711F	89	SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUCLEAR EFFECTS)	36		36
0604727F	90	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	23,563		23,563
0604733F	91	SURFACE DEFENSE SUPPRESSION	-		-
0604735F	92	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	23,018	5,000	28,018
0604740F	93	COMPUTER RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (CRTT)	1,956		1,956
0604750F	94	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,211		1,211
0604754F	95	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	11,075		11,075
0604770F	96	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	207,284	20,000	227,284
0604779F	97	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (JINTACCS)	5,976		5,976
0604851F	98	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	198,595	24,300	222,895
0207325F	99	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	198,632		198,632
0303606F	100	UHF SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	-		-
0603402F	101	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (SPACE)	44,752		44,752
0604256F	102	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	43,635		43,635
0604258F	103	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,966		4,966
0604759F	104	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	33,529		33,529

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0605101F	105	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	23,292		23,292
0605306F	106	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	9,212		9,212
0605502F	107	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (H)	-		-
0605704F	108	THEATER AIR DEFENSE BMC4I	12,496		12,496
0605708F	109	NAVIGATION/RADAR/SLED TRACK TEST SUPPORT	-		-
0605712F	110	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	26,921		26,921
0605807F	111	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	425,195		425,195
0605808F	112	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	6,531		6,531
0605853F	113	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	10,870		10,870
0605854F	114	POLLUTION PREVENTION	20,628		20,628
0605856F	115	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	22,698		22,698
0605860F	116	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	8,152	25,100	33,252
0605863F	117	RDT&E AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-		-
0605876F	118	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	-		-
0605878F	119	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	-		-
0605896F	120	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	128,676		128,676
0909900F	121	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0604268F	124	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	-		-
0101113F	125	B-52 SQUADRONS	11,035		11,035
0101120F	126	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	1,165		1,165
0102325F	127	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	13,239		13,239
0102411F	128	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM	5,278		5,278
0102412F	129	NORTH WARNING SYSTEM (NWS)	-		-
0207129F	130	F-111 SQUADRONS	-		-
0207133F	131	F-16 SQUADRONS	142,202	13,700	155,902
0207134F	132	F-15E SQUADRONS	143,095	29,000	172,095
0207136F	133	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	12,384		12,384
0207141F	134	F-117A SQUADRONS	12,050		12,050
0207160F	135	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	-		-
0207161F	136	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	36,382		36,382
0207163F	137	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	25,883	10,000	35,883
0207217F	138	PODDED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM	6,714		6,714
0207247F	139	AF TENCAP	20,116		20,116
0207248F	140	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	53,495		53,495
0207268F	141	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	99,050		99,050

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0207320F	142	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS	-	19,100	19,100
0207412F	143	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	622		622
0207417F	144	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	57,559	30,000	87,559
0207419F	145	TACTICAL AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS	342		342
0207422F	146	DEPLOYABLE C3 SYSTEMS	-		-
0207423F	147	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	1,822		1,822
0207424F	148	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	85,521		85,521
0207431F	149	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,749		7,749
0207433F	150	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	72,501		72,501
0207438F	151	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	30,915	5,000	35,915
0207579F	152	ADVANCED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENTS	-		-
0207590F	153	SEEK EAGLE	15,469		15,469
0207591F	154	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	198,327		198,327
0207601F	155	USAF WARGAMING AND SIMULATION	19,361		19,361
0208006F	156	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	18,500		18,500
0208060F	158	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	22,285		22,285
0208160F	159	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	114,603		114,603
0208161F	160	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	41,776		41,776
0303110F	165	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	24,527		24,527
0303131F	166	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	21,902		21,902
0303140F	167	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	6,900		6,900
0303144F	168	ELECTROMAGNETIC COMPATIBILITY ANALYSIS CENTER (ECAC)	7,667		7,667
0303152F	169	WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFORMATION SYSTEM	7,481		7,481
0303601F	170	MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	26,962		26,962
0303605F	171	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS TERMINALS	-		-
0304311F	173	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	3,000		3,000
0305110F	174	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	89,960		89,960
0305111F	175	WEATHER SERVICE	5,126		5,126
0305114F	176	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	3,870		3,870
0305119F	177	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	13,368		13,368
0305128F	178	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	289		289
0305137F	179	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	12,614		12,614
0305138F	180	UPPER STAGE SPACE VEHICLES (SPACE)	3,154		3,154
0305144F	182	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	105,472		105,472
0305145F	183	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	26,786		26,786

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0305158F	184	CONSTANT SOURCE	2,914		2,914
0305160F	185	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	17,964		17,964
0305164F	186	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	32,450	5,000	37,450
0305165F	187	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	42,243		42,243
0305182F	189	EASTERN SPACE LAUNCH FACILITY (ESLF) (SPACE)	35,704		35,704
0305887F	190	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	-		-
0305906F	191	NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	31,692		31,692
0305910F	192	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	18,867		18,867
0305911F	193	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	29,397		29,397
0305913F	194	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,623		13,623
0308610F	195	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT-AUTOMATION-PROGRAM 3	15,193		15,193
0401119F	196	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	1,153		1,153
0401130F	197	C-17 AIRCRAFT	87,486		87,486
0401214F	198	AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)	3,212		3,212
0401218F	199	KC-135S	757		757
0404102F	200	AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY	3,322		3,322
0702207F	201	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,444		1,444
0708011F	202	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	49,969	20,000	69,969
0708012F	203	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	-		-
0708026F	204	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	13,564	4,500	18,064
0708054F	205	POLLUTION PREVENTION	-		-
0708611F	206	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,405		5,405
0804734F	207	CRYPTOLOGIC/SIGINT-RELATED SKILL TRAINING	1,887		1,887
0901218F	208	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	5,917		5,917
1001004F	209	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,633		3,633
1001018F	210	NATO JOINT STARS	-		-
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	4,844,501	(161,000)	4,683,501
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AIR FORCE	14,417,456	370,900	14,788,356

Carbon/carbon nosetips

The committee is aware of current efforts by the Air Force to develop carbon/carbon thermal protection materials for reentry vehicles, as well as aircraft, spacecraft, and missile applications. The committee recommends that of the amounts requested for the Air Force Materials program (PE 62102F), $1.5 million be used for reentry vehicles material development. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost-sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Ejection seat development

The committee has taken a strong interest in improving the capability of ejection seats in our military aircraft. The committee noted in its report on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (S. Rest. 103-282) that new technologies, including some deriving from the ballistic missile defense programs, could have promise for automatically varying the explosive forces acting on ejecting pilots. Such technologies show promise for reducing the incidence of serious, career-ending injuries.

The Air Force submitted a report that indicates that designers could use new seat propulsion technology in controlling:

(1) acceleration forces for both large and small aircrew, limiting these forces to non-injurious levels; and

(2) seat instability generated by having to eject in situations other than slower, level flight.

The report further identified a three phased approach to improving survivability of our aircrews. The first phase would consist of making changes to improve aircraft accommodations and to make modest increases in ejection seat safety. The second phase would involve making more extensive changes to reduce ejection risk more substantially. The third phase would seek to expand greatly the safe ejection envelope at high and low speeds, and in situations when the aircraft is at adverse attitudes or operating in out-of-control flight.

The Air Force budget request included $18.0 million in PE 060231F for crew systems and personnel protection technology. The Navy budget request included $11.1 million in PE 060426N for aircrew systems development. The committee is disappointed that the Air Force and the Navy have not taken a more forceful approach in implementing the phased approach identified in the Air Force report. The committee, therefore, recommends an additional $10.0 million for accelerating the program phases for ejection seat upgrades as identified in the Air Force report, with the additional funds evenly divided between the two service programs.

Thermally stable jet fuels

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62203F for the acceleration of a program to develop thermally stable jet fuels using chemicals derived from coal.

High frequency active auroral research program

The committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million for the high frequency active auroral research program, $7.5 million in PE 62601F and $7.5 million in PE 63160D.

Airborne laser program

The budget request included $56.8 million in PE 63319F for the Airborne Laser (ABL) program. Although the committee agrees to authorize the full budget request for ABL, it has serious reservations and concerns related to this program. The Air Force currently plans to spend $682.6 million in the future years defense program (fiscal years 1997–2001) on an ABL demonstration and validation (Dem/Val) program. The committee does not believe that the Air Force has adequately demonstrated the feasibility of the necessary technology to justify beginning such a significant investment. The committee is also not convinced that the ABL concept of operations will allow the system to be cost and operationally effective. Under any serious threat scenario, the ABL aircraft will be required to stand off approximately 90 kilometers from the forward edge of the battle area. Yet the ABL will have a range well below 500 kilometers (in most cases against most threats probably less than 300 kilometers). This means that the ABL will have very little capability against short-range missiles and longer-range missiles launched from significant distances behind the forward edge of the battle area. Moreover, the 747–400F aircraft that the Air Force plans to use as the ABL platform will be an extremely vulnerable and lucrative target for enemy air defense systems.

The committee notes that the Air Force is planning to acquire a 747–400F aircraft as the ABL test platform through multi-year incremental funding. The committee views this acquisition as inconsistent with the Department of Defense's policy on incremental funding. The committee will not support incremental funding of a 747–400F aircraft while the Department opposes incremental funding of other major platforms, such as ships.

Notwithstanding the reservations expressed above, the committee does support a robust technology development and risk reduction effort for ABL. The committee strongly supports the development of directed energy systems for ballistic and cruise missile defense applications. Nonetheless, the committee remains skeptical about making a commitment to a significant ABL Dem/Val program at this time. This skepticism has been heightened by the fact that the Department of Defense's recent BMD Program Update Review recommended significant reductions in other key theater missile defense programs. The committee does not understand how the administration can justify a $2.0 billion reduction in the Theater High Altitude Area Defense system, for which we have a critical near-term requirement, and at the same time dedicate approximately $700.0 million for a system that may not work or make operational sense.

National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System

The National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System (NPOESS) is a joint weather satellite development program

involving the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The budget request included $34.0 million for NPOESS. Since the development program has recently been stretched-out by three years, the committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million to PE 63434F.

Joint Advanced Strike Technology Program

Last year the Joint Advanced Strike Technology (JAST) Program Office rebaselined its development profile, deferring $137.0 million of fiscal year 1996 funding. The committee notes that the deferred funds are included in the budget request of $544.3 million, and the committee further notes the program is now structured to produce the Joint Strike Fighter.

The committee is persuaded that the benefits of engine competition will outweigh any near-term investment. Accordingly, the committee directs that remaining competition funds be rebaselined to guarantee integration into the preferred weapons system concept at the earliest practical point.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $13.0 million to the $15.0 million in the budget request for the alternate engine to accelerate the profile leading to a demonstrator engine, and integration of the competitive engine in the selected weapons systems concepts.

Hardened and deeply buried target technology demonstration

The committee understands that the Air Force Air Combat Command and the U.S. Strategic Command have submitted mission need statements for capabilities to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets, and that these were validated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and approved by the Defense Acquisition Board for acquisition phase 0 efforts. The committee also understands that the Air Force Space Command has submitted an advanced technology concept demonstration proposal to develop a capability to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets. The committee endorses this effort and recommends an increase of $19.1 million in PE 63851F.

B–1B bomber virtual umbilical device

The committee supports the bomber virtual umbilical device (BVUD) program, which will provide B–1 bombers with an effective interim capability to deliver precision guided munitions. The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 64226F for 600 BVUD tail kits for 500 pound bombs and the outfitting of two additional B–1 bombers with BVUD global positioning system equipment.

B–1B upgrades

The committee recommended significant increases in B–1B enhancements last year in response to the Heavy Bomber Study that recommended investment in precision guided munitions. The B–1B is undergoing a Conventional Munitions Upgrade Program (CMUP) to ready the aircraft for Precision Guided Munitions (PGM) now in development. The committee understands that an earlier start to

the Electronics Countermeasures (ECM) portion of the CMUP could reduce risk to the schedule as well as speed up operational capability by nearly two years while reducing work required in later years.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the Defensive System Upgrade Program (PE 604226F), an element of the ECM upgrades, to provide for an accelerated start for the initiative while maintaining the overall program's balance between development and PGM availability.

Variable Stability In-Flight Simulator Test Aircraft (VISTA)

Because of limited resources, the budget request did not include funds for the VISTA project in fiscal year 1997, thus canceling an ongoing project to add thrust vectoring capability to this unique F–16D aircraft. Acknowledging the importance of manned flight experiments with variable stability aircraft, the committee recommends an additional $1.4 million to complete and test Phase I of this technologically advanced program.

Milstar automated communication management system

The budget request included $700.3 million for the Milstar satellite communications system. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64479F for the automated communication management system (ACMS), which will perform essential network planning and management of Milstar communications resources for a wide range of users. The Army's tactical terminal field operators and planners, in particular, will benefit from an ability to directly task the satellite constellation, move antennas, and change network configurations. ACMS will enable all users to fully utilize the flexibility and responsiveness of the Milstar system.

Global Positioning System

The committee supports the Global Positioning System (GPS) and the Air Force's acquisition strategy for the Block IIF satellite. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $7.1 million in PE 64480F to sustain the development and support a production rate of three Block IIF satellites per year, which will be required to maintain a full 24-satellite constellation.

Section 279 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–106) established a requirement for the Department of Defense to prepare and present to Congress a plan for dealing with GPS jamming and denial. The committee remains strongly interested in quickly resolving GPS vulnerabilities related to use in battlefield jamming environments, and the growing potential for GPS exploitation by adversaries. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 35164F to accelerate activities necessary to ensure effective use of high-precision GPS signals by United States forces, and the means to deny access to those signals by hostile forces.

Minuteman third stage upgrade

Air Force studies have identified the need to include Minuteman stage 3 flight control systems in the Propulsion Replacement Program (PRP). Flight control systems could be evaluated in planned

PRP altitude chamber tests. Flight testing could be accomplished in conjunction with planned Rocket System Launch Program flights. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.3 million in PE 64851F to develop and build seven flight test stage 3 flight control systems.

Minuteman safety enhanced reentry vehicle

The Minuteman guidance replacement program (GRP) currently preserves the option of incorporating the Mark-21 safety enhanced reentry vehicle on Minuteman III if Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles are retired. But no hardware or software prototyping has been accomplished to date for this purpose as part of the GRP. There are several reasons why this work should be performed now rather than in the future. Integrating this effort with current design and development work in GRP will save money and provide greater confidence in the system. Existing contracts could be used to perform all necessary tasks. This would preclude the cost and risk of reopening the guidance set after the GRP is concluded to make these changes. Given these factors, the committee recommends an increase of $13.7 million in PE 64851F to perform hardware and software prototyping and testing associated with incorporation of the Mark-21 reentry vehicle on the Minuteman III system.

Rocket System Launch Program

Systems to defeat hardened and deeply buried targets share many of the same technical challenges faced by kinetic energy boost-phase missile defense systems. Both require technologies for high speed in-atmosphere vehicles, precise guidance, plasma attenuation, and advanced vehicle antennas and materials. Several programs address these technologies in coordinated efforts but lack experimental flight testing capabilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.1 million in PE 65860F to fund two atmospheric interceptor technology, plasma attenuation, and materials demonstration flights coordinated by the Air Force Ballistic Missile Technology Program and flown by the Rocket System Launch Program.

Data links

Last year, the committee applauded the Air Force's decision to equip its air superiority fighters (F–15Cs) with the data link called "Link-16." Nevertheless, the committee does not believe that the budget invests heavily enough in proliferating this important capability to other parts of the Air Force. The committee believes that the added situational awareness resulting from sharing data among various platforms has real potential for making our forces more effective warfighters.

The committee believes that the Air Force should accelerate its plan to install Link-16 on F–16, F–15E, and RC–135 aircraft, complete installation in the modular air operation centers, and expand Link-16 capability to the B–1 fleet. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $65.9 million for the Air Force as follows:

DATA LINK INITIATIVE

[Dollars in millions]

	Request	Recommended	Change	Ref
Procurement	114.2	124.4	10.2	
DARP	66.2	74.2	+8.0	APAF line 59
RC–135 Rivet Joint Mods	.....	.....	+8.0	
Theater battle management	48.0	50.2	+2.2	OPAF line 56
Research and Development	506.2	561.9	55.7	
B–1	220.9	233.9	+13.0	RDAF line 63
F–16	142.2	155.9	+13.7	RDAF line 131
F–15E	143.1	172.1	+29.0	RDAF line 132
Total increase	.....	.....	+65.9	

Theater Battle Management Core Systems (TBMCS)

The committee is aware of an Air Force requirement to continue an initiative begun last year to provide an automated, integrated system to plan and execute air campaigns, known as the TBMCS. The system provides the Joint Force Air Component Commander (JFACC) the ability to generate air tasking orders with more capability and precision than are now available. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to PE 207438F to support a 1998 completion date of version 1.0 of the TBMCS.

Blade repair program

The committee recommends an increase of $4.5 million in PE 78026F to extend the current modeling under the Air Force Blade Repair Program to the Propulsion Directorate at the Oklahoma Air Logistics Center. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under the program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
ACCOUNT	0	**RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEFWIDE**			-
0601101D	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,154		2,154
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	74,923		74,923
0601103D	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	209,235	(10,000)	199,235
0601110D	4	FOCUSED RESEARCH INITIATIVES	15,580		15,580
0601384BP	5	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	28,739		28,739
	5a	ASAT		75,000	75,000
0602160D	6	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	-		-
0602173C	7	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES/FOLLOW-ON TECHNOLOGIES EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	94,023	10,000	104,023
0602227D	8	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	23,457		23,457
0602228D	9	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE AND ENGINEER	11,163		11,163
0602234D	10	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	20,068		20,068
0602301E	11	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	346,957		346,957
0602384BP	12	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	65,273		65,273
0602702E	13	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	117,944	3,000	120,944
0602708E	14	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	45,000		45,000
0602712E	15	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	218,539	15,000	233,539
0602715H	16	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	195,131	12,000	207,131
0602787D	17	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,196		8,196
0305108K	18	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,856		1,856
0603002D	19	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,363		3,363
0603104D	20	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603105D	21	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	-		-
0603120D	22	DEMINING	7,746		7,746
0603122D	23	COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	16,521		16,521
0603160D	24	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	54,142	7,500	61,642
0603173C	25	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES/FOLLOW-ON TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVEL	132,319	140,000	272,319
0603225D	26	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,158	5,000	21,158
0603226E	27	EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION OF MAJOR INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	635,553	72,300	707,853
0603232D	28	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	4,841		4,841
0603384BP	29	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	41,685		41,685
0603569E	30	ADVANCED SUBMARINE TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603570D	31	DEFENSE LABORATORY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	-		-
0603570E	32	DEFENSE REINVESTMENT	-		-
0603704D	33	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	12,068		12,068

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603711H	34	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	26,199		26,199
0603712S	35	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	18,162	2,000	20,162
0603716D	36	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	54,880		54,880
0603724D	37	BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	-		-
0603726D	38	JOINT TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	14,523		14,523
0603738D	40	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH	-		-
0603739E	41	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	332,100		332,100
0603744E	42	ADVANCED SIMULATION	-		-
0603745E	43	SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603746E	44	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY	37,408		37,408
0603747E	45	ELECTRIC VEHICLES	-		-
0603750D	46	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	98,471		98,471
0603752D	47	COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM	48,411	(24,200)	24,211
0603755D	48	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	99,880	25,000	124,880
0603756D	49	CONSOLIDATED DOD SOFTWARE INITIATIVE	-		-
0603771S	50	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY	-		-
0603800E	51	JOINT ADVANCED STRIKE TECHNOLOGY - DEM/VAL	78,400		78,400
0603805E	52	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAMS	250,000	(150,000)	100,000
0603832D	53	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	59,968		59,968
0603889E	54	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	-		-
0603228D	55	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	18,676		18,676
0603708D	56	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	9,742		9,742
0603709D	57	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	23,744		23,744
0603714D	58	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	24,001	10,000	34,001
0603715D	59	AIM-9 CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM	-		-
0603734J	60	ISLAND SUN SUPPORT	1,246		1,246
0603736D	61	CALS INITIATIVE	1,936	14,000	15,936
0603790D	62	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	22,776		22,776
0603851D	63	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	14,155	8,000	22,155
0603861C	64	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEM/VAL	269,000	75,000	344,000
0603862C	65	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE GROUND BASED RADAR (GBR-T) - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603863C	66	HAWK UPGRADES THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603864C	67	BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND C4I FOR TMD ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	-		-
0603867C	68	NAVY LOWER TIER TMD ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	60,000		60,000
0603868C	69	NAVY UPPER TIER TMD - DEM/VAL	58,171	246,000	304,171

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0603869C	70	CORPS SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE - TMD - DEM/VAL	56,232	(10,800)	45,432
0603870C	71	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEM/VAL	-	24,300	24,300
0603871C	72	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	508,437	300,000	808,437
0603872C	73	OTHER THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE/FOLLOW-ON TMD ACTIVITIES ACQUISITION - DEM	520,111	6,400	526,511
0603884BP	74	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	54,511		54,511
0604160D	75	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - EMD	2,651		2,651
0604384BP	76	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	89,915		89,915
0604771D	77	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	44,501		44,501
0604861C	78	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	212,798	65,000	277,798
0604864C	79	BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND C4I FOR TMD ACQUISITION - EMD	-		-
0604865C	80	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	381,509		381,509
0604866C	81	ERINT/PATRIOT PAC-3 RISK REDUCTION - TMD - EMD	-		-
0604867C	82	NAVY LOWER TIER TMD ACQUISITION - EMD	241,582		241,582
0604889K	83	COUNTERDRUG ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	-		-
0305889D	84	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-		-
0605104D	85	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	35,101		35,101
0605110D	86	TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO USD(A)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY	2,743		2,743
0605114E	87	BLACK LIGHT	4,730		4,730
0605117D	88	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	40,750		40,750
0605128D	89	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	11,400		11,400
0605129D	90	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	4,785		4,785
0605160D	91	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	8,563		8,563
0605218C	92	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE RDT&E PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	-		-
0605384BP	93	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	16,708		16,708
0605502D	94	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-		-
0605710D	95	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	2,311		2,311
0605790D	96	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,628		1,628
0605798S	97	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	13,796	3,000	16,796
0605801S	98	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER	45,238		45,238
0605898E	99	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	36,369		36,369
0909900E	100	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0201135J	101	CINC C2 INITIATIVES	-		-
0208045K	102	C3 INTEROPERABILITY (JOINT TACTICAL C3 AGENCY)	24,268		24,268
0302016K	106	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	2,047		2,047
0302019K	107	JOINT/DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	4,594		4,594

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
0303126K	108	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	23,361		23,361
0303127K	109	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	3,910		3,910
0303129K	110	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	2,532		2,532
0303131K	111	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	2,311		2,311
0303140D	113	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	-		-
0303149J	115	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	2,618		2,618
0303149K	116	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	2,907		2,907
0303153K	117	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	-		-
0305139B	121	DMA MAPPING, CHARTING, AND GEODESY (MC&G) PRODUCTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	100,997		100,997
0305154D	122	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	438,559	23,400	461,959
0305159B	124	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	-		-
0305159I	126	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	55,911		55,911
0305190D	127	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	7,081		7,081
0305889D	130	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-		-
0305889G	131	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-		-
0708011S	133	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,831		6,831
0902298J	134	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	34,912		34,912
0909900S	135	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
0909999D	136	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-		-
1160279BB	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	-		-
1160401BB	138	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,083		4,083
1160402BB	139	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,927		7,927
1160404BB	140	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	83,923	8,600	92,523
1160405BB	141	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,315		1,315
1160407BB	142	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,887		1,887
1160408BB	143	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	23,216		23,216
XXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,202,794	34,200	1,236,994
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEFWIDE	8,398,836	989,700	9,388,536
ACCOUNT	0	**DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVAL DEFENSE**			
0604940D	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	116,007		116,007
0605130D	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	33,560		33,560
0605804D	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	102,471		102,471
		TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVAL DEFENSE	252,038	-	252,038

PE	Line No.	Title	FY 1997 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
ACCOUNT	0	**DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION**			
0605118D	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	11,980		11,980
0605131D	2	LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,988		9,988
		TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	21968	-	21,968

Defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research (DEPSCoR)

The committee recommends continuation of the DEPSCoR program to strengthen infrastructure, enhance research, and develop human resources to assist the universities in the states designated under the National Science Foundation EPSCoR program to become more competitive for federal research and training grants. The committee recommends that, of the funds requested in PE 61003D, $20.0 million shall be used for these purposes.

The committee notes the progress made by the Department of Defense to better coordinate its activities under the DEPSCoR program with the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and the state-based EPSCoR committees. Coordination with the state-based EPSCoR committees is an essential element for the ultimate success of this program. The committee urges the Department of Defense to give significant weight to the recommendations of the state committees and to the likely impact an award under the DEPSCoR program will have on the overall EPSCoR program of participating states.

Small low-cost interceptor device

The small low-cost interceptor device (SLID) program began in 1992 for a point defense, self-protection system mounted on combat vehicles and helicopters. The committee notes the potential of this program for a limited area defense against artillery and mortars. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62702E for the manufacture and testing of 10 additional projectiles for the limited area defense capability.

Hard carbon-based coatings

The committee is aware of recent developments in new, very hard carbon-based coatings that have potential applications for sensors operating in harsh environments and other opto-electronic applications. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million in PE 62712E for the development of Pulsed Laser Deposition to create carbon-based coatings for critical applications. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost-sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

High temperature superconductivity

The committee continues to support efforts to advance high temperature superconductivity (HTS) technology, including wire technologies affordable for applications in weapon systems. In order to support continuation of these efforts within the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in PE 62712E. The committee urges DARPA to take aggressive action under its HTS program to support efforts by the services to develop this technology for near-term applications and notes the potential of HTS wire technologies for a variety of military applications. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost-shar-

ing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Diamond substrates

The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has an ongoing program to address issues in the manufacture of industrial diamond materials for use in thermal management in integrated circuits. With the growth of on-chip integration of transistors, developers and producers are facing serious limitations because of the need to dissipate ever-increasing thermal energy. Diamond has the highest thermal conductivity of any known material, combined with high electrical resistance, making it a leading material for addressing this problem. Successful reduction in the cost of producing diamond substrates using the chemical vapor deposition (CVD) process could result in significant increases in power and decreases in size and weight of military electronics. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million to PE 62712E to accelerate the program.

The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate. The committee believes that investments in fiscal year 1997 should bring diamond substrate production to such a low cost, as industry begins adopting the new technology for commercial purposes, that further Department of Defense investments should no longer be needed.

Joint Department of Defense-Department of Energy munitions

The budget request included $16.2 million for the joint Departments of Defense and Energy (DOD and DOE) munitions technology development program. The committee recommends a $5.0 million increase to the budget request for projects approved by the joint technology advisory committee. This program leverages DOE-supported work at the three DOE weapons laboratories, such as increasing DOE investment in stockpile management related technologies.

Cruise missile defense funding

Section 274 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) directs the Secretary of Defense to strengthen and coordinate the Department's cruise missile defense programs and activities. Public Law 104–106 also provides significant increases in funding for this effort.

For fiscal year 1997, the committee recommends a continuation of this effort and a net increase of $170.0 million for this purpose. None of these funds may be obligated, however, until the committee receives the implementation plan specified in section 274 (Public Law 104–106). For fiscal year 1997, the committee recommends four programmatic initiatives.

First, to enhance the ability of United States forces to detect rapidly the launch of cruise missiles across the breadth and width of the battlefield, the committee recommends an increase in funding to transition surveillance technology developed by the Defense Ad-

vanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to aerostats and the Airborne Warning Command and Control System (AWACS). To begin a program to modify four-to-five AWACS aircraft by fiscal year 2000, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 63226E and $30.0 million in PE 27417F. Since Aerostats are not as far along in the development cycle and require that DARPA's technologies undergo more significant modifications to be hosted on them, the committee recommends a measured risk reduction effort prior to a development program.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is considering upgrades to the E–2C aircraft in a manner similar to AWACS to support the Navy. Given the challenge associated with accommodating such a sensor on the E–2C, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress a report on the technical, engineering, operational, and programmatic issues associated with this effort. The report should include an analysis of alternative solutions based on the same criteria used to evaluate the E–2C. The report should recommend a solution that has an acceptable degree of risk in terms of cost, schedule, and performance. The report should be provided to Congress not later than March 1, 1997.

The committee also urges DARPA, in collaboration with the Air Force, to evaluate innovative airborne sensor platforms that could offer significant gains in power-aperture at airplane altitudes and speeds, including flying-wing designs.

The second initiative supported by the committee would ensure that we have adequate fire control and identification once cruise missiles are detected. The committee believes that improvements to the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) are promising. These improvements will allow JSTARS to identify and track cruise missiles with sufficient accuracy to vector air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles, among other capabilities. The committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for this effort ($20.0 million in PE 63226E and $20.0 million in PE 64770F). This effort should produce four to five upgraded aircraft by fiscal year 2003. The additional funds should be equally divided between efforts to insert DARPA's sensor technology and efforts to add synthetic aperture radar technology for imaging and geolocation.

The third initiative supported by the committee would ensure that our inventory of air-to-air and surface-to-air missiles are capable of intercepting cruise missiles. The committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million ($10.0 in PE 63746N, $10.0 million in PE 63009A, and $10.0 million in PE 27163F) to address this issue. The committee also recommends an increase of $40.0 million in PE 23801A to complete the development of the Patriot anti-cruise missile program, which was started in fiscal year 1996.

Large millimeter wave telescope

As the committee noted last year, the large millimeter wave telescope (LMT) design project has significant potential for advancing the state of the art for radio telescopes through the use of intelligent structures. The design could greatly improve capabilities for acquisition and recognition of targets in space, as well as demonstrate the feasibility of long range directed energy devices. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for the continu-

ation of the LMT program in the Advanced Space Technology Project within the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's Experimental Evaluation of Major Technologies program (PE 63226E). The committee directs that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized under the program where appropriate.

Crown Royal

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in PE 63226E for the continuation of the Crown Royal program.

Thermophotovoltaics

The thermophotovoltaics program (TPV) is a collaborative program between the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and NASA to demonstrate and develop a passive power generator powered by liquid and gaseous fuels. TPV has potential for a number of military applications including power generation in unmanned underwater vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 63226E to continue the program in fiscal year 1997. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contracts or other agreements under this program and that cost sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Generic logistics R&D technology demonstrations

The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million in PE 63712S to accelerate the current government-industry metal casting program conducted by the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of any contract or other agreement under the program and that cost-sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Rapid acquisition of manufactured parts (RAMP)

The committee continues to support efforts to develop and deploy technologies under the RAMP program. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the CALS initiative program (PE 63736D) to continue the research and development portion of the RAMP program in fiscal year 1997. The committee expects that funds required in future years to continue research and development under this program will be included in future budget requests submitted by the administration. The committee directs that all applicable competitive procedures be used in the award of contracts or other agreements under the program and that cost-sharing requirements for non-federal participants be utilized where appropriate.

Integrated weapons system database

The committee recommends an increase of $4.0 million in PE 63736D for the Integrated Weapons System Database for continuation of the Integrated Data Environment (IDE) program, a subset of the Continuous Acquisition and Life-cycle Support Activities (CALS).

High performance computing modernization

The committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million in PE 63755D to sustain the operations of supercomputing centers which were purchased with DOD funds and which can play an integral role in helping the Department meet its supercomputing capability and capacity requirements. The Air Force Phillips Laboratory and Air Force Space Command rely on one such center to provide image processing and simulation capabilities. Another such center provides key support to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and the Navy.

Defense dual-use applications program

The committee has for many years supported the concept of leveraging the nation's commercial research and development investments (now approaching $100 billion per year) to meet the military services' needs for dual-use technologies. The committee notes that retired General Al Gray, former Commandant of the Marine Corps, recently headed a study of the Pentagon's dual-use research efforts. His panel concluded that dual-use research has great potential to provide military users with needed warfighting capabilities more rapidly and at lower cost. But the panel also concluded that additional steps needed to be taken to embed the dual-use approach into the military services' core science and technology base programs. To achieve this, they recommended that the Secretary of Defense issue a policy directive that would codify dual-use strategy in defense acquisition, establish policy oversight through a senior dual-use board, and establish a joint dual-use implementation office. Whatever the approach used by the Secretary of Defense, the committee agrees with the Gray Panel that the fundamental problem the Pentagon faces is to instill the dual-use approach as the normal business approach within the services' research programs. The committee hopes that the panel's recommendations will be given serious consideration by the Secretary and that those recommendations or a similar approach will be adopted.

However, the committee is concerned that the substantial request for a new dual-use applications program (PE 63805E) will, in fact, serve as a disincentive for the services to fund such research internally. At a time when the 6.2 and 6.3 accounts of the services are funded in the budget request for fiscal year 1997 significantly below the level needed to support validated requirements, the natural tendency in the services is to regard dual-use research as Defense Advanced Projects Agency's (DARPA) responsibility. The committee is willing to support the program at a $100.0 million level, a decrease of $150.0 million from the request, as a transition step toward instilling these efforts in the services' science and technology bases. To facilitate that transition, the committee expects the program will be carried out through a management process that will involve the services to a much greater degree in the selection and execution of projects than was the case in the early stages of the Technology Reinvestment Project. To facilitate the transition further, the committee has elsewhere attempted to resolve problems that have impeded greater use by the services of flexible cooperative agreements and other transactions in pursuing dual-use re-

search projects with commercial firms. The Gray panel strongly supported expanded use of these authorities to broaden the Pentagon's research base.

Non-acoustic antisubmarine warfare

The Department of Defense (DOD) is pursuing a number of projects that attempt to develop better submarine detection. Most research has historically focused on acoustics. The DOD has been exploring various other means of submarine detection. These efforts are consolidated under non-acoustic antisubmarine warfare (NAASW) programs. The committee has had a continuing interest in these NAASW programs. The budget request included $24.0 million in PE 63714D for supporting the DOD NAASW program.

The committee's review of the budget request indicates that the DOD has delayed important work that would lead to further development of scattering theories and improved understanding of microwave radiometry. The committee understands that this has been the result of various general reductions to the research and development accounts and funding shifts to meet other emergent requirements. The committee believes that the NAASW efforts funded in this program merit higher priority than the DOD has apparently accorded them in executing the fiscal year 1996 budget and developing the fiscal year 1997 budget request.

The committee is also not impressed with the response of the DOD to direction given in the statement of managers to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) to conduct a comparative evaluation of a light detection and ranging (LIDAR) system, ATD–111, against other comparable approaches. The DOD intends to test the ATD–111 system this fiscal year. However, the DOD would then conduct testing on another LIDAR system, April Showers, in fiscal year 1998, after having spent two more years developing that system. The DOD proposes to then compare those two sets of test results. The committee finds this proposal unacceptable. The DOD has failed to make a persuasive case that we should test one system now, spend a significant amount to develop a competitor, and then compare ATD–111 testing results *before* additional development on April Showers has occurred with April Showers testing results *after* such work.

Therefore, the committee directs that:

(1) a competitive evaluation be conducted in fiscal year 1997 between ATD–111 and the April Showers sensor; and

(2) the results of the evaluation be provided to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 1997.

To fund this competitive evaluation, and to continue the work on scattering theory, microwave radiometry, and on the joint U.S.-UK radar ocean imaging investigations, the committee recommends an additional $10.0 million in PE 63714D for the DOD NAASW program. The committee further directs that, of the amounts authorized and appropriated in PE 65104D for technical studies, support, and analysis for fiscal year 1997, not more than $5.0 million may be obligated or expended until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology certifies to the congressional defense committees that he intends to comply with the committee's direc-

tion with respect to a competitive evaluation between ATD–111 and April Showers.

Fuel cells

For several years Congress has provided funding for a cooperative fuel cell development program between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. The committee supports these ongoing programs but serious concerns remain that the programs have expanded and lengthened beyond their original scope. The committee also continues to be concerned that these programs do not have substantial cost sharing provisions despite their obvious dual-use nature. The committee is awaiting the report from the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy on these programs required on page 174 of Senate Report 104–112, and will consider further support of fuel cell programs based on the information contained in the report. The committee recommends an increase of $4.3 million in PE 63226E for the completion of the 2 MW carbonate-based fuel cell program and an increase of $8.0 million in PE 63851D to complete the development of the climate change fuel cell.

Commercial technology insertion program

The committee recommends a decrease in the funding request of $24.0 million for the Commercial Technology Insertion Program (PE 63752D) without prejudice to fund higher priority programs. The committee believes that a level of $24.8 million is more appropriate for such a new start program. The committee believes that greater use of commercial technology by the military services in the future is essential if future systems are to be affordable and incorporate the latest technologies. The committee commends the Department for embarking on this program but is concerned that the program focuses only on adaptation of selected commercial technologies for specific applications without addressing the systemic barriers that exist in the defense R&D community between the military users and the commercial technology developers. Rather than trying to address certain specific opportunities for the insertion of commercial technologies, the program should have as its primary goal developing a process to ensure that commercial technologies are routinely incorporated into defense systems and that such applications are funded through the normal acquisition programming and budgeting processes. The committee urges the Department of Defense to reorient the program in this manner and to incorporate a plan to "sunset" the effort as the current systemic problems are successfully addressed.

Ballistic missile defense funding and programmatic guidance

The fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) was $2.8 billion, including research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), procurement, and military construction. The committee notes with concern that the budget request is over $200.0 million less than the administration's own recommendation of one year ago, and approximately $700.0 million less than the level authorized for fiscal year 1996. This con-

tinuing trend of sharply cutting funding for ballistic missile defense (BMD) programs has now jeopardized critical theater missile defense (TMD) programs, just as national missile defense (NMD) and advanced technology programs were previously undermined by the administration's BMD funding cuts. The committee finds these actions at odds with the administration's own stated position that TMD is a high priority.

The committee is also concerned by the administration's apparent willingness to disregard legal requirements to accelerate several TMD programs. Section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) establishes clear objectives for development and deployment of a core TMD program—consisting of the Patriot PAC–3 system, the Navy Lower Tier system, the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, and the Navy Upper Tier system. The Department of Defense's budget request and BMD program satisfy only one of the seven key milestones mandated by section 234, even though these milestones were derived directly from the Department's own fiscal year 1996 proposal and information provided to the committee by the Department of Defense.

In order to satisfy the requirements established in section 234 (Public Law 104–106), to the maximum extent possible, and to correct other deficiencies in the budget request regarding BMD programs, the committee recommends a total BMDO authorization of $3.6 billion, an increase of $855.9 million. As a point of comparison, the committee notes that the administration's Bottom-Up Review of September 1993 recommended a BMDO budget of $3.4 billion for fiscal year 1997, approximately $600.0 million more than the administration has requested.

The committee's recommended funding allocations for BMDO in fiscal year 1997 are summarized in the following table. Additional programmatic and funding guidance are also provided below.

BMDO FUNDING ALLOCATION

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Request	Change	Recommendation
Support Technology	226.3	+150.0	376.3
THAAD	481.8	+140.0	621.8
Hawk*	19.4		19.4
TMD–BM/C3*	19.3		19.3
Navy Lower Tier**	310.7		310.7
Navy Upper Tier	58.2	+246.0	304.2
Corps SAM	56.2	−10.8	45.4
BPI		+24.3	24.3
NMD	508.4	+300.0	808.4
Joint TMD***	521.5	+6.4	527.9
PAC–3**	596.9		596.9
BMDO Total	2,798.7	+855.9	3,654.6

*Procurement only.
**Procurement and RDT&E.
***RDT&E and Military Construction.

Support technology

The budget request for BMDO's support technology programs (PE 62173C/63173C) was $226.3 million. The committee notes that

the Director of BMDO has testified repeatedly in recent years regarding the shortfall in BMDO's advanced technology investment. The committee supports the Director's desire to increase the level of investment in advanced BMD technology and, therefore, recommends a net increase of $150.0 million for support technology.

The committee supports BMDO's efforts in the area of wide bandgap electronics that are funded in the Innovative Science and Technology program (project 1651). The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million in PE 62173C to facilitate a wide bandgap electronics program specifically targeting gallium nitride and silicon carbide as the major semiconductor technologies to be developed. The program should be affiliated with an academic institution involving a research and development facility for material growth, material characterization (including material surface behavior), and wide bandgap semiconductor device development.

In testimony before the committee this year, the Director of BMDO specified several basic technology projects that require additional funding. Based on BMDO's stated priorities, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 63173C for advanced radar transmit/receive modules, advanced interceptor satellite communications, and advanced image processing.

Although the committee recommended the termination of BMDO's kinetic boost-phase intercept (BPI) program in fiscal year 1996, the committee continues to strongly support BMDO's development of the Atmospheric Interceptor Technology (AIT) program. The AIT program is designed to develop advanced kill vehicle technologies for future hypersonic hit-to-kill interceptors, and for applications as potential product improvements to a wide range of TMD programs, including THAAD, Navy Upper Tier, Patriot PAC–3, and Corps SAM. The budget request includes only $7.4 million for the AIT program as part of the Applied Interceptor Materials and Systems Technology program (project 1270). This level of funding is inadequate to support any significant degree of progress. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million in PE 63173C to support the AIT program.

The committee continues to support development of the Space-Based Laser (SBL) program. SBL offers the potential for a high leverage system to deal with ballistic missiles of virtually all ranges. The SBL appears to be by far the most effective boost-phase intercept system being developed by the Department of Defense. In testimony before the committee on March 25, 1996, the Director of BMDO characterized SBL as "the next real quantum jump" in active BMD development. Given the importance of this program and its high potential payoff, the committee is disappointed that the budget request contained only $30.0 million for SBL. The committee recommends an increase of $70.0 million in PE 63173C to continue the SBL effort. The committee believes that the Air Force should begin to take a much more active role in developing the SBL program. Specifically, the committee believes that the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center should play a key role in designing a demonstrator spacecraft and providing detailed cost estimates for completion of such a demonstration program.

Theater high altitude area defense system

The budget request included $481.8 million to complete THAAD demonstration and validation (Dem/Val) and to begin engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). The committee continues to support the development, production, and fielding of THAAD as a matter of highest priority. To reflect the priority attached to the THAAD program by Congress, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 mandated in section 234 that the system achieve a first unit equipped (FUE) not later than fiscal year 2000.

Despite this clear congressional direction, the Department of Defense has proposed a restructuring of the THAAD program as part of its BMD Program Update Review that is inconsistent with the law and congressional intent. There are two important aspects of this proposed restructuring. First, the Department proposed streamlining the planned EMD phase for THAAD by proceeding with production of the so-called user operational evaluation system (UOES) configuration. Subsequent improvements to enhance overall THAAD system robustness would be pursued in the future as warranted by threat developments. The committee supports this particular recommendation, which is consistent with the programmatic guidance it provided to the Department last year. Aside from yielding significant savings by simplifying the EMD phase of the program, this action could also be used to facilitate earlier fielding of the THAAD system.

The committee strongly disagrees with the second element of the Department's proposed restructuring of the THAAD program. This involves delaying the initiation of low-rate initial production (LRIP), and hence achievement of the FUE until fiscal year 2004, at the earliest. This proposal to delay LRIP reflects the administration's budgetary priorities, not military or technical considerations. The committee rejects this prioritization. If adopted, the administration's recommendation would mean that THAAD would be fielded 12 or more years after the program was initiated on a virtual "crash" basis to address the inadequacies in U.S. TMD capabilities that were illustrated during Operation Desert Storm. Furthermore, after fielding the UOES system in fiscal year 1998, there would be a four year delay before beginning LRIP, which would almost certainly lead to a shutdown of the production facility. This not only stretches the development phase of a system that would otherwise be ready for production, but shutting down the production facility is untenable from an industrial base perspective. For these reasons, the committee believes that the proposed delay is unacceptable.

The committee remains committed to fielding the THAAD system as quickly as technically feasible. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to structure the THAAD program to begin LRIP in fiscal year 1999 and to adjust the future years defense program accordingly. The committee recommends an increase of $75.0 million in PE 63861C and an increase of $65.0 million in PE 64861C, an overall increase of $140.0 million for the THAAD program.

The committee also attaches importance to the UOES system, which will be delivered to the United States Army in fiscal year 1998. This system will provide valuable opportunities for training and testing. Most importantly, it will provide some limited oper-

ational capability in the event of a crisis. The committee questions the adequacy of a UOES capability based on 40 interceptor missiles. This would provide for just one load-out of missiles for each of the four THAAD UOES launchers. Once these missiles are used for testing purposes, or launched during a crisis, no reloads would be available. In this regard, the committee notes that 36 Patriot missiles were expended on the first day of combat during Operation Desert Storm. Accordingly, the committee believes that a total of 80 missiles is more appropriate, and directs the Secretary of Defense to include funding to acquire these additional 40 UOES missiles in the fiscal year 1998 budget request.

The administration's proposed program for THAAD does not include funding for a second EMD radar until very late in the program. The committee believes that there are many compelling reasons to fund this radar earlier. Specifically, a second EMD radar would reduce overall THAAD system development and production risk. The first EMD radar will be used primarily for flight testing at the Kwajalein test range. A second radar would be able to support operational ground testing, and could serve as a back-up asset in the event of unforeseen problems during the test program or to support testing activities at two locations (e.g., White Sands missile test range and Kwajalein). Procuring this second EMD radar beginning with long-lead funding in fiscal year 1997 would avoid disruption to the production line and hence would be more cost effective. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to proceed with acquisition of a second EMD radar in fiscal year 1997 and provides $65.0 million in long-lead funding for this purpose.

The committee has been concerned by the operational limitations of testing the THAAD system at the White Sands range. Numerous delays have already been imposed on the program due to these limitations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to transition to flight testing at the Kwajalein range at the earliest practical opportunity. The committee is also concerned about the fact that the EMD request for proposal (RFP) has still not been finally issued. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to issue the EMD RFP as soon as possible.

Navy upper tier (theater wide)

The budget request included $58.2 million for continued development of the Navy Upper Tier (Theater Wide) TMD system. This is a significant reduction from the $200.4 million authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1996, and reflects the low priority that the administration attaches to this program. The committee does not support the Department's recommendation to delay the development and deployment of the Navy Upper Tier system and strenuously objects to the Department's disregard of requirements set forth in the law.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 mandates that the Navy Upper Tier system become the fourth "core" TMD system and establishes accelerated milestones for this program. Specifically, a UOES capability was to be achieved in fiscal year 1999 and a FUE by fiscal year 2001. Under the administration's proposed program, these milestones would be delayed well into the next century. There is no technical reason why a Navy

Upper Tier capability cannot be fielded on a much more aggressive schedule than proposed by the administration.

The committee continues to support the Navy Upper Tier system as a matter of priority. Sea-based upper tier TMD capability provides an important complement to ground-based systems, and each has unique attributes. Sea-based upper tier systems can provide initial protection to facilitate the insertion of ground forces, including ground-based TMD systems, which in turn provide the firepower needed for sustained operations. A sea-based upper tier system would also offer the possibility of defending large areas where it may not be possible to insert ground-based TMD assets. Deployed together, ground-based and sea-based TMD can provide very robust protection through multiple engagement opportunities. The committee believes that both systems are essential.

The Statement of Managers (H. Rest. 104–450) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 required the Director of BMDO to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 1996, detailing the Department's plan for Navy Upper Tier, including options to reduce risk. Although the Department recently recommended that several kill vehicle options be considered, the budget request does not support an aggressive effort to identify and develop the most effective options for the Navy Upper Tier mission. Accordingly, the committee recommends a net increase in PE 63868C of $246.0 million to support an accelerated Navy Upper Tier effort and to thoroughly evaluate the Lightweight Exoatmospheric Projectile (LEAP) and a modified version of the THAAD kill vehicles.

For the modified THAAD kill vehicle, the committee directs BMDO to begin funding the key modifications required to support the Navy Upper Tier mission, including a solid divert and attitude control system and AEGIS weapon system/vertical launch system integration activities. The committee recommends the use of $50.0 million to support this effort in fiscal year 1997 from the overall amount authorized for the Navy Upper Tier program.

The committee believes that the Navy, in conjunction with BMDO, should assess the potential that development of a new second stage motor for the Standard Missile could have for a range of missile defense and other applications. The committee believes that a new second stage motor could provide improved performance for sea-based BMD and could also support enhanced deep and fast strike missile options for the Naval Surface Fire Support mission. A new second stage could simplify integration issues associated with kill vehicle options for Navy Upper Tier and other BMD missions, thereby reducing the cost and complexity of the kill vehicle development program. In addition, such a new second stage could support future growth options for sea-based BMD. Accordingly, the committee recommends the use of $25.0 million of the funds authorized for Navy Upper Tier to initiate this second stage motor development effort.

Corps Sam/medium extended air defense system

The budget request included $56.2 million for the Corps surface-to-air missile (SAM)/Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program. Because of remaining concerns about the long-

term viability and cost of this program, especially in light of the questionable European commitment to the program, the committee recommends two actions. First, the committee recommends a reduction of $10.8 million in PE 63869C. The committee notes that the General Accounting Office has reviewed the Corps SAM budget request and concluded that such a reduction is in order. Second, the committee directs that none of the funds authorized for Corps SAM/MEADS for fiscal year 1997 be obligated until: (1) the MEADS Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is signed by all parties; (2) the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that, pursuant to the MOU, the U.S. share of the costs for the MEADS program will not exceed 50 percent; and (3) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees the report on options associated with the use of existing systems, technologies, and program management mechanisms to satisfy the Corps SAM requirement specified in the Statement of Managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

United States-Israel Boost Phase Intercept Program

In the Statement of Managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1996, the conferees endorsed a cooperative program between the United States and Israel to develop a kinetic energy boost-phase intercept program based on an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). The committee maintains its strong support for this concept. The budget request included $9.3 million in the Joint TMD program element (PE 63872C) to continue this effort. The committee recommends that these funds be transferred to the BPI program element (PE 63870C) and that this amount be increased by $15.0 million for a total authorization of $24.3 million.

The committee believes that the first step of this U.S.-Israel BPI program should be a joint technology risk mitigation effort, aimed at reducing technological uncertainties and developing, to the extent possible, a common set of user requirements. If this proves successful, it can be followed by an advanced technology demonstration to validate the technical feasibility of the concept and the major system elements. This would enable the United States and Israel to evaluate the potential for a joint acquisition program or one in which both countries continue to collaborate on separate but mutually reinforcing efforts.

National Missile Defense

The budget request included $508.4 million for National Missile Defense (NMD) to support the administration's so-called deployment readiness program known as "3+3". Based on information received from the Department of Defense, the committee does not believe that the administration's proposed budget and program plan for NMD are adequate even to meet the stated purpose of its "deployment readiness" program. As acknowledged by the Director of BMDO in congressional testimony, the planned test program for the exoatmospheric kill vehicle (EKV) is inadequate to support a deployment decision within the framework of the "3+3" program. The administration's proposed NMD program consists of just five EKV flights: two in fiscal year 1997; two in fiscal year 1998; and

one in fiscal year 1999. Under this plan, an NMD deployment decision supposedly could be made at the end of fiscal year 1999; however, such a decision would be based on a single integrated interceptor test. Furthermore, the test booster would not represent an operational configuration.

To support a lower risk and more robust NMD program, the committee believes that additional EKV flight tests are required. Specifically, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to restructure the EKV program to support two flight tests in fiscal year 1997, three in fiscal year 1998, and four in fiscal year 1999. This requires the acquisition of additional kill vehicle and test booster hardware. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary to upgrade the Payload Launch Vehicle (PLV) system to provide a more representative velocity regime and test environment for NMD system tests. To accomplish these objectives, and to ensure that other aspects of the NMD program are able to support an initial operational capability (IOC) in fiscal year 2003 (which the administration's proposal supposedly protects), the committee recommends an increase of $300.0 million in PE 63871C. The committee recommends the use of $50.0 million to begin upgrading the PLV and whatever funds are necessary to support the EKV flight profile specified above.

Joint theater missile defense

The budget request included $521.5 million in BMDO's Joint TMD program element (formerly known as Other TMD). The committee recommends a net increase of $6.4 million in PE 63872C, including the following adjustments: (1) a transfer of $9.3 million to the BPI program element for the U.S.-Israel Joint BPI program; (2) an increase of $3.7 million for the Arrow Deployability Project (ADP), for a total authorization of $35.0 million to fully fund the U.S. share of the program envisioned in the recently completed Memorandum of Agreement between the United States and Israel; (3) an increase of $7.0 million for the Army's Advanced Research Center (ARC), for a total authorization of $15.0 million; and (4) an increase of $5.0 million for BMDO to ensure that the Navy's Cooperative Engagement Capability is compatible with all of BMDO's core TMD programs.

Data review and analysis monitoring aid

The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million for Defense Support Activities (PE 605798S) specifically for continuation of the Data Review and Analysis Monitoring Aid (DRAMA) program, which is designed to reduce duplication in the supply system.

Advanced SEAL delivery system

The committee has learned that additional development funding in fiscal year 1997 could provide a significant improvement in the acoustic characteristics of the advanced SEAL delivery system (ASDS) before procurement begins.

The committee recommends an increase of $2.8 million above the budget request in PE 116404BB to provide quieter pumps and motors for the base design of the ASDS.

M4A1 Carbine INOD, special operations command

The Special Operations Command is developing the integrated night/day observation/fire device (INOD) for the M4A1 carbine. The INOD will enable special forces to use a single rifle sight for both night and day operations. Such a capability would be particularly useful for special forces, who must currently carry two sights and frequently cannot boresight and zero a sight during operations without compromising their position.

The committee recommends an increase of $1.9 million in PE 1160404BB to accelerate completion of engineering analysis and initiate engineering design for the INOD for the M4A1 carbine.

AC–130 aircraft enhancements, special operations command

The committee recommends an increase of $5.8 million in PE 1160404BB for enhancements to the AC–130 aircraft. These enhancements would upgrade AC–130 lethality and the accuracy of weapons systems for use in special operations.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Battle group airborne anti-submarine warfare

The committee has become concerned with the Navy's slow progress in planning for and funding organic battle group airborne anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems suitable for countering the existing and projected littoral ASW threat. The committee recognizes the Navy's difficulty in modernizing existing systems within budgetary constraints. However, programs that provide a solid conceptual plan, supported by adequate resources, should be in place to meet the evolving littoral ASW threat.

The committee believes that the Navy's overall plan for modernizing its H–60 series helicopters has not met these criteria. The broad concept, to convert existing H–60 variants into a multi-mission SH–60R helicopter and introduce it by fiscal year 2001 as a complement to introduction of DDG–51 Flight IIA destroyers into the fleet, appears sound. However, the mix of aircraft to be converted and the funding programmed to implement this concept have remained in an almost continuous state of flux for the past two years. For example, in reviewing the Navy's integrated helicopter plan for fiscal year 1997, the committee has noted a change in the Navy's previous decision to convert aircraft carrier based SH–60F ASW helicopters to HH–60H combat/utility helicopters. Instead the new plan would convert these SH–60F helicopters to the SH–60R configuration. Some would be converted in the near-term to fill surface combatant requirements, but the balance of the SH–60Fs would not undergo conversion until after fiscal year 2006.

Last year, the Navy's fiscal year 1996 helicopter plan would not have converted some 60 SH–60Fs to the SH–60R configuration. The statement of managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed the Secretary of the Navy to evaluate the cost effectiveness of a modernization program for the dipping sonars installed on these helicopters. Since the fiscal year 1997 plan now calls for conversion of these 60 helicopters to the SH–60R configuration, implying eventual installation of the

airborne low frequency dipping sonar (ALFS), a different set of assumptions applies, and different questions have emerged.

Although the 60 SH–60F helicopters are now to be converted to the SH–60R, most of these conversions will not occur for at least 10 to 15 years. The committee remains concerned about whether the dipping sonars presently installed on these carrier based SH–60F helicopters are now, or will remain, suitable for the littoral ASW operations envisioned by the Navy's strategic concept "Forward * * * From the Sea" during this 15 year period.

To help resolve its uncertainty, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to develop a plan, containing decision options, that would ensure that its carrier based SH–60F helicopters not scheduled for conversion to the SH–60R in the near-term, which will be the helicopters that will remain responsible for inner-zone battle group ASW, are equipped with a dipping sonar, including possible modifications to the presently installed sonar, that is suitable, and will remain suitable, for littoral ASW operations. The Secretary is directed to submit this plan no later than March 1, 1997.

FFG–7 modernization

The Navy now plans to retain more of its FFG–7s in active and reserve status than had been previously planned. Heavy operational demands have caused the Navy to reverse an earlier decision to retire most of the FFG–7 class of ships. While the Navy has not made a final decision on the total number that will be retained, it is likely that the Navy will retain a portion of them in active service until at least 2010.

The committee appreciates the Navy's rationale in retaining these FFG–7s in service. However, it would now appear prudent to evaluate the ability of these ships to deal with evolving threats during their remaining service life. Factors for consideration include:

(1) the FFG–7 class has several different configurations, some have an updated anti-air warfare (AAW) system, while others have a more capable anti-submarine warfare (ASW) weapons system;

(2) the FFG–7 class was originally developed as a design-to-cost, open ocean, anti-submarine escort, and was not optimized for near land operations or countering advanced sea-skimming cruise missiles; and

(3) several groups have approached the committee during its review of the fiscal year 1997 budget request, asserting that relatively inexpensive off-the-shelf upgrades are available that will provide the FFG–7 class with the capabilities needed to counter modern threats.

The committee wants the Navy to clarify its intentions for modernizing the FFG–7 class. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a report on options for modernizing the FFG–7 class and submit that report with the fiscal year 1998 budget request. The report should include, but need not be limited to, answers to the following questions:

(1) what are the threats that will likely be encountered in operational situations where the FFG–7s might be employed?

(2) what priority does the Navy place on modernizing the FFG–7 class to deal with these threats?

(3) what are the alternatives for buying off-the-shelf upgrade packages that could defeat these threats?

(4) would buying off-the-shelf upgrade packages be cost effective relative to potential developmental programs? and

(5) what would be a reasonable funding and installation program to procure and install either off-the-shelf packages or upgrade packages deriving from a development program?

Integrated ship control systems

During its review of the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the committee has determined that the Navy is pursuing a number of initiatives that are designed to provide automated and integrated control of ship systems for bridge, engineering, and damage control systems. Examples include following:

(1) the standard monitoring and control system (SMCS) that is part of the advanced surface machinery program;

(2) the engineering control system equipment (ECSE) upgrade program for DD–963, DDG–993, and CG–47 class ships that is being pursued by the PMS–400 division of the Naval Sea Systems Command;

(3) the Navy initiative called "Smart Ship," a program to help reduce crew size that includes using a variant of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) integrated ship control system; and

(4) programs to develop integrated ship control systems for new ship classes, such as the LPD–17 class and the next generation of surface combatant, the SC–21, that appear to have similar objectives as the other independent programs.

It would appear, based on information provided by the Navy, that there are areas where these programs aim to achieve different objectives. However, it would also appear that there are areas of overlap that the Navy should reconcile. The committee believes that the Navy should be trying to field shipboard configurations that have as much commonality as is reasonable. The questions that the Navy needs to analyze is how much commonality is achievable and cost effective. For example, the committee was informed by representatives of the Director of Space and Electronic Warfare (N6) of the Chief of Naval Operations staff that the N6 organization is developing a common configuration for local area networks (LANs) to be installed on existing and future Navy ships. These LANs will provide the backbone for an open architecture integration of combat, logistics, personnel, communications, bridge, and engineering control systems. Yet, similar briefings on individual programs such as SMCS, Smart Ship, and SC–21 indicate that these programs may be pursuing independent LAN development efforts that may not be consistent with the N6 program.

Of additional note, the committee has received various contractor proposals that offer COTS systems to meet some of the Navy's requirements for an automated ship control system. These proposals would preempt the ongoing Navy ship control programs. The committee is convinced that neither:

(1) the Navy's approach on several fronts is the best approach;

(2) the other COTS proposals would be able to satisfy the full range of Navy requirements; nor

(3) any of these alternatives presents the more cost effective alternative.

Committee efforts to resolve these concerns during its consideration of the budget request have not produced a satisfactory answer.

It may be that the rapid progress of commercial technology has outstripped the ability of the Navy's acquisition system to develop and field comparable ship control systems. However, the committee needs to have more information before it can adopt a course of action.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to evaluate the various integrated ship control systems currently under development by the Navy and those available as COTS alternatives. He should report his findings and recommendations for both new construction and backfit programs by February 15, 1997. The report should provide decision options based on life cycle cost estimates, and should address questions such as:

(1) how best to address the reported obsolescence and high maintenance costs of existing ship control systems;

(2) how well could COTS systems address the full range of Navy requirements;

(3) what lessons may be learned from planned employment of a COTS system as part of the Navy's Smart Ship initiative;

(4) how does the Navy plan to incorporate a common open architecture backbone into its ships for use by integrated ship control and other systems;

(5) what is the extent to which different approaches on subsets of existing ships may be more cost effective than a universal backfit approach;

(6) what is the requirement and cost and schedule impact associated with an apparent need to adopt a new architecture for the SMCS program because its existing developmental architecture has already become obsolescent;

(7) what are the benefits of pursuing a functional standard, rather than a hardware standard, to provide for common ship control configurations; and

(8) to what extent do any of the alternatives rely on a proprietary design that would limit the Navy's ability to take advantage of the rapid pace of technological advance and competitive nature inherent in the commercial market?

CV–22

The committee is aware of an agreement between the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition (RDA) and the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) Acquisition Executive of the structure, schedule and content of the engineering and manufacturing development of the Special Operations Forces variant of the V–22, known as the CV–22. The agreement supports USSOCOM mission requirements within the $550.0 million (then year) cap established by the Navy and is predicated

upon the remanufacture of an MV–22 aircraft for CV–22 test and evaluation, rather the purchase of a new V–22. The configuration represents compliance with all key performance parameters and most of the threshold requirements defined in the joint operational requirements document (JORD).

The committee further understands that an additional $10.0 million will be provided by the Navy to ensure the program meets its initial operating capability (IOC) on time with agreed-on capabilities.

The use of a remanufactured MV–22 flight test article represents an innovative, cost-effective solution to the problem of living within the program's resources. It also represents a challenge for the program office to complete the CV–22 program with the agreed-on capabilities on or before the required IOC. Accordingly, the committee expects the joint program office to release aircraft number nine back to the contractor for remanufacture by August 1, 1999. Should additional testing for the MV–22 program be necessary, the committee directs the program manager to develop and implement the necessary options to complete MV–22 testing without the use of aircraft number nine after August 1, 1999.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The committee is disappointed with the Navy's delay in carrying out research and development on the parametric airborne dipping sonar for which $4.5 million was authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 1996. As the committee noted in its report last year, this technology has potential for improving weapon systems performance in applications such as dipping sonars installed in helicopters. The committee directs the Navy to execute the program in accordance with congressional direction in fiscal year 1996.

National automotive center

The committee commends the Army for its efforts, through the National Automotive Center, to extend the life of its wheeled vehicle fleet through the adaptation of commercially developed automotive technologies. As a result of this initiative, the Army is modernizing its wheeled vehicles at a modest cost.

It is the committee's desire that all services have the benefit of the technologies identified and adapted to military vehicles by the National Automotive Center. Therefore, the Secretary of Defense shall designate the Army's National Automotive Center as the Department's executive agent for commercial automotive technology collaboration. The committee further directs that the Director, National Automotive Center shall report directly to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Research, Development and Acquisition. A charter incorporating these guidelines shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 1996, and be executed by the Secretary of Defense or his designated agent by November 1, 1996.

The committee commends the National Automotive Center for its efforts to identify commercial technologies to apply to military vehicles, and to reduce the cost of developing, producing and operating military vehicle systems. By requiring cost sharing and collaborat-

ing with industry, the Center is able to leverage the substantial investment and expertise of commercial industry and academia.

The committee is aware of a proposal to expand this work to develop advanced engine technologies (particularly four-stroke direct injection diesel engines) and to create a framework for collaborative vehicle design and development with industry. Such efforts could lead to improved design on a cost shared basis. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review the available funding for this effort and to consider a reprogramming request for additional funds if he deems it appropriate.

National Solar Observatory

The National Solar Observatory (NSO), formerly known as the Sacramento Peak Observatory, is internationally recognized as the world's best site for studying the sun. NSO scientists carry out frontier research in solar physics. On a practical level, however, its scientists work to understand and predict the occurrences and effects of solar flares and other bursts of radiation. Understanding solar activity is increasingly vital for global communications, military surveillance, and navigation.

The Air Force supports NSO operations through its Science and Technology program in the amount of $650,000 that is transferred to the National Science Foundation, which operates the NSO. The committee supports the continuation of this annual contribution for the support of the National Solar Observatory.

United States-Japan management training

The committee has been impressed by the degree to which the United States-Japan management training program has achieved its primary objective of preparing young American scientists, engineers and managers for positions in American industry and government from which they can exploit their knowledge of Japanese research and development institutions. This program, initiated by the committee in 1991, is run by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR). In fiscal year 1996, AFOSR was only able to fund the program at $2.0 million from its own resources after several years in which the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) had provided AFOSR $10.0 million per year for the program. The committee believes that a larger investment in this program may be warranted. The Secretary of the Air Force, at her discretion, may apply funds in PE 61102F, or the Secretary of Defense, at his discretion, may apply funds in PE 61103D, to continue the program at a total level of up to $10.0 million. The committee notes that cost sharing from non-federal sources is a statutory selection criterion in the program and that historically the program has leveraged significant non-federal funding. The committee directs AFSOR to ensure that cost sharing from non-federal sources should match AFOSR funds to the maximum extent practicable in future grant awards.

Totally integrated munitions enterprise (TIME)

The committee notes that the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Department of Energy's Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos National Defense Laboratories, is preparing to initiate the

Totally Integrated Munitions Enterprise (TIME) project in support of U.S. conventional munitions production. The committee believes the TIME project could reduce the time required to develop, manufacture, and procure advanced munitions systems while improving their overall cost effectiveness. The program has the potential to reduce overhead and infrastructure costs in the management of U.S. munitions production.

Strategic deterrent development capability

The committee recognizes the Department of Defense's progress in identifying and establishing programs to protect the key sectors of the strategic deterrent force industrial base. The Department has funded programs to preserve critical strategic deterrent development activities in the areas of reentry vehicles and precision long-range inertial guidance systems. The committee strongly supports this process, especially with regard to technology applications and components that may be required to maintain and replace existing strategic forces. In several of these areas no other commercial or governmental market exists.

The committee is concerned, however, that certain critical technologies, materials, or processes may still be excluded from this process. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to Congress, not later than March 15, 1997, for the preservation of all elements necessary for development of the next generation of strategic deterrent forces. The plan should include technology applications and selective component development, as well as the practice of the systems engineering and integration disciplines required to develop and to maintain a responsive strategic deterrent system development capability.

Post-boost propulsion for strategic delivery systems

The Air Force is beginning the third year of research and development investment in its Minuteman post-boost system. This investment is necessary to ensure the continuing readiness and effectiveness of United States strategic ballistic missile forces. Both the Air Force and the Navy rely on the same down-sized corporate pool of specialists who have unique capabilities and qualifications derived from twenty-five years of direct experience with the data and tests to assure reliability and affordability. Under present and foreseeable circumstances, the committee endorses retention of a consolidated corporate pool and recommends that the Department of Defense continue to support the post-boost system infrastructure at budgeted or increased levels.

Chemical-biological defense program

The committee recommends authorization of the budget request of $505.6 million for the Department of Defense chemical-biological defense program for research and development ($296.8 million) and procurement ($208.2 million).

The committee is disturbed with the findings in a March 1996 Government Accounting Office (GAO) report on chemical and biological defense, and wishes to express its general and growing unhappiness with the Department's management and oversight of the chemical-biological defense program. According to the President's

1996 National Security Strategy, a key part of United States strategy is to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and to develop effective capabilities to deal with these threats. U.S. national security strategy requires that U.S. military forces be prepared to respond, in the United States as well as abroad, to the danger posed by weapons of mass destruction.

Since 1990, the Congress has expressed concern about the conduct of the chemical and biological defense program and the readiness of the U.S. military forces to operate in a chemically or biologically contaminated environment. In 1993, concerned that the overall defense budget was declining and wanting to ensure that requirements for an effective chemical and biological defense program not be ignored, the Congress took steps to strengthen the chemical and biological defense program. To meet the potential threat of the proliferation of chemical and biological agents, the Congress directed the Secretary of Defense to fund the chemical and biological defense program in a DOD budget account. This DOD chemical and biological defense program was to be assigned to a single office in the Office of the Secretary, and reflect a coordinated and integrated chemical and biological defense program for the military departments, with the Army as the executive agent.

Despite the increased attention since the Gulf War by the Department and the Congress to the potential threat of the use of chemical or biological agents against U.S. military forces, the committee is disturbed with the findings of a March 1996 Government Accounting Office (GAO) report on DOD's chemical and biological defense program.

The GAO report notes improvement in the readiness of U.S. military forces to operate in a chemical or biological environment. However, the report also identifies continued deficiencies in the areas of: chemical-biological defense training; inadequacy of the biological vaccine stockpile; development and implementation of a DOD immunization policy; and adequacy of training and equipment for medical personnel.

In testimony before the Congress on the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commanders in Chief of our regional commands highlighted the chemical and biological threat as a priority. However, despite the high priority and emphasis placed on combating this threat, the committee is disturbed with the GAO findings that chemical and biological training and preparedness have been assigned a lower priority by the Commanders in Chief. Additionally, the committee is disturbed that DOD has been unable to make a decision with regard to the development and implementation of a DOD immunization policy. As a result of lessons learned from the Gulf War, it is essential that a decision be made on the vaccines to be stockpiled and on an immunization policy. In the event of a crisis, it is imperative that forces deployed to a high threat area receive the necessary medical protection to protect them against biological agents. In that same regard, it is essential that medical personnel assigned to deploy with the forces have the necessary training and equipment to treat casualties in a chemically or biologically contaminated area.

For the past three years, the Congress has increased funding for the chemical and biological defense program above the President's request. For example, in fiscal year 1996, the Congress authorized a $24.0 million increase to augment and accelerate research and development in medical and non-medical chemical and biological defense, and an increase in the military service operations and maintenance accounts of $50.0 million for chemical defense training and chemical medical defense training.

The committee directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to review and report back prior to the conclusion of the House and Senate conference on the fiscal year 1997 defense authorization bill on steps the Department has taken to correct the deficiencies highlighted by the GAO report, and on the use of the increased funding provided to the Department in the fiscal year 1996 for the chemical and biological defense program and on the use of the operations and maintenance funds for increased chemical defenses training, as well as the use of these funds for the procurement of chemical-biological defense equipment.

Biological and medical defense technologies

As noted elsewhere in the report, the committee recommends that the Department continue to place increased research and development efforts in the area of biological detection. Those efforts should include working with the national laboratories, universities and, where appropriate, industry. Additionally, the committee believes that the Department needs to increase research and development in the area of biological medical technologies. Detection of biological agents and physical protection of our military forces are essential. These two elements should not be relied upon as a sole means of defense. A third element which is essential in the defense of our military services against biological agents are vaccines, toxoids, antitoxins and antibodies. It is critical that our biological defense include medical technologies. The committee believes that increased emphasis is necessary in the area of prophylaxis and specific therapies to protect against potential biological pathogens which would be used offensively against our military forces.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996 the committee highlighted concerns about the progress in bio-technology that could lead to the development of new biological warfare agents and requested the Department to report to Congress by March 1, 1996 (which was extended by 45 days) on the national security threats posed by these new advances in bio-technology and genetic engineering. To date, the committee has not received this report. The committee directs the Department to submit the report expeditiously so that consideration may be given to its findings during the conference on the defense authorization bill between the House and Senate.

Additionally, the committee intends to review possible benefits of increasing the chemical-biological defense program for the conduct of research and development on human monoclonal antibodies as medical defenses against biological agents. The committee recommends that the Department report to the committee on the utility and possible benefits of this medical technology program in reducing the threat of the use of biological agent. This report should

include input by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)

The committee directs the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to consult and coordinate their chemical and biological research and development programs more closely with the Department's executive agent for the chemical-biological defense program. In addition to leveraging existing technologies, it is important that the capabilities of all contributing agencies be utilized to their fullest extent.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The President's budget request included $88,859.7 million for operation and maintenance of the armed forces and component agencies of the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1997.

The committee recommends authorization of $89,025.8 million for the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts for fiscal year 1997, an increase of $166.1 million from the President's budget request. The recommended amount authorized for the O&M accounts includes, to the extent provided in an appropriations act, transfer of $150.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

The committee recommends authorization of $2,215.9 million for the revolving and management funds.

The O&M accounts include approximately 36 percent of the total Department of Defense budget. Expenditures from these accounts pay the costs for:

—day-to-day operations of our military forces in the United States and around the world;

—all individual and unit training for military members, including joint exercises;

—maintenance and support of the weapons, vehicles and equipment in the military services;

—purchase and distribution of spare parts and supplies to support military operations; and

—support, maintenance, and repair of buildings and bases throughout the Department of Defense.

The funding in these accounts has a direct impact on the combat readiness of U.S. military forces. While insufficient O&M funds would lead to problems with short-term or current readiness, excessive and unnecessary O&M expenditures for low priority or non-defense programs also serve to restrict the availability of funds for modernization programs. Modernization is nearly synonymous with long-term or future readiness. The quality of overall readiness essentially depends upon a careful balance of funding between both current and future readiness.

This year the full committee received testimony on readiness issues from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service secretaries and the service chiefs, and the unified commanders-in-chief. The Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony on readiness issues from the four service chiefs, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, the chiefs of the reserve components, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and other senior military representatives.

The primary readiness concern expressed by these witnesses was the inadequate funding that was provided by the President's budget request in the long-term readiness or modernization accounts.

Although current readiness is not robust, future readiness is in far more serious jeopardy.

The committee believes future readiness deficiencies must be addressed now or our armed forces will be ill-equipped for the potential military conflicts of the next century. However, current readiness must also be maintained in order to ensure that the myriad of contingency operations in which today's military forces are engaged are performed with minimum casualties and without exposure to unnecessary risk.

The committee approves of the Department's decision to budget for the known costs of ongoing operations for the first time this year. This will help to ensure that necessary training will not be canceled due to a lack of funds available in the fourth quarter because of the unbudgeted costs of these operations.

The committee recommends a reduction in O&M funding for low-priority and non-defense programs and that funds made available from these reductions be authorized for higher-priority readiness programs. This planning consideration required the committee to make some difficult decisions; however, the continuing decline in defense budgets have made such decisions necessary.

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		LAND FORCES	8,978,250	-	8,978,250
2020A	10	COMBAT UNITS	1,785,131		1,785,131
2020A	20	TACTICAL SUPPORT	1,144,383		1,144,383
2020A	30	THEATER DEFENSE FORCES	150,569		150,569
2020A	40	FORCE RELATED TRAINING/SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	1,410,908		1,410,908
2020A	50	FORCE COMMUNICATIONS	65,150		65,150
2020A	60	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	845,251		845,251
2020A	70	JCS EXERCISES	55,087		55,087
2020A	80	BASE SUPPORT	2,686,320		2,686,320
2020A	85	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	835,451		835,451
		LAND OPERATIONS SUPPORT	270,307	-	270,307
2020A	90	COMBAT DEVELOPMENTS	206,538		206,538
2020A	100	UNIFIED COMMANDS	63,769		63,769
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	9,248,557	-	9,248,557
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS	586,443	27,000	613,443

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
2020A	110	POMCUS	82,303		82,303
2020A	120	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	287,934	27,000	314,934
2020A	130	WAR RESERVE ACTIVITIES	150,971		150,971
2020A	140	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	65,235		65,235
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	586,443	27,000	613,443
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	334,200	-	334,200
2020A	150	OFFICER ACQUISITION	61,442		61,442
2020A	160	RECRUIT TRAINING	13,131		13,131
2020A	170	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	16,679		16,679
2020A	180	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	120,634		120,634
2020A	190	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	81,493		81,493
2020A	195	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMY ONLY)	40,821		40,821
		BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING	2,115,411	-	2,115,411
2020A	200	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	242,298		242,298
2020A	210	FLIGHT TRAINING	225,460		225,460
2020A	220	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	68,478		68,478
2020A	230	TRAINING SUPPORT	405,222		405,222
2020A	240	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	898,954		898,954
2020A	245	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	274,999		274,999

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	720,329	-	720,329
2020A	250	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	228,234		228,234
2020A	260	EXAMINING	72,125		72,125
2020A	270	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	101,970		101,970
2020A	280	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	83,296		83,296
2020A	290	JUNIOR ROTC	76,640		76,640
2020A	300	BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	158,064		158,064
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	3,169,940	-	3,169,940
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	364,270	(1,500)	362,770
2020A	310	SECURITY PROGRAMS	364,270		362,770
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		(1,500)	
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,479,853	80,000	1,559,853
2020A	320	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	515,541		515,541
2020A	330	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	398,003		398,003
2020A	340	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	308,497		308,497
2020A	350	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	257,812	40,000	337,812
		END ITEM MANAGEMENT		40,000	

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	2,952,589	20,000	2,972,589
2020A	360	ADMINISTRATION	309,075		309,075
2020A	370	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	689,100		709,100
		POWER PROJECTION C4I		20,000	
2020A	380	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	158,424		158,424
2020A	390	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	171,661		171,661
2020A	400	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	596,539		596,539
2020A	410	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	175,881		175,881
2020A	420	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	79,628		79,628
2020A	430	BASE SUPPORT	666,216		666,216
2020A	431	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	106,065		106,065
2020A	432	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION	0		-
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	312,827	-	312,827
2020A	440	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	273,924		273,924
2020A	450	MISC SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	38,903		38,903
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	5,109,539	98,500	5,208,039
		UNDISTRIBUTED		(92,356)	(92,356)
		REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		32,444	
		NON-LETHAL WEAPONS		2,000	
		FUEL TAX CREDIT		(13,800)	

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		RMS PROGRAM		20,000	
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(133,000)	
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	18,114,479	33,144	18,147,623
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	4,385,939	13,100	4,399,039
1804N	10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	1,867,999		1,881,099
		P-3 SQUADRONS		13,100	
1804N	20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	606,264		606,264
1804N	30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	64,855		64,855
1804N	40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	65,742		65,742
1804N	50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	602,679		602,679
1804N	60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	24,613		24,613
1804N	70	BASE SUPPORT	807,680		807,680
1804N	75	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	346,107		346,107
		SHIP OPERATIONS	6,482,485	94,000	6,576,485
1804N	80	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,919,975	16,000	1,935,975
1804N	90	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	457,005		457,005

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1804N	100	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	396,844	26,000	422,844
1804N	110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,803,854	52,000	1,855,854
1804N	120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	787,330		787,330
1804N	130	BASE SUPPORT	828,295		828,295
1804N	135	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	289,182		289,182
		COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT	1,636,958	-	1,636,958
1804N	140	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	206,422		206,422
1804N	150	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	7,589		7,589
1804N	160	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	144,806		144,806
1804N	170	WARFARE TACTICS	138,113		138,113
1804N	180	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	212,854		212,854
1804N	190	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	386,011		386,011
1804N	200	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	163,038		163,038
1804N	210	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,146		1,146
1804N	220	BASE SUPPORT	327,468		327,468
1804N	225	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	49,511		49,511
		WEAPONS SUPPORT	1,371,828	40,600	1,412,428
1804N	230	CRUISE MISSILE	79,828		79,828
1804N	240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	756,722		756,722
1804N	250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	50,875		50,875

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1804N	260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	389,406		430,006
		TLAM RECERTIFICATION		40,600	
1804N	270	BASE SUPPORT	63,750		63,750
1804N	275	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	31,247		31,247
		DBOF SUPPORT	0	-	-
1804N	276	DBOF SUPPORT	0		-
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	13,877,210	147,700	14,024,910
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES	497,905	-	497,905
1804N	280	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	497,905		497,905
		ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	571,006	-	571,006
1804N	290	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,699		2,699
1804N	300	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	568,307		568,307
		MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	42,025	-	42,025
1804N	310	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	19,374		19,374
1804N	320	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	722		722
1804N	330	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,929		21,929
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	1,110,936	-	1,110,936

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	258,380	-	258,380
1804N	340	OFFICER ACQUISITION	66,825		66,825
1804N	350	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,887		4,887
1804N	360	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	67,777		67,777
1804N	370	BASE SUPPORT	54,338		54,338
1804N	375	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	64,553		64,553
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	1,126,663	-	1,126,663
1804N	380	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	218,689		218,689
1804N	390	FLIGHT TRAINING	295,280		295,280
1804N	400	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	65,981		65,981
1804N	410	TRAINING SUPPORT	119,098		119,098
1804N	420	BASE SUPPORT	316,260		316,260
1804N	425	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	111,355		111,355
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	245,735	-	245,735
1804N	430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	136,474		136,474
1804N	440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	61,643		61,643
1804N	450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	22,218		22,218
1804N	460	JUNIOR ROTC	24,902		24,902

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1804N	470	BASE SUPPORT	439		439
1804N	475	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	59		59
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,630,778	-	1,630,778
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	1,504,637	27,000	1,531,637
1804N	480	ADMINISTRATION	570,921		570,921
1804N	490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	21,406		21,406
1804N	500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	69,426		69,426
1804N	510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	129,426		129,426
1804N	520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	237,647		237,647
1804N	530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	230,240		257,240
		CHALLENGE ATHENA		27,000	
1804N	540	BASE SUPPORT	200,375		200,375
1804N	542	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0		-
1804N	544	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	45,196		45,196
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT	1,496,944	-	1,496,944
1804N	550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	151,371		151,371
1804N	560	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	284,268		284,268
1804N	570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	467,318		467,318
1804N	580	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	276,446		276,446

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1804N	590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	48,613		48,613
1804N	600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	39,083		39,083
1804N	610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,540		72,540
1804N	620	BASE SUPPORT	145,338		145,338
1804N	625	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	11,967		11,967
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	568,148	(3,700)	564,448
1804N	630	SECURITY PROGRAMS	555,721		552,021
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		(3,700)	
1804N	640	BASE SUPPORT	7,344		7,344
1804N	645	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	5,083		5,083
		SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	7,544	-	7,544
1804N	650	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	7,544		7,544
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	3,577,273	23,300	3,600,573
		UNDISTRIBUTED		(68,858)	(68,858)
		REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		36,142	
		RMS PROGRAM		20,000	
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(125,000)	
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	20,196,197	102,142	20,298,339

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		EXPEDITIONARY FORCES	1,503,579	35,000	1,538,579
1106N	10	OPERATIONAL FORCES	331,478		356,478
		PERSONNEL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		25,000	
1106N	20	FIELD LOGISTICS	171,056		171,056
1106N	30	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	155,168		165,168
		CORRRESSION CONTROL		10,000	
1106N	40	BASE SUPPORT	593,307		593,307
1106N	45	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	252,570		252,570
		USMC PREPOSITIONING	77,751	-	77,751
1106N	50	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	74,003		74,003
1106N	60	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,748		3,748
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,581,330	35,000	1,616,330
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	73,091	-	73,091
1106N	70	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,139		8,139
1106N	80	OFFICER ACQUISITION	270		270
1106N	90	BASE SUPPORT	47,092		47,092

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1106N	95	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	17,590		17,590
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	183,009	-	183,009
1106N	100	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	26,578		26,578
1106N	110	FLIGHT TRAINING	155		155
1106N	120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	5,929		5,929
1106N	130	TRAINING SUPPORT	74,859		74,859
1106N	140	BASE SUPPORT	51,086		51,086
1106N	145	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,402		24,402
		RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	95,300	4,700	100,000
1106N	150	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	65,382	4,700	70,082
1106N	160	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	10,593		10,593
1106N	170	JUNIOR ROTC	8,562		8,562
1106N	180	BASE SUPPORT	8,427		8,427
1106N	185	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,336		2,336
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	351,400	4,700	356,100
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	271,047	-	271,047
1106N	190	LOGISTICS SUPPORT	0		-
1106N	200	SPECIAL SUPPORT	196,367		196,367

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
1106N	210	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	38,479		38,479
1106N	220	ADMINISTRATION	25,459		25,459
1106N	230	BASE SUPPORT	9,283		9,283
1106N	235	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	1,459		1,459
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	271,047	-	271,047
		UNDISTRIBUTED		36,000	36,000
		AMMUNITION REWORK PROGRAM		5,000	
		REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		15,000	
		NON-LETHAL		3,000	
		WARFIGHTING LAB		8,000	
		JTF HQS COMMUNICATIONS		5,000	
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,203,777	75,700	2,279,477
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	6,773,763	42,900	6,816,663
3400F	10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,314,739		2,357,639
		B-52 OPERATIONS		42,900	
3400F	20	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	394,408		394,408
3400F	30	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	250,614		250,614

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
3400F	40	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	570,948		570,948
3400F	50	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	867,912		867,912
3400F	60	BASE SUPPORT	1,680,275		1,680,275
3400F	65	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	694,867		694,867
		COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	1,409,766	-	1,409,766
3400F	70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	736,038		736,038
3400F	80	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	114,842		114,842
3400F	90	OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	197,861		197,861
3400F	100	JCS EXERCISES	37,973		37,973
3400F	110	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	106,309		106,309
3400F	120	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	216,743		216,743
		SPACE OPERATIONS	1,202,080	-	1,202,080
3400F	130	LAUNCH FACILITIES	237,508		237,508
3400F	140	LAUNCH VEHICLES	106,266		106,266
3400F	150	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	311,304		311,304
3400F	160	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	44,301		44,301
3400F	170	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	101,723		101,723
3400F	180	BASE SUPPORT	291,242		291,242
3400F	185	MAINT OF REAL PROPERTY	109,736		109,736
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	9,385,609	42,900	9,428,509

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
		MOBILITY OPERATIONS	2,689,257	-	2,689,257
3400F	190	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,584,175		1,584,175
3400F	200	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	13,784		13,784
3400F	210	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	138,167		138,167
3400F	220	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	422,700		422,700
3400F	230	BASE SUPPORT	408,945		408,945
3400F	235	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	121,486		121,486
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	2,689,257	-	2,689,257
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
		ACCESSION TRAINING	192,430	-	192,430
3400F	240	OFFICER ACQUISITION	48,213		48,213
3400F	250	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,586		4,586
3400F	260	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	42,738		42,738
3400F	270	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	56,843		56,843
3400F	275	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMIES ONLY)	40,050		40,050
		BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	1,166,728	-	1,166,728
3400F	280	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	195,098		195,098
3400F	290	FLIGHT TRAINING	331,663		331,663

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
3400F	300	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	74,060		74,060
3400F	310	TRAINING SUPPORT	59,607		59,607
3400F	320	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	388,965		388,965
3400F	325	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	117,335		117,335
		RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION	217,406	-	217,406
3400F	330	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	52,218		52,218
3400F	340	EXAMINING	1,954		1,954
3400F	350	OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	71,210		71,210
3400F	360	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	66,791		66,791
3400F	370	JUNIOR ROTC	25,233		25,233
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,576,564	-	1,576,564
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	2,454,193	-	2,454,193
3400F	380	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,042,759		1,042,759
3400F	390	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	371,521		371,521
3400F	400	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	240,740		240,740
3400F	410	BASE SUPPORT	581,182		581,182
3400F	415	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	217,991		217,991
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,245,218	-	1,245,218

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
3400F	420	ADMINISTRATION	121,337		121,337
3400F	430	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	268,687		268,687
3400F	440	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	89,196		89,196
3400F	450	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	44,413		44,413
3400F	460	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	0		-
3400F	470	ARMS CONTROL	28,814		28,814
3400F	480	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	482,192		482,192
3400F	490	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	30,873		30,873
3400F	500	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	14,526		14,526
3400F	510	BASE SUPPORT	145,053		145,053
3400F	515	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	20,127		20,127
		SECURITY PROGRAMS	550,240	(5,600)	544,640
3400F	520	SECURITY PROGRAMS	550,240		544,640
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		(5,600)	
		SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS	12,374	-	12,374
3400F	530	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	12,374		12,374
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,262,025	(5,600)	4,256,425
		UNDISTRIBUTED		2,284	2,284
		REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE		33,884	

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(94,600)	
		AWACS EXTEND SENTRY		7,100	
		FUEL TAX CREDIT		(8,500)	
		JSAS		3,200	
		RMS PROGRAM		20,000	
		DEPOT MAINTENANCE		41,200	
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	17,913,455	39,584	17,953,039
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
0100D	10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	464,199		464,199
0100D	20	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	962,319	15,300	984,619
		SOCOM MLA MISSION		7,000	
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,426,518	22,300	1,448,818
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
0100D	30	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	21,942		21,942
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	21,942	-	21,942
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
0100D	50	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,417		100,417

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
0100D	55	OSD (DBMU)	0		-
0100D	60	DEFENSE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY	0		-
0100D	65	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	35,500		35,500
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	135,917	-	135,917
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
0100D	70	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	100,558		100,558
0100D	80	CORPORATE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	46,367		46,367
0100D	90	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	3,384,576	(50,700)	3,333,876
0100D	100	DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SERVICE	49,302		49,302
0100D	110	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	335,486		335,486
0100D	120	DEFENSE INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	193,232		193,232
0100D	130	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,181,738	12,000	1,074,438
0100D		RM&S-DBOF		(90,000)	
0100D		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(25,800)	
0100D		HOMELESS INITIATIVE		(3,500)	
0100D	140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	7,297		7,297
0100D	150	DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY	741,157		741,157
0100D	160	DEFENSE NUCLEAR AGENCY	85,083	3,000	88,083
0100D	170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	12,694		12,694
0100D	180	FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM	116,853	(96,853)	20,000
0100D	190	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,322,254		1,322,254

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
0100D	200	DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	125,269		125,269
0100D	210	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	10,504		10,504
0100D	220	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	121,295		121,295
0100D	230	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	39,330		39,330
0100D	240	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	339,558	(20,373)	319,185
0100D	245	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (NO YEAR)	0		-
0100D	250	ON SITE INSPECTION AGENCY	109,030		109,030
0100D	255	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	55,200		55,200
0100D	260	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	195,308		195,308
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	8,572,091	(272,226)	8,299,865
		UNDISTRIBUTED		(42,600)	(42,600)
		DFAS		9,000	
		CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION		(51,600)	
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	10,156,468	(292,526)	9,863,942
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		MISSION OPERATIONS	970,519	10,000	980,519
2080A	10	BASE SUPPORT	258,273		258,273

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
2080A	15	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	50,913	10,000	60,913
2080A	20	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	45,853		45,853
2080A	30	RECRUITING AND RETENTION	36,998		36,998
2080A	40	TRAINING OPERATIONS	578,482		578,482
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	970,519	10,000	980,519
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	113,917	-	113,917
2080A	50	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	20,772		20,772
2080A	60	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	467		467
2080A	70	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	63,521		63,521
2080A	80	STAFF MANAGEMENT	29,157		29,157
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	113,917	-	113,917
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,084,436	10,000	1,094,436
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	509,858	7,100	516,958
1806N	10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	275,838		282,938
		P-3 SQUARDONS		7,100	

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1806N	20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,299		1,299
1806N	30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,499		17,499
1806N	40	AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,048		2,048
1806N	50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	70,560		70,560
1806N	60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	341		341
1806N	70	BASE SUPPORT	117,353		117,353
1806N	75	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,920		24,920
		RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS	158,167	-	158,167
1806N	80	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	61,784		61,784
1806N	90	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	642		642
1806N	100	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	9,961		9,961
1806N	110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	83,969		83,969
1806N	120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,811		1,811
		RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	78,634	-	78,634
1806N	130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	0		-
1806N	140	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	27,905		27,905
1806N	150	BASE SUPPORT	41,769		41,769
1806N	155	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	8,960		8,960
		RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT			

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1806N	160	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	6,121		6,121
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	752,780	7,100	759,880
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	91,147	-	91,147
1806N	170	ADMINISTRATION	6,153		6,153
1806N	180	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	2,764		2,764
1806N	190	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	28,349		28,349
1806N	200	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	0		-
1806N	210	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	19,427		19,427
1806N	220	BASE SUPPORT	26,488		26,488
1806N	225	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	4,906		4,906
1806N	230	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	2,555		2,555
1806N	240	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	505		505
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	91,147	-	91,147
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	843,927	7,100	851,027
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		MISSION FORCES	63,728	10,700	74,428

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
1107N	10	TRAINING	13,611		13,611
1107N	20	OPERATING FORCES	27,569		38,269
		PERSONNEL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,700	
1107N	30	BASE SUPPORT	14,628		14,628
1107N	35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	4,967		4,967
1107N	40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,953		2,953
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	63,728	10,700	74,428
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	35,939	-	35,939
1107N	50	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,538		7,538
1107N	60	SPECIAL SUPPORT	10,477		10,477
1107N	70	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	4,507		4,507
1107N	80	ADMINISTRATION	6,151		6,151
1107N	90	BASE SUPPORT	7,266		7,266
1107N	100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY			
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	35,939	-	35,939
		TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	99,667	10,700	110,367
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	1,412,272	5,000	1,417,272
3740F	10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,102,739		1,102,739
3740F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	38,645		38,645
3740F	30	BASE SUPPORT	222,851		222,851
3740F	35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	48,037	5,000	53,037
3740F	37	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	0		-
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,412,272	5,000	1,417,272
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	76,281	-	76,281
3740F	40	ADMINISTRATION	42,799		42,799
3740F	50	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	19,386		19,386
3740F	60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,714		7,714
3740F	70	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,047		6,047
3740F	80	AUDIOVISUAL	335		335
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	76,281	-	76,281
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,488,553	5,000	1,493,553
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		MISSION OPERATIONS	2,055,571	10,000	2,065,571
2065A	10	TRAINING OPERATIONS	1,736,633		1,736,633
2065A	20	RECRUITING AND RETENTION	20,214		20,214
2065A	30	MEDICAL SUPPORT	18,514		18,514
2065A	40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	36,099		36,099
2065A	50	BASE SUPPORT	196,070		196,070
2065A	55	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	48,041	10,000	58,041
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	2,055,571	10,000	2,065,571
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	152,906	-	152,906
2065A	60	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	42,461		42,461
2065A	70	PUBLIC AFFAIRS	1,463		1,463
2065A	80	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	60,730		60,730
2065A	90	STAFF MANAGEMENT	48,252		48,252
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	152,906	-	152,906
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NAT. GUARD	2,208,477	10,000	2,218,477
		OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
		AIR OPERATIONS	2,646,533	38,000	2,684,533
3840F	10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,935,403	38,000	1,973,403
3840F	20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	325,996		325,996
3840F	30	BASE SUPPORT	285,396		285,396
3840F	35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	80,255		80,255
3840F	40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	19,483		19,483
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	2,646,533	38,000	2,684,533
		BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
		SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	7,940	-	7,940
3840F	50	ADMINISTRATION	3,076		3,076
3840F	60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	4,864		4,864
		TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	7,940	-	7,940
		TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NAT. GUARD	2,654,473	38,000	2,692,473
		MISCELLANEOUS	12,167,240	127,256	12,294,496
0107D	10	INSPECTOR GENERAL	138,501		138,501
1705A	10	RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY	0		-
0104D	10	COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS	6,797		6,797
0116D	10	SUMMER OLYMPICS	0		-

Authorizations for Operations and Maintenance Accounts for FY 1997

(Dollars in Thousands)

APPROP	ID	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1997	Change	Senate Authorized
0832D	10	SPECIAL OLYMPICS	0		-
0810A	10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	356,916		356,916
0810N	10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	302,900		302,900
0810F	10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	414,700		414,700
0810D	10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	258,500		258,500
0819D	10	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	80,544	(31,544)	49,000
0105D	10	DRUG INTERDICTION	642,724	151,100	793,824
1236N	10	PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND	10,000	(10,000)	-
0829D	10	WORLD CUP	0		-
0130D	10	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	9,627,758	17,700	9,645,458
0134D	10	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	327,900		327,900

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 304. Transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, to the extent provided in appropriations acts, to transfer $150.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the operations and maintenance accounts.

Section 305. Civil Air Patrol.

The committee is concerned that an inordinant amount of the funds provided by the Department of Defense to the Civil Air Patrol is used for administration and overhead expenses instead of the important search and rescue missions for which it is intended. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would require that at least 25 percent of the funds provided to the Civil Air Patrol Corporation shall be available only for the costs of search and rescue missions.

Section 306. SR–71 contingency reconnaissance force.

The committee is pleased that the Department of Defense has been able to reactivate the SR–71 aircraft for substantially less than the original estimate. The Deputy Secretary of Defense has informed Congress that the Department will modify the SR–71 aircraft in fiscal year 1996 as directed by Congress. However, since the Department views the SR–71 as an intelligence program, the Department interpreted language in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 as prohibiting expenditures from within operation and maintenance accounts to operate the aircraft. Therefore, the committee has included a provision that clarifies the intent of the Defense authorization committees, the committees of jurisdiction, with regard to operating and supporting this important capability.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 311. Funding for second and third maritime propositioning ships out of National Defense Sealift Fund.

The budget request contained no funding for enhancement of the Marine Corps maritime prepositioning force (MPF).

The Marine Corps MPF consists of three squadrons of forward deployed maritime prepositioned ships (MPS). Each of these squadrons carries sufficient equipment, supplies, and sustainment for a brigade-sized force of 17,300 Marine Corps and Navy personnel. The MPF enhancement (MPF(E)) program, begun as the result of a committee recommendation in fiscal year 1995, will provide one additional ship for each MPS squadron. This additional ship will allow each squadron to carry extra materiel, including an expeditionary airfield, a fleet hospital, a Navy mobile construction battalion equipment set, Marine Corps command element equipment, and additional sustainment supplies. Having this extra equipment will provide our warfighting commanders with much greater flexibility when they choose to employ Marine Corps units.

Congress had previously appropriated $110.0 million for acquisition of the first MPF(E) ship. Last year, the committee expressed concern about the slow progress the Navy had made in procuring this ship. The Navy has now developed an acquisition strategy that would cause the winning bidder of a current solicitation to acquire the ship, manage the contract for its conversion, and operate and maintain the ship for five years. Contract award for acquisition of the first ship is now scheduled to occur in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1996.

As originally conceived by the committee, the MPF(E) program was intended to satisfy very specific Marine Corps threshold requirements at an affordable price. Prior to making its recommendation to Congress in fiscal year 1995, the committee discussed its concept thoroughly with the Marine Corps to ensure that it would meet Marine Corps needs. The MPF(E) program that was incorporated into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 was the result of those discussions.

In fiscal year 1996, the committee expressed its continuing support for the program by recommending authorization of an additional $110.0 million for the purchase and conversion of a second ship. However, while the statement of managers that accompanied the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) expressed the House and Senate Conferee's strong support for the purchase and conversion of an additional ship for the MPF(E) program, a ship was not authorized because sufficient funds were not available.

This year, based on proposals that new construction might be a better option for the MPF(E) program, the committee reviewed its original decision to recommend purchase and conversion of an existing ship, vice new construction. As previously discussed, the Navy is well along with contract award for the first ship and, in briefings to the committee this year, expressed confidence that it would be able to acquire the ship for the appropriated amount.

The committee also asked about the historical costs of the original MPS ships, which were acquired in the mid-1980s. The Navy reported that, although some of these ships were converted and some were built new, the end cost of the conversions and the new construction ships was roughly the same. The cost of these original MPS ships in today's dollars would likely exceed $200.0 million, and perhaps be closer to $250.0 million.

When the committee pointed out the apparent disparity between the $110.0 million appropriated for the first MPF(E) ship and the end-cost of the original MPS ships in fiscal year 1997 dollars, the Navy provided amplifying information that showed that the conversions done for the MPS ships in the mid-1980s had been far more extensive than the work that would be required to satisfy the threshold requirements of the MPF(E) program. In particular, the mid-1980s MPS conversions involved cutting the converted ships in half and inserting another hull section, a "plug," to give them greater capacity for cargo and fuel than is necessary for the MPF(E) ships. The complexity of the original MPS conversions, roughly comparable to the work being done on the five large, medium-speed roll-on/roll-off (LMSR) ships that are now under conversion to carry Army prepositioned equipment, added considerably

to their conversion cost. The Navy then contrasted the scope of the conversions for the mid-1980s MPS ships with the much more limited work that will be needed for the MPF(E) ships to satisfy their threshold military requirements. Specifically, none of the proposals currently under consideration for the MPF(E) program involves insertion of a new hull section.

The committee also investigated assertions that the life cycle cost of a new construction ship might be lower than the purchase and conversion program sponsored by the committee. A lower life cycle cost might well imply greater cost effectiveness for a new construction ship.

The likely new construction candidate for the MPF(E) program would be a variant of the Army LMSR's that are currently under construction at two shipyards. The committee made a determination about the probability of lower life cycle costs for new construction ships based on the following information:

(1) when queried by the committee, the Navy reported that the average estimated cost at completion for the 17 LMSR's currently under contract will exceed $300.0 million per ship;

(2) Navy representatives indicated that the design of the Army LMSR's would have to be altered because the MPF(E) ships need a different relative allocation of container capacity versus vehicle space;

(3) the Army LMSR's are in series production, so it is highly unlikely, considering the non-recurring design effort that would be needed for an MPF(E) variant, that a small buy of three MPF(E) ships could achieve an average unit cost any less than that for the Army's LMSR's, even if they were built at the same yards that are building the LMSR's;

(4) given the approximately three-to-one differential in acquisition cost derived from Navy cost estimates, there does not appear to be a reasonable set of assumptions that would cause the committee to conclude that the life cycle costs of a new construction variant for the MPF(E) program would be lower than those associated with the purchase and conversion program already in progress; and

(5) disruption of the Army's LMSR program, to satisfy near-term requirements for the MPF(E) program, would inevitably delay the Army's LMSR program even more. Such delays would increase the cost of the ships now under construction.

As with most military programs, the MPF(E) ships have a threshold requirement that they must satisfy and an objective requirement that would be desirable. The Navy appears confident, based on proposals that had been submitted by several potential contractors, that its plans for conversion of the first MPF(E) ship can be completed within the $110.0 million originally appropriated. The committee interviewed Marine Corps and Navy leaders to determine whether the threshold requirements that this ship must meet or exceed are adequate to the mission requirements for the ship. The committee also discussed the current state of the strategic sealift program with the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Transportation Command. The responses of these senior leaders were as follows:

(1) they consider the Marine Corps requirement for the capability that the MPF(E) program will provide is urgent;

(2) the program of purchase and conversion currently being pursued by the Navy will meet the Marine Corps threshold requirements for MPF(E);

(3) they continue to support the program for purchase and conversion that the committee has sponsored for the past two years;

(4) they have no desire to wait until MPF(E) program ships could be added at the end of the Army's LMSR program;

(5) they have no desire to disrupt the Army's ongoing LMSR procurement program by having MPF(E) ships inserted into the middle of the program; and

(6) the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Transportation Command has informed the committee that:

(a) the Army's LMSR program is already two years behind schedule;

(b) this delay perpetuates a serious shortfall in strategic sealift until at least fiscal year 2001; and

(c)further disruption of the program would have a serious impact on the nation's ability to provide sufficient surge sealift to meet the demands of two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts.

As a result of its re-examination of the MPF(E) program, in conjunction with its review of the fiscal year 1997 budget request, the committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) continued strong support for the purchase and conversion of existing ships that can meet the Marine Corps' threshold requirements for the MPF(E) program;

(2) the need to field an adequate MPF(E) capability, one that satisfies the program's threshold requirement, at the earliest possible date;

(3) support for the consideration of new construction ships as an option for satisfying the MPF(E) requirement, provided they are cost competitive, do not delay the Army's strategic sealift program, and do not delay the MPF(E) program; and

(4) a provision that would authorize the purchase and conversion, or construction if competitive based on price and timeliness, of two additional ships for the MPF(E) program, and an increase of $240.0 million above the budget request in the National Defense Sealift Fund to acquire them and to include an allowance for inflation that has occurred since fiscal year 1995.

Based on the assertions and arguments presented to date, the committee has no reason to conclude that a new construction option for MPF(E) will be cost effective compared to the ongoing program of purchase and conversion, when evaluated against the threshold requirements identified by the Marine Corps. However, the committee remains open to additional facts.

The acquisition of two ships additional MPF(E) ships would satisfy the force structure requirements of the program. If the committee's recommendation prevails, the Navy would be able to negotiate favorable contract options that would permit the Navy to procure and convert the two additional ships less expensively by avoiding the cost of a second stand-alone competition.

Section 312. National Defense Sealift Fund.

The committee recommends a provision that would make certain amendments to section 2218 of title 10, United States Code. Section 2218 deals with the national defense sealift fund (NDSF). A thorough discussion of the rationale for this provision may be found elsewhere in this report in the section dealing with the national defense reserve fleet.

Section 313. Nonlethal weapons capabilities.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to the operations and maintenance accounts for the military services, $3.0 million for the Marine Corps and $2.0 million for the Army, to fulfill immediate procurement needs for nonlethal technologies.

Section 314. Restriction on Coast Guard funding.

The committee notes that funds provided to federal agencies from the 054 budget account are supposed to be used for national security activities. This year the administration requested $119.0 million in this account to support the operations of the Coast Guard. The committee is concerned that these are not national security operations and that this is a direct subsidy to the Department of Transportation using funds that are intended for the Department of Defense; a violation of the Senate rule on fire walls between the Defense budget and the budgets of civilian agencies. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which will prevent the payment of funds to the Coast Guard out of funds authorized to be appropriated in the 054 budget account. This reduction was used to fund an increase in the Department of Defense's drug interdiction and counter narcotics activities account in order to fund important counter narcotics initiatives.

SUBTITLE C—DEPOT-LEVEL ACTIVITIES

Sections 321 through 330

Department of Defense depot maintenance and repair services

The Department of Defense (DOD) annually expends approximately $13.0 billion for the maintenance and repair of military equipment. This includes the repair, rebuilding, and major overhaul of weapons systems, parts, assemblies, and subassemblies. It also includes limited manufacture of parts, technical support, modifications, testing, and reclamation as well as software maintenance. Current law (10 U.S.C. 2466) requires that each military service perform at least 60 percent of its annual depot maintenance in depots owned and operated by the Department of Defense. A separate provision of current law (10 U.S.C. 2469) requires a competition before the Department moves any work with an annual value in excess of $3.0 million from one public depot to another, or to a private contractor.

The administration has requested that these provisions be repealed in order to provide the Department of Defense with greater flexibility to manage its depot maintenance workload in a more efficient manner. Some individuals have pointed to section 2466 of

title 10, United States Code, commonly referred to as the 60/40 rule, as a particularly restrictive and arbitrary law which significantly restricts the Department's ability to manage its operations efficiently. However, others argue that this provision is necessary in order to ensure that the Department of Defense retains the capability to effectively maintain and repair vital weapons systems.

Section 311 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed the Secretary of Defense to provide the Congress with a report outlining the depot policy which the Department would use, absent the restrictions referenced above, in managing its depot maintenance activities. Congress indicated that if the policy were acceptable, it would repeal sections 2466 and 2469.

On April 4, 1996, the Department issued the required depot policy report. This report did not recommend any specific legislative proposals to implement the new depot maintenance policies. However, subsequent to the issue of the report the administration did propose legislation that would grant DOD blanket authority to contract out "commercial and industrial type supplies and services" including, but not limited to, depot maintenance, "notwithstanding any provision of title 10, United States Code, or any statute authorizing appropriations for, or making appropriations for, the Department of Defense."

On April 17, 1996, the Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on the Department's proposed depot policy with Deputy Secretary of Defense John White, General Henry Viccellio, Commander of the Air Force Materiel Command, and witnesses from the General Accounting Office.

Based on its review of the DOD depot policy report, the DOD legislative proposal, and the testimony presented by the Department at this hearing, the Committee concluded, with great disappointment, that the Department did not meet the requirements that the Congress laid out in last year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The committee believes the Department's proposed depot policy was not well thought out in general and was not responsive to Congressional guidance on several important issues, such as the requirement to provide for full and open competition for all non-core workloads. Furthermore, the committee found the Department's request for a blanket waiver of all existing statutes unacceptable. While the committee believes that the Department needs to be given greater flexibility to manage its maintenance operations, the committee determined that it could not support the administration's proposed policy.

Therefore, the committee does not approve the Administration's proposed policy regarding the management of DOD depot maintenance. However, the committee recommends a number of provisions relating to DOD depot maintenance that are intended to enhance flexibility and ensure the preservation of military readiness.

Department of Defense Performance of Core Logistics Functions

The failure of the Department of Defense to clearly identify what workloads and capabilities it believes should be retained in public depots was one of the chief shortcomings of the DOD depot policy report. The committee recommends a provision that would

strengthen the requirements of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, and reaffirm the policy outlined in section 311(d)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 that requires DOD to perform core depot maintenance workloads in maintenance depots owned and operated by the Department of Defense.

Increase in Percentage Limitation on Contractor Performance of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workloads

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the current 60/40 rule regarding the public/private allocation of depot maintenance to 50/50, contingent upon the Department of Defense providing to the congressional defense committees a report outlining the Department's strategic plan for depot-level maintenance and repair. This report, mandated by section 325, would require, among other things, the Department to identify those depot-level maintenance and repair activities and workloads that are necessary to be performed within Department of Defense maintenance depots in order to maintain its core capabilities. It would also require the Department to provide the Congress an analysis of the cost savings that can be achieved through the outsourcing of depot maintenance work. The committee notes that although saving money was the major reason the Department of Defense cited for greater outsourcing, DOD provided no credible analysis of the savings that would result from the increased outsourcing of depot maintenance work that it proposed.

The report would also require DOD to report on ways in which the public depots that remain after the conclusion of the BRAC process could be run more efficiently. The committee was disappointed that the Department's policy report did not emphasize maximizing or improving the productivity of the organic facilities and workforces that the Department manages. With respect to the management of depot personnel, the committee is concerned by reports that the Department continues to manage its depots by personnel levels rather than by workloads in violation of the requirements of sections 2466 and 129 of title 10, United States Code.

Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair Workload Defined

The committee recommends a provision that would codify the current definition of depot maintenance as prescribed by DOD Directive 4151.18. This section would also clarify the intent of the Congress that any services that are essentially the same as those DOD currently includes in its calculations for purposes of section 2466, including the depot maintenance portions of interim contractor support and contractor logistics support, are to be included in the calculations required to determine compliance with section 2466.

This provision would not require funds spent by organic depots to purchase parts and supplies from private contractors to be counted as private sector depot maintenance funds for the purposes of section 2466. Furthermore, the amendment is not intended to reclassify any ship modernization activities or post-shakedown repairs on new naval vessels, currently funded in the shipbuilding and conversion account, as depot maintenance if those activities

are not currently included in the calculations required by section 2466.

The committee also recommends a provision, section 323, that would amend section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report to the Congress identifying the percentage of depot maintenance funds that were expended in the previous fiscal year in public depots and for private entities, and would also provide for a review of the DOD report by the General Accounting Office.

Annual Report on Competitive Procedures

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2469 of title 10, United States Code by requiring the Secretary of Defense to annually report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives those procedures that will be used for competing workload between public and private sector suppliers of depot maintenance.

The committee strongly endorses the principle of competition and is disappointed that the Department has refused to conduct public-private competitions for the past two years. If the Department wishes to take advantage of the increased flexibility to outsource depot maintenance work that would be provided by the revisions the committee is recommending to section 2466, it will have to reinstate public-private competitions.

The committee will carefully monitor the procedures the Department uses to conduct future competitions, including the reports required by this section, to determine whether or not additional legislation is required.

Annual risk assessments regarding private performance of depot-level maintenance work

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Joint Chiefs of Staff to be involved in the decision making process regarding what depot maintenance work could be provided by private sector entities with minimal risk to military readiness. The provision would require that the Service Chiefs prepare for the Secretary of Defense a risk assessment of that depot maintenance workload that can be provided by the private sector, and that workload which should be maintained in public depots. The Secretary of Defense would then either concur with this report and forward it to the Congress or submit an alternative report together with his reasons for disagreeing with the report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Extension of authority for naval shipyards and aviation depots to engage in defense-related production and services

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 1997 the authority provided by section 1425 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as amended, for naval shipyards and aviation depots of all services to bid on defense-related production and services.

Limitation on use of funds for F–18 aircraft depot maintenance

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees a report outlining the results of a competition between all Department of Defense aviation depots to perform depot maintenance on F–18 aircraft. The Department would be restricted in obligating more than $5.0 million for this workload until 30 days after submission of this report. The committee is concerned with the problems identified by the General Accounting Office with respect to the previous competition for this work.

Depot maintenance and repair at facilities closed by BRAC

The committee is concerned that the administration is pursuing a policy of privatizing depot maintenance workload at locations that were closed by the 1995 BRAC process without any demonstration that this decision would provide any advantages to the Department of Defense or to the American taxpayer. Despite repeated committee requests, the Department has failed to provide the analysis which supports this decision.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the implementation of the administration's privatization-in-place initiative, or any other outsourcing of the workloads currently performed at Kelly and McClellan AFBs, until the conclusion of a public-private competition for those workloads.

The Department would be required to provide to the Congress a detailed cost comparison with respect to any such competitions as well as an analysis which demonstrates that the option selected would result in the best value to the American taxpayer. The committee will closely scrutinize the results of these competitions and expects a rigorous justification of any competition where the lowest bid was not selected.

The administration should not construe this section as a statement by the committee that current law, including section 2469, title 10 United States Code, does not already require competition with respect to privatization of these workloads.

New Weapons Systems

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has recently changed longstanding policies regarding the need to maintain a core logistics capability and has recently established a preference for performing the maintenance of all new weapons systems in the private sector. Section 3.3.7 of DOD Regulation 5000.2 establishes a policy within DOD of maximizing the use of private sector maintenance for new weapons systems and states that waivers will be required to provide maintenance for new weapons systems in organic depots. This new policy is inconsistent with current law, inconsistent with the direction provided in section 311(d)(9) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, and might be inconsistent with our national security interests.

The committee reemphasizes the direction stated in last year's conference report that DOD must maintain a core capability to maintain essential weapons systems in organic facilities and that this policy applies equally to current and new weapons systems.

Since the new Department of Defense Regulation 5000.2 is inconsistent with congressional guidance with respect to the maintenance of new weapons systems, the committee expects the Department to issue revised regulations consistent with the policy contained in this section and with the requirements of Chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code.

Capacity Utilization

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not provided the Congress with adequate information concerning the capacity utilization of the Department's organic depot maintenance facilities. The committee expects the Department to make every effort to achieve efficient utilization of its organic depots. Inefficient utilization of these facilities is unwise and unfair to the taxpayers. The committee reminds the Department that section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, provides the Department with the latitude to utilize the organic depots in an efficient manner and the committee expects the Department to exercise this discretion in a manner that minimizes the overall cost of the Department's depot maintenance program.

The committee notes that much of the current excess capacity at public depots could be leased to private companies for the purpose of carrying out commercial activities. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to make use of the authority provided by section 2471 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the amount of excess capacity at public depots.

SUBTITLE D—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 341. Establishment of separate environmental restoration transfer accounts for each military department.

In a memorandum dated May 3, 1995, the Deputy Secretary of Defense announced a proposal to devolve the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA), a single transfer account administered by the Department of Defense, to four separate transfer accounts administered by each of the military departments. The execution of the Deputy Secretary of Defense's proposal would require modification of the DERA statutory framework.

The Statement of Managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 requested a report on the subject of devolution of DERA based on concerns regarding congressional oversight. The Department has since responded to the reporting requirement and submitted a legislative proposal that would devolve DERA to the military departments. Information contained in the report has addressed the committee's concerns. As a result, the committee recommends a provision that devolves DERA.

Section 342. Defense contractors covered by requirement for reports on contractor reimbursement costs for response actions.

Section 2706 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Department of Defense to submit an annual report to Congress that describes the reimbursement of environmental response action costs, and the amount and status of pending requests for reimbursement

for the top 100 defense contractors. The administration has proposed that the law be amended to limit data collection to the top 20 defense contractors.

The Department of Defense maintains that the current reporting requirement is burdensome to the Department and to contractors, diverting limited resources for data collection with minimal benefit to the procurement process. The committee supports the proposed modification. The new provision would capture most contractor reimbursements for environmental response action costs, and eliminate the unnecessarily burdensome aspects of the reporting requirement.

Section 343. Repeal of redundant notification and consultation requirements regarding remedial investigations and feasibility studies at certain installations to be closed under the base closure laws.

Section 334 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 establishes deadlines for the completion of draft final remedial investigations and feasibility studies (RI/FS) at certain Department of Defense installations selected for closure that are on the National Priorities List (See Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.)). Section 334 provides the Secretary of Defense with the discretion to extend deadlines by six months, after consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency and if certain conditions exist. The extension takes effect 30 days after congressional notification. Section 334 was intended to address concerns related to delays of environmental cleanup actions at closing installations.

Delays in the completion of a draft final RI/FS may be attributable to a number of unpredictable factors that are inherent to environmental cleanup: newly discovered areas or sites requiring cleanup action; technical engineering difficulties; and inadequate funding. While section 334 provides a framework for documenting the reasons for delay, it does not prevent the unanticipated events that slow the cleanup process. The administration has proposed legislation that would repeal section 334.

The committee supports the administration's proposed provision. The periodic notification and formal consultation requirements divert project management resources away from site cleanup goals and priorities. Elimination of the provision would reduce red tape and serve to accelerate the cleanup and transfer of closing bases.

Section 344. Payment of certain stipulated civil penalties.

Federal Facility Agreements

The Department of Defense (DOD) has entered into Federal Facility Agreements (FFAs) with environmental regulators for installations that are on or proposed for inclusion on the National Priorities List. FFAs are typically three party agreements that involve a DOD installation, the State, and the regional office of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). FFAs establish schedules and milestones for the completion of actions related to environmental cleanup of DOD installations. The agreements are intended to es-

tablish a working relationship between DOD and the regulators to facilitate site cleanup. The FFAs allow for dispute resolution and the use of stipulated penalties in the event of missed deadlines. However, stipulated penalties are not available if a delay is the result of an unforeseen disruptive or force majeure event.

Payment of stipulated penalties is contingent upon authorization and appropriation. Subsequent to authorization and appropriation, stipulated penalties are paid out of the Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA), resulting in the diversion of scarce dollars from actual cleanup. The result is that these funds are transferred from one agency appropriation to another, distorting the cleanup priorities established by Congress in the authorization and appropriation process.

The committee is concerned that there may be an increased emphasis on stipulated penalties. The committee expects that the parties to FFAs will focus on the evolving partnership aspect of their relationship and work out their differences in a manner that avoids assessment of penalties or the need for supplemental environmental projects (SEPs) performed in satisfaction of an assessment. If that is not possible, negotiated settlements of stipulated penalties should be resolved at a level commensurate with formal dispute resolution to ensure these issues are handled in a consistent and reasoned manner. Moreover, when a penalty or SEP is part of a negotiated settlement, the Department must request specific authorization and appropriation of funds for the payment. Finally, the military departments must be mindful of the statutory limitations associated with the use of DERA funds (10 U.S.C. 2703).

Request and Authorization

Payment of the following requested fines and penalties is authorized, consistent with the legislative funding direction, as follows: Fort Riley, Kansas, $34,000 penalty; Loring AFB, Maine, $50,000 penalty; F.E. Warren AFB, Wyoming, $10,000 penalty; Massachusetts Military Reservation, Massachusetts, $55,000 penalty, $500,000 for a groundwater modeling SEP; and the Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $30,000 penalty.

Section 345. Authority to withhold listing of Federal facilities on National Priorities List.

Current law does not specifically provide the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with the discretion to defer placement of a federal facility site on the National Priorities List (NPL) when a site meets the criteria set forth in the hazardous ranking system. Section 120(d) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(d)) requires NPL listing of federal facilities, when determined appropriate, if a preliminary assessment demonstrates that the site meets the eligibility standards contained in section 105 of CERCLA. The EPA has narrowly construed these provisions of law to mean that a federal facility site must be listed on the NPL if a preliminary assessment indicates that the site meets the hazardous ranking system threshold. In relation to private sites, the EPA has been willing to use a more flexible approach that considers ex-

tenuating factors, such as cleanup actions completed pursuant to other State or Federal authorities.

Many of the federal facilities that are susceptible to NPL listing have ongoing cleanup actions that are subject to State authority. NPL listing of a State controlled federal facility cleanup triggers an additional regulatory regime that conforms cleanup activities to federal requirements, resulting in duplication and reorientation of cleanup efforts. The disparate treatment of federal facilities causes unnecessary delays and increases the overall cost to complete cleanup. The administration submitted a legislative proposal to address this issue.

The committee recommends a provision that would give EPA the specific authority to withhold NPL listing if the federal facility cleanup action is already subject to a legitimate Federal or State regulatory scheme. It is expected that the EPA would not impose NPL listing unless it is demonstrated that the continued use of existing oversight authority is an impediment to cleanup.

The provision would not affect those facilities already on the NPL. It is intended to apply to facilities that have not yet been ranked.

Section 346. Authority to transfer contaminated Federal property before completion of required remedial actions.

Section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620) requires the completion of the construction and installation of an approved remedial design, and a demonstration that the remedy is operating properly and successfully prior to the transfer of contaminated federal property. It may take several years to successfully construct, install, and demonstrate the operation of a remedial action.

The current law serves to delay transfer of Department of Defense (DOD) installations designated for closure, further exacerbating problems associated with economic reuse. Moreover, transfers of federal facilities are treated differently from those in the private sector, where contaminated property is transferred subject to a purchase agreement that identifies the remedial liabilities of the parties. The administration has submitted a legislative proposal that would eliminate the disparate treatment of public sector transfers of contaminated property.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 120(h)(3)(B) to allow the United States to enter into agreements that would ensure appropriate remedial actions are undertaken subsequent to the transfer of federal property. The agreement would be similar to the purchase agreements used in the private sector, with the additional element of regulatory participation.

The new provision would facilitate early transfer of property at closing DOD installations. The rapid turnover of such property would enhance the potential for economic redevelopment.

Section 347. Clarification of meaning of uncontaminated property for purposes of transfer by the United States.

Section 120(h)(4)(A) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)) excludes from clean parcel determinations property where hazardous materials were stored, regardless of whether a release occurred. Without any apparent relationship to human health and the environment, the provision has effectively hampered the Department of Defense's ability to transfer uncontaminated property.

The administration has submitted a legislative proposal that would enable the Department to facilitate the expeditious transfer of clean parcels on closing installations, facilitating economic reuse. The committee recommends a provision that is consistent with the administration proposal.

Section 348. Shipboard solid waste control.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, section 1003, amended the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (APPS) (33 U.S.C. 1901, et. seq.) by requiring the Navy to submit a plan to Congress by November 1996 that addresses compliance with the prohibition against discharging solid waste (paper, cardboard, metal, and glass) in "special areas" (the Baltic Seas, the North Sea, Mediterranean Sea, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Antarctic Ocean). The APPS, as amended, implements Annex V of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution on Ships (MARPOL).

The amended APPS specifically requires the Navy to: (1) Install plastics processors aboard U.S. Navy surface ships by December 31, 1998; (2) comply with the prohibition on plastics discharges for submarines by December 31, 2008; (3) comply with the prohibition on discharges of other solid waste (except food waste) in special areas from surface ships by December 31, 2000; and (4) comply with the prohibition on discharges of other solid waste (except food waste) in special areas from submarines by December 31, 2008. The APPS provides that the Navy plan must specifically identify the extent to which full compliance is not technologically feasible.

The Navy is in the process of completing a draft special area plan, which will undergo public review and comment. Following submission of the Navy's special area plan to Congress, it is expected that the Secretary of the Navy will issue the directives necessary to implement the plan. These directives will address hardware installation requirements and shipboard solid waste management practices.

Consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4321, et. seq.), the Navy is expected to release a draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) in May 1996, and a record of decision (ROD) in November 1996. The Navy has identified the use of paper/cardboard pulpers and metal/glass shredders as the preferred alternative for special area shipboard solid waste management.

The Navy has analyzed technologies and management practices for special area compliance. According to the Navy, full compliance with APPS could be achieved, as follows: installation of inciner-

ators, at a fleet-wide cost of about $1.2 billion; or garbage compaction and retrograde for shore disposal, at a fleet-wide cost of about $1.1 billion.

The Navy has informed the committee that incinerator installation would significantly degrade operations through displacement of existing ship systems and addition of significant weight. Garbage compaction and retrograde would severely degrade operational capability through displacement of existing ship systems for processing and storage rooms, increased dependence on garbage collection ships, and further burden garbage reception facilities domestically and overseas.

The Navy has determined that full compliance with APPS through the use of other possible technologies, such as plasma arc pyrolysis and supercritical water oxidation, is not possible because such technologies have not yet been sufficiently developed for shipboard application. The Navy will continue to review these technologies for future applications.

According to the Navy, full compliance with MARPOL could be achieved through the use of pulpers and shredders in special areas, at a fleet-wide cost of about $300.0 million. Installation of pulpers and shredders would actually enhance operational capability by enabling shipboard discharge of pulped garbage during heavy weather and flight operations. At present, discharges of unprocessed garbage are currently prohibited for safety reasons during heavy weather and flight operations. The Navy's use of pulpers and shredders worldwide, regardless of area designation, would minimize shipboard waste washup on beaches. Moreover, studies commissioned by the Navy indicate that pulper and shredder discharges would have no adverse environmental impacts.

The administration has requested legislation that would amend section 1902© of the APPS to allow for the use of pulpers and shredders to dispose of non-plastic and non-floating solid waste within MARPOL Annex V special use areas. The adoption of the pulper and shredder technology would ensure environmental protection, shipboard quality of life, operational capability, and affordability. Although the pulper and shredder approach is entirely consistent with the obligations of the United States under international law, such discharges are not permitted under the APPS.

The Navy must be prepared to carry out duties assigned by the President to protect the nation's interests around the world. Most of the designated special areas include locations of great strategic and economic interest. Navy missions in such areas often require that ships remain at sea for prolonged periods of time. Thus, the special area compliance plan must consider impacts on mission effectiveness and operational flexibility. The special area compliance plan must be compatible with warship design. Navy ships are designed to maximize mission performance, especially combat missions. Ships are self-contained units with severe limits on space, weight, and power requirements for onboard equipment.

In the committee's judgment, the administration's legislative proposal would preserve operational capability, shipboard quality of life, and the environment. The committee recommends a provision that would incorporate the administration's request.

Section 349. Cooperative agreements for the management of cultural resources on military installations.

The Sikes Act (Public Law 99–561) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to plan, develop, maintain, and coordinate wildlife conservation and rehabilitation efforts on Department of Defense (DOD) installations through the use of cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements are an essential instrument used to enter into partnerships with other Federal, State, and local governments, or other entities to share personnel and fiscal resources for the mutual benefit of all participating parties.

In the absence of specific statutory authority, the military departments have been reluctant to enter into such cooperative agreements for the management of cultural resources. The administration has submitted a legislative proposal that would resolve such concerns and would serve to enhance cultural resource stewardship on DOD lands. The committee recommends a provision that is consistent with the administration position. The proposal has no budgetary impact for the DOD.

Section 350. Report on withdrawal of public lands at El Centro Naval Air Facility, California.

The Navy requested a withdrawal of public lands at El Centro Naval Air Facility, California. The issue is addressed in the administration's legislative proposal. The committee has not had sufficient time to review the withdrawal request. The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress to address that concern.

Section 351. Use of hunting and fishing permit fees collected at closed military reservations.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 670(a) of title 16, United States Code, commonly known as the "Sikes Act", to authorize the transfer of fees collected on a closing military installation for hunting and fishing permits. The provision would allow the transfer of those fees collected at a closing installation to another open installation for the conservation purposes expressed in the Act.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361. Firefighting and security-guard functions at facilities leased by the Government.

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the current prohibition on contracting for firefighting and security-guard services. This provision would amend the current authority by making it clear that the Department of Defense may contract with non-federal employees for these services if they are to be carried out at a private facility at which a federal government activity is located pursuant to a lease of the facility to the Government.

The committee understands that the flexibility of the Department to efficiently manage small operations which are not collocated with other DOD operations is constrained by current law. This law forces the DOD to maintain excess and unnecessary in-house federal providers at locations where these services are al-

ready available through private or other public providers. Therefore, the committee has determined that in those situations where the Department has an operation located in a commercial facility, the Department can rely on private or local government providers of firefighting and security services.

Section 362. Authorized use of recruiting funds.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the expenditure of appropriated funds during a five year period to provide refreshments at recruiting functions for members of the Delayed Entry Program, other prospects, and community leaders. The provision requires an annual report on the amounts used for this purpose and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.

Section 363. Noncompetitive procurement of brand-name commercial items for resale in commissary stores.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of noncompetitive procedures to procure brand-name commercial items for resale in commissary stores unless the commercial item is available for sale outside commissary stores under the same brand-name.

Section 364. Administration of midshipmen's store and other Naval Academy support activities as nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the conversion of all midshipmen trust fund operations that support the Naval Academy and the Brigade of Midshipmen to nonappropriated fund status. The activities include: the Midshipmen's Store; the Naval Academy Dairy Farm; the Midshipmen Barber, Cobbler, and Tailor Shops; and the Naval Academy Laundry. The recommended provision will give the Naval Academy support activities the same status as those of the other service academies.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Superintendent of the Naval Academy to ensure the equitable and humanitarian treatment of the employees of these activities and any benefits which may have accrued to them as the activities are converted to nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.

Section 365. Assistance to committees involved in inauguration of the President.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2543 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to provide safety, security, and ceremonial assistance to the presidential inaugural committee. The Secretary would also be authorized to provide other assistance deemed appropriate but only if done on a reimbursable basis.

The committee expects that assistance provided by the Secretary of Defense to the presidential inaugural committee will be done only if such assistance is not readily available from commercial sources at a reasonable price. Furthermore, the committee expects that such assistance which is provided will not replace or duplicate support readily available from other government agencies.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report outlining those guidelines which the Secretary issues for support of inaugural activities. This report should be submitted no later than March 31 of the year preceding each Presidential inauguration.

Section 366. Department of Defense support for sporting events.

The committee is concerned with the increasing level of support which the Department of Defense has provided to civilian sporting events on a non-reimbursable basis. It is estimated that the Department will expend $50.0 million for support to the 1996 Summer Olympics and Paralympics.

While the committee understands the valuable security assistance that the Department can provide to state and local governments during special events which are expected to overwhelm the capabilities of these entities, the committee is concerned with the increasing share of a declining defense budget which these events absorb. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance for security and safety to civilian sporting events only after entering into an agreement with the entity responsible for organizing the event. This agreement should provide for reimbursement of costs incurred by the Department of Defense for such assistance. The reimbursement to be provided by the responsible entity shall include expenses incurred by the Department of Defense for support provided to local government organizations for event related essential security and safety services. However, the responsible entity shall not be required to pay any reimbursement to the Department of Defense in excess of the surplus funds available after all other event related expenses have been paid. The requirement for a reimbursement would not apply to the Special Olympics, Paralympics, or events for which funds have already been appropriated.

Section 367. Renovation of building for Defense Finance and Accounting Service Center, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

With the closure of Fort Benjamin Harrison, the Department transferred the Indianapolis Center of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, located in Building 1, to the General Services Administration. GSA intended to undertake a complete renovation of the building and move other government activities in the Indianapolis area into Building 1. Funding constraints have prevented GSA from programming the necessary resources.

On their current schedule, GSA will be unable to provide renovation funding for Building 1 until 1999, which effectively defers the start of renovation until the next century. Working with GSA, the Department has developed a concept for an accelerated renovation program utilizing DOD funds, which would be rebated by GSA through subsequent rent reductions. The committee supports this concept and has included a provision that would authorize DOD to transfer operating funds to GSA for purposes of renovating Building 1. The committee recommends an authorization of $9.0 million

in fiscal year 1997 to initiate the design phase of the renovation project.

Army

Army strategic mobility

The committee notes that strategic mobility is increasingly important to U.S. military forces. The committee is concerned that, although prepositioning is one of the top priorities of the U.S. Army, insufficient funds are provided by the 1997 budget for the transload of the prepositioned stocks from the interim Roll-On/Roll-Off (RO/RO) ships to the Large Medium Speed Roll-On/Roll-Off Ships (LMSR), deployment infrastructure repairs/upgrades, and deployment training.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $27.0 million to complete the transload of prepositioned stocks from six RO/ROs to four LMSRs.

Ammunition management

The committee is concerned that current budget constraints have forced the Army to reduce funding for the processing, issuing, and receiving of ammunition. The fiscal year 1997 budget provides only 53 percent of the requirement for these activities. The committee is concerned that the Army will be forced to shift funds from other accounts in order to fully fund the remaining requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million for the management of ammunition in order to provide sufficient funds for this program and ensure the protection of other high priority programs. The additional funding will allow the Army to fund some of its remaining high priority projects.

End Item Materiel Management Program

The committee is concerned that System Technical Support (STS) for all post-production major weapons systems is funded at 70 percent of critical requirements in fiscal year 1997. STS is the post-production sustainment phase of the integrated logistics support life-cycle of a weapon system. STS encompasses the engineering and design involved in configuration management; engineering change proposals; technical data packages which constitute a system's specification database; technical manuals; modification work orders; depot maintenance work requests; production improvements; testing; stockpile reliability; and logistics assistance and contractor field service representatives to the field soldier.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $40.0 million to fund requirements including: (1) Apache, contracts for design and modernizations, fatigue testing; (2) Kiowa, Force XXI planned improvements for Embedded Global Positioning Integration, Improved Computer Processing Units, and Improved Data Modem Standard Improvements ground to air communications; and (3) Abrams, testing of nuclear hardening components, software updates for test sets, live fire, and engine fire.

Power Projection C4I

The Power Projection C4 Infrastructure (PPC4I) is an initiative to upgrade the telecommunications infrastructure at Army installations to ensure it supports power projection and other operations. This initiative will synchronize the upgrades of existing infrastructure components to reduce the cost and disruption at military installations, and to prepare for the arrival of software programs whose data transmissions require enhanced communications capability.

The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for this important effort.

Navy

Intermediate maintenance

The committee is concerned with the level of intermediate maintenance that is unfunded in the fiscal year 1997 budget request. This maintenance is normally accomplished by Navy Intermediate Maintenance Activities (IMAs). IMAs perform those maintenance, repair, overhaul, installation, quality assurance, calibration, testing, and related functions on hull, mechanical, electrical, and combat equipment systems which are beyond the capability or capacity of ship personnel. The fiscal year 1997 budget funds only 85.7 percent of the requirement for ship and submarine maintenance.

The committee recommends an increase of $26.0 million to the Navy operation and maintenance accounts in order to ensure that required maintenance can be performed.

Ship depot maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing backlog in ship depot maintenance. The committee is aware that budget constraints in the fiscal year 1997 budget request have forced the Navy to delay the maintenance of two CG–47 class cruisers. The committee is concerned that the cost of this maintenance could increase if current problems go uncorrected for another year.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $52.0 million for ship depot maintenance in order to provide funding to the two CG–47 class cruiser overhauls now in backlog.

Active and reserve component P–3 squadrons

The services of P–3 squadrons have historically been in very high demand by the unified commanders. In recent years, that demand has increased dramatically as the ability of the P–3 aircraft to carry out littoral warfare missions has become more apparent. Simultaneously, however, budget pressures have forced the Navy to cut P–3 force structure in its budget request. The current maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) force structure consists of 22 squadrons composed of 13 active and 9 reserve squadrons (13/9). The budget request reflected the Navy's resource-constrained plans to reduce MPA force structure to 20 squadrons composed of 12 active and 8 reserve (12/8).

The committee believes MPA make an invaluable contribution to surveillance, antisurface, and antisubmarine warfare missions. The

committee also recognizes that MPA are ideally suited to a variety of littoral warfare missions.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $45.3 million above the budget request to sustain the MPA force structure at 13/9 in fiscal year 1997.

Marine Corps

Personnel support equipment

The committee recommends an increase of $35.7 million in the operation and maintenance accounts for the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve to purchase items of individual combat clothing and equipment. This will help provide Marines in the field with the clothing and equipment they need to survive and sustain themselves during combat operations.

Corrosion prevention and control

The naval environment in which the Marine Corps operates creates special problems in maintaining military equipment. Recently, the First Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) identified over 8,500 principal end items requiring maintenance because of the effects of corrosion. The current Marine Corps' funding level is based on the assumption that the fleet can conduct sufficient maintenance on all of its equipment. However, the reality is that this is not being accomplished because of OPTEMPO, personnel, equipment and vehicle non-availability and other additional resource requirements levied against the MEFs for contingency operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for the Corrosion Prevention and Control program managed by the Marine Corps Systems Command.

Ammunition rework

The ammunition rework line or maintenance program provides for hands-on maintenance and refurbishment of conventional ground ammunition stocks. This program provides for significant cost avoidance in new procurement by restoring items to a serviceable condition code for training and war reserve use. The average return on investment is approximately 22 to 1. In addition, maintenance lead times are usually far shorter than procurement.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to provide technical support for the renovation of designated items and restoration for full service use, ensuring continued safety and reliability of the ammunition stockpile.

Joint task force headquarters deployable communications support

The committee is concerned with the inadequate communications bandwidth necessary to support the Joint Task Force Headquarters while deployed to a theater of operation. Current military satellite communications (SATCOM) assets are not able to provide the data rates required by the new Marine Air-Ground Task Force C4I System.

The committee understands that there is a contract available to purchase a commercial SATCOM system capable of providing the

necessary bandwidth; however, there is insufficient funding for training and connectivity expenses. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to support training and connectivity expenses for the Commandant's Planning Guidance initiative for JTF Headquarters.

Commandant's warfighting laboratory

In October, 1995, the Commandant's Warfighting Laboratory was established at the Marine Corps Combat Development Command at Quantico, Virginia, and charged with implementing the "Sea Dragon" experimental process to develop enhanced operational concepts, tactics, techniques, procedures and doctrine. Unfortunately, funding was not provided in the President's budget request for fiscal year 1997 because that request was crafted prior to the creation of this center. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million to provide for travel, per diem, equipment maintenance, and other associated costs for Phase I and Phase II experiments of the Combat Development Command during fiscal year 1997.

Air Force

AWACS Extend Sentry

Extend Sentry is an aggressive sustainment approach to take the E–3 AWACS program into the 21st century by decreasing aborts and addressing reliability, maintainability and availability issues. The committee recommends an increase of $7.1 million in operations and maintenance funding in order to accelerate the Extend Sentry program in fiscal year 1997. This funding will enable the Air Force to replace highly corrosive magnesium parts and midspar supports, and to inspect and repair antenna pedestals and perform other important tasks.

Air Force depot maintenance

In fiscal year 1997, the backlog in Air Force depot maintenance will increase from approximately $248.0 million to $268.0 million. The committee is concerned with the continuing growth in the backlog of Air Force depot maintenance. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $41.2 million to Air Force depot maintenance to help reverse this trend.

Defense-Wide

Homeless support initiative

The budget request includes $3.5 million for the Homeless Support Initiative. The committee notes that section 2546 of title 10, United States Code, allows the service secretaries to provide assistance to homeless shelters so long as the assistance does not interfere with military preparedness or military requirements. The committee further notes that modernization programs, such as the Armored Gun System, have been canceled because of a lack of funds. Therefore, the committee believes that providing $3.5 million to this program qualifies as interference with military preparedness and military requirements.

While the committee is concerned with the health and welfare of the nation's homeless, the committee believes that supporting homeless shelters is outside the primary mission of the Department of Defense and would more appropriately be funded through those agencies with primary funding and policy responsibility for this issue. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $3.5 million.

Federal Energy Management Program

The budget request included $116.8 million for the Federal Energy Management Program. This represents a growth of $86.8 million from the fiscal year 1996 level of spending for this program. While the committee believes in the importance of conserving energy at the nation's military facilities, it does not believe that energy conservation activities needs to be directed from a central organization when base commanders are in the best position to identify the most important needs of each facility. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has transferred responsibility for this program to the military services without providing the services with additional operations and maintenance funding.

Therefore, the committee authorizes $20.0 million for the Federal Energy Management Program and transfers the remaining funds to the services real property maintenance accounts.

Office of the Secretary of Defense

The committee is concerned that funding for the Office of the Secretary of Defense is absorbing too large a portion of the Defense budget. This imbalance in the "tooth-to-tail" ratio is resulting in a military establishment that has a decreasing warfighting capability relative to its increasing bureaucracy. The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed that the Office of the Secretary be reduced by 25 percent over a five year period, or 5 percent a year. However, once again, as the total defense budget has declined by 6 percent from its 1996 level of spending, the budget for this office has increased.

The committee has reduced the authorization for the Office of the Secretary of Defense by $20.4 million or 6 percent from its fiscal year 1996 authorization.

Civilian personnel levels

The committee notes that the Department of Defense civilian personnel drawdown continues faster than expected. During the past several years, civilian personnel levels in the Department of Defense have been reduced faster than anticipated when the budgets for each succeeding fiscal year were drafted. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this drawdown means lower-than-budgeted civilian personnel levels, resulting in savings of approximately $430.0 million during fiscal year 1997. The committee has made the appropriate adjustments in the fiscal year 1997 budget to reflect these savings.

Real property maintenance

The committee is concerned with the continuing growth in the backlog of real property maintenance (RPM) throughout the De-

partment of Defense. If this necessary maintenance continues to go unfunded, the Department will be faced with even larger costs to repair damages caused by inclement weather and other environmental conditions. Therefore, the committee authorizes increases to the services operations and maintenance accounts for real property maintenance, in the following amounts:

	(Millions)
Army	$32.5
Navy	36.1
Air Force	33.9
Marine Corps	15.0
Army Reserve	10.0
Air Force Reserve	5.0
Army National Guard	10.0

In relation to the total amount of increases, $96.8 million is the result of a transfer of funds from the Federal Energy Management Program. In using these funds, the military services are encouraged to give special consideration to maintenance projects which will reduce the consumption of energy.

In addition, the committee is concerned about reports that Guard and Reserve forces must often draw on RPM funds in order to pay for unfunded contingency operations. The Secretary of Defense is encouraged to prevent these practices from decreasing the amount of RPM funds available for important maintenance projects.

Operation and maintenance, Special Operations Command

The committee recommends an increase of $15.3 million to the operation and maintenance account of the Special Operations Command in order to fund the following: flying hours program ($3.4 million); depot-level repairables, parts and supplies ($2.0 million); aircrew training system ($3.4 million); SCAMPI communications support ($2.5 million); steaming hour program for patrol coastal craft ($2.0 million); and counter-proliferation equipment ($2.0 million).

Other Items of Interest

United States Army marksmanship units

The committee understands that the Department of the Army has the unique opportunity to purchase an electronic target system for half of its value. This system electronically scores each shot fired at a specific target. It provides immediate scoring feedback to shooters. If the Army were to acquire this system for use at U.S. Army Marksmanship Unit (USAMU) ranges, it would be a major enhancement to the competitive shooting program of the Total Army. Furthermore, acquisition of this system would save the Army over $175,000 of annual travel expenses.

The committee believes that this system would enhance the Army's marksmanship program. The committee urges the Secretary of the Army to consider using available funds to purchase this system.

Quality of Life and the Military Traffic Management Command's Re-engineering Personal Property Initiative Pilot Program

The committee is concerned about the quality of service provided by some moving and storage companies when moving the personal property of military families undergoing Permanent Change of Station (PCS) moves. The committee has become increasingly concerned by the number of instances in which household goods are damaged by movers and by those who provide storage services for in-transit household goods.

The day-to-day requirements of military service are sufficiently taxing on service members and their families that they should not have to worry about damage to their personal property. Change of station moves, though necessary, are inherently disruptive to family life. To tolerate, and pay for, a system that provides a level of service to military families that would be unacceptable to civilian families is incompatible with the emphasis placed on improving the military Quality of Life by the Secretary of Defense and the Congress. Service members and their families who comply with PCS orders should have confidence that their household goods will arrive in the correct location, on time, and in the conditions in which they were when the move originated. The committee does not believe that such is now the case.

At the same time, however, the committee is concerned that the Military Traffic Management Command's Re-engineering Personal Property Initiative Pilot Program will not adequately address the concerns of the small moving companies which make up much of this industry. The committee understands that the Department needs to proceed with this initiative; however, the committee believes that it is important to address the concerns of the small businesses which will be providing moving services to military personnel.

Regarding the quality of service provided to military personnel, the committee directs the Department of Defense to conduct, or include as part of any ongoing review, an analysis of the following:

(1) damage rates for military moves vis-a-vis industry norms and the extent to which claims for lost or damaged household goods reflect differences among moving and/or storage companies based on geography, company size, distance of moves, or other identifiable categories;

(2) the methods used by the Department of Defense to ensure moving and/or storage companies exercise sufficient care and genuine concern for the property entrusted to them;

(3) the processes used to reimburse service members for lost or missing household goods in terms of equity, timeliness, and administrative burden; and

(4) the responsibility of moving and/or storage companies for payment for lost or damaged household goods, including a comparison of Department of Defense's procedures to industry norms and any recommended changes in the procedures of the Department of Defense.

These matters are to be included in a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 1997. The report should include recommendations for enhancing the quality of moving and storage

service, including changes in contractor liability, monetary sanctions for unacceptable performance, and improved systems to monitor contractor performance.

Regarding the effect of the Military Traffic Management Command's Re-engineering Personal Property Initiative Pilot Program on small moving companies, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a working group of military and industry representatives to develop an alternative pilot program and submit the program to the congressional defense committees by July 15, 1996 for review. The committee notes that the Department of Defense does not intend to implement its current pilot program until August 1996. The committee urges the Department to maintain its planned implementation schedule which will allow the working group of military and industry representatives to provide the Congress with any alternative plans that they develop.

The committee further directs that the working group shall review any pilot program as it proceeds and recommend solutions to problems that might emerge. Further, the committee directs the General Accounting Office to review the pilot program and any alternative approaches that industry or others may provide, and report to the congressional defense committees the results of its analysis by March 31, 1998. The committee directs the Department to refrain from expansion of the pilot program until 30 days after the submission of the General Accounting Office report.

Aquifer study at Fallon Naval Air Station

The recent drought conditions in and around Fallon Naval Air Station have fractured the aquifer which is the primary source of water for that area. This has caused a drop in water levels and has resulted in increased concentration of heavy metals such as arsenic in the water. The committee encourages the Navy to undertake a study of this situation, in partnership with the relevant state and local governmental entities, to examine the severity of this problem and to recommend alternative courses of action.

Exclusion of uncontaminated parcels from the national priorities list

Sections 120(d) and 120(h)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Recovery Act (CERCLA) of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620) do not specifically distinguish between contaminated and uncontaminated parcels identified at Federal facilities on the National Priorities List (NPL) for purposes of determining whether listing of the entire facility is appropriate. The current law has been implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in a manner that effectively results in a fence-to-fence listing of a federal facility on the NPL without any consideration of the uncontaminated parcels identified within its boundaries. The impact of that interpretation has been to discourage transfer of clean parcels at facilities designated for closure.

The committee is very concerned about the manner in which sections 120(d) and 120(h)(4) have been implemented by the EPA. There should be no need for a statutory solution. The committee expects the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the EPA to work together to resolve this issue in a manner that

will allow uncontaminated parcels to be excluded from NPL listing of federal facilities. That exclusion will facilitate the transfer of uncontaminated portions of closing installations by avoiding the stigma of NPL listing.

Kaho'olawe cleanup

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1994 directed the conveyance of approximately 28,000 acres encompassing Kaho'olawe Island and surrounding waters to the State of Hawaii. The provision authorized to be appropriated up to $400.0 million, available until obligated, for a trust fund that was established to facilitate the environmental remediation of unexploded ordinance on the island. Based on that provision, the State of Hawaii is entitled to 11 percent of any trust fund appropriations.

In fiscal year 1994, $60.0 million was appropriated to the Navy for initiation of evaluation and remediation activities at Kaho'olawe Island. Since the enactment of the original legislation, $75.0 million of unauthorized and unrequested funds have been appropriated to the trust fund: fiscal year 1995, $50.0 million, the State's 11 percent share ($5.5 million); fiscal year 1996, $25.0 million, the State's 11 percent share ($2.7 million). About $27.0 million of the money in the Kaho'olawe trust fund has been obligated and about $14.0 million of the money appropriated directly to the Navy has been obligated, resulting in a total of $93.4 million remaining unobligated funds. The Navy proposes to expend $10.8 million in the remaining months of fiscal year 1996 and to expend $39.0 million in fiscal year 1997. The Department of Defense's fiscal year 1997 budget request includes an additional $10.0 million for the Kaho'olawe trust fund.

The committee is concerned about the unobligated and unexpended balances related to the Kaho'olawe cleanup. As a result, the committee has declined to authorize the fiscal year 1997 request for additional cleanup funds.

Proposed reduction of the current permissible exposure level for manganese

The committee directs the Department of Defense (DOD) to open a dialogue with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and to participate fully in any proposed rulemaking to reduce the current permissible exposure limits (PEL) for manganese, per the procedures promulgated in the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. During the rulemaking process, the DOD shall provide to OSHA any existing manganese studies available within the military departments, describe current worker exposure and protective measures employed, and work with OSHA to avoid unnecessary costs or mandates. The committee further directs the DOD to open a dialogue with industry representatives of the Ferroalloys Association Manganese Subcommittee to ascertain how industry can help to determine the cost of compliance for DOD, should a lower PEL be adopted.

Although the PEL for manganese has not changed, the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists has recommended a reduction of the threshold limit value for all forms of airborne manganese. The Ferroalloys Association has indicated

that the lowering of the standard for manganese exposure will impose additional regulatory burdens on producers and users of manganese materials, ultimately resulting in a significant cost to taxpayers.

DOD is one of the world's largest recipients of manganese products. The committee understands that the impact of inadequately protecting DOD workers from the health hazards associated with airborne manganese could result in illness to workers and a significant cost to the taxpayers. The committee also understands that the cost of compliance with a stricter standard could have additional budgetary implications of a similar magnitude. Based on these concerns, the committee has determined that it is appropriate for the DOD and OSHA to engage in a dialogue.

Defense Commissary Agency designation as a Performance Based Organization

The committee is aware that the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) was nominated by the Department of Defense and accepted by the Administration to be converted to a Performance Based Organization. The committee was not advised of this action until the decision was made. The information available to the committee relating to the detailed impacts and effects on DeCA and the commissary benefit is very limited.

The committee strongly supports the commissary benefit and will continue to take the actions necessary to ensure the benefit is maintained. To the extent that DeCA's conversion to a Performance Based Organization will increase the effectiveness of the agency and will reduce the level of appropriated fund support without degrading the benefit, the committee would support the initiative. Should conversion to a Performance Based Organization begin to erode the benefit, reduce services, increase the commissaries vulnerability to pressures to privatize commissaries, consolidate the commissaries with the exchanges, or change stockage lists so as to directly compete with the exchange systems, the committee expects the Department to seek the concurrence of the oversight committees.

The committee expects that the Department of Defense and DeCA will maintain a continuously open line of communication as the initiative evolves from concept to reality. The committee believes that certain legislative authorities will be necessary to fully implement such a Performance Based Organization. Any request for legislative changes from the Department of Defense will be carefully considered.

Electronic warfare squadrons

As the Navy reviews its overseas basing of forces, it appears that there are opportunities to reduce costs and maintain operational effectiveness by moving an electronic warfare (VQ) squadron, currently based in Rota, Spain, to Naval Air Station Brunswick. The committee requests that the Navy review this proposal and provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 1997 on the feasibility and cost effectiveness of such action.

Revolving Funds

Reliability, Maintainability and Sustainability Program (RM&S)

The committee is concerned with the viability of the Reliability, Maintainability and Sustainability Program (RM&S) and the centralization of this program above the service level.

Sufficient information has not been provided to demonstrate: the ability of the Defense Business Operating Fund (DBOF) to track operating and support costs for an individual weapon system adequately; benefits that would be generated from this program; or reduced costs of operating a selected system. The committee feels a decentralized RM&S program at the service level would be more beneficial. Therefore, the committee has redistributed the increases to the Defense Logistics Agency for this program to the services operation and maintenance accounts, in the amount of $20.0 million to each service, and expects to be kept apprised of the progress made in the development of this new program.

Advance billing in Defense Business Operating Fund

The committee has been assured in the past that the Department of Defense would use advance billing practices only in extreme situations to maintain the solvency of the fund. The committee has previously been notified that the practice of advance billing and the backlog of advance billing orders would be discontinued not later than fiscal year 1995. Subsequently, the date for the elimination of the backlog orders has been adjusted to fiscal year 1996 and now fiscal year 1997.

The committee is specifically concerned about the Navy's resolve to eliminate advance billing, and is disturbed to find the Navy's failure to eliminate the advance billing backlog of orders. The committee notes that the practice is being used to compensate for poor rate management. The committee considers this a serious readiness distractor, and will eliminate this option in the future, if advance billing continues unconstrained.

National defense features

The budget request contained no funding in the national defense sealift fund (NDSF) for the national defense features (NDF) program.

Last year, Congress provided $50.0 million to initiate an NDF program. In response to this initiative, the Navy, the Maritime Administration, and the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers hosted a commercial ship for military use conference in March 1996. This conference generated broad industry response and comment that the Navy can use when it soon begins a bid solicitation process that could lead to a contract award by the end of 1996. While exact details of the program must still be worked out, the contract award process is specifically designed to resolve them. It would appear clear that the nation's maritime industry is very interested in an NDF program that will install defense features on vessels that would be built in and documented under the laws of the United States. Such a program would have the potential to revive construction of commercial ships in the nation's largest ship-

yards, which have become almost wholly dependent on Navy production, and provide an active ready reserve force, available in time of national emergency, in a cost-effective manner.

Section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 stipulated that, of the amounts appropriated in the NDSF for fiscal year 1996, $50.0 million would be available for use by the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for advanced submarine technology. When queried about his intentions for the use of these funds, at a hearing held by the committee's subcommittee for acquisition and technology this year, the Director of DARPA clearly indicated that he had no real enthusiasm for pursuing an advanced submarine technology initiative at this time.

Based on progress to date in the establishment of a definitive NDF program and the Director of DARPA's lack of interest in pursuing a submarine technology program with the $50.0 million appropriated in the NDSF in fiscal year 1996, the committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The committee's recommendation for advanced submarine technology, discussed elsewhere in this report, would fund the Navy's advanced submarine technology program at a robust level through the use of fiscal year 1997 funds. Consequently, the committee directs that the $50.0 million that would become available in the NDSF, if the committee's recommended provision is adopted, be used for additional funding of the NDF program. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a separate line item in the NDSF budget request for the NDF program. The committee views the NDF program as a matter of special interest and directs that the Secretary not transfer any funds out of the NDF line item without prior notification to the congressional defense committees.

National defense reserve fleet

The budget request contained $90.0 million in the national defense sealift fund (NDSF) for the procurement and modification of additional ships for the ready reserve force (RRF) component of the national defense reserve fleet (NDRF). In testimony and briefings before the committee, the nation's commanders-in-chief have consistently reiterated that they consider robust surge sealift an essential element of their ability to adequately respond to a major regional conflict. They have stated that:

(1) a fiscal year 1996 Joint Staff exercise, Nimble Dancer, revealed that the margin of safety in distributing planned sealift in response to two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts, the planning assumption for the Department of Defense's Bottom-Up Review, will be razor thin at best;

(2) today we have only about 65 percent of the 10.0 million square feet of surge sealift in hand;

(3) the large medium speed roll-on/roll-off (LMSR) acquisition program, under which the Navy intends to acquire 19 new or converted strategic sealift ships, has been funded by Congress but has experienced delays and is now about two years behind initial completion estimates;

(4) prohibitions imposed by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 will prevent the Department of Defense from buying five existing roll-on/roll-off (RO/RO) ships, totaling about 750,000 square feet, from the world market for about one-third the cost of providing an equivalent capability through new construction;

(5) when the life cycle costs of acquiring, operating, and maintaining the 750,000 square feet capacity represented by the five RO/ROs that the Department wants to buy are compared to those for an equivalent new construction capacity, the advantage remains with the five RO/RO option by a factor of about two to one;

(6) if congressional limitations were lifted, the Department could cost effectively acquire these five ships in approximately one year, partially resolving what the commanders-in-chief consider a serious shortfall in surge sealift;

(7) no alternative program, including the national defense features (NDF) program that this committee has supported in the past and continues to support, is apparent that could acquire 750,000 square feet of surge sealift capacity in a manner that is comparable in either cost effectiveness or timeliness; and

(8) the NDF program appears to be an attractive program for stimulating domestic construction of sustaining sealift in a cost effective manner.

As a consequence of the information provided by the commanders-in-chief, the committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) a provision that would lift the current congressionally imposed restriction on the cost effective procurement of five RO/ROs from the world market for introduction into the RRF component of the NDRF; and

(2) an increase of $60.0 million above the budget request of $90.0 million in the NDSF for the acquisition and modification of two additional RO/ROs for the RRF.

The committee's recommended provision would only authorize acquisition of the five RO/RO ships needed to satisfy the procurement objectives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's Mobility Requirements Study. Beyond these five ships, the existing limitation on procurement of ships from the world market would remain intact as a matter for future consideration, when the time to recapitalize the NDRF arrives. The committee also directs that none of the this total NDSF authorization of $150.0 million may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has certified in writing to the congressional defense committees that funds authorized elsewhere in this report for the NDF program have been made available for expenditure for the NDF program.

Maritime training ship

The budget request for the national defense sealift fund (NDSF) contained no funding for the repair and refurbishment of the United States Naval Ship (U.S.N.S.) *Tanner* prior to her redesignation as a maritime training ship.

The committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in the NDSF to complete necessary repair and refurbishment of U.S.N.S. *Tanner* prior to its redesignation as a maritime training ship.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

The Congress, exercising its military manpower oversight responsibilities, authorizes the end strength of the active and reserve forces annually. This year the Subcommittee on Personnel held hearings to examine the force structure plans of the Department of Defense and the military services. Based on those hearings, the administration's budget request and other information, the committee recommended end strength ceilings for the active and reserve forces, including active component support for the reserves. Additionally, the committee adjusted the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (DOPMA) grade tables and began a process to address the appropriate numbers of general and flag officers.

Section 401. End strengths for active forces.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active duty end strengths for fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	1996 authorization	1997 request	1997 recommendation
Army:			
Total	495,000	495,000	495,000
Officer	81,300	.....	80,300
Navy:			
Total	428,340	406,900	407,318
Officer	5,870	.....	56,165
Marine Corps:			
Total	174,000	174,000	174,000
Officer	17,978	.....	17,978
Air Force:			
Total	388,200	381,100	381,222
Officer	75,928	.....	74,445

The active component authorization for the Navy includes an increase of 418, of which 65 would be officers, to permit the Navy to retain an active P–3 squadron. The committee recommends the Military Personnel, Navy, appropriation be increased by $18.6 million and the Operation and Maintenance, Navy, appropriation by $13.1 million above the budget request in Fiscal Year 1997 to accommodate this increase.

The active duty Air Force authorization includes an increase of 122 enlisted personnel to permit the Air Force to retain 28 B–52 aircraft in the force. The committee recommends the Military Personnel, Air Force, appropriation be increased by $4.4 million above the request in Fiscal Year 1997 to accommodate this increase.

Section 402. Temporary flexibility relating to permanent end strength levels.

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the flexibility afforded the military services to manage their active duty end strengths from 0.5 percent to 5.0 percent. The committee has found that the one-half percent flexibility is insufficient to prevent the services from taking short-term management actions that may adversely affect service members, solely to meet the assigned end strengths at the end of the fiscal year.

Section 403. Authorized strengths for commissioned officers in grades O–4, O–5, and O–6.

The committee recommends a provision that would permanently increase the grade ceilings of active duty Army, Air Force and Marine Corps majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels, and active duty Navy lieutenant commanders, commanders and captains relative to the total number of commissioned officers on active duty. The recommended provision supersedes the necessity for the temporary grade increases authorized during the past several years.

The committee notes that this change to the grade ceilings is intended to assist the services meet the increased field grade requirements resulting from the continued implementation of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986. Additionally, the committee believes that the increased grade ceilings should permit all services to cease or greatly reduce the practice of frocking to circumvent the statutory grade ceilings. In that light, the committee recognizes that the increased grade ceilings will reduce—at least in the near term—promotion flow points. The committee hopes that the services will take this opportunity to realign the number of officers selected for promotion in a particular year with the number of officers that can be expected to be promoted—not frocked—during that year and, thereby, reduce the length of time officers spend on promotion lists before appointment.

The committee also notes that, historically, many speciality corps officers in the military services, such as the Nurse Corps, may not have had sufficient field grade authorizations to meet requirements in those specialities. The committee expects that the military services having speciality corps will allocate the permanent grade relief provided in this provision among line and speciality corps in an equitable, requirement-based manner. The committee believes that a result of such an allocation will be more consistent promotion opportunities among line and speciality corps officers.

Section 404. Extension of requirement for recommendations regarding appointments to joint 4-star officer positions.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the exemption of combatant commanders (CINCs), the Deputy Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. European Command (DCINCEUR), and the Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Forces, Korea from the ceiling for grades above major general or rear admiral for three years from September 30, 1997 to September 30, 2000. The test directed by the Senate Report 103–282 to break the traditional patterns for filling CINC positions will continue during the period of the recommended extension.

Section 405. Increase in authorized number of general officers on active duty in the Marine Corps.

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the number of active duty general officers in the Marine Corps by 12, from 68 to 80. This increase is intended to permit the Marine Corps to have greater representation at the general officer level on the Department of the Navy/Secretariat staff and in the joint arena. As a general rule, the committee is reluctant to act on independent service requests of this nature, preferring to receive comprehensive proposals that address the needs of all services. The committee's action in this instance is based on compelling justification provided by the Marine Corps and on the inability of the Department of Defense to provide a more comprehensive recommendation in a timely manner. The committee does not believe that the Marine Corps should be disadvantaged by this delay.

The committee is aware that the Office of the Secretary of Defense is developing a comprehensive proposal to address general and flag authorizations in the Army, Navy, Air Force and the joint arena. The committee staff has been briefed on a portion of this proposal. The committee encourages the Office of the Secretary of Defense to complete this action in time for it to be considered prior to mark-up of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1998. The committee expects that during development of any comprehensive general and flag officer proposal the Secretary of Defense would include an assessment of the appropriate grade for the Chief of the Nurse Corps in the Army and the Air Force and, if appropriate, a recommendation for legislation to provide for appointment of officers holding these positions to that grade.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize selective reserve end strength levels for fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	1996 Authorization	1997 Request	1997 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	373,000	366,758	366,758
The Army Reserve	230,000	214,925	214,925
The Naval Reserve	98,894	95,941	96,304
The Marine Corps Reserve	42,274	42,000	42,000
The Air National Guard of the United States	112,707	108,018	108,594
The Air Force Reserve	73,969	73,281	73,281
The Coast Guard Reserve	8,000	8,000	8,000

The recommended increase in the Naval Reserve end strength reflects the committee's belief that one reserve component P–3 squadron be retained in the force. The increase of 363 in the selected reserve, combined with a recommended increase of 97 in full-time support would permit the Navy to retain one reserve P–3 squadron. The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Navy, appropriation by $6.6 million and the Operation and Mainte-

nance, Navy Reserve, appropriation by $7.1 million to accommodate this increase.

The committee recommends an increase in the Air National Guard end strength of 576 and 249 in full-time support strength. These increases will permit the Air National Guard to have the manpower necessary to maintain the number of general purpose fighter aircraft at 15 in each unit. The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Air National Guard, appropriation by $8.5 million and Operations and Maintenance, Air National Guard, by $38.0 million to accommodate this increase.

The committee recommends increasing the Reserve Personnel, Air Force Reserve, appropriation by $2.6 million to support a recommended increase in the full-time support strength of the Air Force Reserve by 30.

Section 412. End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strength levels for fiscal year 1997 as shown below:

	Fiscal Year		
	1996 Authorization	1997 Request	1997 Recommendation
The Army National Guard of the United States	23,390	22,798	22,798
The Army Reserve	11,575	11,475	11,475
The Naval Reserve	17,587	16,506	16,603
The Marine Corps Reserve	2,559	2,559	2,559
The Air National Guard of the United States	10,066	10,129	10,378
The Air Force Reserve	628	625	655

The committee recommends an increase of 97 in full-time support strength for the Naval Reserve to support retention of one reserve P–3 squadron.

The committee recommends an increase of 249 in full-time support strength that would permit the Air National Guard to maintain the number of general purpose fighter aircraft at 15 in each unit.

The committee recommends an increase of 30 in the full-time support strength of the Air Force Reserve to assist the Air Force Reserve in maintaining readiness while continuing to assist in reducing the OPTEMPO of the active Air Force.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421. Authorization of appropriations for military personnel.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $69,878,600,000 to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel.

This authorization reflects an increase of $95,600,000 above the budget request. The increase results from the following recommendations:

Maintain one active P–3 Squadron	+18.6
Maintain one reserve P–3 Squadron	+6.6

Increase to Military Personnel, Army to fund special duty assignment pay for Army Special Operations Forces	+6.4
Maintain force structure to support 28 B–52s	+4.4
Increase BAQ (3.0% to 4.0%)	+37.0
Authorized dentist special duty assignment pay	+7.6
Increased Full Time Support for AF Reserve	+3.0
Increased Air National Guard end strength and Full Time Support required to maintain 15 PAA aircraft per squadron	+12.0

The committee has fully funded each of the provisions in which the committee's recommendation was different from the budget request. The committee included several pay and compensation provisions requested by the administration. The committee discovered that the budget request funded these provisions using an unworkable budget process. In order not to under fund the military personnel accounts, the committee recommends an undistributed reduction to the permanent change of station account of $24.1 million. If the Department of Defense finds sufficient resources to fund the pay and compensation provisions, the committee would consider a reprogramming request to restore the permanent change of station account to the requested level.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

The committee addressed a number of military personnel policy issues as a result of information received during hearings conducted by the full committee and the Subcommittee on Personnel. The committee authorized the military services to reenlist military personnel with at least 10 years of service for an indefinite period and limited the number of retired officers that may be recalled to active duty in peacetime. In other policy initiatives, the committee addressed issues pertaining to the reserve components, Reserve Officers Training Corps and Service Academies.

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501. Extension of authority for temporary promotions for certain Navy lieutenants with critical skills.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for the Navy to promote temporarily, lieutenants without Senate confirmation, in certain positions from September 30, 1996 until September 30, 1997.

Section 502. Exception to baccalaureate degree requirement for appointment in the Naval Reserve in grades above O–2.

The committee recommends a provision that would provide members of the Naval Reserve participating in the Seaman to Admiral program an exception to the requirement for reserve officers to hold a baccalaureate degree in order to be promoted above the grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

Section 503. Time for award of degrees by unaccredited educational institutions for graduates to be considered educationally qualified for appointment as reserve officers in grade O–3.

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the number of years that the Department of Defense could recognize a baccalaureate degree awarded by qualifying educational institution from three years to eight years. This change will enable reserve officers with degrees from unaccredited institutions to remain in the reserves for the entire period of time that he or she remains eligible for promotion to grade O–3.

Section 504. Chief Warrant Officer promotions.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit below the zone selection for promotion to Chief Warrant Officer, W–3, and would reduce the time-in-grade requirement for warrant officer promotion from three years to two years.

Section 505. Frequency of periodic report on promotion rates of officers currently or formerly serving in joint duty assignments.

The committee recommends a provision that would change the requirement that the Secretary of Defense report to Congress every six months on the promotion rates of officers currently or formerly serving in joint duty assignments. Normally, promotion boards are convened only once each year. The recommended provision would change the reporting requirement from every six months to every twelve months.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO RESERVE COMPONENTS

Section 511. Clarification of definition of active status.

The committee recommends a provision that would expand the definition of the term "active status" in section 101(d)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to include both officers and enlisted members of the reserve components and make the definition consistent with other references in title 10, United States Code.

Section 512. Amendments to Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act provisions.

The committee recommends a provision that would make several amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act.

The first amendment would eliminate the three year time-in-grade requirement to retire in the highest grade for Adjutants General and Assistant Adjutants General when they are required to vacate the position before serving three years. The provision would provide discretionary authority to a service secretary to credit time served in a position that requires a higher grade for which the incumbent has been selected for promotion, but has not yet been appointed.

The second amendment would make a technical correction to permit the services not to retain reserve officers found not qualified for promotion to first lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade).

The third amendment would make a technical amendment to ensure that Adjutants General of both the Army and Air Force are treated similarly.

Section 513. Repeal of requirement for physical examinations of members of National Guard called into federal service.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement that each member of the National Guard receive a physical examination when called into and again when mustered out of federal service. In view of other statutory and regulatory requirements for periodic medical examinations, the existing requirement is unnecessary.

Section 514. Authority for a Reserve on active duty to waive retirement sanctuary.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit a reservist serving on active duty for less than 180 days to waive the

applicability of the retirement sanctuary. The purpose of the waiver is to permit a reservist who, by virtue of his or her years of service, may qualify for the retirement sanctuary to serve on active duty for a period of less than 180 days, if he or she waives the retirement sanctuary.

Section 515. Retirement of Reserves disabled by injury or disease incurred or aggravated during overnight stay between inactive duty training periods.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize disability retirement for a member of the selected reserves who becomes disabled due to injury or disease which was incurred during the period between successive drill periods. Previous legislation provided similar authority for a disability that occurs during travel to and from reserve drills. The recommended provision covers the only remaining period in which a reservist might suffer a disabling injury or disease while attending inactive-duty training.

Section 516. Reserve credit for participation in the Health Professions Scholarship and Financial Assistance Program.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize service secretaries to award service credit toward non-regular retirement for certain members of the reserve forces who participated in the Health Professions Scholarship Program or the Financial Assistance Program and who completed the course of study, completed the active duty obligation, and are in a speciality designated by the secretary as critically needed in wartime.

Section 517. Report on guard and reserve force structure.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to study and report on the current and projected force structure of the National Guard and other reserve components not later than March 1, 1997. The committee received testimony that the reserve components may be retaining force structure in excess to war fighting requirements.

The committee expects the report to include information at the unit level and their planned role in a conflict situation. Specifically, if the study finds force structure in excess to the war fighting requirement, all units of the type that is excess to the needs must be identified, including any recommendations to eliminate the excess structure.

SUBTITLE C—OFFICER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Section 521. Increased age limit on appointment as a cadet or midshipman in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the service academies.

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum age for entrance into the service academies from 22 to 23, and for commissioning of those who participate in a Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarship program from 25 to 27.

Section 522. Demonstration project for instruction and support of Army ROTC units by members of the Army Reserve and National Guard.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to conduct a demonstration program in order to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing instruction and support to units of the Reserve Officers Training Corps using members of the Army Reserve, including the Individual Ready Reserve, and the Army National Guard. The committee recognizes that the reserve components may be able to provide innovative and non-traditional support to the ROTC program, such as the one attempted at the Community College of Southern Nevada. This demonstration project would provide the framework on which such a program can be developed and evaluated.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 531. Retirement at grade to which selected for promotion when a physical disability is found at any physical examination.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit disability retirements for service members at the grade to which they would have been promoted had it not been for an intervening physical disability.

Section 532. Limitations on recall of retired members to active duty.

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the number of retired officers who may be recalled to active duty. The recommended provision would: limit the number of officers who may be recalled to active duty to 25 per service at any one time; prohibit the recall of officers who retired as a result of an early retirement board or who retired after being notified that he or she was to be considered by an early retirement board; and limit the tenure of a recall to 12 months. Chaplains, health care professionals and officers assigned to the American Battle Monuments Commission are excepted from these limits.

The committee believes that the statute was intended to permit the services to fill billets for chaplains, health care professionals, and those assigned to the American Battle Monuments Commission with qualified retired officers. The authority was not intended to retain officers who were selected for early retirement or who retired to avoid such a selection. The committee believes that the authority provided under section 688 of title 10, United States Code, was being used for purposes other that those intended by the original legislation. The recommended changes are intended to more strictly define the authority to recall retired officers during peacetime.

Section 533. Disability coverage for officers granted excess leave for educational purposes.

The committee recommends a provision that would provide disability coverage for officers who are on excess leave while participating in a educational program. Currently, the only officers af-

fected by the recommended provision would be Marine Corps officers who are granted excess leave to participate in an educational program leading to designation as a judge advocate.

Section 534. Uniform policy regarding retention of members who are permanently nonworldwide assignable.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations and directives establishing uniform policies and procedures regarding the retention of members of the armed forces who are permanently nonworldwide assignable for medical reasons. The committee intends that all categories of medical reasons that result in a service member being classified as nondeployable be treated identically with regard to retention on active duty without regard to service or military department.

Section 535. Authority to extend period for enlistment in regular component under the delayed entry program.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize extension in the Delayed Entry Program (DEP) for meritorious cases as determined by the secretary of the military department to accommodate extraordinary circumstances when a delay beyond the 365-day limit is in the best interests of the military department concerned.

The secretaries of the military departments are directed to provide to the Congress a report on December 1, 1998, and 1999 that describes the exceptions authorized during the previous fiscal year.

Section 536. Career service reenlistments for members with at least 10 years of service.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments, on a discretionary basis, to accept reenlistments for an indefinite period from enlisted members with at least 10 years of service. The committee recognizes that some services may want to retain the current fixed-term enlistment system. Specifically, the committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to permit the Navy and the Marine Corps to pursue either policy independent of the other service's choice.

Section 537. Revisions to missing persons authorities.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal certain provisions in the Missing Persons Act in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The recommended provision would: remove Department of Defense civilian employees and contractor personnel from the coverage; increase the time limit for the first line commander to submit a missing persons report from 48 hours to 10 days; remove the requirement that the theater commander participate in the missing persons report; repeal the requirement that a counsel be appointed for the missing person; amend the conditions under which subsequent reviews are conducted to give the service secretary total discretion to determine when a subsequent review will be conducted; remove the criminal penalties for wrongful withholding of information; reduce the information required to be submitted for a board to make a rec-

ommendation of death; repeal the right of judicial review; and repeal the mandatory review of Korean War and special interest cases.

The committee retained the pre-enactment review of cold war and Indochina missing in action cases. The committee intends that this apply only to those unaccounted for military personnel whose original status was prisoner of war or missing in action and not those cases classified as killed-in-action/body-not-recovered (KIA/BNR).

Section 538. Inapplicability of Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to the period of limitations for filing claims for corrections of military records.

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the period of limitations for the filing of a request for relief before the Boards for Correction of Military Records. Under section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, a request must be filed within three years after discovery of the alleged error or injustice. The Boards have the authority to waive the three year period "in the interest of justice."

A recent court decision, *Detweiler* v. *Pena,* 38 F.3d 591 (D.C. Cir. 1994), held that the three year statute of limitations does not apply to persons within military service as a result of section 205 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, which contains a general waiver of periods of limitation for persons in military service with respect to civil proceedings.

The provision recommended by the committee would make it clear that the three year statute of limitations for correction board requests is not waived by the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. Nothing in this provision would affect the discretion of the Correction Boards to waive the three year period "in the interest of justice," and the Boards could consider any effect an individual's military service may have had on his or her ability to file a claim within the three year period. In order to provide an appropriate period of transition for the filing of requests to the correction boards by persons currently in military service, the provision would not take effect until three years after the date of enactment.

Section 539. Medal of honor for certain African-American soldiers who served in World War II.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to the seven African-American soldiers who served in the United States Army during World War II and whom the Army recommended be awarded the Medal of Honor after a congressionally mandated review of their records.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSIONED CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Section 561. Applicability to Public Health Service of prohibition on crediting cadet or midshipmen service at the service academies.

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, like members

of the armed forces, do not receive length-of-service credit for service as a student at a service military academy.

Section 562. Exception to grade limitations for Public Health Service officers assigned to the Department of Defense.

The committee recommends a provision that would exclude Public Health Service officers assigned to the Department of Defense from Public Health Service end strength limits. The recommended provision would ensure that the Public Health Service is not penalized for assigning Public Health Service Officers to duty within the Department of Defense.

SUBTITLE F—DEFENSE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT, DIVERSIFICATION, CONVERSION, AND STABILIZATION

Section 571. Authority to expand law enforcement placement program to include firefighters.

The committee recommends a provision that amends section 1152, title 10, United States Code, to include federal firefighters in the legislation that permits the Secretary of Defense to establish a program to assist eligible members and former members of the armed forces and eligible civilian employees of the Department of Defense to obtain employment in public safety jobs.

Section 572. Troops-to-teachers program improvements. (Also refer to Section 1122)

The committee recommends a provision that would revise the Troops-to-Teachers program to permit service members retiring under the temporary early retirement authority to participate and to reduce the teaching obligation, incentive grant, and local education authority reimbursement periods from five years to two years.

SUBTITLE G—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

The committee reaffirms its support for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) as an expression of national commitment to veterans whose service and sacrifices have secured our freedom.

The committee is concerned, however, about the soundness of the funding mechanism for operation of the AFRH. The AFRH has been compelled to operate since fiscal year 1993 with a negative cash flow in order to meet financial obligations, and the AFRH Trust Fund will become insolvent unless changes are made to the funding mechanism.

In accordance with instructions contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, the AFRH Board commissioned a comprehensive study to examine this matter and develop alternative solutions. The Armed Forces Retirement Home Strategic Study, conducted by the firm of Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P., indicates that the AFRH cannot become financially viable under the current funding scheme and still meet requirements. The committee agrees with the Board that the AFRH should accommodate a minimum total of 2300 residents in order to meet responsibilities to eligible veterans, based on actuarial projections.

The committee notes the achievement of significant efficiencies and numerous improvements in the management and operation of the AFRH. However, unless steps are taken to rectify the funding situation, admissions to the AFRH may be slowed and restricted over subsequent years. Services may be reduced and in some cases eliminated. Additional staff reductions also may be necessary.

Although such measures may achieve short-term fiscal goals, they will not resolve shortcomings in the funding scheme, nor will they yield adequate resources to meet the needs of veterans for whom the homes are intended. The committee prefers that admissions not be slowed and recommends a series of provisions to meet both present and long-term responsibilities.

Section 582. Acceptance of uncompensated services.

The committee recommends a provision that would enable the Chairman of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Board, or the directors of the individual homes, to accept uncompensated or gratuitous services from volunteers under procedures similar to those currently in place in the Department of Defense.

Section 583. Disposal of real property.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the disposal of a 49 acre parcel of real property at the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) in accordance with title 24, United States Code.

The committee directs the AFRH Board to consult with the General Services Administration (GSA) prior to offering the parcel for sale, in order for GSA to screen the property for possible use by other federal agencies.

The committee strongly recommends that the GSA administer the disposal.

In the event a federal agency expresses the need to acquire the parcel, the Board and GSA should effect the transfer with the express requirement that the fair market value amount of the property, less appropriate transaction costs, is transferred from the acquiring agency to the AFRH Trust Fund.

The treatment of proceeds is consistent with section 416(d)(2) of title 24, United States Code.

Section 584. Matters concerning personnel.

The committee recommends a provision that would enable members of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Board and local boards to be reappointed under certain conditions.

The provision also would permit a change in the method by which certain AFRH employees are compensated. Salaries for all AFRH employees are currently paid from the AFRH Trust Fund. Some employees who are also military retirees receive little or none of their retired pay as a result of dual compensation restrictions (5 U.S.C. 5532).

The recommended provision pertains to AFRH employees who are not able to collect some or all of their retired pay as a result of dual compensation restrictions. In such cases, at the discretion of the AFRH Board, those employees would be paid their full retired pay from the military retired pay account. However, their

compensation from the AFRH Trust Fund would be decreased by the amount of retired pay that otherwise would have not been paid under dual compensation restrictions. The amount they receive from retired pay and their AFRH salary would be the same total as prior to the enactment of the recommended provision, although the amounts from the two sources would be different.

Benefits, contributions, and deductions would be based on the individual employee's AFRH salary—which may be different from the amount paid from the trust fund—for Civil Service retirement and other purposes.

The committee expects the AFRH Board to continue to set levels of compensation strictly on the basis of job requirements and industry standards. The provision would direct the AFRH Board to note in its annual report to Congress whenever this authority is exercised, and explain how each affected employee's AFRH salary is comparable to prevailing rates for similar employees in the retirement home industry.

Section 585. Fees for residents.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the military departments and the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Board, to report to the congressional defense committees on aspects of the AFRH resident fees structure and the monthly assessment on active duty service members (as established in section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995) no later than March 3, 1997.

The report should address: how much income is expected for each incremental resident fee increase; the conditions under which various sources of income and disability payments should be included in determining fees; the degree of flexibility desired to adjust fees; the categories of monthly income that should be considered in calculating fees; what authorities are needed to set fees in exceptional circumstances; fairness and equitable treatment of residents; the advisability of exercising current authority to increase the monthly assessment on active duty service members; alternative financing options to avoid the need to increase the assessment; other matters deemed appropriate by the Secretary, the military departments and the AFRH Board.

The committee expects that the views of the senior enlisted advisor in each service will be solicited, considered, and included in the report.

The provision would delay the implementation of the fee structure established in the section cited above for one year, pending the outcome of the report and in anticipation of hearings into this matter that the committee intends to conduct in fiscal year 1997.

Section 586. Authorization and appropriations.

The committee recommends $57.3 million to be appropriated from the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH) Trust Fund for operation of the AFRH in fiscal year 1997.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Legislative fellows from the Department of Defense

The committee continues to note the increase in the number of legislative fellows and detailees from the military services working in the legislative branch. While the programs under which these service members are assigned to the Congress may have merit, the committee is concerned that they might not be managed effectively, if at all, in the Department of Defense. Military personnel participating in a formal fellowship program can gain valuable insights into the workings of the federal government, experience which can be beneficial to their services after they return to their services. Fellows can also provide expert advice and counsel to members of Congress, on the military matters with which they are familiar, during their fellowship.

When the committee requested information from the Office of the Secretary of Defense concerning where military personnel are working within the legislative branch, the Department was unable to provide that information and referred the committee to the individual services. The military services were able to provide information concerning those military personnel participating in formal legislative fellowship programs, but were not able to provide reliable information concerning military personnel detailed or "on loan" to individual congressional offices. The committee questions whether the Department of Defense knows how many military personnel are working in the legislative branch at any point in time. Additionally, the committee questions whether there is appropriate management of these personnel to ensure their experience is properly used when they return to duty within the Department of Defense.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to perform a critical review of how the legislative fellowship programs are managed and controlled within the Department of Defense. The review should address the criteria and circumstances under which individuals are detailed and "loaned." The Secretary shall report to the congressional defense committees not later than May 1, 1997. As a minimum, this report should:

(1) Identify and describe those programs under which military personnel work, under any circumstances, for congressional offices, committees and agencies;

(2) Identify the authority for and purpose of those programs and the extent to which the current practices fulfill these objectives;

(3) Assess the participation by each service in these programs both in terms of the number of officers assigned or detailed each year and in terms of the types of positions to which they are assigned or detailed;

(4) Evaluate the appropriateness of the grades of the officers assigned or detailed to these programs in view of the objectives of the different programs;

(5) Evaluate the extent to which the assignment pattern of officers assigned or detailed to these programs justifies these programs at a time when the services are experiencing shortages of field grade officers.

The committee did not examine the civilian personnel component of the legislative fellowship program. However, the same tenets apply and should be a part of the Secretary's review.

Relocation assistance programs

The committee recognizes that over one-third of the active force relocates each year and that, in many cases, service members and their families are making their very first move. The support available to service members and their families during relocation is an important component of any quality of life program. With that in mind, the Committee continues to support efforts within the Department of Defense to enhance Family Service Center programs and services intended to meet the various needs of military members and their families involved in permanent change of stations moves. The committee encourages the Department to continue to seek new, innovative, cost-effective methods of meeting these needs.

Review of opportunities for ordering individual reserves to active duty with their consent

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 directed the Secretary of Defense to review the opportunities for members of the reserve components to serve during peacetime in positions normally filled by active duty personnel, to identify and remove any impediments to increasing those opportunities, and to report to the committees of jurisdiction on this matter.

The committee is unaware of any action or progress in this area and directs the Secretary of Defense to advise the committee not later than 30 days after enactment concerning: (1) the status of that review; (2) the status of actions to remove any impediments to increasing opportunities for reservists; and (3) specific examples of instances in which the opportunities for reservists to serve have been increased.

Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund

The Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 provided that all costs for operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home (AFRH), to include the salaries of staff and capital improvements, would be paid from a single trust fund. The fund was intended to be part of a self-sustaining mechanism that would maintain the solvency of the fund by relying on income from several principal sources: interest from the trust fund balance; a monthly assessment of 50 cents from certain active duty service members; and fines and forfeitures resulting from courts-martial and other disciplinary actions.

However, the funding stream envisioned by Congress was based on assumptions about the size of the active duty force. Force reductions have resulted in a significant decrease in income derived from assessments, since the force is smaller. A further decrease in revenue occurred as a result of fewer fines and forfeitures due to the high quality of the force.

In order to pay the operating costs of the AFRH, the corpus of the trust fund has been decreasing since fiscal year 1993. The total amount of this decrease through the end of fiscal year 1997 is ap-

proximately $33.7 million. The decrease of the corpus has further reduced the amount of trust fund income derived from interest.

Improvements to assisted living and long-term care facilities at the Naval Home, and a building renovation at the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, are urgently needed in fiscal year 1997. The cost of these improvements is $42.5 million.

All analysis suggests the funding mechanism must be revised in order to attain solvency. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the military departments and the AFRH Board, to report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 3, 1997, on alternatives to the current funding mechanism to enable the AFRH to maintain its traditional population of 2300 residents.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

The committee addressed a number of pay, allowances and other compensation issues. One of the committee's priorities this year was to continue to improve the quality of life for military personnel, their families, and retired service members and their families. The committee recommended a number of provisions that will significantly improve the quality of life and living conditions, and provide equitable compensation for military personnel to protect against inflation. The committee directed the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures that would permit retired military personnel to establish allotments from their retired pay account in order to facilitate paying TRICARE enrollment fees and dental insurance premiums. In general, the committee's recommendations reflect a commitment to enhancing quality of life and concern for the welfare of military personnel and their families.

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601. Military pay raise for fiscal year 1997.

The committee recommends a provision that would waive Section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, and increase the rates of basic pay and the basic allowance for subsistence for members of the uniformed services by 3.0 percent. Additionally, the provision would increase the rate of the basic allowance for quarters for members of the uniformed services by 4.0 percent. These increases would be effective January 1, 1997.

Section 602. Rate of cadet and midshipman pay.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal a provision in title 37, United States Code, that would link the rate of cadet and midshipman pay to changes in the section in which military pay is determined. Cadet and midshipman pay is established at a specified rate in another section of title 37, United States Code. The repealed provision was inconsistent and unnecessary.

Section 603. Pay of senior noncommissioned officers while hospitalized.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the senior enlisted member of an armed force to continue to receive the basic pay authorized for that position for no more than 180 days while no longer in that position and hospitalized prior to retirement.

Section 604. Basic allowance for quarters for members assigned to sea duty.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize several changes concerning the payment of basic allowance for quarters and variable housing allowance for service members assigned to sea duty. The recommended provision would authorize a single service member continuous basic allowance for quarters and variable housing allowance if he or she executes a permanent change of station move to a deployed unit on sea duty.

The recommended provision would also authorize the senior member of a joint military couple to continue to receive basic allowance for quarters and variable housing allowance when both are serving onboard ships at sea at the same time.

The recommended provision would authorize quarters ashore or payment of the basic allowance for quarters to single E–5 members assigned to sea duty.

Section 605. Uniform applicability of discretion to deny an election not to occupy government quarters.

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical change clarifying the authority of a secretary of a military department to deny certain service members the ability to elect not to occupy government quarters. As a result of a change in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, members in the grade of E–6 were granted authority to elect to live off-base. Previously, the secretary of a military department had the authority to deny a service member in the grade of E–7 or higher the election to reside off-base on the basis of an adverse effect on a training mission, military discipline, or military readiness. The recommended change extends the authority to deny an election to live off-base to service members in the grade of E–6.

The committee does not intend that this authority be used to circumvent the discretion of single members in the grade of E–6 and above who have been assigned to inadequate quarters to elect to live off-base and receive the basic allowance for quarters and the variable housing allowance.

Section 606. Family separation allowance for members separated by military orders from spouses who are members.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize payment of the family separation allowance to the senior of two service members who are married to each other and who would normally reside with each other but are separated by military orders.

Section 607. Waiver of time limitations for claim for pay and allowances.

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Comptroller General authority, upon the request of a service secretary, to waive the time limits in the case of a claim for pay and allowances up to a maximum of $25,000, subject to the availability of appropriations.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611. Extension of certain bonuses for reserve forces.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority to pay the special pay for critically short wartime health specialists in the selected reserves, selected reserve reenlistment bonus, selected reserve enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to certain high priority units, selected reserve affiliation bonus, ready reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus until September 30, 1998.

Section 612. Extension of certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority to pay certain bonuses and special pay for nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists until September 30, 1998.

Section 613. Extension of authority relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, reenlistment bonus for active members, enlistment bonus for critical skills, special pay for nuclear qualified officers extending period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, nuclear career annual incentive bonus, and repayment of education loans for certain health professionals who serve in the selected reserve until September 30, 1998.

Section 614. Increased special pay for dental officers of the armed forces.

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the special pay, additional special pay, and board certified pay for certain dental officers of the armed forces. The committee understands that recruiting of dental officers has become increasingly difficult and retention is declining as private sector pay outpaces military pay. The recommended increases should be targeted toward dental officers with less than 10 years of service.

Section 615. Retention special pay for Public Health Service optometrists.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize retention special pay for optometrists in regular and reserve components of the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service (PHS) in the same manner as optometrists in the armed forces. The recommended provision standardizes the retention special pay for optometrists in the uniformed services and will assist the Public Health Service in recruiting optometrists. The committee understands that PHS optometrists are especially critical to support the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Prisons and will cost less than contracting with civilian optometrists.

Section 616. Special pay for nonphysician health care providers in the Public Health Service.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize special pay for nonphysician health care providers in the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service in the same manner authorized for nonphysician health care providers in the armed forces. The recommended provision would provide equity between physician and nonphysician health care providers within the Public Health Service and among health care providers in each of the uniformed services.

Section 617. Foreign language proficiency pay for Public Health Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration officers.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend foreign language proficiency pay now authorized for members of the armed services to any member of the uniformed services whose duties require such language proficiency. The Public Health Service (PHS), for example, has requirements for PHS officials to work in Africa and Asia as part of the Center for Disease Control and to be proficient in the local language.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 621. Round trip travel allowances for shipping motor vehicles at government expense.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize travel allowances for travel to and from a port while transporting motor vehicles at government expense in conjunction with a permanent change of station move between the continental United States and overseas locations.

Section 622. Option to store instead of transport a privately-owned vehicle at the expense of the United States.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize government-funded storage, in lieu of transportation, of one vehicle when a service member is ordered to make a permanent change of station move to a location that precludes entry or requires extensive modification to the vehicle prior to entry of the vehicle.

Section 623. Deferral of travel with travel and transportation allowances in connection with leave between consecutive overseas tours.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the service secretaries to defer the travel and transportation allowances that accrue in conjunction with service members being ordered to consecutive overseas tours, when participation in a contingency mission precludes completion of the travel within one year. Under normal conditions a service member ordered to consecutive overseas tours is authorized to be reimbursed for the cost of round-trip travel from the overseas base to his or her home. This benefit must be used within one year. When service members participate in critical operational missions, such as Operation Joint Endeavor

in Bosnia, the one year period could expire and the service member would lose the benefit. The recommended provision would permit the service secretaries to defer the travel for one additional year.

Section 624. Funding for transportation of household effects of Public Health Service officers.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization to be reimbursed for "do-it-yourself" moves currently authorized for members of the armed forces to the Public Health Service.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY, SURVIVOR BENEFITS, AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 631. Effective date for military retiree cost-of-living adjustment for Fiscal Year 1998.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the date of the military retirement cost-of-living adjustment in Fiscal Year 1998 as January 1, 1998.

Section 632. Allotment of retired or retainer pay.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures to allow military retirees a maximum of six retiree pay allotments.

Section 633. Cost-of-living increases in SBP contributions to be effective concurrently with payment of related retired pay cost-of-living increases.

The committee recommends a provision that would require that annual cost-of-living increases to Survivor Benefit Plan premiums be effective on the date on which the retired pay cost-of-living increase is effective.

Section 634. Annuities for certain military surviving spouses.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to pay an annuity to the surviving spouses of retired service members who died before March 21, 1974. This group of surviving spouses has become known as the "Forgotten Widows" since they were widowed before the Survivor Benefit Plan was enacted.

Section 635. Adjusted annual income limitation applicable to eligibility for income supplement for certain widows of members of the uniformed services.

The committee recommends a provision that would adjust the maximum level of annual income at which eligibility for minimum income widows payments end. This adjustment is necessary to resolve the current situation in which the widow must be eligible for a nonservice connected death pension from the Department of Veterans' Affairs to receive the minimum income widow payment from the Department of Defense and, once she receives the combined payments, becomes ineligible by virtue of exceeding the maximum allowable annual income. Once the payments cease, the widow be-

comes eligible for the combined payments again. The recommended adjustment would eliminate the "yo-yo" effect required under current law.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 641. Reimbursement for adoption expenses incurred in adoptions through private placements.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority to reimburse adoption expenses to those service members who adopt through private agencies if the adoption is supervised by the court.

Section—642. Waiver of recoupment of amounts withheld for tax purposes from certain separation pay received by involuntarily separated members and former members of the armed forces.

The committee recommends a provision that would waive the recoupment of the amount of separation pays paid to involuntarily separated members which was withheld for tax purposes if the separation pay is later recouped. The most common example of this situation is when a member is involuntarily separated, paid separation pay, and is later determined to be eligible for tax-exempt disability compensation. Prior to receiving disability compensation, the individual must repay the separation pay. Without this waiver, the member would be forced to pay taxes on the separation pay with tax-exempt disability compensation.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Foreign Language Proficiency Pay Qualification

The committee has been advised that some service members attempt to circumvent the qualification procedures established to determine who may receive foreign language proficiency pay and the amount of that pay. In order to qualify for foreign language proficiency pay, a service member, in a speciality and duty assignment requiring language proficiency, must be certified by the service secretary as being proficient in the language. This certification is normally granted following successful completion of a test. In addition, the monthly amount may be determined according to how well the service member does on the test.

It has come to the committee's attention that some service members are taking the certification tests multiple times at different testing sites in an attempt to qualify and/or to artificially raise their scores to qualify for higher monthly pays. The committee believes that, as a minimum, this behavior is outside the spirit of the Foreign Language Proficiency Pay authority.

The integrity of any service member who attempts such activities is compromised. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the secretaries of the military services, to review the policies and procedures relating to certification for foreign language proficiency pay to ensure that the integrity of the process has not been compromised and to confirm that those certified to receive foreign language proficiency pay really merit

such pay. The Secretary of Defense is directed to report the results of the review and any recommended corrective action to the Congress not later than February 1, 1997.

Special Duty Assignment Pay, Army Special Operations personnel

The committee recommends an increase of $6.4 million in the Military Personnel, Army appropriation in order to fund Special Duty Assignment Pay (SDAP) for Army Special Operations Forces.

It is the intent of the committee that this increase, funded from within the Special Operations Command operation and maintenance account at the Commander-in-Chief, Special Operations Command's request, be used to pay Army Special Forces and Ranger personnel Special Duty Assignment Pay. Army Special Operations Forces are the only component of Special Operations Command who do not receive SDAP. The committee understands that the Army has programmed funds to support SDAP for Special Operations Forces in fiscal year 1998 and beyond.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

The committee addressed a number of health care issues. One of the committee's priorities this year was to continue to improve the quality of life for military personnel, their families, and retired service members and their families. The committee views health care as an important aspect of quality of life. The committee included several initiatives to improve the Department's ability to implement managed care. The committee was not able to include a provision that would provide for Medicare to reimburse the Department of Defense for care provided to Medicare eligible beneficiaries. The committee believes Medicare subvention would be fiscally beneficial to Medicare and would enable the Department of Defense to continue to provide health care to DOD beneficiaries within TRICARE. In general, the committee's recommendations reflect commitment to enhancing quality of life and concern for the welfare of military personnel and their families.

Section 701. Implementation of requirement for Selected Reserve dental insurance plan.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the implementation date of the selected reserve dental insurance program from October 1, 1996 into fiscal year 1997. The provision would also stipulate a full and open competition for the award of the contract or contracts.

The committee expects this program to be implemented as early as possible in 1997.

Section 702. Dental insurance plan for military retirees and certain dependents.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a dental insurance plan for military retirees and certain dependents. The program, which would be available to eligible beneficiaries not later than October 1, 1997, would require a plan similar to the active duty dependant dental insurance plan with voluntary enrollment and premiums paid by the member. Under the recommended provision, determination of the eligibility of a contractor would be within the purview of the government.

The committee has included a separate provision providing for allotments from military retirement accounts to pay premiums under this program.

Section 703. Uniform Composite Health Care System software.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to field a standardized version of the Composite Health Care System (CHCS) to be utilized by both managed care support contractors and military treatment facilities. This uni-

form interface should include industry standard methods for the bi-directional exchange of enrollment, provider, and other health insurance information and should be fully tested prior to implementation.

The recommended provision would also direct the department to amend existing TRICARE managed care support contracts to require TRICARE contractors to use government furnished CHCS software for Military Treatment Facility (MTF) provider appointments and to record TRICARE MTF enrollment through direct use of the CHCS software, or through the uniform, bi-directional interface between the contractor and the MTF systems.

Contractors would have the option to maintain a centralized enrollment function, including eligibility determination, and use CHCS to manage the MTF population for which the MTFs are responsible.

The committee does not view this to constitute a cardinal change to existing contracts.

Section 704. Clarification of applicability of CHAMPUS payment rules to private CHAMPUS providers for care provided to enrollees in health care plans of uniformed services treatment facilities.

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that CHAMPUS payment rules apply to military beneficiaries enrolled in the USTF program, including dependents of active duty personnel and retirees, and that they apply even in situations when the health care is provided within the catchment area of the facility.

Section 705. Enhancement of third party collection and secondary payer authorities under CHAMPUS.

The committee recommends a provision that would refine the Third Party Collection Program under which military medical facilities collect from third party payers for health care services provided to beneficiaries who have additional coverage by a third-party plan or the CHAMPUS Double Coverage Program.

Section 706. Codification of authority to credit CHAMPUS collections to program accounts.

The committee recommends a provision that would make permanent the authority that allows the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) to credit refunds and similar collections to the current year appropriation available for that program.

Section 707. Comptroller General review of health care activities of the Department of Defense relating to Persian Gulf Illnesses.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to conduct several reviews related to Persian Gulf Illnesses. The Comptroller General would review: the effectiveness of research and clinical programs of the Department of Defense which relate to illnesses which might be attributable to service in the Persian Gulf War; the Department of Defense policies relating to the use of drugs that are experimental or not approved

by the Federal Drug Administration; and the administration of military medical records to assess the extent to which those records reflect pre-deployment medical processing, immunization records, informed consent releases, sick call and clinic visits during deployment, and other relevant medical information.

The committee acknowledges the good work of the Department of Defense in pursing the causes and cures for the Persian Gulf Syndrome. The Department of Defense has initiated a number of scientific research efforts, some in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Additionally, the Department of Defense has initiated several outreach programs to identify victims and suspected victims of these diseases. The committee believes that every effort must be made to ensure full and fair consideration of the needs of our veterans and to prevent any future occurrences of this type of undiagnosed illness. The committee notes that the Department of Defense did take proactive steps which resulted from lessons learned during Operation Desert Storm prior to the deployment to Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Examination of alternative financing methods of managed care support contracts

The committee understands that the Department has developed alternative financing methods for managed care support contracts that will be incorporated into the TRICARE contracts for regions 1, 2, and 5. The committee believes that these revised financing methods may have significant merit and urges the Department to carefully evaluate the implementation of the project.

The committee recommends the formation of a working group consisting of representatives from the Department of Defense and the managed care industry to scrutinize all aspects of the proposed revisions, including the bid price adjustment methods, resource sharing, and incentive and risk shifting prior to the implementation of the program in regions 1, 2, and 5. The working group would also monitor and assist the actual implementation of the program in those regions.

Should the alternative financing methods prove to be effective in regions 1, 2, and 5, the committee would encourage the Secretary to make a recommendation to have the alternative financing methods applied to the remaining TRICARE regions through a contract modification process.

Portability and reciprocity for TRICARE Prime enrollees across regions

The committee encourages the implementation of several administrative policies that would further the seamlessness of the TRICARE program throughout the continental United States and enhance the convenience of the program for its beneficiaries.

The committee supports the portability of enrollment amongst TRICARE regions. This would enable an enrolled beneficiary who changes his or her place of residence to transfer enrollment from one region to another. The current policy is cumbersome and re-

quires the beneficiary to disenroll from one region to subsequently enroll in another.

The committee also supports reciprocity of services amongst regions to ensure that a beneficiary enrolled in the TRICARE system has accessibility to care in any TRICARE region. This would accommodate beneficiary families that have covered family members residing in more than one TRICARE region.

The committee believes that these initiatives advance the intended continuity, uniformity, and accessibility of the TRICARE program.

Continuation of support for telemedicine initiatives

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is encouraged by their test of the transportable computer-based patient record, a part of PACMEDNET, during OPERATION JOINT ENDEAVOR. PACMEDNET is in the second phase of a three phase demonstration project. The committee urges the Department to designate $5.0 million from the Defense Health Program account to finance completion of the project.

The committee believes the integration and application of network information technology systems throughout military medicine is crucial to the maintenance of medical readiness. However, the committee also believes that the integration and application of such technology should not be addressed in a piecemeal, service-specific or contractor-led manner. The development of, contracting for, or purchase of sophisticated, expensive information technology should respond to valid requirements and a comprehensive, coordinated plan that maximizes interoperability and cost-effectiveness without unnecessary redundancy and without degrading readiness.

Study of the extension of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) option to military retirees

The committee directs the Department of Defense to conduct a study of the cost and feasibility of extending the option of enrollment in FEHBP to military retirees over age 65 and report to the Congress not later than March 1, 1997. The study should include the impact on cost, access, and utilization rates of other health care options under the health care system of the uniformed services, and a determination of the number of retirees that would exercise this option if it were available. The study should also include a recommendation as to whether such a proposal should be adopted.

Center for Prisoners of War Studies

The committee recommends an increase of $2.7 million in the Defense Health Program appropriation to support establishment of a Center for Prisoners of War Studies under the auspices of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. This center would continue the efforts of the Navy's Prisoner of War program in the Naval Aerospace and Operational Medicine Institute, Pensacola Naval Station, Florida which has become the repository for historical and longitudinal studies of prisoners of war.

Dental readiness

The committee recognizes the importance of individual dental readiness in the overall combat readiness equation. The committee is, therefore, concerned about the capability of the military departments to fill requirements for dentists over the next several years. Therefore, the committee directs the Surgeons General to review the adequacy of accession and retention programs for dentists and to report their views on this matter to the Committee on Armed Services not later than April 1, 1997. These reports should, at a minimum, address: (1) requirements; (2) accession and retention projections; (3) the causes of any projected shortages; and 4) recommendations for reducing and eventually eliminating shortages in dentists.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 801. Procurement technical assistance programs.

The committee recommends an increase of $12.0 million to continue the procurement technical assistance center program in fiscal year 1997. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should continue to administer this program. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to continue to utilize the infrastructure of the centers to implement acquisition streamlining initiatives in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 such as electronic commerce.

Section 802. Extension of pilot mentor-protégé program.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the period in which mentor firms under the Mentor-Protégé program may incur costs for furnishing developmental assistance under the program until September 30, 1999. The provision would also extend the period during which new agreements can be entered into until September 30, 1998.

Section 803. Modification of authority to carry out certain prototype projects.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until September 30, 2001 the authority in section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to enter into prototyping projects using the other transactions authority in section 2371 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also extend such authority to the military services and other defense agencies.

Section 804. Revisions to the program for the assessment of the national defense technology and industrial base.

The committee recommends a provision that would substantially amend the requirements in chapter 148 of title 10 of the United States Code for analysis, assessment and planning concerning the national technology and industrial base. The committee has expressed its concern over the last several years with the inability of the Department of Defense to fulfill the requirements in current law with regard to technology and industrial base assessment and planning. The committee commends recent efforts by defense officials to establish procedures and policies to ensure that technology and industrial base considerations are given appropriate consideration in the programming and budgeting process in the Department of Defense. The amendments recommended by the committee would adjust the requirements in law to the capabilities that are being developed in the Department of Defense to ensure that Con-

gress receives timely and meaningful information on the impact of budget decisions on the national technology and industrial base. The committee expects that the Department of Defense will comply fully and promptly with the requirements of the law.

The provision would clarify that the Secretary of Defense has responsibility for preparing periodic and selected assessments of the capability of the national technology and industrial base to attain the national security objectives outlined in section 2501(a) of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also establish a requirement that the Secretary prepare and submit to Congress an annual report describing the assessment and analyses used to identify and address concerns about national technology and industrial base capabilities as well as each program in the annual budget request designed to sustain such capabilities.

Section 805. Procurements to be made from small arms industrial base firms.

The committee is concerned about the viability of the small arms industrial base and notes the findings of a 1994 Army Science Board review of this issue. These findings recommended that procurements of small arms parts, supplies, and services be made only from manufacturers which were listed in the study to support preservation of this critical industrial base. The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to limit future contracts for such items to those firms listed in the study report.

Section 806. Exception to prohibition on procurement of foreign goods.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2534 of title 10, United States Code, by providing additional authority for the Secretary of Defense to waive limitations on the procurement of goods other than United States goods. The amendment would authorize the Secretary to waive a limitation in a case where he determines that the application of the limitation would impede the reciprocal procurement of defense items under a memorandum of understanding entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 807. Treatment of Department of Defense cable television franchise agreements.

Section 823 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) directed the United States Court of Federal Claims to render an advisory opinion to Congress as to whether it is within the power of the executive branch to treat cable franchise agreements as contracts under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and, if so, whether the executive branch is required by law to treat these agreements as contracts under the FAR. Pending receipt of the advisory opinion from the Court of Federal Claims, the committee recommends a provision similar to that included in S. 1026 (S. Rept. 104–112), with a new subsection that would limit applicability to the Court of Federal Claims decision. It is the intention of the committee that this provision serve solely as a means to allow for later congressional action subsequent

to issuance of an advisory opinion by the Court and is not intended to influence the advisory opinion of the Court on this matter.

Section 808. Remedies for reprisals against contractor employee whistleblowers.

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the remedies in current law available to a contractor employee who is wrongfully terminated because he reported wrongdoing. Under current law, the employee must be reinstated in order to receive back pay and other compensation. The amendment would also allow for the payment of back pay and other compensation in the event that the employee is not reinstated.

Section 809. Implementation of information technology management reform.

The committee continues to support the various management initiatives that the Department of Defense (DOD) has been attempting to implement over the past few years. These initiatives include those required by law such as the Chief Financial Officers Act and the Government Performance and Results Act, as well as internal DOD initiatives such as the Defense Business Operating Fund (DBOF), Corporate Information Management (CIM), and the Defense Performance Review. All of the initiatives, when successfully implemented, have the potential to provide better direct support to the warfighter while using less resources.

Last year, the Department's Inspector General noted in a review of these various Defense Management Improvement Programs that these programs duplicated one another and were diluting management focus and resources at all organizational levels. The Inspector General recommended that DOD establish an integrating framework for these various initiatives.

The committee has shown its support for improving management controls and establishing performance measures by requiring in section 381 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 that DOD report for three years on DOD's progress in doing so. It was the committee's intention that these changes would enable DOD to implement more successfully not only CIM, but improve the overall framework in managing the resources provided by the Congress to DOD. Last year the committee provided additional guidance in the Information Technology Management Reform Act of Fiscal Year 1996 (ITMRA).

The committee is encouraged that DOD has utilized the expertise of both the National Academy of Public Administration and the General Accounting Office in preparing these reports. However, the fact remains that DOD has yet to commit to the definite performance measures and management controls it intends to implement.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department's leadership to establish an integrated management framework that weaves the many management initiatives with the established Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS). The committee also encourages the Department to establish a strategic information resources management plan based on the Secretary's strategy for using the Department's core and supporting processes to support the Department's overall strategic goals.

In order to measure the progress toward achieving these goals, the committee recommends a provision to require the Department to report to Congress on the establishment of the integrated management framework and provide to the committee the Department's overall strategic information resources management plan (including any service and agency subsets). The committee also directs that, as part of this report, the Department identify any directives and policies issued and/or actions taken to implement the reforms required by ITMRA, including National Security Systems under Subtitle E, sections 5141 and 5142, of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

Software management best practices

The committee supports the use of benchmarking DOD processes as required in section 5123(4) of ITMRA and encourages the development of best practices for software acquisition for all information technology in DOD. The committee is encouraged by the progress made in the Software Management Initiative, the Software Acquisition Best Practices Initiative, the report by the Defense Science Board on "Acquiring Defense Software Commercially" and the work of the DOD Software Managers Network.

The committee is concerned, however, by the lack of progress in implementing best practices in software acquisition and encourages the Secretary to prepare an implementation plan by January 1, 1997 of software acquisition best practices for information technology programs including those defined as national security systems under section 5141 and 5142 of ITMRA. In preparing this plan, the Secretary shall consider using modular acquisition methods as defined in section 5201 and 5202 of ITMRA and the pilot authority granted in Section 5312 of ITMRA.

Year 2000 software conversion

The committee, concerned by reports that the federal government may be underestimating the potential problem of converting date fields in software code and embedded systems to accommodate operation in the year 2000 directs the Department to assess the risk to DOD systems and to report to Congress on the resources necessary to complete conversion by the year 2000. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that after September 30, 1996 all information technology as defined by ITMRA purchased by the Department will operate in 2000 without technical modifications.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Procurement goals for small business concerns owned by women

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) established a government-wide goal for participation of small business concerns owned and controlled by women at not less than five percent of the total value of all prime contract and subcontract awards for each fiscal year. The Department of Defense has fallen significantly short of the goal with fiscal year 1995

awards to small businesses owned and controlled by women at only two percent of the total value of all contracts and subcontracts.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by March 31, 1997 describing the current and past efforts of the Department to achieve the five percent goal and describing the detailed plan of initiatives the Department intends to pursue to achieve such goal.

Economy Act transfer regulatory implementation

The Department of Defense (DOD) has implemented significant policy changes to place effective controls on Economy Act purchases, as required by section 844 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1994 and section 1074 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994. These policy changes should help to eliminate the abuse of contract "off-loading", which has been used to avoid competition requirements, improperly obligate expiring funds, and avoid oversight and audit requirements. The greatest dollar value of Economy Act transfers takes place between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy.

In cases where the Economy Act order will require contracting by the agency receiving the order (the servicing agency), the Federal Acquisition Regulation now requires a determination that the order would be appropriate because: (1) the purchase is appropriately made under a contract previously entered into by the servicing agency to meet its own similar requirements; (2) the servicing agency has special expertise that makes it better qualified to enter into or administer the contract; or (3) the servicing agency is specifically authorized by law or regulation to purchase such goods or services on behalf of other agencies.

Some confusion has arisen as to how work that is to be performed by (and not merely passed through) the Department of Energy's national laboratories should be treated under this provision. It is the view of the committee that work to be performed by a national laboratory should be subject to the determination requirement described above only if the order is likely or expected to require subcontracting by the national laboratory. Regardless of whether the order will require subcontracting, however, the committee expects the DOD to comply with provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation which limit the national laboratories to performing work that is within the laboratories' mission and cannot be effectively provided by the private sector.

Research projects: transactions other than contracts and grants

The committee is encouraged by the findings of a March 1996 General Accounting Office (GAO) report, "DOD Research: Acquiring Research by Nontraditional Means." The report concluded that cooperative agreements and other transactions carried out under the authority of section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, have provided the Department of Defense (DOD) a tool to leverage the private sector's technological know-how and financial investment and have attracted firms that traditionally did not perform research for DOD to carry out such research. In light of the significant declines projected in defense research spending and the continued rapid

growth of private sector research investments, the committee believes that it will become even more important for DOD to leverage commercial research investments and attract commercial firms to working on service requirements.

However, the report also points out that DARPA has been the primary user of this innovative transaction authority thus far and that there has been some confusion on the use of this authority among the services. Since DOD is preparing new guidance on this matter, the committee would like to clarify several points. First, the committee intended in creating "other transactions authority" to maximize flexibility on intellectual property negotiations with private sector entities. In particular, the committee did not intend that such transactions be subject to the provisions of Public Law 96–517, as amended. The GAO report specifically supports the committee's position and points out that this additional flexibility has been important in attracting commercial firms to carry out cost-shared research with the Pentagon. Second, the committee intended that the sunk cost of prior research efforts not count as cost-share on the part of the private sector firms. Only the additional resources provided by the private sector needed to carry out the specific project should be counted. Finally, in the committee's hearings, DOD officials testified that the reluctance of the services to use other transactions authority derived in part from the requirement that standard contract, grant or cooperative agreements first be found not feasible or appropriate for carrying out any given project. The committee did not intend that this requirement unduly restrict use of the other transactions instrument. DARPA has properly interpreted Congress' intent that if the goal of a research project is to leverage the capabilities of firms that will not accept a standard grant, contract or cooperative agreement to conduct defense research, then it is not feasible or appropriate to use such instruments and the use of "other transactions authority" is warranted. The committee intended that program managers in DARPA and the services be given the discretion to make these judgments within a framework provided by overall defense guidance. The committee urges that these issues be clarified by the Office of the Secretary of Defense as soon as possible so that the services can gain the benefits which the GAO report demonstrates DARPA has received from use of other transaction authorities.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

The committee notes that, as the Executive Branch downsizes and seeks ways to re-engineer, the Department of Defense continues to lead the efforts. The Department of Defense has implemented drastic reductions in terms of both military and civilian personnel. While some Executive Branch agencies remain essentially status quo, the Department of Defense may have reduced too much, too quickly, causing readiness to be degraded and potentially increasing costs. The committee included several provisions consistent with the administration's request.

SUBTITLE A—GENERAL MATTERS

Section 901. Repeal of reorganization of Office of Secretary of Defense.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal sections 901 and 903 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 which directed the reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Section 902. Codification of requirements relating to continued operation of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

The committee recommends a provision that would codify in title 10, United States Code, those portions of the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996 that prohibit the closure of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS).

The National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 1995 and 1996 provide in the most straightforward terms possible that it is the will of the Congress that USUHS not be closed. Despite this unambiguous position on the part of the Congress, the Committee continues to receive incontrovertible evidence that the administration has every intention of closing USUHS. Further, the committee is concerned that the administration and the Department of Defense fail to understand the deleterious effects their ill-advised actions have on the current and prospective students and faculty of this national institution.

Given the numerous critical issues facing the administration and the Department of Defense, the committee is disappointed in the amount of time and resources that have been and are being spent attempting to close this university in blatant disregard for the will of the Congress. The Secretary of Defense is directed to report to the congressional defense committees in writing each time he, or any official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, becomes aware of a initiative or action that would in any way suggest that

USUHS would be closed. Such reports shall be in writing and submitted within 30 calendar days of the Secretary or other official becoming aware of an initiative or action requiring such a report.

Section 903. Codification of requirement for United States Army Reserve Command.

The committee recommends a provision that would codify the requirement for the United States Army Reserve Command. The recommended provision would establish that the chain of command for the United States Army Reserve Command shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

Section 904. Transfer of authority to control transportation systems in time of war.

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer the control of transportation systems during time of war from the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to the Secretary of Defense. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense to centralize a function that was previously assigned to the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force.

Section 905. Executive oversight of defense human intelligence personnel.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 193 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of Defense shall exercise oversight of the clandestine activities of Department of Defense human intelligence personnel, and that such responsibility may only be delegated to the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Section 906. Coordination of defense intelligence programs and activities.

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 203 of title 10, United States Code, to designate the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency as the Director of Military Intelligence (DMI) and would provide that the DMI manages the General Defense Intelligence Program and chairs the Military Intelligence Board (MIB). The provision would also designate the members of the MIB and provide that the MIB shall be the principal forum for the coordination of the intelligence programs and activities of the Department of Defense.

Section 907. Redesignation of Office of Naval Records and History Fund and correction of related references.

The committee recommends a provision that would update the statutory references to the name of the Navy's central historical activity. The Navy has changed the name of this activity from the Naval Records and History Fund to the Naval Historical Center Fund.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY

Sections 911 through 934

National Imagery and Mapping Agency

The Executive Branch has recommended the establishment of a new Combat Support Agency within the Department of Defense called the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to provide a single agency focus for imagery and geospacial information within the United States Government. The committee strongly supports this initiative and recommends a provision that would establish this new organization.

NIMA would: (1) be the focal point for the growing and diverse number and types of customers of imagery and geospacial information; (2) ensure visibility and accountability for imagery and geospacial resources; (3) harness, leverage, and focus rapid technological developments to serve imagery, imagery intelligence, and geospacial information customers; and (4) solicit and advocate customer needs for this growing and diverse customer pool. The term "imagery," as defined and used in this Act, includes products produced from space-based national intelligence reconnaissance systems, in accordance with Executive Order 12951 and any successor or superseding Orders.

Although NIMA would carry out its mission responsibilities under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, with the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it would have a vital "national" mission to serve the imagery and geospacial information needs of consumers outside the Department of Defense. It would carry out its responsibilities to national intelligence customers in accordance with the policies and priorities of the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI). The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) would have clear, affirmative authorization to provide administrative and contracting services to the NIMA to insure accomplishment of the national mission of the NIMA or the performance of intelligence community activities of common concern, notwithstanding provisions of law that would otherwise limit such an authorization. The CIA also would be permitted to provide security police services for NIMA facilities, notwithstanding any limitations on jurisdiction of such personnel contained in section 15 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949.

NIMA would be established by bringing together various agencies and organizations already in existence within the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community. Specifically, NIMA would be made up of: the Defense Mapping Agency; the Central Imagery Office; other elements of the Department of Defense identified in the classified annex to this Act; the National Photographic Interpretation Center of the CIA; and other elements of the CIA identified in the classified annex to this Act.

NIMA would be responsible for imagery requirements management, exploitation, dissemination, and archiving. It would define and recommend policies on imagery and geospacial information, and coordinate requirements for an end-to-end architecture, inte-

grated into the National and Defense Information Infrastructure, to satisfy customer needs and to ensure appropriate interoperability.

NIMA would not be responsible for developing, procuring, or operating imagery collection systems, which are responsibilities currently held by the National Reconnaissance Office, the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office, and the intelligence elements of the military services. Nor would NIMA include or replace current organizations for tactical military exploitation and use of imagery products. In effect, NIMA would provide a coherent and uniform linkage between these two ends of the imagery spectrum.

NIMA would not replace or diminish the current responsibilities of federal civilian agencies for mapping, charting, and geodesy, or change their existing responsibilities for disaster or emergency response or civil imagery archives. Rather, NIMA would facilitate their access to critical national security information, when appropriate, and promote technology exchange through established interagency mechanisms, such as the Civil Applications Committee. The ability of all members of the intelligence community to obtain both imagery intelligence support regarding matters of common concern and support necessary for individual agency requirements would be maintained and expanded, as appropriate.

The committee believes that the legislative charter for NIMA contained in this Act strikes an appropriate balance between the needs of "national" intelligence and combat support. As a Combat Support Agency, NIMA must be under the clear authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense. But the charter also provides for a clear and prominent role for the DCI to task imagery systems and exploit imagery products in support of the national mission. The committee notes that the Director of Central Intelligence strongly supports establishment of NIMA as a Combat Support Agency in Title 10, United States Code. The DCI has testified that his peacetime imagery tasking authorities are protected under this arrangement and that he does not believe that support to national customers will be in any way jeopardized. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, establishment of NIMA will not derogate from the existing authorities of the Secretary of Defense or the DCI.

The committee also notes that the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community strongly endorsed the establishment of NIMA as a combat support agency within the Department of Defense. The committee shares the Commission's conclusion that NIMA will significantly improve imagery support to both military operations and planning, as well as to national consumers of intelligence.

The committee notes that limited collective bargaining would be permitted in NIMA. Collective bargaining units that were recognized by the Defense Mapping Agency at the time its employees and positions were transferred to NIMA would continue to represent the same categories of employees in the NIMA, although expansion of those units or the creation of new bargaining units in NIMA would be prohibited. Positions determined at any time to be engaged in intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or security work directly affecting national security would be excluded, at the discretion of the NIMA Director. Permitting continuation of

limited collective bargaining in NIMA would not be intended to be a precedent affecting current or future employees or agencies of the Intelligence Community. It would be a one-time solution to a unique situation. The same would be true for the granting of statutory adverse action due process rights, including the right to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board, to NIMA employees.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1003. Authorization of prior emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the emergency supplemental appropriations enacted in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1996. The supplemental appropriations provided funding for fiscal year 1996 expenses related to military operations in Bosnia.

Section 1004. Use of funds transferred to the Coast Guard.

The committee is concerned with the lack of oversight of the funds which are appropriated to the Department of Defense for transfer to the Coast Guard for its activities in support of national security. The committee believes that these funds should be used for the national security functions of the Coast Guard, including its support of the DOD counter-narcotics program. Therefore, the committee includes a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation to jointly certify to the Congress that the funds transferred from the Department of Defense to the Coast Guard will be used for the national security functions of the Coast Guard.

Section 1005. Use of military-to-military contacts funds for professional military education and training.

The committee recognizes the value that the military-to-military contacts program has provided in the development of close ties between the military forces of the United States and those of other nations. These ties serve to ensure greater stability in an unpredictable world.

The committee recommends a provision to expand the current military-to-military contacts program to increase the participation of civilian and military personnel of foreign countries in training programs of the U.S. military.

Section 1006. Payment of certain expenses relating to humanitarian and civic assistance.

The committee strongly supports the humanitarian demining program of the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes the valuable contribution that this program has made to United States military personnel and civilians of other nations.

The committee includes a provision to amend section 401 of title 10, United States Code, in order to allow funds appropriated to the overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic assistance program to be used to pay for the travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses of Department of Defense personnel providing humanitarian

demining assistance. The provision would also allow for the purchase of supplies, services, and equipment to be used in providing such assistance.

Section 1007. Prohibition on expenditure of Department of Defense funds by officials outside the department.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2215 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for intelligence activities may not be obligated or expended by an officer or employee of the United States who is not an officer or employee of the Department of Defense. The provision would also provide that an officer or employee of the Department of Defense may not delegate the authority to obligate or expend funds appropriated for the Department of Defense for intelligence activities to an officer or employee of the United States who is not an officer or employee of the Department of Defense.

Section 1008. Prohibition on use of funds for Office of Naval Intelligence representation or related activities.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for the Navy for fiscal year 1997 for use by the Office of Naval Intelligence for official representation or related activities.

Section 1009. Reimbursement of Department of Defense for costs of disaster assistance provided outside the United States.

The committee is concerned with the current practice of using funds appropriated to the Department of Defense to provide disaster assistance to foreign nations. The committee believes that funds appropriated to the Agency for International Development would be more appropriate for providing such assistance.

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that whenever the President directs the Secretary of Defense to provide disaster assistance outside the United States, the President should also direct the Administrator of the Agency for International Development to reimburse the Department of Defense for the cost of the assistance provided. The committee further reduces the amount of money authorized to the Department of Defense for humanitarian and disaster assistance by $31.5 million. This would still provide the Department with $49.0 million for these activities.

Section 1010. Fisher House Trust Fund for the Navy.

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a trust fund on the books of the Treasury for Fisher Houses in the Navy. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 established trust funds for the Fisher Houses in the Army and the Air Force. The Navy was inadvertently omitted. The recommended provision resolves that omission.

Section 1011. Designation and liability of disbursing and certifying officials for the Coast Guard.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization for the designation and appointment of disbursing and certifying officials within the Department of Defense to the Secretary of Transportation for the Coast Guard. The Department of Defense was authorized to designate and appoint disbursing and certifying officials in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The recommended provision would include the Coast Guard in these financial management authorities.

Section 1012. Authority to suspend or terminate collection actions against deceased members of the Coast Guard.

The committee recommends a provision that would rescind the requirement to initiate and pursue collection actions against the estates of members of the Coast Guard who die while on active duty and are indebted to the government. The Secretary of Transportation would have discretionary authority to suspend or terminate collection when the Secretary determines that collection action would be inappropriate. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 rescinded this requirement for members of the armed forces providing the discretion to the Secretary of Defense. The recommended provision gives the Secretary of Transportation the same authority relative to the Coast Guard.

Section 1013. Check cashing and exchange transactions with credit unions outside the United States.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Department of Defense disbursing officials to cash checks for U.S. Federal Credit Unions operating at the invitation of the Department of Defense in foreign countries where contractor-operated military banking facilities are not available. The recommended provision would allow the government to provide cash to the federal credit unions so that the credit unions can provide retail financial services to U.S. military and civilian personnel and their families who are authorized to use the facilities.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021. Authority to transfer naval vessels.

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer six *Knox* class frigates, one *Oliver Hazard Perry* class guided missile frigate, one *Newport* class tank landing ship, and two *Stalwart* class ocean surveillance ships to various countries. All transfers would be on a sale or lease basis with the exception of the transfer of one of the two *Stalwart* class ships to Portugal on a grant basis under section 2321j of title 22, United States Code. The Chief of Naval operations has certified that these naval vessels are not essential to the defense of the United States. Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with these transfers would be charged to the recipient. The provision would also direct the Secretary of the Navy to require, to the maximum extent possible, that repairs or refurbishment associated with making these vessels

ready for transfer be performed at shipyards located in the United States.

Section 1022. Transfer of certain obsolete tugboats of the Navy.

The committee recommends a provision that would transfer six obsolete tugboats from the Navy to an instrumentality of the State of Wisconsin, the Northeast Wisconsin Railroad Transportation Commission. The transfer would be at no expense to the Navy. The provision would also direct the Secretary of the Navy to require, as a condition of transfer, that use of the vessels by the Commission not commence until the terms of any necessary environmental compliance letter have been met.

Section 1023. Repeal of requirement for continuous applicability of contracts for phased maintenance of AE class ships.

The Committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1016 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

Section 1024. Contract options for LMSR vessels.

The Navy has negotiated contracts or contract options with two shipyards for the construction of 12 new large medium speed roll-on/roll-off (LMSR) ships to address a requirement for 1.0 million square feet of strategic sealift capacity. This requirement, which initially emerged as a recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's Mobility Requirements Study (MRS), was subsequently reaffirmed by an update of the MRS that was performed after completion of the Bottom-Up Review.

Section 1013 of The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 expressed the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should conduct a limited competition between the two shipyards involved in the construction of new LMSRs and negotiate contract options for the remaining two ships not yet under contract. The provision also stipulated that these two options should be available to the Secretary for exercise during 1995, 1996, or 1997.

The committee has learned through testimony and briefings associated with the fiscal year 1997 budget request that there has been schedule delays and cost growth in the new construction LMSR program, and that the Department of the Navy is involved in internal discussions of how best to address these issues in preparing its fiscal year 1998 budget request.

To some degree, schedule disruption in the new construction program has been induced by delays of up to two years in a complementary program for the conversion of five commercial ships to LMSR configuration. This conversion program is currently in progress at two shipyards, one of which is also building new LMSRs. Information gathered by the committee indicates that the full cost and schedule impact of delays in the conversion program also remains unclear and will not be available until submission of the fiscal year 1998 budget request.

One of the two shipyards may be disadvantaged by a limited competition now. The disadvantaged shipyard would be the ship-

yard that is currently working on both conversions and new construction LSMRs, both programs having encountered schedule delays and cost growth. Until the Navy decides what to do about the cost growth in both the conversion and new construction LMSR programs, it is not clear that further contract awards now make sense.

Given these uncertainties, the committee has concluded that it would be imprudent to leave intact directive language that might cause the Secretary of the Navy to make contract option awards in fiscal year 1997 before the full extent of known and potential schedule delays and cost growth can be evaluated. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 to prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from negotiating and awarding these contract options before fiscal year 1998.

SUBTITLE C—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Sections 1031–1033

Drug interdiction and counterdrug activities

The budget request for drug interdiction and other counterdrug activities of the Department of Defense totals $814.1 million. This includes the $642.7 million drug interdiction account, $32.1 in the National Foreign Intelligence Program for the National Drug Intelligence Center and Throttle Car, and $139.5 million in the military services' operating budgets for counterdrug operations. This compares with a total of $810.9 million for these activities during fiscal year 1996, including $679.4 million for the drug interdiction account and $131.5 million in the services" operating budgets.

The committee is concerned with the continued support of the National Drug Intelligence Center through funds appropriated to the Department of Defense. The committee notes that the National Drug Intelligence Center is an activity operated by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and principally staffed by the DOJ, but totally financed by DOD, including the salaries and travel of DOJ employees. The committee notes that a recent letter to the Congress from the Deputy Attorney General stated that "NDIC shall remain under the direction and control of the Attorney General, which it must as a law enforcement agency."

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision which would prohibit further DOD funding of NDIC. If the Attorney General chooses to operate NDIC with DOJ funds, the Secretary of Defense may continue to provide DOD intelligence personnel to support intelligence activities at NDIC as long as the number of personnel provided by DOD does not exceed the number provided to support intelligence activities at NDIC on the date of enactment of this bill.

The committee is further concerned with the recent decision by the administration to transfer this program from the drug interdiction account to accounts normally under the control of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The National Security Act of 1947 prohibits the Director of Central Intelligence from having any control over domestic law enforcement operations such as NDIC. The committee is concerned that funding NDIC in this manner

may lead to an inappropriate relationship between the foreign intelligence community and domestic law enforcement. Therefore, the committee includes a provision directing the General Accounting Office and other investigatory agencies to review the operation of NDIC to ensure that there are no inappropriate activities taking place.

Funding adjustments

The committee recommends an increase of $119.0 million for the counterdrug initiatives of the Office of National Control Policy. This increase would provide $15.0 million for the refurbishment and installation of an TPS–70 radar, $98.0 million for the retrofitting of two P–3B AEW aircraft to be used in counter narcotics activities, and $6.0 million for the purchase of non-intrusive inspection systems. The increase in funding for these items would be offset by a reduction in the DOD budget request of $119.0 million for the Coast Guard. The budget request has not been justified by an explanation as to how these funds will be used by the Coast Guard in support of America's national security.

These increases will support important counter narcotics activities. The retrofitting of the P–3B aircraft will provide the U.S. Customs Service with two additional detection and monitoring aircraft by installing airborne radars on excess Navy P–3 aircraft. This initiative will provide increased pressure against the narcotrafficker air bridge in the source countries. Since these aircraft will assume much of the tracking responsibility, this initiative will also reduce the OPTEMPO, operating costs, and personnel stress that is placed on high-demand USAF E–3 AWACS.

The installation of the TPS–70 radar will assist the Department, and those cooperative governments of the source nations, in efforts to further reduce the amount of drugs that smugglers are moving using aircraft.

The committee has long supported the Department's prototype development plan for non-intrusive inspection of cargo containers for contraband drugs. This effort reached partial fruition last year with a decision by the U.S. Customs Service to deploy 12 fixed-site backscatter x-ray systems along the southwest border for the detection of contraband drugs in empty or lightly loaded trucks and cargo containers. As stated above, the committee recommends an additional $6.0 million for the purchase of these devices in fiscal year 1997.

Unfortunately, the high energy x-ray system that was developed by DOD and fully tested at Tacoma, Washington for inspection of loaded cargo containers was not economically feasible for use by Customs. The Committee understands that the Pulsed Fast Neutron Activation (PFNA) system, a prototype of which has been successfully tested by DOD, has also been determined by Customs to be economically infeasible for the counter-drug mission because of the expense required to deploy such a system at every major seaport. This year, $6.5 million has been made available under the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) program to further develop the PFNA system for explosives detection. However, despite the potential multi-mission use of the PFNA system, its relatively high cost as a fixed-site system may still cause it to be economi-

cally infeasible. Accordingly, the committee recommends the addition of $9.0 million to make the PFNA prototype system relocatable for potential use at high-threat seaports for the detection of contraband drugs and explosives. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, through normal reprogramming procedures, to provide any additional funds necessary for this effort.

The committee recognizes that a substantial quantity of the narcotics entering the United States from South America continues to come across the southwest border. Some reports put this quantity as high as 70 percent. The committee urges the Department to increase its efforts in stemming the flow of narcotics across this border and recommends a provision, section 1031, that would grant the Secretary of Defense the authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of the Government of Mexico. In addition, the committee recommends an increase of $8.0 million in fiscal year 1997 to be used for this purpose. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on National Security and International Relations of the House of Representatives each time the Department provides such assistance pursuant to the provision. Further, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for the purchase of signal intelligence equipment to be used for communications intercept activities along the southwest border.

The committee is aware that the Department's request is insufficient to provide full funding of Operation Laser Strike in fiscal year 1997. Laser Strike will build on the success of Operation Green Clover and involves a sustained level of U.S. detection, monitoring and tracking resources, as well as assessments and training, to support expanded interdiction and law enforcement efforts by nations of the source region. The committee supports this important operation and recommends an increase of $8.0 million in order to provide full funding.

The committee is also aware that drug traffickers are making greater use of the vast river network in the Andean region to transport processed cocaine and pre-cursor materials. Currently, the governments in the source nations are ill-equipped and ill-trained to interdict drug trafficking on their rivers and waterways. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million for assistance to the governments of the source nations in their efforts to stem the flow of narcotics moving on these rivers.

The committee has learned that the number of OH–58D helicopters in the Army National Guard will be reduced dramatically under the Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative. These helicopters, with their forward looking infrared radar (FLIR), are particularly useful in the National Guard's detection of illicit marijuana fields. The committee has been advised that the Department of Defense's Office of Drug Enforcement Policy and Support is reviewing this situation with a view towards the retention of additional OH–58D helicopters, as appropriate, within existing funding resources. The committee strongly supports this initiative and directs that Office, in coordination with the Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau, to ensure the allocation of addi-

tional helicopters to those states that have historically used these assets for the detection and destruction of illicit marijuana fields.

Drug Interdiction & Counterdrug Activities, Operations and Maintenance [1]

	Thousands
Fiscal Year 1997 Drug and Counterdrug Request	$814,100
Source Nation Support	154,000
Detection and Monitoring	232,100
Disruption of Drug Mafia Organizations	57,100
Law Enforcement Agency	255,000
Demand Reduction	84,000
National Drug Intelligence Center and Throttle Car	32,100
Reductions:	
National Drug Intelligence Center (NFIP)	29,000
Throttle Car (NFIP)	3,100
Increases:	
Throttle Car	3,100
Pulsed Fast Neutron Activation	9,000
Support for Military Counterdrug Units of Mexico	8,000
Laser Strike	8,000
Riverine Operations in South America	2,000
Signal Intelligence Equipment for Southwest Border	2,000
Refurbish and Install TPS–70 Radar	15,000
P–3B AEW Retrofit (2 a/c)	98,000
Non-Intrusive Inspection Systems	6,000
Recommendation	933,100

[1] May not add due to rounding.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Section 1041. Agreements for exchange of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with the governments of allies of the United States and other friendly countries for the exchange of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense and military and civilian personnel of the defense ministries of foreign governments in order to promote greater understanding, standardization, and interoperability. The benefit to each government must be substantially equal and each government must pay the travel, per diem, and training costs for their own personnel. No oath of allegiance to the host country may be taken and no exchange personnel may hold an official capacity in the host country.

The committee intends that this authority be implemented specifically as written. This authority is not to be used as a mechanism to require the Department of Defense to fund visits and training of military and civilian personnel from certain countries without reciprocal exchanges that provide substantially equivalent benefits to the United States.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to report to the Congress annually, not later than March 1 each year, the costs of this program to the United States, which appropriation funded those costs, and the agencies and positions that are involved in the exchange program, both within the United States and in the foreign countries.

Section 1042. Authority for reciprocal exchange of personnel between the United States and foreign countries for flight training.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the exchange of students on a one-for-one basis each fiscal year between U.S. flight training schools and comparable flight training schools of foreign countries. These exchanges are currently being accomplished through the Foreign Military Sales program which is cumbersome and not responsive to fluctuating currency exchange rates.

Section 1043. Extension of counterproliferation authorities.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1505 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484) to extend the authority of the Department of Defense to provide support to the United Nations Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) through the end of fiscal year 1998. The provision would also revise funding restrictions in a manner consistent with the original legislation. Such authority is especially important given ongoing concerns over Iraq's continued possession of weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems. The Department of Defense, including its executive agent for matters regarding UNSCOM, the On-Site Inspection Agency (OSIA), requires the authority to continue much of its current activities in support of UNSCOM.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 1051. Annual report on emerging operational concepts.

Elsewhere in the report, the committee has expressed a concern about the fact that the activity to explore operational concepts made possible by recent technologies and the end of the Cold War is not sufficiently focused at a level above the individual military services. The committee believes that such an approach is necessary to ensure an adequate consideration of joint operational concepts and the coordination of each of the service processes into a coherent and affordable defense program in the 21st century. In order to foster a greater degree of coordination among the services on these issues, the committee recommends a provision requiring the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in his role as Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to provide an annual report to the Congress describing the processes for defining emerging operational concepts in each of the services and the manner in which services' processes are coordinated in matters of doctrine, operational concepts, organization and acquisition strategy.

Section 1052. Annual joint warfighting science and technology plan.

The committee supports current efforts in the Department of Defense to implement a process to ensure that DOD science and technology programs adequately support future warfighting requirements. For that reason, the committee recommends a provision

that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees the annual Joint Warfighting Science and Technology plan so that it may be considered in the congressional review of the President's defense budget request. The provision would also require that additional information of interest to Congress be submitted in conjunction with the plan.

Section 1053. Report on military readiness requirements of the Armed Forces.

In the 1970s the United States allowed its military to become hollow by failing to dedicate adequate resources to the day-to-day operational requirements of our armed forces. This crisis was reversed by increasing funding for operations and maintenance, ammunition, spare parts, and other accounts directly related to near-term readiness.

During its hearings on the fiscal year 1997 defense budget request, the committee has heard repeated testimony from the service chiefs and service secretaries that the future readiness of our armed forces is jeopardized by a shortfall in modernization funding. Because of our failure to adequately fund the investment accounts, our forces today face a future armed with rapidly aging equipment which will be difficult and expensive to maintain and operate.

Finding the funds to develop weapons systems for the force structure of the next century means that we must look for efficiencies in the armed forces of today. There are many approaches to streamlining defense operations and activities that could result in cost savings and which should be done to ensure the best value to the American taxpayer. Another approach which would save scarce defense resources and make available needed funding for critical modernization programs would be to reevaluate the readiness requirements of our military forces.

Although, to a limited extent, the military services currently maintain forces at varying readiness levels, a comprehensive, force-wide review must be performed to ensure the future overall readiness of our forces. The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Joint Chiefs of Staff to perform such an assessment.

This provision would establish a requirement for a one-time report from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military readiness requirements of all U.S. armed forces, including active and reserve components as well as support units, using a tiered readiness system. The provision would also direct the service chiefs and the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Special Operations Command to prepare the report for the Chairman. The report which they prepare should assign each force unit, described by type rather than unit name, to one of three tiers of combat readiness which are defined in the provision. The provision establishes parameters for the assessment. The provision would also direct the Chairman to provide a listing of all forces that are not assigned to one of the three readiness tiers. After the service chiefs provide the Chairman with this report, the Chairman shall provide the report to the congressional defense committees together with his comments. The report is required to be submitted by January 31, 1997.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1061. Uniform Code of Military Justice amendments.

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical amendment to existing legislation requiring forfeitures by persons sentenced to confinement by a special court-martial to conform the provision to the maximum punishment that may be adjudged by a special court-martial.

The committee also recommends a provision, requested by the Department of Defense and the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, concerning the appointment of certain employees of the court. This change to Article 143 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (10 U.S.C. 943(c)) would allow the Court to make appointments to non-attorney positions established in a judge's chambers in the same manner as they currently make attorney position appointments. The change will affect a total of between 10 to 20 individuals for the entire court.

Section 1062. Limitation on retirement or dismantlement of strategic nuclear delivery systems.

Section 1404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) prohibits the use of funds during fiscal year 1996 for the retirement of B–52H bombers, Trident ballistic missile submarines, Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles, or Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles, or preparing to retire or dismantle such systems. The Statement of Managers accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 emphasized the need not to begin reducing strategic delivery systems until the future of the START II Treaty became clearer. It also emphasized the need to maintain 94 B–52H bomber aircraft in the active inventory (partly in an attrition reserve status) until all issues related to conventional bomber requirements had been thoroughly studied and resolved.

The committee recommends a similar provision for fiscal year 1997 and notes that the budget request does not include funds to support the 28 B–52H aircraft that the Air Force was planning to retire. Therefore, the committee recommends a net increase of $58.8 million to retain these aircraft in attrition reserve status, including $11.5 million in Air Force aircraft procurement funds, $42.9 million in Air Force operation and maintenance funds, and $4.4 million in Air Force military personnel funds. In making this recommendation, the committee does not intend to alter the Air Force's ongoing effort to consolidate B–52 squadrons. The committee also does not intend to preclude long-range pre-planning, design, or evaluation efforts to allow the Navy and the Air Force to be ready to execute various retirement and dismantlement options in an efficient manner.

The committee does not intend to preclude the implementation of the START II Treaty should it enter into force during fiscal year 1997. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the funding restrictions on retiring or dismantling strategic nuclear delivery systems, other than for B–52H bombers, to the extent necessary to implement the START II Treaty.

Section 1063. Correction of references to Department of Defense organizations.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the reference to North American Air Defense Command in title 10, United States Code, to conform to the new name as the North American Aerospace Defense Command. The provision also would change all references to "Anniston Army Depot" each place it appears in the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety Act to "Defense Distribution Depot, Anniston".

Section 1064. Authority of certain members of the Armed Forces to perform notarial or consular acts.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize all judge advocates of the armed forces, adjutants, assistant adjutants, personnel adjutants, and other members of the armed forces designated by regulations of the armed forces to have the same notary public authority without regard to whether they are on active duty or performing inactive duty for training. Under current law, reserve component personnel do not have the general powers of a notary public unless they are on active duty.

Section 1065. Training of members of the uniformed services at non-Government facilities.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military personnel to use the same procedures for acquiring commercial training courses as civilian personnel.

Section 1066. Third-party liability to United States for tortious infliction of injury or disease on members of the uniformed services.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section one of the Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651) to enable the United States to recover the costs of compensation provided to members of the armed forces by the United States when they are unable to perform their regular military duties due to circumstances in which a third party has tort liability. The recommended provision would be an extension of current law which allows the United States recovery of costs incurred by the United States for the medical treatment of a beneficiary. Any amounts recovered would be credited to the appropriation supporting the command to which the injured member was assigned. The provision would permit recovery without a finding of tort liability in no-fault states.

Section 1067. Display of State flags at installations and facilities of the Department of Defense.

Recent confusion concerning the display of state flags at official military functions indicates that there is a lack of uniformity among the services as to the proper method of handling official state and territorial flags. The exclusion of certain flags from a full display of official state flags for any reason tends to indicate that the Department of Defense has varying degrees of respect for different states.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the adoption or enforcement of any rule that discriminates against the display of any official state or United States' Territory flag at an official ceremony at Department of Defense installations at which the flags of the other states are being displayed.

Section 1068. George C Marshall European Center for Strategic Security Studies.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the George C. Marshall Center for Strategic Security to accept contributions from foreign governments, foundations, charitable organizations, and individuals in foreign countries. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 authorized the center to receive contributions from the Federal Republic of Germany.

Section 1069. Authority to award to civilian participants in the defense of Pearl Harbor the congressional medal previously authorized only for military participants in the defense of Pearl Harbor.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend to civilians who participated in the defense of Pearl Harbor eligibility for award of a bronze medal to commemorate the services of those persons to the United States.

Section 1070. Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The committee recommends a provision that would designate the Nellis Federal Hospital in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the Michael O'Callaghan Federal Hospital.

Section 1071. Naming of building at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense name Building A at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences the David Packard Building. Mr. David Packard was a former Deputy Secretary of Defense and was instrumental in establishing the Uniformed Services University. Following Mr. Packard's service in the Department of Defense, he agreed to serve as the Chairman of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Board of Regents. In this capacity he provided the initial vision and leadership which enabled the School of Medicine and other affiliated academic programs to achieve national and international standing.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Support for the Young Marines Program

The committee understands that the portion of the Conference Report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 addressing sections 571 through 574 of that Act have been erroneously interpreted to preclude the Secretary of Defense using discretionary funds to support, on an interim basis, programs such as the Young Marines and the Seaborne Conservation Corps. To the contrary, the Secretary of Defense may use dis-

cretionary funds to support these program on an interim basis while these programs develop non-Department of Defense funding sources.

Support services at the Port of Haifa

Section 1336 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the availability of port services for the Navy in the eastern Mediterranean Sea region, with particular emphasis on the services required by the Navy when calling at the Port of Haifa, Israel. Section 1336 also expressed the sense of Congress that the Navy should ensure that suitable services are preserved as commercial activities increase and compete for pier space and other support. Additionally, in the Senate report accompanying S. 1026 (S. Rest. 104–112), the committee directed the Navy to begin prompt discussions with Port of Haifa officials and others to develop detailed plans for support service upgrades.

The Navy has responded to the committee's direction with a one-page letter. This letter indicates that the services available at Haifa are "adequate" and expresses the view that ". . . improvements being undertaken by the port authority will enhance Haifa's ability to meet the needs of the U.S. Navy."

The committee finds the Navy's response inadequate. In briefings following the committee's action on S. 1026, Navy officials indicated that a survey of U.S. naval commanders had identified upgrades that would be desirable to improve the services the Navy receives at the Port of Haifa. Moreover, as the committee indicated in its report, there is reason to be concerned that expansion of commercial activities at the port, rather than improving its ability to support the needs of the Navy, could interfere with such support. Loss of such support would be of particular concern if the peace process succeeds and the port's commercial activities expand significantly, a prospect more likely with the recent success of the peace process.

The committee directs the Navy to immediately submit its findings on desirable upgrades in services at the Port of Haifa, along with cost estimates for those potential upgrades. The committee also directs that none of the funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 in PE 64310N for development of the arsenal ship be expended or obligated until the Secretary of the Navy has formally transmitted this information to the committee.

U.S.-Asian military-to-military dialogue

The United States has significant political, economic, and security interests in Asia that are growing as a result of rapid economic growth in Asia. The stability provided by U.S. security alliances and other military relationships with Asian countries has promoted Asian economic development to the mutual benefit of the United States and Asia. Preserving stability in Asia remains a major objective of U.S. policy.

The People's Republic of China (PRC) continues to grow economically and to modernize its military forces. Efforts by the PRC to enhance its naval and air capabilities, combined with recent PRC military activities, have raised questions regarding their military and foreign policy objectives. The growth of PRC military power is

the subject of major interest, and potentially of concern, for the other nations of Asia and for the United States.

In light of these developments, continued dialogue on security matters between the United States and Asian countries, including the People's Republic of China, is critical to promoting stability in the region and protecting and promoting U.S. interests and the interests of our Asian allies. The committee therefore encourages the Department of Defense to engage PRC defense officials, at all levels, in exchanges and other forms of dialogue.

Implementation of arms control agreements

The budget request included $282.3 million in the procurement, operation and maintenance, and research and development accounts for the Department of Defense and the Military Services for implementation of arms control agreements. The budget request for this account is based on anticipated dates of implementation of the various arms control treaties. The committee recommends authorization of the requested amount. Due to possible changes in the assumptions on the dates of entry into force of the arms control treaties, it is the intention of the committee to review the budget request during the conference between the House and Senate, as there is a potential for reduced funding requirements, resulting in cost-savings for the program.

The Congress included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106) that limits the expenditure of defense funds for the reimbursement for arms control implementation inspection costs borne by the inspected party to a treaty or agreement. In order to continue its oversight of the use of these funds, the committee requests that the Department continue to provide a report on the use of defense funds to reimburse our treaty partners for inspected party reimbursement costs.

The committee has been informed by the Department of Defense that the On Site Inspection Agency (OSIA) has been directed by the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) for purposes of implementing Annex 1-B of the General Framework for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina Agreement (also known as the Dayton Agreement). As the committee understands it, OSIA will participate in the planning and conduct of confidence building and arms control measures to reduce the risk of conflict in the Balkans. Specifically, OSIA's role will be to train international inspectors, who will monitor and verify compliance with the confidence building and arms control measures, as well as participate in the conduct of these inspections.

The committee understands that there could be further refinement of OSIA's role in the implementation of Annex 1-B of the Dayton Accord. The committee is concerned about the assignment of this mission to OSIA and the potential impact on the ability of OSIA to conduct monitoring and verification inspections required by other arms control treaties to which the United States is a party. The committee requests that the Department keep the committee informed on the status of this new mission, and any impact

this mission may have on the ability of OSIA to conduct its other arms control inspection responsibilities.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

SUBTITLE A—PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, PAY AND, ALLOWANCES

Section 1101. Scope of requirement for conversion of military positions to civilian positions.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal as much of section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 that would require the Secretary of Defense to convert 7,000 military positions to civilian positions during Fiscal Year 1997. The committee has not received the implementation plan required by section 1032 and believes, based on correspondence from the Department of Defense and meetings with representatives from the General Accounting Office, that conversions of military positions to civilian positions beyond the 3,000 converted during Fiscal Year 1996 may not be in the best interests of the Department of Defense.

Section 1102. Retention of civilian employee positions at military training bases transferred to National Guard.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to retain civilian positions which support active and reserve training at an installation after that installation has been transferred to the National Guard.

Section 1103. Clarification of limitation on furnishing clothing or paying a uniform allowance to enlisted National Guard technicians.

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify the circumstances under which uniforms could be furnished to enlisted National Guard technicians.

Section 1104. Travel expenses and health care for civilian employees of the Department of Defense abroad.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, under certain circumstances, to pay civilian personnel serving overseas allowances and benefits comparable to those paid to members of other government agencies that routinely assign personnel overseas.

Section 1105. Travel, transportation, and relocation allowances for certain former nonappropriated fund employees.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a nonappropriated fund employee who moves in conjunction with being hired as an appropriated fund employee to receive the same

travel, transportation, and relocation expenses authorized for appropriated fund employees.

Section 1106. Employment and salary practices applicable to Department of Defense overseas teachers.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to reclassify General Schedule professional educator positions as "overseas teachers" compensable under the Overseas Teacher Pay and Personnel Act.

Section 1107. Employment and compensation of civilian faculty members at certain Department of Defense schools.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies and the English Language Center of the Defense Language Institute to employ and compensate the civilian faculty, including the Director and Deputy Director of the Asia-Pacific Center, in the same manner as the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies and other Department of Defense education facilities.

Section 1108. Reimbursement of Department of Defense domestic dependent school board members for certain expenses.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Department of Defense domestic dependent school board members to be reimbursed for travel and transportation expenses, program fees, and activity fees that the Secretary of Defense determines reasonable and necessary in the performance of their duties.

Section 1109. Extension of authority for civilian employees of Department of Defense to participate voluntarily in reductions in force.

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until September 30, 2001, the authority to allow employees who are not affected by a reduction-in-force (RIF) to volunteer to be RIF–separated in place of other employees who are scheduled for RIF separation.

Section 1110. Compensatory time off for overtime work performed by wage-board employees.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize agency heads to grant compensatory time off in lieu of overtime pay under certain circumstances.

Section 1111. Liquidation of restored annual leave that remains unused upon transfer of employee from installation being closed or realigned.

The committee recommends a provision that would require under certain circumstances, automatic liquidation of annual leave restored under section 6304(d) of title 5, United States Code.

Section 1112. Waiver of requirement for repayment of voluntary separation incentive pay by former Department of Defense employees reemployed by the Government without pay.

The committee recommends a provision that would allow civilian employees who accept separation pay under section 5597 of title 10, United States Code, to return to government service as advisors without compensation, prior to the expiration of a five-year period following separation and not be required to repay the separation pay.

Section 1113. Federal holiday observance rules for Department of Defense employees.

The committee recommends a provision that would change the required designation of holidays for employees on compressed work schedules when a holiday falls on the employees' day off.

Section 1114. Revision of certain travel management authorities.

The committee recommends three provisions that would: 1) repeal a reporting requirement; 2) eliminate the requirement for agency heads to certify official long-distance telephone calls made during official travel; and 3) repeal the prohibition on paying lodging expenses to Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees who do not use adequate government quarters when they are available.

The committee believes that these provisions will assist the DOD in its ongoing efforts to simplify the travel management system and, in doing so, improve efficiency and reduce costs associated with official travel.

The committee notes, however, that the success or failure of the DOD travel management initiatives will not depend on the relaxation of the many detailed rules and regulations that have governed travel management over the years. Rather, the success or failure will be a direct reflection of the seriousness and discipline with which executives and supervisors at every level approach their individual responsibilities in overseeing their own official travel and that of their subordinates.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT, DIVERSIFICATION, CONVERSION, AND STABILIZATION

Section 1121. Pilot programs for defense employees converted to contractor employees due to privatization at closed military installations.

The committee recommends a provision that would permit certain federal workers who accept employment with a contractor in conjunction with a privatization initiative, referred to as "transferred" employees, to continue to accrue years of federal service for the purpose of determining eligibility for federal retirement but not for determining the amount of the employees retirement benefit. The amount of a "transferred" employee's retirement benefit would be indexed for annual federal pay raises beginning on the date that actual federal service ends.

The committee believes that the migration of skilled, experienced federal workers from federal service to the private sector is important to the success of privatization initiatives. A large number of federal employees who expected to migrate to the private sector participate in the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS), which does not allow an employee to move between federal and private sector employment without a reduction of benefits. The most experienced employees—and, therefore, the employees most valuable to private sector employers who are involved in a privatization initiative—tend to be covered by CSRS because they joined federal service prior to 1984. These are the same employees that have the most to lose under current rules if they terminate their federal employment before they become eligible to receive an immediate retirement annuity. It is very possible that a significant number of CSRS employees will choose to relocate in order to remain in federal service, rather than hire on with a private contractor and suffer the diminishment of federal retirement benefits. If this occurs, this could jeopardize the overall success of the privatization initiative.

The recommended provision would:

(1) authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish pilot programs in conjunction with certain privatization initiatives;

(2) define a transferred employee as a CSRS employee whose function was privatized and who accepts employment with the private contractor performing that function within 60 days of separation from federal service, and remains with that contractor until first eligible for a retirement benefit;

(3) permit a "transferred" employee to receive a federal retirement annuity when the employee first becomes eligible for early retirement (as opposed to waiting until age 62);

(4) permit the "transferred" employee to leave federal service and continue to accrue years of federal service for the purpose of becoming eligible to receive a retirement annuity;

(5) not permit years after leaving federal service to count in determining the actual amount of the federal retirement benefit;

(6) require the amount of pay upon which a retirement annuity would be based as of the date the "transferred" employee leaves federal service to be increased by normal pay raises each year as if the "transferred" employee were still in federal service until first eligible to receive a retirement benefit;

(7) require the military department concerned to be liable for any increase in the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund that results from indexing the pay of a "transferred" employee or from allowing a "transferred" employee to receive retirement benefits prior to age 62;

(8) require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of each pilot program.

Section 1122. Troops-to-teachers program improvements applied to civilian personnel. (Refer to Section 572)

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Flexible, compressed and alternative schedules

The committee is concerned about the extent to which the use in the Department of Defense of flexible, compressed and alternative schedules authorized under sections 6122 and 6127, respectively, of title 5, United States Code, may fail to recognize the fundamental purposes of those authorizations and the extent to which the unconstrained use of these authorities, despite being convenient for employees, may actually disrupt a department or agency in carrying out its functions. The committee notes that there are many situations in which the productivity and efficiency of an office or agency may be increased through the use of these authorities. The committee notes, however, that using flexible, compressed and alternative schedules in management headquarters offices may actually degrade the productivity and efficiency of those offices.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the use of flexible, compressed and alternative schedules in the military departments and in the defense agencies and report the results of that review to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate by May 1, 1997. As a minimum, this report should address:

(1) the extent to which flexible, compressed and alternative schedules are used in the Department of Defense;

(2) the extent to which the use of flexible, compressed and alternative schedules actually contributes to the ability of the military departments and defense agencies to accomplish assigned missions;

(3) the extent to which the use of flexible, compressed and/or alternative schedules have been extended to members of the uniformed services, and the rationale for such extension; and

(4) the extent to which employees and supervisors understand that flexible, compressed and alternative schedules are not an inherent employee right but rather a management tool to assist the military departments and defense agencies accomplish their assigned missions.

The committee expects that as a result of the review, and if appropriate, the Secretary of Defense would promulgate regulations and policies that would enhance the management of these authorities, including prohibiting managers and members of the Senior Executive Service from participating in flexible, compressed or alternative schedules, except under extraordinary circumstances.

Authority to conduct civilian personnel demonstration projects

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 made permanent the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to continue personnel demonstration projects at the Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake, California, and the Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Center, San Diego, California, and at successor organizations resulting from the reorganization of

Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division or the Naval Command, Control, and Ocean Center.

Additionally, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 provided expanded authority for the Secretary of Defense to conduct personnel demonstration projects at Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories and expressed the conferees concern about what appeared to be a lack of real progress in this area. The conferees directed the Department of Defense to report to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House National Security Committee not later than February 1, 1996, the extent to which these expanded authorities had been used in each of the military departments.

Despite assurances to the contrary from senior officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the committee believes that cumbersome processes and frameworks that mask bureaucratic inertia, together with artificial constraints and unnecessary coordination requirements, have delayed the evaluation and approval of individual projects proposed by the military departments to an unacceptable degree.

Additionally, the committee is concerned that the establishment of a complex approval bureaucracy and a reluctance on the part of key executives to think beyond past and current practices has tended to support excessively conservative approaches that lead to a least common denominator solution in lieu of the bold, innovative thinking and initiatives necessary to really reinvent the government. Therefore, committee urges to Secretary of Defense to authorize direct liaison between each of the military departments and the Office of Personnel Management in order to facilitate timely approval and implementation of the type of demonstration projects envisioned by the underlying legislative authority and the Administration's National Performance Review and Reinventing Government initiative.

TITLE XII—FEDERAL CHARTER FOR THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

Sections 1201 through 1216

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a federal charter for the Fleet Reserve Association. The federal charter is an honorary recognition that does not convey any special status or authority.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorization and related authority to support the military departments and defense agencies during fiscal year 1997. The administration's budget request is reflected in S. 1673, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, as introduced by request. This division, as recommended by the committee, totals $9.8 billion in authorization for appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This authorization provides funding for construction and military family housing operations for the military services, the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the NATO Security Investment program. It also provides authorization for the base closure account that funds activities associated with the 1991, 1993, and 1995 base closure rounds.

Committee Action

The committee recommends an overall authorization for the Department of Defense military construction program that is above the administration's request for fiscal year 1997. For fiscal year 1997, the Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $5.3 billion for military construction, and $3.9 billion for family housing construction and support. The committee recommends $5.9 billion for military construction, and $4.0 billion for family housing construction and support for fiscal year 1997. These amounts include a $700.0 million increase above the administration's request. The increase is a reflection of the committee's concern about the effects of the administration's construction program funding request for fiscal year 1997, which is $1.56 billion below the fiscal year 1996 request.

The committee reaffirms its support of the military services' efforts to modernize, renovate, and improve aging defense facilities and focuses its funding priorities on improving quality of life and readiness-related projects for the active and reserve components. Of the $700.0 million added to the construction program, more than $289.0 million will fund unaccompanied personnel quarters, child development centers, dining facilities, and military family housing.

The committee members are hopeful that the increased attention to and funding for unaccompanied military personnel quarters will enable the military services to expedite the replacement and modernization of these antiquated facilities, many of which are more than 40 years old and need to be refurbished and brought up to modern standards.

The following table identifies the committee's recommendations for fiscal year 1997 military construction and family housing construction projects.

Summary of
National Defense Authorization for FY 1997

(In Millions of $s)

	FY 1997 Authorization Request	FY 1997 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1997 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	434,723	434,723	94,975	529,698	529,698
Military Construction, Navy	525,346	525,346	90,290	615,636	615,636
Military Construction, Air Force	603,059	603,059	147,215	750,274	750,274
Military Construction, Defense-wide	812,945	812,945	4,400	817,345	817,345
Military Construction, Army National Guard	7,600	7,600	72,028	79,628	79,628
Military Construction, Air National Guard	75,394	75,394	133,090	208,484	208,484
Military Construction, Army Reserve	48,459	48,459	10,715	59,174	59,174
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	10,983	10,983	21,760	32,743	32,743
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	51,655	51,655	3,115	54,770	54,770
Base Realignment and Closure II, III, IV	2,507,476	2,751,476		2,507,476	2,751,476
NATO Infrastructure	197,000	197,000		197,000	197,000
BRAC Receipts		(244,000)			(244,000)
Total Military Construction	5,274,640	5,274,640	577,588	5,852,228	5,852,228
FAMILY HOUSING					
Family Housing Construction, Army	75,013	75,013	27,120	102,133	102,133
Family Housing Support, Army	1,212,466	1,212,466	50,000	1,262,466	1,262,466
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	403,726	403,726	6,490	410,216	410,216
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	1,014,241	1,014,241		1,014,241	1,014,241
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	231,236	231,236	33,802	265,038	265,038
Family Housing Support, Air Force	829,474	829,474		829,474	829,474
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	4,371	4,371		4,371	4,371
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	30,963	30,963		30,963	30,963
Homeowners Assistance Fund	36,181	36,181		36,181	36,181
DoD Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	20,000	20,000		20,000	20,000
Total Family Housing	3,857,671	3,857,671	122,412	3,980,083	3,980,083

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Alabama	Army	Ft. Rucker	Air Traffic Control Tower	0	3,250	3,250
Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Off Tng School Academic Facility	7,875		7,875
Alabama	Defense Medical Facility Office	Maxwell AFB	Ambulatory Health Care Center, Phase II	25,000		25,000
Alabama	Air National Guard	Birmingham	Joint Medical Training Facility	0	4,600	4,600
Alabama	Air National Guard	Dannelly Field	Munitions Complex & Aircraft Equipment Shop	0	4,500	4,500
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Conventional Munitions Shop	0	3,900	3,900
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Hangar/Squadron Operations/ Aircraft Maint	19,435		19,435
Alaska	Air Force	Elmendorf AFB	Upgrade Storm Drainage System	2,095		2,095
Alaska	Air Force	King Salmon	Repair Airfield Pavements	0	5,700	5,700
Alaska	Defense Logistics Agency	Elmendorf AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	18,000		18,000
Alaska	Army National Guard	Fairbanks	Readiness Center	0	4,955	4,955
Arizona	Navy	NAVDET Camp Navajo	Magazine Modifications and Addition	3,920		3,920
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	EC-130 Aircraft Maint Facility	4,330		4,330
Arizona	Air Force	Davis-Monthan AFB	Consolidated Material Processing Facility	5,590		5,590
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Squadron Operations/ Aircraft Maint	14,045		14,045
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	C-130 Add/Alter Field Training Facility	1,525		1,525
Arkansas	Air Force	Little Rock AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,535		2,535
Arkansas	Chemical Demilitarization	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac Phase II	46,000		46,000
Arkansas	Army National Guard	Benton	Armory	0	1,805	1,805
Arkansas	Army National Guard	Camp Robinson	Army Aviation Support Facility	0	14,081	14,081
California	Army	Camp Roberts	Power Systems Upgrade	5,500		5,500
California	Army	NWS Concord	Ammunition Pier (DBOF)	27,000		27,000
California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Child Development Center	4,020		4,020
California	Navy	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Runway Improvements	1,390		1,390
California	Navy	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Aircraft Parking Apron Expansion & Taxiway	2,600		2,600
California	Navy	MCAS Camp Pendleton	Transportation Infrastructure	2,250		2,250
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Physical Fitness Center	4,150		4,150
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Tactical Vehicle Maintenance Facility	9,060		9,060
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Automated Field Firing Range	4,020		4,020
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	11,800		11,800
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	12,500		12,500
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	10,100		10,100

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
California	Navy	MCRD San Diego	Combat Training Tank	0	8,150	8,150
California	Navy	NAS North Island	Dredging	59,502	(9,630)	49,872
California	Navy	NAS North Island	Ship Maintenance Facility	27,000		27,000
California	Navy	NAVFAC San Clemente	BEQ And Mess Hall Replacement	17,000		17,000
California	Navy	NAVSTA San Diego	Oily Waste Collection Facility	7,050		7,050
California	Navy	NCCOSC San Diego	Pier (San Clemente)	1,960		1,960
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Landfill Closure	6,735		6,735
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	CARS Deployable Ground Station Spt Fac	7,690		7,690
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Convert Boilers	3,120		3,120
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Add to and Alter Anechoic Chamber	4,890		4,890
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	F-22 Alter Aircraft Maint Facility	4,390		4,390
California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Renovate Aircraft Maintenance Facility	7,680		7,680
California	Air Force	McClellan AFB	Flood Control Measure	8,795	(8,795)	0
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Dormitory	7,980		7,980
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Dormitory	0	7,000	7,000
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Satellite Processing Facility	3,290		3,290
California	Defense Logistics Agency	Def Dist San Diego	Replace General Purpose Whse	15,700		15,700
California	Defense Logistics Agency	NAF El Centro	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	5,700		5,700
California	Defense Logistics Agency	Travis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	15,200		15,200
California	Defense Medical Facility Office	MCB Camp Pendleton	Branch Medical Clinic (Edson Range)	3,300		3,300
California	Defense Medical Facility Office	NAS Lemoore	Hospital Replacement	38,000		38,000
California	Special Operations Command	NAB Coronado	SOF - Ops & Logistics Support Facility	7,700		7,700
California	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Norton AFB	Renovate Existing Facility For Admin Use	13,800		13,800
California	Army National Guard	Los Alamitos AFRC	JP-8 Fuel Tank Replacements	0	1,092	1,092
Colorado	Army	Ft. Carson	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal Phase II	13,000		13,000
Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Upgrade Academic Facility	10,065		10,065
Colorado	Air Force	Air Force Academy	Family Support Center	0	2,100	2,100
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	Space-Based Infrared Sys Ops Facility	14,460		14,460
Colorado	Air Force	Buckley ANGB	Base Supply And Equipment Warehouse	3,500		3,500
Colorado	Air Force	Falcon AFS	Alter Dining Facility/Safety Upgrade	2,095		2,095
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Dormitory	8,350		8,350
Colorado	Air Force	Peterson AFB	Mission Support Facility	12,370		12,370

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Colorado	Chemical Demilitarization	Pueblo AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac Phase I	17,497		17,497
Colorado	Air Force Reserve	Peterson AFB	Composite Maintenance Facility	3,200		3,200
Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Hazardous Material Storehouse	3,230		3,230
Connecticut	Navy	NSB New London	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	10,600		10,600
Connecticut	Army National Guard	Groton	ADAL Aviation Classif. Repair Activity Depot	0	5,647	5,647
Connecticut	Army National Guard	Windsor Locks	Army Aviation Support Facility	0	3,045	3,045
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	C-5 Aerial Delivery Facility	7,980		7,980
Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Visiting Officers Quarters	0	12,000	12,000
Delaware	Air National Guard	New Castle County AP	Operations & Training Complex	0	9,300	9,300
District of Columbia	Army	Ft. McNair	National Defense University Fac Phase II	6,900		6,900
District of Columbia	Navy	NAVDIST Washington	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Complex	19,300		19,300
District of Columbia	Defense Intelligence Agency	Bolling AFB	Reconfiguration DIAC HVAC	6,790		6,790
District of Columbia	Navy Reserve	NAF, Andrews AFB, Washington	Training Building Addition	1,465		1,465
District of Columbia	Navy Reserve	NAF, Andrews AFB, Washington	Addition To Hangar 12	640		640
Florida	Navy	NAS Key West	Fitness Center	2,250		2,250
Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution System	4,590		4,590
Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Transient Personnel Quarters	6,825		6,825
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Control Tower	2,595		2,595
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Air Freight/Passenger Terminal & Base Ops	0	7,900	7,900
Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Aircraft Equipment Maintenance Shop	0	3,600	3,600
Florida	Defense Medical Facility Office	NAS Key West	Med/Dent Clinic Replacement	13,600		13,600
Florida	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	NTC Orlando	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	2,600		2,600
Florida	Air National Guard	Jacksonville IAP	Upgrade Heating Plants And Chillers	680		680
Florida	Air National Guard	Jacksonville IAP	ADAL Medical Training Facility	0	1,100	1,100
Florida	Navy Reserve	NRRC Jacksonville	Reserve Center Addition	770		770
Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead AFRB	Fire Training Facility	1,300		1,300
Georgia	Army	Ft. Benning	Rail Loading Facility	9,400		9,400
Georgia	Army	Ft. Benning	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	44,000		44,000
Georgia	Army	Ft. McPherson	Military Entrance Processing Facility (Ft. Gillem)	0	3,500	3,500
Georgia	Army	Ft. Stewart/Hunter AAF	Close Combat Tactical Training Building	6,000		6,000
Georgia	Air Force	Moody AFB	Rescue C-130 Parking Apron	0	3,350	3,350
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	JSTARS Squadron Operations/ Aircraft Maint	8,270		8,270

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	JSTARS ADAL Apron/Hydrant Fuel System	6,585		6,585
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	JSTARS ADAL Aircraft Maint Shops	1,645		1,645
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	JSTARS Child Development Center	2,145		2,145
Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Upgrade Dormitories	0	6,400	6,400
Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 AGE & Munitions Trailer Maint Complex	2,800		2,800
Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Site Improvements, Roads & Utilities	5,500		5,500
Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Aircraft Park Apron & Relocate Taxiway	8,800		8,800
Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Composite Aircraft Maint. Complex	12,400		12,400
Georgia	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Operations & Training Facility	0	5,000	5,000
Georgia	Navy Reserve	NAS Atlanta	Renovate Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	3,250	3,250
Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFRB	ADAL Communications Facility	1,137		1,137
Georgia	Air Force Reserve	Dobbins AFRB	Upgrade Storm Water System	0	1,150	1,150
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	0	16,500	16,500
Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	19,600		19,600
Hawaii	Navy	NSB Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	5,390		5,390
Hawaii	Navy	NSB Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	30,500		30,500
Hawaii	Special Operations Command	NAVSTA Ford Island, Pearl	SOF - Advanced SEAL Delivery Sys Facility	12,800		12,800
Hawaii	Air National Guard	Hickam AFB	Alter Avionics Shop	1,000		1,000
Hawaii	Air National Guard	Hickam AFB	Alter Squadron Operations Facility	0	9,000	9,000
Idaho	Navy	NSWC Bayview	Ships Model Engineering & Support Facility	7,150		7,150
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Flightline Fire Station	6,545		6,545
Idaho	Air Force	Mountain Home AFB	Corrosion Control Facility	0	9,400	9,400
Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field	Fuel Sys Maint & Corrosion Control Fac	4,500		4,500
Idaho	Air National Guard	Gowen Field	C-130 Engine & Propeller Shops	0	1,500	1,500
Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	22,900		22,900
Illinois	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Rock Island Arsenal	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	14,400		14,400
Illinois	Air National Guard	Greater Peoria RAP (ANG)	Fuel Systems Maint & Corrosion Control Fac	4,200		4,200
Illinois	Air Force Reserve	Scott AFB	Consolidated Medical Training Facility	2,300		2,300
Indiana	Army National Guard	Atterbury Training Center	Central Vehicle Wash Facility	0	4,747	4,747
Indiana	Air National Guard	Fort Wayne IAP	Upgrade Drainage System	480		480
Indiana	Air National Guard	Fort Wayne IAP	Base Supply Complex	0	4,150	4,150
Indiana	Air National Guard	Hulman AP	Fuel Cell, Corrosion Control, Fire Station	0	4,700	4,700

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Iowa	Air National Guard	Des Moines IAP	Aircraft Arresting System	0	2,350	2,350
Kansas	Army	Ft. Riley	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	26,000		26,000
Kansas	Army	Ft. Riley	Modified Record Fire Range	0	3,350	3,350
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Dormitory	8,480		8,480
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Dormitory	0	7,100	7,100
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Consolidated Education Center	0	6,700	6,700
Kansas	Air Force	McConnell AFB	Flight Simulator Training Facility	0	3,550	3,550
Kansas	Defense Logistics Agency	McConnell AFB	Add/Alter Jet Fuel Storage Facility	2,200		2,200
Kansas	Army National Guard	Topeka	USP&FO Warehouse Alteration/Addition	0	1,917	1,917
Kansas	Army Reserve	Wichita ARC	Add/Alt USARC, New OMS/AMSA	5,670		5,670
Kentucky	Army	Ft. Campbell	Rail Spur	16,100		16,100
Kentucky	Army	Ft. Campbell	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal (Ph II)	35,000		35,000
Kentucky	Army	Ft. Campbell	Tactical Equipment Shop (Ph II)	0	9,900	9,900
Kentucky	Army	Ft. Knox	Urban Training Range	0	13,000	13,000
Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Ft. Campbell	SOF - Supply Support Facility	4,200		4,200
Louisiana	Army	Ft. Polk	Consolidated Rail Complex	0	4,800	4,800
Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,390		2,390
Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Communications Systems Squadron Complex	2,500		2,500
Louisiana	Defense Logistics Agency	Barksdale AFB	Jet Fuel Offload Facility	4,300		4,300
Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	8,900	8,900
Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NSA New Orleans	Naval Reserve Management School	0	3,650	3,650
Maine	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Loring AFB	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	6,900		6,900
Maine	Air National Guard	Bangor IAP	Upgrade Base Facilities	0	13,000	13,000
Maryland	Navy	NAS Patuxent River	Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	1,270		1,270
Maryland	Navy	United States Naval Academy	Chiller System Upgrade	0	10,480	10,480
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Alter Dormitory	5,990		5,990
Maryland	Air Force	Andrews AFB	Family Support Center	0	2,150	2,150
Maryland	Defense Logistics Agency	Andrews AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	12,100		12,100
Maryland	National Security Agency	Ft. Meade	Friendship Annex III Purchase	25,200		25,200
Maryland	Defense Medical Facility Office	Andrews AFB	Life Safety/Emergency Room Upgrade	15,500		15,500
Maryland	Defense Medical Facility Office	WRAIR, Forest Glen	Army Institute Of Research Phase IV	92,000		92,000
Maryland	Army National Guard	Annapolis	Armory Addition/Alteration	0	2,332	2,332

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Maryland	Air National Guard	Andrews AFB	Munitions Trailer Maintenance Facility	500		500
Maryland	Air Force Reserve	Andrews AFB	Consolidated Medical Training	2,600		2,600
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Barnes MAP	Upgrade Heating Distribution System	500		500
Massachusetts	Air National Guard	Milford ANGS	Vehicle Maintenance Complex	0	1,900	1,900
Michigan	Air National Guard	Selfridge ANGB	Upgrade Heating Systems	3,000		3,000
Michigan	Air National Guard	W.K. Kellogg AP	Composite Support Complex	0	6,000	6,000
Michigan	Air Force Reserve	Selfridge ANGB	Fuel System Maintenance Hangar	6,000		6,000
Minnesota	Air National Guard	Minneapolis/St Paul IAP	Base CE Operations & Maintenance Complex	0	4,150	4,150
Minnesota	Army Reserve	ARC Buffalo	USARC/OMS	4,260		4,260
Mississippi	Navy	NS Pascagula	Extend West Quaywall	0	4,990	4,990
Mississippi	Navy	Stennis Space Center	Ocean Acoustics Research Lab	0	7,960	7,960
Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Student Dormitory	14,465		14,465
Mississippi	Army National Guard	Camp Shelby	Multipurpose Range Complex (Ph II)	0	5,000	5,000
Mississippi	Air National Guard	Gulfport-Biloxi RAP	Relocate Hewes Road (Ph II)	0	5,400	5,400
Missouri	Air National Guard	Rosencrans Memorial AP	Vehicle Maintenance & AGE complex	0	4,000	4,000
Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Dormitory	0	6,300	6,300
Montana	Air National Guard	Great Falls IAP	Composite Support Facilities Complex	0	5,400	5,400
Nebraska	Army National Guard	Hastings Training Range	MRF RETS/MPMG	0	1,250	1,250
Nebraska	Air National Guard	Lincoln MAP	Composite Support Facilities Complex	0	7,300	7,300
Nebraska	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Offutt AFB	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	7,000		7,000
Nevada	Navy	NAS Fallon	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	14,800	14,800
Nevada	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	UAV Operations And Maintenance Facilities	4,690		4,690
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Dormitory	0	9,900	9,900
Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Weapons School Addition	0	4,800	4,800
Nevada	Defense Logistics Agency	NAS Fallon	Addition To Hot Refueling Area	2,100		2,100
Nevada	Air National Guard	Reno Cannon IAP	Fuel Sys Maint & Corrosion Control Hangar	4,600		4,600
New Hampshire	Army Reserve	Manchester	AFRC/OMS/AMSA	0	5,315	5,315
New Jersey	Air Force	McGuire AFB	Dormitory	8,080		8,080
New Jersey	Air National Guard	Atlantic City IAP	Add To & Alter Medical Training Facility	380		380
New Jersey	Air National Guard	McGuire AFB	Consolidated Squadron Operations Facility	0	9,900	9,900
New Mexico	Air Force	Cannon AFB	Logistics Administration Facility	0	7,100	7,100
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Advanced Laser Research Facility	0	10,000	10,000

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Replace Manzano Bridge	0	6,300	6,300
New Mexico	Air National Guard	Kirtland AFB	Munitions Maint. & Storage Complex	3,000		3,000
New York	Army	Ft. Drum	Military Training & Education Center	0	6,500	6,500
New York	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Griffiss AFB	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	10,200		10,200
New York	Air National Guard	Gabreski Airport	Aircraft Wash And Deicing Facility	659		659
New York	Air National Guard	Hancock Field	Composite Operations & Training Facility	0	4,500	4,500
New York	Air National Guard	Stewart IAP	C-5 Flight Simulator Facility	3,000		3,000
New York	Air National Guard	Stewart IAP	Cover Landfill	0	2,200	2,200
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls ARS	Fire Training System	1,600		1,600
New York	Air Force Reserve	Niagara Falls ARS	Deicing Facility	342		342
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS Cherry Point	Tactical Mission Planning Facility	1,630		1,630
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Corrosion Control Hangar	12,900		12,900
North Carolina	Navy	MCAS New River	Aviation Armament Shops	4,140		4,140
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	5,190		5,190
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Physical Fitness Center	2,530		2,530
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Training Range Facilities	9,800		9,800
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Wastewater Treatment Plant (Phase III)	3,230		3,230
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,065		2,065
North Carolina	Air Force	Pope AFB	C-130 ADAL Sqd Ops Aircraft Maint Fac	3,850		3,850
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	F-15E Student Officer Quarters	1,925		1,925
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	F-15 Air Grd Equip Facility/Pod Storage	2,405		2,405
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	F-15E Add To And Alter Flight Simulator	3,460		3,460
North Carolina	Air Force	Seymour Johnson AFB	F-15E Squadron Ops/ Academic Fac	3,490		3,490
North Carolina	Defense Medical Facility Office	Ft. Bragg	Hospital Replacement Phase IV	89,000		89,000
North Carolina	Defense Medical Facility Office	Ft. Bragg	Ambulatory Clinic, Smoke Bomb Hill	11,400		11,400
North Carolina	Special Operations Command	Ft. Bragg	SOF - Company Ops & Supply Complex	14,000		14,000
North Carolina	Army Reserve	USAR Cntr Ft. Bragg	Add/Alt USARC/OMS	9,966		9,966
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Dining Facility	5,985		5,985
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	KC-135 Sqd Ops/Acft Maint Unit Fac	6,485		6,485
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Ugnd Storage Tanks Msl Facilities	3,940		3,940
North Dakota	Army National Guard	Bismarck	AASF/Armory Complex Exp	0	3,650	3,650
Ohio	Air Force	Wright-Patterson AFB	ADAL Engineering & Research Lab	7,400		7,400

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Ohio	Defense Logistics Agency	DCSC Columbus	Construct Entrance Gate	600		600
Ohio	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Columbus Center	DFAS Operations Facility - Increment II	20,822		20,822
Ohio	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Gentile AFS	Renovate Facility For Admin Use	11,400		11,400
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Consolidated Maint Fac	3,600		3,600
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Wing Headquarters Facility	5,300		5,300
Ohio	Air Force Reserve	Youngstown ARS	Fire Training Facility	1,500		1,500
Ohio	Air National Guard	Mansfield Lahm AP	Composite Operations & Training Facility	0	4,550	4,550
Ohio	Air National Guard	Rickenbacker ANGB	Fuel Cell & Corrosion Control Facility	0	5,700	5,700
Oklahoma	Air Force	Tinker AFB	Consolidated Vehicle Maint/Metals Facilities	9,880		9,880
Oklahoma	Defense Logistics Agency	Altus AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	3,200		3,200
Oklahoma	Army National Guard	Camp Gruber	Modified Record Fire Range	0	1,551	1,551
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Will Rogers World Airport	ADAL Security Police Facility	570		570
Oklahoma	Air National Guard	Will Robers World Airport	Aeromedical Evacuation Training Facility	0	3,000	3,000
Oklahoma	Army Reserve	USAR Cntr Muskogee	ADAL USARC/OMS	3,125		3,125
Oklahoma	Air Force Reserve	Tinker AFB	ADAL Facilities For Conversion	5,700		5,700
Oklahoma	Air Force Reserve	Tinker AFB	Operations Training Facilities	3,400		3,400
Oregon	Chemical Demilitarization	Umatilla Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Fac Phase II	64,000		64,000
Oregon	Air National Guard	Klamath Falls IAP	Upgrade Infrastructure	0	2,500	2,500
Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	USAR Cntr St. Mary's	Add/Alt USARC/OMS	2,333		2,333
Pennsylvania	Army Reserve	Keystone Tng Area Geneva	ECS/AMSA/Warehouse	9,352		9,352
Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	NAS Willow Grove	Aircraft Rinse Facility	750		750
Pennsylvania	Navy Reserve	NMCRC Pittsburgh	Purchase Reserve Center Building And Land	3,480		3,480
South Carolina	Navy	MCRD Parris Island	Recruit Operations Facility	0	2,550	2,550
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Dormitory	8,180		8,180
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Aircraft Maintenance Facility	5,785		5,785
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 ADAL Apron/Hydrant System	13,170		13,170
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 ADAL Aircraft Maintenance/NDI Shop	4,590		4,590
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Squadron Ops\Aircrft Maint Unit Fac	5,685		5,685
South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Child Development Center	0	5,700	5,700
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Security Police Operations Facility	3,300		3,300
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,365		2,365
South Carolina	Air Force	Shaw AFB	Dormitory	0	8,800	8,800

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
South Carolina	Defense Logistics Agency	Shaw AFB	Alt Railroad Jet Fuel Unload Facility	2,900		2,900
South Carolina	Defense Medical Facility Office	Charleston AFB	WRM/BEE Facility	1,300		1,300
South Carolina	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Charleston	Renovate Existing Fac For Admin Use(DBOF)	6,200		6,200
South Carolina	Air National Guard	McEntire ANGB	ADAL Fuel Cell, Corrosion Control Facility	0	1,500	1,500
South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Child Development Center	0	4,150	4,150
South Dakota	Army National Guard	Rapid City	Army Aviation Support Facility Ramp	0	4,329	4,329
Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold Eng Dev Ctr	Upgrade ETF Refrig System, Plant C	3,790		3,790
Tennessee	Air Force	Arnold Eng Dev Ctr	Upgrade Jet Engine Air Induction System	2,991		2,991
Tennessee	Army National Guard	Ashland City	Armory	0	1,530	1,530
Texas	Army	Ft. Hood	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal (Ph II)	35,000		35,000
Texas	Army	Ft. Hood	Close Combat Tactical Training Building II	5,900		5,900
Texas	Army	Ft. Sam Houston	Dining Facility	0	3,100	3,100
Texas	Navy	NAVSTA Ingleside	Magnetic Silencing Facility Addition	7,250		7,250
Texas	Navy	NAVSTA Ingleside	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	9,600		9,600
Texas	Navy	NAS Kingsville	Combined Fire/Crash Rescue Station	1,810		1,810
Texas	Air Force	Dyess AFB	ADAL Dormitories	5,895		5,895
Texas	Air Force	Kelly AFB	Wing Support Facility	3,250		3,250
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	PIF Combat Arms Training Facility	4,800		4,800
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Upgrade Recruit Dormitory	4,613		4,613
Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Consolidated Logistics Warehouse	9,400		9,400
Texas	Defense Medical Facility Office	Ft. Bliss	Life Safety Upgrade	6,600		6,600
Texas	Defense Medical Facility Office	Ft. Hood	Social Work Services Clinic	1,950		1,950
Texas	Army National Guard	Bryan	Organizational Maintenance Shop	0	1,358	1,358
Texas	Army National Guard	Jasper	Armory	0	2,103	2,103
Texas	Air National Guard	JRB Ft. Worth	Fuel Cell & Corrosion Control Facility	3,450		3,450
Texas	Navy Reserve	Dyess AFB	Marine Corps Reserve Center	0	3,100	3,100
Utah	Air Force	Hill AFB	Correct Fire Protection Deficiencies	3,690		3,690
Utah	Air National Guard	Salt Lake City IAP	Electronics Security Squadron Complex	2,250		2,250
Utah	Navy Reserve	MCRC Camp Williams	Reserve Training Center	1,994		1,994
Vermont	Army National Guard	Jericho	Upgrade Ranges	0	746	746
Virginia	Army	Fort Eustis	Child Development Center	0	3,550	3,550
Virginia	Navy	AFSC Norfolk	Wargaming And Research Center	12,900		12,900

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	Sanitary Landfill	8,930		8,930
Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	Ammunition Storage Magazines	2,060		2,060
Virginia	Navy	MCCDC Quantico	Battle Staff Training Facility	3,580		3,580
Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Controlled Industrial Facility	16,500		16,500
Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Shore Interm Maint Activ Addn & Upgrade	8,820		8,820
Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Oily Waste Collection System	10,200		10,200
Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Deperming Piers	0	12,400	12,400
Virginia	Navy	NSWC, Dahlgren	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	0	8,030	8,030
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Alter HQ Air Combat Command Facilities	5,160		5,160
Virginia	Air Force	Langley AFB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	2,845		2,845
Virginia	Defense Intelligence Agency	Charlottesville	NGIC, land purchase	0	2,400	2,400
Virginia	Defense Logistics Agency	NAS Oceana	Jet Fuel Storage Tank	1,500		1,500
Virginia	Defense Medical Facility Office	NAS Norfolk	Environmental Preventive Med Unit Addition	1,250		1,250
Virginia	Defense Medical Facility Office	NAVHOSP Portsmouth	Hospital Replacement Phase VIII	24,000		24,000
Virginia	Army National Guard	Danville	Armory Addition/Alteration	0	1,789	1,789
Virginia	Army Reserve	USAR Cntr, Ft. Eustis	USARC/OMS	10,273		10,273
Washington	Army	Ft. Lewis	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation-Yakima	2,000		2,000
Washington	Army	Ft. Lewis	Readiness Deployment Facility	3,600		3,600
Washington	Army	Ft. Lewis	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	49,000		49,000
Washington	Navy	NAVSTA Everett	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	10,940		10,940
Washington	Navy	NAVSTA Everett	Berthing Pier	14,800		14,800
Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	KC-135 Sqd Ops/ Aircraft Maint Unit Fac	7,280		7,280
Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	KC-135 Hydrant Fueling System	10,875		10,875
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Alter Hydrant Fueling System	1,100		1,100
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 ADAL Avionics Maintenance Facility	1,300		1,300
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Modular Replacement Center	16,460		16,460
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Fuel Cell Maintenance Facility	7,480		7,480
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Maintenance Training Facility	5,685		5,685
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 ADAL Flight Simulator	2,095		2,095
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Dormitory	5,390		5,390
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Beddown Support Utilities	5,985		5,985
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Corrosion Control Facility	11,570		11,570

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Wisconsin	Air National Guard	Volk Field AGB	Upgrade Sanitary Sewer System	850		850
Wisconsin	Air Force Reserve	Mitchell ARS	Medical Training Facility	2,500		2,500
Wisconsin	Air Force Reserve	Mitchell ARS	Stormwater Retention/Treatment Basin	950		950
CONUS Classified	Army	Classified	Classified Project	4,600		4,600
Bahrain	Navy	ASU Bahrain	Quality Of Life Facilities Improvements	5,980		5,980
Bahrain	Defense Medical Facility Office	ASU Bahrain	Medical/Dental Clinic	4,600		4,600
Germany	Army	Taylor Bks, Mannheim	Barracks Restoration	0	9,300	9,300
Germany	Army	Spinelli Bks, Mannheim	Barracks Restoration	0	8,100	8,100
Germany	Air Force	Ramstein AFB	Dormitory	5,370		5,370
Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Fire Station	1,890		1,890
Greece	Navy	NSA Souda Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	7,050		7,050
Italy	Army	Camp Ederle, Vincenza	Upgrade Water System	3,100		3,100
Italy	Navy	NAS Sigonella	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Replacement	15,700		15,700
Italy	Navy	NSA Naples	Air Cargo Terminal	8,620		8,620
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Upgrade Flightline Water Distribution Syst	2,900		2,900
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Consolidated Support Center	5,225		5,225
Italy	Air Force	Aviano AB	Upgrade Electrical Distribution System	1,935		1,935
Italy	Defense Logistics Agency	NAS Sigonella	Extend Hydrant Fuel System	6,100		6,100
Korea	Army	Camp Casey	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	16,000		16,000
Korea	Army	Camp Red Cloud	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	14,000		14,000
Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Construct Enlisted Dormitory	9,780		9,780
Puerto Rico	Navy	NS Roosevelt Roads	Bachelor Enlisted Qtrs Replacement	0	23,600	23,600
Puerto Rico	Air National Guard	Puerto Rico IAP	Refueling Vehicle Shop & Paint Bay	450		450
Spain	Defense Logistics Agency	Moron AB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	12,958		12,958
Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Add to and Alter Transient Dormitory	1,740		1,740
Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Add To And Alter Physical Fitness Center	1,740		1,740
Turkey	Air Force	Incirlik AB	Base Ops and Control Tower Complex	3,680		3,680
United Kingdom	Navy	JMCC St. Mawgan	Physical Fitness Ctr Addn and Alterations	4,700		4,700
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Croughton	Fire Station	1,740		1,740
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	F-15E Add To Jet Engine Shop	2,700		2,700
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Dormitory	4,260		4,260
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Dormitory	7,950		7,950

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	F-15E Add To And Alter Weapons Release Fac	2,615		2,615
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Dormitory	6,195		6,195
Overseas Classified	Army	Overseas Classified	Strategic Logistical Prepo Complex Ph II	64,000		64,000
Overseas Classified	Air Force	Overseas Classified	Munitions Storage Igloos	6,735		6,735
Overseas Classified	Air Force	Overseas Classified	Special Tactical Unit Detachment Facility	3,680		3,680
Overseas Classified	Air Force	Overseas Classified	War Readiness Material Warehouse	5,765		5,765
Overseas Classified	Air Force	Overseas Classified	War Readiness Material Warehouse	2,215		2,215
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Host Nation Support	Army - Host Nation Support	20,000		20,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,000	2,000	7,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	23,623	8,125	31,748
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Reduction for Prior Year Savings	(12,000)	12,000	0
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	0	(12,000)	(12,000)
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,115	2,000	7,115
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Access Roads	300		300
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	42,559	4,960	47,519
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,328	2,000	11,328
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	43,387	10,110	53,497
Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,200		3,200
Worldwide Unspecified	Office Secretary of Defense	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	47,765		47,765
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Medical Facility Office	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,142		5,142
Worldwide Unspecified	DoD Dependents Schools	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction - SOCOM	4,000		4,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design - SOCOM	2,305		2,305
Worldwide Unspecified	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,404		1,404
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	9,500		9,500
Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Planning & Design	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,948		4,948
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	0	2,000	2,000
Worldwide.Unspecified	NATO Security Investment Program	Unspecified Worldwide	NATO Security Investment Program	197,000		197,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	2,100	9,101	11,201
Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,500		5,500
Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	7,725	5,890	13,615
Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,100		4,100

Fiscal Year 1997 Military Construction Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	3,480	4,069	7,549
Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	0	1,331	1,331
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	1,884	1,860	3,744
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	0	1,000	1,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	5,900	965	6,865
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,326	1,000	5,326
Worldwide Unspecified	Chemical Demilitarization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning And Design	4,124		4,124
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	862		862
Worldwide Unspecified	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,128		6,128
Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure II	BRAC II	Base Realignment & Closure Acct Part II	352,802		352,802
Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure III	BRAC III	Base Realignment & Closure Acct Part III	971,925		971,925
Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Base Realignment & Closure Acct Part IV	1,182,749		1,182,749

Fiscal Year 1997 Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Fire Station	2,950		2,950
Alaska	Air Force	Eielson AFB	Replace MFH Ph 3--72 units	21,127		21,127
Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Community Center	709		709
California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Housing Office	956		956
California	Navy	MCAGCC Twentynine Palms	Community Center	1,982		1,982
California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	FH New Construction -- 128 Units	19,483		19,483
California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	FH Units Replacement --276 Units	39,837		39,837
California	Navy	NPWC San Diego	FH Units Replacement --366 Units	48,719		48,719
California	Air Force	Beale AFB	Replace MFH Ph 2--56 units	8,893		8,893
California	Air Force	Travis AFB	Replace MFH--70 units	8,631		8,631
California	Air Force	Vandenberg AFB	Replace MFH Ph4--112 units	20,891		20,891
District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Replace MFH Ph 4--40 units	5,000		5,000
Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Construct MFH (GOQ)	249		249
Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace MFH Ph 1-- 56 units	8,822		8,822
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Housing Maint Facility	853		853
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Housing Sup & Storage Facility	756		756
Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Replace Housing Office Facility	821		821
Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Family Housing Replacement Const--54 units	10,000		10,000
Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Hawaii, Kaneohe Bay	FH Units New Construction -- 54 Units	11,676		11,676
Hawaii	Navy	NPWC Pearl Harbor	FH Units Replacement -- 264 Units	52,586		52,586
Louisiana	Air Force	Barksdale AFB	Replace MFH Ph 4-- 80 units	9,570		9,570
Maryland	Navy	NAS Patuxent River	Community Center	1,233		1,233
Massachusetts	Air Force	Hanscom AFB	Replace MFH Ph 3--32 units	0	5,100	5,100
Missouri	Air Force	Whiteman AFB	Construct MFH Ph 2-- 68 units	9,600		9,600
Montana	Air Force	Malmstrom AFB	Replace MFH Ph 1--20 units	0	5,242	5,242
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Replace MFH Ph 3-- 50 units	5,450		5,450
New Mexico	Air Force	Kirtland AFB	Replace MFH Ph 4--37 units	0	6,400	6,400
North Carolina	Army	Ft. Bragg	Family Housing Replacement Const--88 units	9,800		9,800
North Carolina	Navy	MCB Camp LeJeune	Community Center	845		845
North Dakota	Air Force	Grand Forks AFB	Replace MFH Ph 2--66 units	7,784		7,784
North Dakota	Air Force	Minot AFB	Replace MFH Ph3--46 units	8,740		8,740
Texas	Army	Ft. Hood	Family Housing Replacement Const--140 units	18,500		18,500

Fiscal Year 1997 Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace MFH--50 units	6,500		6,500
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace MFH Management Office	450		450
Texas	Air Force	Lackland AFB	Replace MFH Maintenance Facility	350		350
Virginia	Navy	AEGIS CSC Wallops Is	FH Units New Construction -- 20 Units	2,975		2,975
Virginia	Navy	NSGA Northwest	Community Center	741		741
Washington	Navy	NAVSTA Everett	FH Units New Construction -- 100 Units	15,015		15,015
Washington	Navy	NSB Bangor	Housing Office	934		934
Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	Replace MFH Ph 2 -- 40 Units	5,659		5,659
United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Replace MFH PhI	0	8,300	8,300
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	525,893		525,893
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	270,391		270,391
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	49,057		49,057
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	84,678		84,678
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,241		1,241
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	227,515		227,515
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Interest & Servicemen's Mortgage Premiums	7		7
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	33,750	76,000	109,750
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	2,963	1,120	4,083
Worldwide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	53,684		53,684
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	80		80
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	204,967		204,967
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	88,707		88,707
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	67,413		67,413
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	34,621		34,621
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	508,632		508,632
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	183,483	5,900	189,383
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,290		1,290
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	22,552	590	23,142
Worldwide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	108,531		108,531
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	9,590	2,760	12,350
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	428,087		428,087
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	88,550	6,000	94,550

Fiscal Year 1997 Family Housing Authorization of Appropriations

(Dollars in Thousands)

Location	Service/Agency/Program	Installation	Project Title	FY 97 Request	Change	Senate Authorized
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	36,228		36,228
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	51,185		51,185
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	32,257		32,257
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	167,985		167,985
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	108,083		108,083
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	5,619		5,619
Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	30		30
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	32		32
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	206		206
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	616		616
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	405		405
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	3,821		3,821
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	500		500
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	137		137
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	355		355
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	184		184
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	500		500
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	50		50
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Of Real Property	524		524
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	35		35
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	70		70
Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	11,271		11,271
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	14,366		14,366
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	2,262		2,262
Worldwide Unspecified	Homeowners' Assistance Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Homeowners' Assistance	36,181		36,181
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Wide	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	20,000		20,000
Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Wide	Unspecified Worldwide	Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund	0	5,000	5,000

Base closure and realignment accounts

The committee recommends authorization of $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1997 for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Account 1990 that supports the recommendations of the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commissions.

The committee will continue to carefully monitor the justification for the construction projects funded within these accounts and the other cost elements of these accounts.

Although funding is not specifically limited to projects identified in its budget justification, the Department of Defense identified the following construction projects for fiscal year 1997 that it plans to fund from these accounts.

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
		Army: BRAC III Construction, Fiscal Year 1997	
Texas	Fort Bliss	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	4,700
		Total Army - BRAC III	**4,700**

Army: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Alabama	Anniston Army Depot	EOD Operations Facility	1,700
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	Building 61801 Renovation	400
	Fort Huachuca	Warehouse	800
District of Columbia	Walter Reed Army Medical Center	Nurse Training Facility	1,500
Maryland	Fort Detrick	Administrative Facility	6,800
	Fort Detrick	General Purpose Storage	1,150
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	Chemical Defense Training Facility	28,000
	Fort Leonard Wood	General Instruction Facility	58,000
	Fort Leonard Wood	Applied instruction Facility	32,000
	Fort Leonard Wood	Unaccompanied Enlisted Housing	4,076
New Jersey	Fort Monmouth	Administrative Facility	2,200

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
New York	Fort Totten	Storage Facility	1,950
Oklahoma	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Universal Functional Test Range	1,950
	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	General & Applies Inst Facility	6,100
	McAlester Army Ammunition Plant	Administrative Facility	14,200
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	DOD Polygraph Institute	4,600
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	Administrative Facility	7,500
Washington	Fort Lewis	Center for Health Promotion	3,050
Various Locations	Various Locations	Planning & Design	9,790
		Total Army - BRAC IV	**185,766**

Army: BRAC IV Family Housing, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	General Officer Quarters	430
		Total Army - BRAC IV Family Housing	**430**

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount

FY 1997 BRAC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
[In Thousands of Dollars]

Navy: BRAC III Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Fleet ASW Training Center, San Diego	Gymnasium	3,400
	Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton	Warehouse & Special Storage Facilities	6,080
	Marine Corps Air Station Miramar	Storage Facilities	9,820
	Marine Corps Air Station Miramar	Tactical Van Pad Facility	15,500
	Marine Corps Air Station Miramar	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	59,883
	Naval Air Station Lemoore	Administrative Office	1,500
District of Columbia	Commandant Naval District, Washington	Headquarters Building Renovation	2,000
	Strategic Systems Program Office, Washington	Building Renovation	14,580
Florida	Army Reserve Center Orlando	Facility Modifications	2,683
	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	Aviation Physiology Training	2,270
Georgia	Naval Air Station Atlanta	Marine Reserve Training Facility	9,100
Hawaii	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Aircraft Parking Apron	14,562
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Maintenance Hangar Alterations	31,400
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Building Renovations	2,500
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Building Additions & Renovations	1,300
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Aviation Supply Facilities	2,700

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Training Facility	8,600
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Quarters	26,900
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Helicopter Landing Pad	400
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Hazardous Storehouse & Waste Transfer Facil.	5,100
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Ordnance Facilities	1,400
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Tactical Support Facility	10,500
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Utilities Upgrade	5,100
	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe Bay	Ordnance Facilities	2,100
Nevada	Naval Air Station Fallon	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters, Phase II	9,830
South Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort	Hangar Renovation	1,900
Tennessee	Naval Air Station Memphis	Building Alterations	17,510
	Naval Air Station Memphis	Building Alterations	7,100
Texas	Naval Air Station Fort Worth	Child Development Center	2,010
Virginia	Naval Station Norfolk	Administrative Facility	1,000
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Engine Maintenance Shop Addition	480
Washington	Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	Ground Support Equipment Shop	2,700
	Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	Sonobuoy Storage Facility	600
Midway Island	Naval Air Facility	Demolition	3,000
		Total Navy - BRAC III	**285,508**

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount

Navy: BRAC III Family Housing, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Florida	Naval Air Station Pensacola	Family Housing	9,845
Washington	Naval Submarine Base Bangor	Family Housing	4,672
	Naval Submarine Base Bangor	Family Housing	6,454
		Total Navy - BRAC III Family Housing	**20,971**

Navy: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Naval Air Station North Island	Maintenance Training Facility	3,780
	Naval Aviation Depot, North Island	Engineering Support Office Modifications	844
	Naval Aviation Depot, North Island	Engineering Support Offices	721
	Naval Weapon Station Concord	Secure Warehouse	15,400
District of Columbia	Commandant, Naval District Washington	Parking Garage	8,900
	Commandant, Naval District Washington	Logistics Support Facility	2,400
	Commandant, Naval District Washington	Public Works Facility	1,900

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Florida	Naval Explosive Diving Unit, Panama City	Manned Diving Physiology	1,870
Maryland	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock	Materials Processing Facility	1,450
	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Carderock	Magnetic Fields Facility	6,400
Pennsylvania	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Philadelphia	Advance Machine R&D Facility	5,400
South Carolina	Naval Weapon Station Charleston	Medical/Dental Clinic Expansion	3,464
Tennessee	Naval Air Station Memphis	Building Modifications	4,744
Virginia	Naval Air Station Oceana	Flight Simulator Building Addition	9,044
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Corrosion Control Hangar	4,800
	Naval Air Station Oceana	F/A 18 Aviation Maintenance Additions	2,700
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Renovate/Addition Training Facility	5,700
Washington	Naval Shipyard Puget Sound	Ship Maintenance Facilities	1,840
Various Locations	Various Locations	Planning & Design	9,700
		Total Navy - BRAC IV	**91,057**

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount

FY 1997 BRAC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
[In Thousands of Dollars]

Air Force: BRAC II Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Beale Air Force Base	Add/Alter Civil Engineer Facilities	900
	Beale Air Force Base	Add/Alter Operations Facility	460
	Beale Air Force Base	Alter Logistics Facilities	520
	Beale Air Force Base	Add/Alter Support Facility	300
	Vandenburg Air Force Base	Campus Utilities	2,900
Colorado	Buckley Air National Guard Base	Enlisted Dormitory	8,150
Indiana	Grissom Air Reserve Base	Munitions Storage	1,500
Mississippi	Keesler Air Force Base	Physical Fitness Center	690
Ohio	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base	Alter Base Maintenance Shops	1,950
	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base	Alter Support Shops	2,000
	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base	Alter Fuel System Maintenance Dock	1,200
	Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base	Jet Fuel Storage/Distribution	9,000
	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	NAOC Complex	5,100
Texas	Lackland Air Force Base	Add/Alter Physical Fitness Center	1,600
	Lackland Air Force Base	Alter Technical Training Facility	2,250

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
	Sheppard Air Force Base	Add to Chapel	700
Various Locations	Various Locations	Planning & Design	580
		Total Air Force - BRAC II	**39,800**

Air Force: BRAC II Family Housing, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
Oklahoma	Altus Air Force Base	Family Housing	22,973
		Total Air Force - BRAC II Family Housing	**22,973**

Air Force: BRAC III Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	March Air Force Base	Alter Combat Camera	1,200
	Travis Air Force Base	Upgrade Roads	2,400
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	Air Control Squad Complex	3,500
New Jersey	McGuire Air Force Base	Public Health Facility	4,000
	McGuire Air Force Base	Upgrade Roads	3,000

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
New York	Griffiss Air Force Base	Alter Support Facilities	750
	Griffiss Air Force Base	Alter Consolidated Logistics Facility	2,550
		Total Air Force - BRAC III	**17,400**

Air Force: BRAC III Family Housing, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
New Jersey	McGuire Air Force Base	Improve Family Housing	15,884
		Total Air Force - BRAC III Family Housing	**15,884**

Air Force: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Edwards Air Force Base	Add/Alter Avionics Research Laboratory	890
	March Air Force Base	Add/Alter Comm/Elec Training Complex	640
Florida	MacDill Air Force Base	Add/Alter Fuel Maintenance Facility	2,900
	MacDill Air Force Base	Alter Squadron Operations Facilities	2,500
	MacDill Air Force Base	Alter Corrosion Control	5,000
	MacDill Air Force Base	Alter Maintenance Facilities	800

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
	Patrick Air Force Base	Pararescue Training Facility	2,650
	Patrick Air Force Base	Maintenance Facilities	500
	Patrick Air Force Base	Add/Alter Corrosion Control Facility	2,750
Mississippi	Columbus Air Force Base	T-37 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	1,100
New York	Fort Drum	Runway/Apron/ILS	46,000
Texas	Carswell-Naval Air Station/Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base	Numbered AF Headquarters	4,300
	Carswell-Naval Air Station/Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base	Security Police Training Facility	720
	Laughlin Air Force Base	Add to Child Development Center	350
Various Locations	Various Locations	Planning & Design	5,543
		Total Air Force: BRAC IV	**76,643**

FY 1997 BRAC Military Construction Projects

(In Thousands of Dollars)

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount

FY 1997 BRAC MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
[In Thousands of Dollars]

Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC III Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Defense Contract Management District West	Administrative Building	5,200
Pennsylvania	Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia	Convert Facilities for Defense Personnel Support Center	31,950
Various Locations	Various Locations	Planning & Design	500
		Total DLA - BRAC III	**37,650**

Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 1997

State	Installation or Location	Description	Amount
California	Defense Distribution Region West	Hazardous Material Storage Addition to Warehouse 28	9,300
		Total DLA - BRAC IV	**9,300**

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Section 2503. Redesignation of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, by redesignating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure program the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program. The provision would establish in law the name change implemented by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization when it revamped the infrastructure program in 1993.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801. Increase in certain thresholds for unspecified minor construction projects.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2805 and 18233 (a) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the operations and maintenance minor construction limit from $300,000 to $500,000 for the active and reserve components. The provision would further amend section 18233 (a) to increase the reserve component minor military construction limit from $400,000 to $1.5 million.

Section 2802. Clarification of authority to improve military family housing.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2825(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the term "improvement" does not include day-to-day maintenance and repair work accomplished concurrently with a family housing unit improvement project. The provision would also amend section 2825(b)(2) to specify that any improvement accomplished beyond the 5-foot line from a housing unit in conjunction with a family housing improvement project would not count as part of the per unit cost limitation of $50,000 or $60,000 in the case of housing for persons who are handicapped.

Section 2803. Authority to grant easements for rights-of-way.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2668(a) of title 10, United States Code, by including poles, lines, structures, and facilities used for transmission or distribution of electrical power and communication signals in the authority for which the Secretary may grant easements on military installations. The provision would also make section 2668(a) the only easement authority for the military departments.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Section 2811. Restoration of authority under 1988 base closure law to transfer property and facilities to other entities in the Department of Defense.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 204(b)(2) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988 as amended, to restore inadvertently eliminated provisions that provided the Department of

Defense the authority for inter-Service transfers of real and personal property at closing and realigning bases.

Section 2812. Disposition of proceeds from disposal of commissary stores and nonappropriated fund instrumentalities at installations being closed or realigned.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988, as amended, and the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to authorize the deposit of proceeds from any transfer or conveyance of a facility built with commissary store funds or nonappropriated funds as a result of base closure activity be deposited in an established fund. The proceeds from facilities built with commissary store funds would be deposited in a Treasury account named Surcharge Collections, Sales of Commissary Stores, Defense. The proceeds from nonappropriated fund construction would be deposited in the appropriate military department nonappropriated fund account.

Section 2813. Agreements for services at installations after closure.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 204(b)(8)(A) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1988 and section 2905 (b)(8)(A) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 to increase the authority of the service secretary to contract for services, such as fire fighting or security guards, for facilities not yet transferred or otherwise disposed of at installations closed under the applicable closure law.

SUBTITLE C—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2821. Transfer of lands, Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the Secretary of the Army a parcel of real property in section 29 of the National Park System known as the Arlington Cemetery Interment Zone and all those lands in the area of section 29 known as the Robert E. Lee Memorial Preservation Zone except those lands in the Preservation Zone that the Secretary of the Interior determines must be retained because of historical significance. The conveyance would be carried out in accordance with the Interagency Agreement dated February 22, 1995.

The provision would further authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Secretary of the Army a parcel of real property and improvements containing 2.43 acres. It would also authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior a parcel of real property and improvements containing 0.17 acre.

Section 2822. Land transfer, Potomac Annex, District of Columbia.

The United States Institute of Peace was established by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1985. In 1992, Congress authorized the Institute, a federal institution, to raise private funds to finance the construction of a permanent headquarters. The Institute has identified a three acre parcel of real property, currently administered by the Department of the Navy as a parking lot, as the site for the headquarters building.

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to transfer approximately three acres of real property located at the Potomac Annex in the District of Columbia to the administrative jurisdiction of the United States Institute of Peace. The committee understands that with administrative jurisdiction, the Institute would maintain custody of and accountability for the parcel of real property. The Institute plans to construct with privately-raised funds, operate, and maintain a permanent headquarters facility on the parcel. As a condition of the transfer, the Institute shall agree to make available to the Navy permanent parking space at the headquarters building and interim parking during construction of the headquarters building.

Section 2823. Land conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Montpelier, Vermont.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, the Army Reserve Center, Montpelier, consisting of approximately 4.3 acres and improvements, to the City of Montpelier, Vermont. The provision would require the City to lease, at no rental charge, to the Civil Air Patrol the space that the Civil Air Patrol leases from the Army at the time of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997. The conveyance would be contingent on a determination of no other agency interest in the property.

Section 2824. Land conveyance, former Naval Reserve Facility, Lewes, Delaware.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey, without consideration, to the State of Delaware a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 16.8 acres and improvements, at the former Naval Reserve Facility, Lewes, Delaware. The provision would require the State to use the property, in perpetuity, solely as a public park or recreational area. The property would revert to the United States if, at any time, the Secretary of Interior determines that the property is not being used in accordance with the conditions of conveyance. The conveyance would be contingent on a determination of no other federal agency interest in the property.

Section 2825. Land conveyance, Radar Bomb Scoring Site, Belle Fourche, South Dakota.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, to the Belle Fourche School District, Belle Fourche, South Dakota, approximately 37 acres of land and improvements that constitute the

support complex and housing facilities for Detachment 21 of the 554th Range Squadron, an Air Force radar scoring site. The conveyance may not include any portion of the radar bomb scoring site located in the State of Wyoming. The provision would require that the property be used for education, economic development, or housing purposes. The conveyance would be contingent on a determination of no other federal agency interest in the property.

Section 2826. Conveyance of primate research complex, Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, on a competitive basis and at no cost to the Air Force, the primate research complex and the colony of Air Force owned chimpanzees located at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico. The authorized conveyance would not include the real property on which the research complex is sited. The Secretary, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and the National Institutes of Health, would be required to develop standards of care and use of the primate research complex and of the chimpanzees, to be used in solicitation of bids. The conditions of conveyance would require that the recipient use the chimpanzees for scientific research, medical research, or retire and provide adequate care for the chimpanzees.

Section 2827. Demonstration project for installation and operation of electric power distribution system at Youngstown Air Reserve Station, Ohio.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish a demonstration project at the Youngstown Air Force Reserve Station, Ohio, to assess the feasibility and advisability of using a private entity to install, operate, and maintain electrical power distribution systems at military installations. To carry out the demonstration project, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with a local electric utility or private company. The agreement may provide that the utility or company shall own the power distribution system installed under the agreement. The provision would stipulate that the rates charged for providing and distributing electric power at the Youngstown Air Reserve Station may not include the costs, including the amortization of any cost, incurred by the utility or company in installing the system. To pay the costs of the United States under the agreement, the Secretary may use funds authorized to be appropriated by section 2601 (3)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 for the purpose of rebuilding the electrical power distribution system at Youngstown Air Reserve Station. The Secretary would not be authorized to enter into an agreement or obligate funds to support an agreement until 21 days after the Secretary submits a report to the congressional defense committees.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Improvements to military family housing units, Army

The committee directs that, within authorized amounts for construction improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Army execute the following projects:

AK:	
Fort Richardson, Family Housing Revitalization	$7,800,000
Fort Wainwright, Family Housing Revitalization	$8,600,000
KY: Fort Campbell, Family Housing Revitalization	$9,600,000

Planning and design, Army

The committee directs that $1.5 million of the amount authorized for appropriations for Army planning and design be directed toward:

HI: Pohakuloa Training Site, Road Improvement	$1,500,000

Report on the Fort Lawton Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center, Seattle, Washington

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (PL 103–337) authorized $10.4 million for the construction of a Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center at Fort Lawton, Seattle, Washington. The committee is aware that due to realignment of Navy Reserve force structure, the construction of a Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center at Fort Lawton may no longer be an appropriate solution to resolve the basing problem in the Seattle area. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army to provide to the congressional defense committees a report on the basing needs for the Navy Reserve and Army Reserve units that would have utilized the Joint Armed Forces Reserve Center. The report should include a recommendation on the most appropriate reallocation of the $10.4 million authorized and appropriated for the construction of the joint facility.

Improvements to military family housing units, Navy

The committee directs that, within authorized amounts for construction improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Navy execute the following project:

SC: MCAS Beaufort, Family Housing Revitalization	$5,900,000

Planning and design, Navy

The committee directs that $500,000 of the amount authorized for appropriations for Navy planning and design be directed toward:

NV: Fallon NAS, Gymnasium/Fitness Center	$500,000

Improvements to military family housing units, Air Force

The committee directs that, within authorized amounts for construction improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Air Force execute the following project:

OH: Wright-Patterson AFB, Family Housing Revitalization	$6,000,000

Planning and design, Air Force Family Housing Construction

The committee directs that $150,000 of the amount authorized for appropriations for the Air Force family housing planning and design account be directed toward:

NV: Nellis AFB, Family Housing Revitalization	$150,000

Availability of funds for credit to Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize to be appropriated $5.0 million to be credited to the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund. The funds shall be used to implement the authorities to improve unaccompanied housing provided to the Secretary of Defense in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. The committee is disappointed that the Department did not provide funds for this critical quality of life program that was included in the Act at the Department of Defense's urging.

Naval Air Station Sigonella

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 authorized funding to expand the Department of Defense controlled elementary/high school at Naval Air Station Sigonella, Italy.

The committee has been informed that during the final design phase of the project, a requirement for additional space was determined. This exceeded the requirement expressed in the DD Form 1391 that was published in the House of Representatives Military Construction Appropriation Hearing for 1994 (Part 2, page 545). The revision is necessary to accommodate an increase in the number of students.

The committee is also aware that the project, as redesigned with the increased square footage and greater number of classrooms, can be constructed without an increase to the currently appropriated funding amount of $7,595,000.

The committee endorses construction of the larger school within the currently authorized and appropriated funding amount.

Report on the implementation of the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act

The committee supports the intent of the Hawaiian Home Lands Recovery Act (title II of Public Law 104–42; 109 Stat.59) to return excess federal lands, that may have been wrongfully diverted during territorial times, to the native Hawaiians. The committee is concerned that the Act may have adverse impacts on the readiness of the armed forces stationed in the Pacific region. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than March 1, 1997, a report to the congressional defense committees addressing the following: the impact of the Act on the readiness of the armed forces stationed on Hawaii; the potential acreage and value of land available to be transferred under the provisions of the Act; the impact of any transfer on the quality of life of the service personnel stationed on Hawaii; and, any legislative changes that may be appropriate to reverse any adverse impact.

Planning and design, Guard and Reserve forces facilities

The committee directs that, of the amount authorized for appropriations for the Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects, not more than the amount indicated for each respective project be directed toward the design of:

Army National Guard

MI: Lansing, Consolidated Support Maintenance Shop	$1,332,000
MT: Billings, Armed Forces Reserve Center	1,108,000
NE: Camp Ashland, Flood Control	665,000
OR:	
Ontario, Armory	226,000
The Dallas, Armory	210,000
SC:	
Eastover, Multipurpose Simulation Center, Leesburg Training Site	224,000
Eastover, Infrastructure Upgrade, Leesburg Training Site	280,000
WY: Camp Guernsey, Vehicle Maintenance Facilities	935,000

Army Reserve

PA: Oakdale, Army Reserve Center, Organizational Maintenance Shop, Area Maintenance Support Activity	2,300,000

Marine Corps Reserve

PA:	
Johnstown, Training Center	590,000
Johnstown, Type 1 Maintenance Hangar	690,000

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for the Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the Department of Energy, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). The title would authorize appropriations in four categories: weapons activities; defense environmental restoration and waste management; other defense activities; and defense nuclear waste disposal.

The fiscal year 1997 budget request for the Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities totaled $10.9 billion. Of the total amount requested, $3.7 billion was for weapons activities, $5.4 billion was for defense environmental restoration and waste management activities, $1.5 billion was for other defense activities, and $200.0 million was for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The committee continues to be concerned with the Department's unwillingness or inability to heed congressional guidance to present a budget for atomic energy defense activities which reflects total requirements for these crucial nuclear weapons related national security and defense nuclear waste cleanup programs. The committee notes that the President's outyear funding level for the atomic energy defense activities account (the 053 account) drops to $8.2 billion in fiscal year 2000, a projected $2.7 billion reduction to the fiscal year 1997 request. The Department's out-year reductions are not compatible with the following projected needs and requirements: (1) weapons activities, without the capability to do underground testing and manufacture new weapons, will require an average of $4.0 billion per year over the next ten years to find a means of maintaining nuclear weapons safety and reliability; and (2) the environmental restoration and waste management program is headed toward a near-term budget crisis wherein projected requirements will far exceed budgetary resources, yet the fiscal year 1997 budget request is below the fiscal year 1996 appropriation level.

To maintain the viability of our nuclear weapons complex and ensure environmental compliance, the committee recommends an increase of $450.0 million above the budget request, totaling $11.5 billion, including $3.9 billion for weapons activities, $5.6 billion for defense environmental restoration and waste management, $1.6

billion for other defense activities, and $200.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal.

The following table summarizes the request and the committee recommendations:

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:			
Weapons Activities			
Operation and Maintenance	3,395,404	239,000	3,634,404
Construction	314,598	0	314,598
Total, Weapons Activities	3,710,002	239,000	3,949,002
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Mgmt.			
Operation and Maintenance	5,203,411	198,000	5,401,411
Construction	205,899	0	205,899
Total, Defense Env. Restoration & Waste Management	5,409,310	198,000	5,607,310
Full Funding for Fixed Assets	182,000	0	182,000
Other Defense Activities			
Operation and Maintenance	1,517,000	13,000	1,530,000
Construction	30,700	0	30,700
Total, Other Defense Activities	1,547,700	13,000	1,560,700

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	200,000	0	200,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**11,049,012**	**450,000**	**11,499,012**
Weapons Activities			
Stockpile stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship			
Operation and maintenance	1,062,570	50,000	1,112,570
Construction:			
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	19,250		19,250
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	15,100		15,100
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	14,100		14,100
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition,			

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
LLNL, Livermore, CA	17,100		17,100
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	15,000		15,000
94-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations	7,787		7,787
Total, Construction	88,337	0	88,337
Total, Core stockpile stewardship	1,150,907	50,000	1,200,907
Inertial fusion			
Operation and maintenance	234,560		234,560
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility Site, TBD	131,900		131,900
Total, Inertial fusion	366,460	0	366,460
Technology transfer/education			
Technology transfer	49,400	10,000	59,400

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Education	10,000		10,000
Total, Technology transfer/education	59,400	10,000	69,400
Marshall island/Dose reconstruction			
Total, Stockpile stewardship	1,576,767	60,000	1,636,767
Stockpile management			
Operation and maintenance	1,704,470	190,000	1,894,470
Construction:			
Stockpile support facilities			
88-D-122 Facilities capability assurance program (FCAP), various locations	21,940		21,940
Total, Production base	21,940	0	21,940
Environmental, safety and health			
97-D-121 Consolidated pit packaging system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	870		870
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	4,000		4,000

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	1,400		1,400
97-D-124 Steam plant waste water treatment facility upgrade, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	600		600
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	100		100
96-D-123 Retrofit HVAC and chillers for ozone protection, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	7,000		7,000
95-D-122 Sanitary sewer upgrade, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	10,900		10,900
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge TN	4,900		4,900

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	5,200		5,200
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	2,200		2,200
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	7,200		7,200
Total, Environmental, safety and health	44,370	0	44,370
Safeguards and security			
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	9,739		9,739
Nuclear weapons incident response			
96-D-125 Washington aerial measurements operations facility, Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, MD	3,825		3,825

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Reconfiguration			
93-D-123 Non-nuclear reconfiguration, Complex-21, various locations	14,487		14,487
Total, Construction	94,361	0	94,361
Total, Stockpile management	1,798,831	190,000	1,988,831
Program direction	334,404	-11,000	323,404
Subtotal, Weapons activities	3,710,002	239,000	3,949,002
Use of prior year balances	0		0
Total, Weapons Activities	**3,710,002**	**239,000**	**3,949,002**
Defense Environmental Restoration And Waste Mgmt.			
Corrective activities			
Construction:			
Environmental restoration			
Operating expenses	1,762,194	15,000	1,777,194
Waste management			
Operation and maintenance	1,448,326	65,000	1,513,326

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Construction:			
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	7,584		7,584
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, various locations	11,246		11,246
95-D-402 Install permanent electrical service, WIPP, AL	752		752
95-D-405 Industrial landfill V and construction/ demolition landfill VII, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN	200		200
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL	6,345		6,345
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	12,600		12,600

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
93-D-182 Replacement of cross-site transfer system, Richland, WA	8,100		8,100
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	20,000		20,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC	11,500		11,500
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	10,000		10,000
Total, Construction	88,327	0	88,327
Total, Waste management	1,536,653	65,000	1,601,653
Technology development			
Operation and maintenance	303,771	25,000	328,771
Total, Technology development	303,771	25,000	328,771

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Transportation management			
Program direction	446,511	-10,000	436,511
Nuclear materials and facilities stabilization			
Operation and maintenance	818,664	91,000	909,664
Construction:			
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,900		7,900
97-D-451 B-Plant safety class ventilation upgrades, Richland, WA	1,500		1,500
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	60,672		60,672
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	10,440		10,440

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID	4,645		4,645
Total, Construction	85,157	0	85,157
Total, Nuclear materials & facilities stabilization.	903,821	91,000	994,821
Analysis, education, and risk management	0		0
Policy and management	48,155	-22,000	26,155
Site operations			
Operation and maintenance	297,054	34,000	331,054
Construction:			
96-D-461 Electrical distribution upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	6,790		6,790
96-D-470 Environmental monitoring laboratory, Savannah River, Aiken, SC	2,500		2,500
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah			

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
River Site, Aiken, SC	8,541		8,541
96-D-473 Health physics site support facility, Savannah river, Aiken, SC	2,000		2,000
95-E-600 Hazardous materials management and emergency response traning center, Richland, WA	7,900		7,900
95-D-155 Upgrade site road infrastructure, Savannah River, South Carolina	4,137		4,137
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, INEL, ID	547		547
Total, Construction	32,415	0	32,415
Total, Site operations	329,469	34,000	363,469
Environmental science program	52,136		52,136
Environmental management privatization	185,000		185,000

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Subtotal, Defense environmental management	5,567,710	198,000	5,765,710
Savannah river pension refund	-8,000		-8,000
Use of prior year balances	-150,400		-150,400
Total, Defense Environmental Restoration & Waste Mgmt.	**5,409,310**	**198,000**	**5,607,310**
Other Defense Activities			
Materials Support			
Other national security programs			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D	194,919	10,000	204,919
Arms control	181,244	35,000	216,244
Intelligence	29,185	6,000	35,185
Total, Verification and control technology	405,348	51,000	456,348
Nuclear safeguards and security	47,208		47,208
Security investigations	22,000		22,000
Office of environment, safety and health (defense)	53,094		53,094
Security evaluations	0		0
Nuclear safety	0		0

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Program direction - EH	10,706		10,706
Worker and community transition	62,659		62,659
Program direction - WT	4,341		4,341
Fissile materials control and disposition			
Operation and maintenance	73,163		73,163
Construction			
97-D-140 Consolidated special nuclear materials storage plant, site TBD	17,000		17,000
Program direction - MD	3,633		3,633
Total, Fissile materials control and disposition	93,796	0	93,796
Emergency management	16,794		16,794
Program direction - NN	95,622	-5,000	90,622
International nuclear safety	66,200	-51,000	15,200
Nuclear security	6,000		6,000
Total, Other national security programs	883,768	-5,000	878,768

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance	631,330	18,000	649,330
Construction:			
97-D-201 Advanced test reactor secondary coolant system refurbishment, INEL, ID	400		400
95-D-200 Laboratory systems and hot cell upgrades, various locations	4,800		4,800
95-D-201 Advanced test reactor radioactive waste system upgrades, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	500		500
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	8,000		8,000
Total, Construction	13,700	0	13,700

Fiscal Year 1997 Department of Energy National Security Programs

	FY 1997 Request	Senate Change	Authorized
Total, Naval reactors development	645,030	18,000	663,030
Enriched materials	0		0
Program direction	18,902		18,902
Total, Naval reactors	663,932	18,000	681,932
Subtotal, Other defense activities	1,547,700	13,000	1,560,700
Total, Other Defense Activities	**1,547,700**	**13,000**	**1,560,700**
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	200,000		200,000
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**10,867,012**	**450,000**	**11,317,012**

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101. Weapons activities.

The committee recommends authorizations of $3.9 billion for weapons activities, an increase of $239.0 million above the Department of Energy request, for the following activities: $1.6 billion for stockpile stewardship activities; $2.0 billion for stockpile management activities; and $323.0 million for program direction. The committee directs that the $11.0 million reduction in program direction only impact foreign and domestic travel, and support service contracts.

Stockpile stewardship programs

The committee continues to be concerned that the Department is placing an undue reliance on the long-term, unproven science-based stockpile stewardship program at the expense of modernizing the more traditional, hands-on production engineering and surveillance approaches needed to maintain stockpile safety and reliability over the next ten to fifteen years. In relation to science-based stockpile stewardship program, the Department continues to stress the policy inherent to the program without providing adequate funds. The committee directs the Department to seek a reasonable balance between the two approaches to ensure that the United States can maintain the safety and reliability of its nuclear stockpile in the near-term, mid-term, and long-term, at START I and START II levels.

The committee authorizes an additional $60.0 million for stockpile stewardship: $20.0 million for an enhanced surveillance program at the National Laboratories to assess the reliability and safety of the stockpile, including chemistry and materials work, and modeling and simulation; $20.0 million for subcritical experiments to support weapons safety and reliability; $10.0 million for an advanced manufacturing program to develop and evaluate technologies and processes to meet present and future stockpile needs; and $10.0 million for technology transfer to support existing cooperative research and development agreements.

Stockpile management programs

The committee believes that the United States must maintain viable weapons manufacturing capabilities and capacities to rebuild aging weapons and to retain the ability to reconstitute its nuclear forces, if necessary. In this regard, the committee is concerned that the underlying rationale for the Department's Draft Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement may result in a decision that would negatively impact production capabilities and capacities by downsizing the production plants (Y–12 Plant, Pantex Plant, Kansas City Plant, and Savannah River Site) and strip those facilities of unique skills and expertise.

The committee authorizes an additional $190.0 million for stockpile management: $45.0 million for the four weapons production plants; $50.0 million to begin a long-term modernization program at the four production plants; $60.0 million for tritium production;

$5.0 million for a surety program to improve waste minimization efforts in the new stockpile management modernization program; $5.0 million for a production plant fellowship program; $6.0 million for tritium recycling plant upgrades; $1.0 million for the Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise; $3.0 million for planning and construction of a tritium extraction facility; and $15.0 million for the enhanced surveillance program to assess the reliability and safety of the stockpile, including chemistry and materials work, and modeling and simulating activities associated with the four production plants.

Section 3102. Environmental restoration and waste management.

This section authorizes $5.6 billion for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management (the Department's Defense Environmental Management Program). That authorization is $198.0 million above the Department's fiscal year 1997 request. The amount authorized is for the following activities: $1.8 billion for Environmental Restoration; $1.6 billion for Waste Management; $329.0 million for Technology Development; $52.0 million for the Environmental Science Program; $995.0 million for Nuclear Material and Facility Stabilization; $363.0 million for Site Operations; $26.0 million for Policy and Management; $185.0 million for privatization; and $436.0 million for Program Direction. The committee recommends approval of the Department's request for a reduction of $150.4 million for prior year balances and $8.0 million offset for the Savannah River Site Pension Refund.

Environmental Restoration

The committee authorizes a $15.0 million increase to the President's budget request for high priority removal and remedial actions at the Savannah River Site. The committee also authorizes a $15.0 million reduction to the President's budget request for the headquarters account and that the funds be redirected to high priority removal and remedial actions at the Department of Energy cleanup sites.

Waste Management

The committee authorizes an increase of $65.0 million to the budget request for this account. The committee authorizes that $15.0 million of the increase be used to accelerate Defense Waste Processing Facility operations and associated high-level waste treatment; that $43.0 million of the increase be used for analysis, retrieval and treatment of transuranic waste; and that $7.0 million of the increase be provided to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant to prepare to receive waste shipments.

Technology Development

The committee authorizes an increase of $25.0 million to the budget request: $20.0 million for plutonium and other materials stabilization research and development, and $5.0 million for canyon decontamination and dismantlement research and development.

Nuclear Material and Facility Stabilization

The committee authorizes an increase of $91.0 million to the budget request: $43.0 million for nuclear material stabilization operations at the F- and H-Canyon facilities; $15.0 million for the National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program; $18.0 million to accelerate facility decontamination and stabilization activities at the Savannah River Site; and $15.0 million for spent nuclear fuels movements and minimization of spent fuel vulnerabilities associated with activities at the Power Burst facility.

Site Operations

The committee authorizes that $34.0 million be restored to this account to partially address the reductions reflected in the budget request for site operations at the Savannah River Site.

Policy and Management

The committee authorizes a $22.0 million reduction to this account.

Program Direction

The committee authorizes a $10.0 million reduction to the budget request for this account. The committee directs that the reduction in program direction only impact foreign and domestic travel, and support service contracts.

Environmental Management Budget Requests

The committee notes that last year's budget request had forecast a growing cleanup gap between program requirements and budget projections. The committee authorizes the Department to develop budget requests that meet program requirements.

Section 3103. Other defense activities.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to the budget request for fiscal year 1996 for the nonproliferation, verification research and development program, for a total of $204.9 million. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, Congress provided $3.0 million for the development of a forensic analytic capability to detect and track shipments of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons materials. Additionally, the Congress directed the Department to broaden the involvement in this area throughout the entire laboratory complex, to include production sites such as Savannah River, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Argonne National Laboratory, and where appropriate, industry.

The committee understands that $1.3 million in fiscal year 1996 funds have been spent by the Department on research and development efforts at Oak Ridge, Sandia, Livermore and Pacific Northwest National laboratories. The committee also understands that $5.6 million in fiscal year 1996 funds have been expended to support radiation detection technologies to inhibit nuclear smuggling. The committee recommends a $10.0 million increase to the President's budget request to accelerate the Department's forensic ana-

lytical program, authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, and for capabilities to address the prevention, detection, interception and attribution of international nuclear smuggling events. In order to leverage existing capabilities, the committee urges the Department and the laboratory complex to coordinate closely with defense agencies, such as the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA), in the conduct of this program.

Arms Control and nonproliferation

The President's budget request included $181.2 million for the arms control and nonproliferation program. The committee recommends a $35.0 million increase to the budget request for the Industrial Partnership Program (IPP). The committee is supportive of the cost share partnerships with U.S. industry. The IPP was established in 1993 to stabilize the technology base in scientific and engineering institutes associated with weapons of mass destruction in the newly independent states (NIS) of the former Soviet Union, in order to prevent and reduce the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

While the Congress authorized funds for this program in fiscal year 1996, no funds were appropriated. There were no funds allocated to this program in fiscal year 1995 and funds authorized in fiscal year 1994 have now been fully obligated. Therefore, the committee believes it is necessary to increase the budget request for this program.

The budget request for fiscal year 1997 included $5.0 million to complete implementation of North Korean Agreed Framework. The committee recommends that $7.9 million be made available from funds authorized for the arms control and nonproliferation program to complete the canning of spent fuel rods in North Korea, pursuant to the Agreed Framework, and to initiate post-canning technical activities.

International Nuclear Safety

The budget request includes $66.2 million for the International Nuclear Safety and Chernobyl Initiative. The committee recommends a reduction of $51.0 million to the budget request. Funds for this program have previously been included in the Department's budget request for nuclear energy program. It is the committee's belief that budget responsibility should be returned to the Department's program for nuclear energy. Alternatively, it may be more appropriate to seek funds for this program through the foreign assistance bill. Recognizing that the safety of the aging Soviet-designed nuclear power plants is questionable, it would seem that improving the safety of these plants is also in the interest of the international community. The committee directs the Department to report to the committee on the financial contribution to this initiative by the international community.

Intelligence

The committee recommends authorization of $35.2 million for the intelligence program, a $6.0 million increase to the budget request

for fiscal year 1996, to create a full-time counterintelligence team at each of the national laboratories.

The committee authorizes $1.6 billion for other defense activities, reflecting increases and decreases related to the fiscal year 1997 DOE request. The programs authorized are:

Verification and control technology	$456,348,000
Nuclear safeguards and security	47,208,000
Security investigations	22,000,000
Emergency management	16,794,000
Program direction	90,622,000
Environment, safety, and health	53,094,000
Program direction (environment, safety and health)	10,706,000
Worker and community transition assistance	62,659,000
Program direction (worker transition)	4,341,000
Fissile materials	93,796,000
International nuclear safety	15,200,000
Nuclear security	6,000,000
Naval reactors	681,932,000

Section 3104. Defense nuclear waste disposal.

The committee recommends authorization of the budget request of $200.0 million as the fiscal year 1997 defense contribution to the defense nuclear waste fund.

SUBTITLE C—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3131. Tritium production.

The committee notes that the Department has established a tritium production program in response to congressional concerns about the lack of progress in this area. The committee considers this program critical to maintaining the nation's nuclear deterrent capability. The committee continues to be concerned with the Department's lack of progress, its inability to develop a technically sound data base sufficient for a decision in fiscal year 1998, and its continuing underestimates of funding requirements. For example, in fiscal year 1996 the Department determined that it needed to spend $75.0 million for the tritium production program, as opposed to the $50.0 million originally requested by the Department. For fiscal year 1997, the Department notified the committee within one month of the release of the President's budget that $157.0 million was needed for the tritium production program, as opposed to the $100.0 million originally requested by the Department.

The Committee believes that the tritium production program must be accelerated to meet the requirements of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum, which identified a new tritium production date of 2005. On this basis, the committee agrees to provide an increase of $60.0 million to the budget request for a total fiscal year 1997 program of $160.0 million. The committee directs the Department to accelerate its phased approach to the tritium production needs of the United States, including proceeding in parallel with site preparation for a new tritium production accelerator. The committee recognizes the need to enhance the ongoing accelerator research and development program at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), in conjunction with Savannah River Site (SRS) personnel, and to expedite the demonstration of accelerator tech-

nology. The committee supports these joint LANL/SRS efforts, and directs the Department to provide the congressional defense committees with a report on the planning and design of the accelerator that shall be proposed for construction at the Savannah River Site. The committee also directs the continued test and development of tritium targets for the light water reactor program option by the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, and the initiation of planning for construction of a tritium extraction facility.

Section 3132. Modernization and consolidation of tritium recycling facilities.

Based on the tritium requirements identified in the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum, it is essential that the existing tritium recycling facilities at the Savannah River Site be upgraded to ensure future use and efficient operation of this critical defense function on a cost effective basis. The committee directs a $6.0 million increase of the funds authorized in fiscal year 1997 for weapons activities in order to upgrade the tritium recycling facilities.

Section 3133. Modification of requirements for manufacturing infrastructure for refabrication and certification of nuclear weapons stockpile.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 directed the Department of Energy (DOE) to initiate a program to modernize the four nuclear weapons production plants. Citing other priorities, DOE did not comply with congressional direction. The committee believes that this initiative is not only prudent but essential to maintaining nuclear weapons core competence to repair and refabricate weapons at a START I or START II stockpile level.

The committee finds that the "technology capability alone" approach to the nuclear weapons infrastructure reconstitution requirement of the Nuclear Posture Review is insufficient to meet national security requirements. The committee directs the Department to pursue this modernization approach within the stockpile management program to assist in assuring near-term confidence in the nuclear stockpile.

Section 3134. Limitation on use of funds for certain research and development purposes.

Section 3141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 limited the obligation of fiscal year 1996 Atomic Energy Defense funds for the Department of Energy (DOE) laboratory-directed research and development (LDRD) program and the DOE technology transfer programs, unless such activities supported the national security missions of the Department. It was concluded that the laboratories needed to focus LDRD program resources on the priorities within the nuclear weapons program.

The committee maintains that the scientific and engineering challenges embodied in the emerging stockpile stewardship and stockpile management programs are sufficient to sustain the preeminence of the laboratories in the areas of science and engineering. The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 1996 limitation to fiscal year 1997.

Section 3135. Accelerated schedule for isolating high-level nuclear waste at the Defense Waste Processing Facility, Savannah River Site.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 contained a provision that directed the Secretary of Energy to accelerate certain high priority Environmental Management (EM) program activities. The committee notes that in recent testimony the Department has emphasized actual cleanup, as opposed to studies, and stressed the need to accelerate actual cleanup to reduce long-term costs. Consistent with that focus, the committee urges Department of Energy to accelerate the isolation of high level nuclear waste, to the extent that technology is available.

The committee authorizes an additional $15.0 million for the Department to maximize the canister production rate of the Defense Waste Processing Facility (DWPF), Savannah River Site (SRS), and to accelerate the removal of the high-level radioactive waste from the tanks at SRS. The Department shall not restrict DWPF production capability and capacity because of limited funds within the overall EM budget. The committee regards the safe, expeditious removal of high-level radioactive wastes from the SRS tanks as one of the highest priorities of the EM program.

Section 3136. Processing of high-level nuclear waste and spent nuclear fuel rods.

The committee understands that a strategic goal of the Environmental Management (EM) program is to eliminate and manage urgent risks in the EM system. The committee believes that the Department of Energy (DOE) created an urgent risk situation with consolidation of the storage of DOE spent nuclear fuel rods at the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL) (stainless steel clad) and at the Savannah River Site (SRS) (aluminum clad).

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 required the initiation of a specific program for the disposition of spent nuclear fuel rods. The committee continues to be concerned with the inadequate funding level reflected in the fiscal year 1997 budget request and with the under utilization of the Department's resources.

The committee authorizes an additional $43.0 million for the material processing canyons and an additional $15.0 million for the DOE National Spent Fuel Program to support program planning, fuel characterization, transportation planning, waste acceptance criteria development and technology development as necessary to assure a path forward for permanent disposition of DOE-controlled spent fuel. In addition, the committee directs the Department to utilize fully all relevant facilities and to accelerate, where possible, activities necessary to stabilize, store, and dispose of materials included in the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) recommendation on site spent fuel rods, foreign fuel rods, and fuel rods being sent to the DOE fuel rod consolidation sites.

Section 3137. Fellowship program for development of skills critical to Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, the Department of Energy (DOE) was directed to initiate a university fellowship program for recruiting the next generation of engineers and technical experts for the modernized nuclear weapons repair and refabrication plants. The DOE was directed to fund the program through authorized appropriations within the Stockpile Management Program. The DOE has not complied with this congressional direction.

In the absence of such a program, the progressing "brain drain," identified in testimony before this committee, could undermine efforts to repair and rebuild the necessary number of aging nuclear weapons in the stockpile. Testimony has suggested that the Russian nuclear weapons production expertise is sustained by rebuilding thousands of weapons per year. While the committee does not propose a massive remanufacturing approach, it is expected that DOE will attract, mentor, and retain the next generation of nuclear weapons refabrication experts. The committee authorizes DOE to use $5.0 million of the authorized appropriations for fiscal year 1997 Stockpile Management Program to immediately initiate the fellowship program.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3151. Requirement for annual five-year budget for the national security programs of the Department of Energy.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit an annual National Security Five-Year Budget Plan to the congressional defense committees. The plan shall be submitted no later than the day on which the President's annual budget request is submitted to Congress. The format of the budget plan shall be based on the structure of the Atomic Energy Defense Activities account, as presented in the President's annual budget request to Congress. At a minimum, the plan shall have the level of detail contained in the Department's National Security Five-Year Budget Plan for fiscal years 1996–2000, submitted to the congressional defense committees on March 20, 1995.

The Office of Management and Budget shall withhold 5 percent of the Department's annual appropriation for Atomic Energy Defense Activities until the Plan is submitted to the congressional defense committees. The provision reiterates the requirement originally contained in section 3144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189). The committee notes that the Department did not submit a plan for fiscal years 1997–2001 with the President's fiscal year 1997 budget request. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit the plan for fiscal years 1997–2001 as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 1996.

Section 3152. Requirements for Department of Energy weapons activities budgets for fiscal years after fiscal year 1997.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Energy to relate the elements of its nuclear weapons program budget submission to the specific requirements of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum and the Nuclear Posture Review. In the context of that submission, the Secretary of Energy would be required to provide a long-term program plan, and a near-term program plan for the certification and stewardship of the nuclear stockpile.

Section 3153. Repeal of requirement relating to accounting procedures for Department of Energy funds.

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. In 1994, at the time this provision was enacted, the Department of Energy did not have adequate control of uncosted and unobligated balances in a number of areas. In many instances, the Department could not identify the original fiscal year for which uncosted balances were appropriated.

Prior to the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995, the committee believed that a change in accounting procedures was necessary to force the Department to track the expenditure of funds and to regain control over uncosted and unobligated balances. Subsequent to the enactment, the Department succeeded in significantly reducing its uncosted and unobligated balances. In addition, the Department has initiated a regular reporting methodology that allows the committee to track unobligated and uncosted funds appropriated for national security activities. The committee supports the continued use of such reports.

Section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 has not yet taken effect. The committee has learned that implementation of the provision would require significant expenditures, and computer hardware and software development. The committee does not believe that these expenditures would be cost effective. Moreover, the information that the provision was intended to elicit is now readily available in the reports submitted to the committee. The committee believes that these reports are an adequate and cost effective substitute for the provision. The provision is no longer necessary.

Section 3154. Plans for activities to process nuclear materials and clean up nuclear waste at the Savannah River Site.

The committee is concerned that future generations may be faced with potential safety issues resulting from the degradation of spent nuclear fuel rods. The committee has been informed that the Department of Energy (DOE) will not fully assess the future missions of the Savannah River Site until next year. The committee notes that the Department has already begun to cut funding, downsize the workforce, and shut down key facilities at the site. To ensure that these critical capabilities and capacities are not lost in the interim and that all safety concerns are addressed in a timely man-

ner, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to continue operations and maintain a high state of readiness at the F–canyon and H-canyon facilities. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to prepare a near-term plan for upgrading and improving the canyons to meet Defense Nuclear Safety Board recommendations.

The committee also notes the absence of a multi-year plan to address the return of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel rods to the Savannah River Site and the consolidation of DOE domestic spent nuclear fuel rods at the Savannah River Site and the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. A clearly defined plan and commitment is necessary for their safe storage and ultimate disposition in a permanent repository. Without an effective program plan in place to deal with these problems, the Department will not be able to adequately assess the future missions of the Savannah River Site.

The committee agrees with the Chairman of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) that both H-canyon and F–canyon facilities at the Savannah River Site have an important future role. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to develop a multi-year program plan to use the H-canyon and the F–canyon for treating DOE and foreign spent nuclear fuel rods. The plan shall provide options for chemical processing, reduction, and isolation of high level nuclear waste contained in on-site spent nuclear fuel rods, in DOE aluminum clad fuel rods, and foreign spent fuel rods being sent to the site under the Department's Fiscal Year 1995 consolidation decision. The plan shall ensure that no additional weapons grade material results as an end product from activities carried out under this plan.

Section 3155. Update of report on nuclear test readiness postures.

The committee recommends a provision that would require an update of the Nuclear Test Readiness Posture Report required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996. That report pertains to the readiness and maintenance of the requisite underground testing expertise at the Nevada Test Site and at the Nuclear Weapons Laboratories.

Section 3156. Reports on critical difficulties at nuclear weapons laboratories and nuclear weapons production plants.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the head of any nuclear weapons laboratory or nuclear weapons production plant to notify the Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs immediately if there is any difficulty associated with the nuclear weapons complex that would have a significant bearing on the confidence in the safety, surety, or reliability of a nuclear weapon within the nuclear stockpile. The Assistant Secretary for Defense Programs is directed to notify the congressional defense committees immediately of any such difficulty. The provision would also require the Nuclear Weapons Council to notify Congress in the event that the Council becomes aware of any difficulties within the purview of the Council.

Section 3157. Extension of applicability of notice-and-wait requirement regarding proposed cooperation agreements.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Section 3155(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995. The amendment would extend the date by which notice is to be made to Congress regarding the release of restricted data or formerly restricted data pursuant to a cooperative agreement with a foreign country. This provision allows the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense to release data, as necessary, to further fissile material and other weapons material control and accountability programs; to support atomic weapons control and accountability; for treaty verification; and to assist in establishing a uniform international system of classification.

Section 3158. Redesignation of Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program as Defense Nuclear Waste Management Program.

The committee is concerned that the true mission of the Department of Energy's Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program is not accurately reflected in the program's current name. Therefore, the committee directs that the Department of Energy redesignate the Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Program (also known as the Environmental Management Program) as the Defense Nuclear Waste Management Program.

Furthermore, the committee directs that the Department of Energy prepare a report describing any difficulties or problems that may arise as a result of such a name change, including estimates of the costs, if any. The committee directs that the report be transmitted to the congressional defense committees no later than January 31, 1997.

Section 3159. Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise.

The committee finds that the Department of Energy (DOE) has not adequately dealt with the problem associated with attracting a new generation of nuclear weapons experts to ensure that the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile is maintained indefinitely. On this basis, the committee directs that the Department organize a high level commission to address this issue.

Section 3160. Sense of Senate regarding reliability and safety of remaining nuclear forces.

The United States is currently participating in multilateral negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) that would prohibit underground nuclear tests. The committee remains concerned with the ability of the Department of Defense to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of the strategic nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of such tests. U.S. strategic nuclear forces will be further reduced with the entry into force of START II. However, the United States will continue to depend on a deterrent nuclear force, according to the Nuclear Posture Review. The safety and reliability of the United States' remaining deterrent

nuclear force depends on the following: maintaining weapons production capabilities and capacities; adequate funding to ensure that the remaining stockpile is maintained in a state of full readiness; meeting full fabrication and tritium production requirements; capabilities for tritium recycling and pit remanufacturing; and a successful science-based stockpile stewardship program to replace underground nuclear testing.

The administration has assured members of the Senate that the United States would invoke its right under the supreme national interest clause in any future treaty, including the CTBT, if our confidence in the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile significantly erodes and cannot be corrected by science-based stockpile stewardship.

The committee recommends a provision that expresses concerns about maintaining confidence in the nuclear stockpile and reaffirms our nation's commitment to ensuring the safety, security, reliability, and performance of our nuclear forces by incorporating a declaration that was part of the START II resolution of ratification that was agreed to overwhelmingly by the Senate in January 1996.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

Department of Energy work force reduction plans

Section 3161(e)(2)of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 directs the Secretary of Energy to provide annual updates of work force restructuring plans that evaluate the implementation of the plan during the year preceding the report. Section 3161 also directed that the Secretary of Energy's preparation of work force restructuring plans be guided by the series of objectives that must fulfilled prior to imposing work force changes: (1) minimize social and economic impacts; (2) provide employee and community notification of changes not later than 120 days before effective date; and (3) minimize layoffs through retraining, early retirement, attrition, and other available options.

The Department of Energy (DOE) provided the committee with a comprehensive work force update through the Report on Work Force Restructuring Plans Completed During Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994, dated February 1996. That update reviews the implementation of twelve work force restructuring plans covering ten sites. A total of 8,029 contractor employees have been separated under these plans, of which 5,791 were permanent management and operating employees.

Based on a review of the overall impacts of the work force restructuring plans, it appears that the Department may have exceeded some of its projected reductions for fiscal year 1996 and plans to continue that aggressive approach. Consistent with section 3161, the committee appreciates the need to restructure the Department's work force, however, it is important that the future mission requirements of the entire complex receive adequate consideration. It is also essential that the Secretary of Energy's actions be guided by the objectives outlined in section 3161, particularly the need to minimize the social and economic impacts.

In addition, the committee is concerned that the future needs of the Department have not been given adequate consideration. The

committee is concerned that decisions regarding work force restructuring must reflect careful review of both the Department's mission and the availability of appropriations. The committee is pleased that the Secretary of Energy has directed a complex wide review to ensure that work force restructuring decisions are appropriately guided by the objectives outlined in section 3161 and by the future mission requirements of the Department. The committee expects that the Secretary of Energy's review will primarily focus on those facilities that have had work force reductions that exceeded the fiscal year 1996 projections. In addition, the committee expects that this review will reflect the current expectation that there will be no need, other than that identified in existing workforce restructuring announcements, for additional involuntary separations in 1996, and that such separations will be limited in 1997 to levels that are necessary to "right size" workforces and achieve Departmental program missions. The committee understands that any further reductions would take place only after completion of any voluntary separations and early retirement programs.

Accelerating radioactive waste cleanup

The committee commends the Department of Energy's efforts to reduce the risks and costs associated with cleanup of radioactive wastes at nuclear production facilities that are planned for reuse or demolition. The committee also notes the contribution that chemical decontamination technology has made in accomplishing those goals. Accordingly, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Energy consider the use of new technologies that accelerate chemical decontamination at nuclear production plants.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Section 3201. Authorization.

The committee is concerned that the Final Report of the Advisory Committee on External Regulation of Department of Energy Nuclear Safety ignores the priorities and paramount objective of the Atomic Energy Act and that it does not grasp the danger inherent in a weakened strategic deterrent. The committee has seen no compelling data or argument to justify the recommendation that would subject national security programs to a new, independent, external regulatory system. In addition, there appear to be two distinct disadvantages to external regulation of the Department of Energy national security program: (1) it could increase the potential effect of intervenors, lawyers, and the members of the judiciary, associated with the regulatory process, in imposing burdens that would have an adverse effect on the Department's defense and national security missions; and (2) it could dramatically increase operating costs. Since the creation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) in 1988, the board has gained the bipartisan support and confidence of the committee. The committee is satisfied with the current relationship between the board and the Secretary of Energy.

The committee commends the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for its participation in and completion of a Memorandum of Understanding with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, and the Department of Energy. That memorandum should sensibly facilitate the application of the respective functions and resources of the board, EPA, and the State of Colorado in the fulfillment of the oversight and regulatory functions related to the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Industrial Area. The memorandum is expected to maximize the effectiveness of oversight responsibilities and minimize duplication of regulatory efforts, resulting in overall progress toward the completion of cleanup and decommissioning work under the Department of Energy's control.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 3301. Authorized uses of stockpile funds.

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Stockpile Manager to obligate $60.0 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transfer Fund during fiscal year 1997 for the authorized uses of funds under section 9(b)(2) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The committee also recommends a provision that would authorize the disposal of excess materials from the National Defense Stockpile. Under current law, the Stockpile Manager cannot dispose of excess materials unless the proposed disposal has been reviewed by the Market Impact Committee and included in the Annual Materials Plan or a revision of the Plan.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.

The President's budget request included $149.5 million for operation of the naval petroleum reserves in fiscal year 1997. The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $149.5 million for the operation of the naval petroleum reserves in fiscal year 1997.

TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

Title XXXV would authorize expenditures from the Panama Canal Revolving Fund for the operation, maintenance, improvement and administration of the Panama Canal, and would also authorize the Panama Canal Commission to expend funds for the purchase of vehicles.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

By letter dated April 5, 1996, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1997, and for other purposes." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 2231 to the Committee on Armed Services on April 17, 1996. Executive Communication 2231 is available for review at the committee. Senators Thurmond and Nunn introduced this legislative proposal as S. 1673, by request, on April 16, 1996. The statement made by Senator Thurmond upon introduction of S. 1673, together with the sectional analysis of the legislation, appear in the Congressional Record of April 16, 1996 on pages S3387–3401.

By letter dated April 8, 1996, the General Counsel of the Department of Defense forwarded to the President of the Senate proposed legislation "To authorize construction at certain military installations for fiscal year 1997, and for other military construction authorizations and activities of the Department of Defense." The transmittal letter and proposed legislation were officially referred as Executive Communication 2330 to the Committee on Armed Services on April 25, 1996. Executive Communication 2330 is available for review at the committee. Senators Thurmond and Nunn introduced this legislative proposal as part of S. 1673, by request, on April 16, 1996.

Committee Action

In accordance with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, there is set forth below the committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

In favor: Senators Thurmond, Warner, Cohen, McCain, Lott, Coats, Smith, Kempthorne, Hutchison, Inhofe, Santorum, Nunn, Exon, Kennedy, Bingaman, Glenn, Byrd, Robb, Lieberman, and Bryan.

Not Voting: Senator Levin

Vote: 20–0.

The other roll call votes on amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the mark-up have been made public and are available at the committee.

Fiscal Data

Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–510) requires that the report accompanying each bill reported by a Senate committee contain certain information on five-year cost projections.

The letter received in compliance with this statutory requirement is shown below. The bill is an annual authorization and does not, within its own terms, generate costs beyond fiscal year 1997 even though the funds authorized to be obligated by this act may not be expended for several years in the future. The fiscal year authorizations herein provided are reviewed annually by the committee and the Congress.

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1100 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20301-1100

COMPTROLLER

RECEIVED
SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
1996 MAY -3 PM 12
MAY - 2 1996

Honorable Strom Thurmond
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with Section 252 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-510), the chart below provides an estimate of how appropriations attendant to the FY 1997 Authorization Request will expend.

Estimated Expenditures
($ in Millions)

FY 1997 Request:	$173,857
FY 1997	96,098
FY 1998	44,318
FY 1999	17,736
FY 2000	7,718
FY 2001	3,587
Beyond	4,400

Sincerely,

John J. Hamre

Enclosure

cc:
Honorable Sam Nunn
Ranking Democrat

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN ON S. 1673

The FY97 National Defense Authorization Senate Armed Services Committee report includes a provision that changes the allocation of maintenance workloads between the public depots and the private sector from a 60/40 to a 50/50 split. Like most compromises, it will probably not satisfy everyone with an interest in this issue. I do not believe that the depot maintenance issue should be addressed this year as a result of the inability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to articulate its depot policy and its failure to adequately answer depot-related questions Congress requested in last year's National Defense Authorization act. It appears that DOD is not interested in providing Congress with the data it needs to make an informed decision.

There is a need to reform how the Pentagon operates. Finding more efficient ways to support our war-fighters could result in billions of dollars in savings that can be transferred to support the modernization of our forces. DOD has proposed three methods of savings to fund modernization—procurement reform, base closings, and privatization. I am highly skeptical about significant savings accruing from any of these. The Congress has given DOD three revolutionary procurement reform acts in the last two years which could generate savings but I am fearful these may fail to achieve the desired effects due to management inertia. Likewise, the savings from BRAC may prove illusionary if the Administration continues to come up with proposals which are designed not for cost savings but to avoid the pain doled out in BRAC to politically important communities.

With regard to privatization, I believe the Pentagon has a misplaced sense of priorities. In the private sector, which DOD claims to emulate, organizations most frequently contract out for building management, fleet management, and information technology to better focus on their "core competencies". DOD has decided to turn this on its head by first outsourcing core competencies—for example, maintaining advanced weapon systems—while keeping most commercial business processes in-house.

If we are truly going to maximize the benefits of the commercial marketplace, I believe we should instead focus on those areas where the private sector has chosen to outsource, such as data processing, accounting, audit, transportation, and inventory. But the Pentagon wants to continue to operate its own data processing centers, develop its own software for financial systems when it can buy them off-the-shelf, like most private companies do, and manage its own inventory so the taxpayer ends up spending $36 billion more on goods that DOD does not need. And yet, the Pentagon wants to move quickly to privatize depots that were slated for closure by BRAC and further contribute to the excess capacity prob-

lem at public depots that have served our country so well since 1799.

On the point of privatizing closing facilities, there also seems to be a misunderstanding about the intent of the BRAC and the closure of the Air Logistics Centers at Kelly AFB and McClellan AFB. First, let there be no misunderstanding about the fact that the BRAC decisions were made under the assumption that 60 percent of the workload would go to public depots. The need to change this ratio to accommodate the Administration's plans to shift work to Kelly and McClellan illustrates that what we are doing in this bill is a clear circumvention of the BRAC process. To change the 60/40 criteria as the Armed Service Committee has agreed to will deteriorate critical warfighting capabilities, impede investment in the public domain, and most likely require further closures beyond what has been accomplished in BRAC.

The BRAC did not recommend or authorize "privatization-in-place" at Kelly or McClellan. Indeed for those facilities where the BRAC thought there was a unique capability that could lend itself to privatization-in-place (such as those at the Naval Air Warfare Center in Indianapolis or the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Louisville), a recommendation was made to that effect. The BRAC made no such identification or recommendation for facilities at the Kelly or McClellan Air Logistics Centers. Perhaps, it can be argued that the BRAC made a mistake and that it did not adequately recognize the unique potential of these two facilities. I would then argue that the BRAC did not adequately recognize the unique capabilities of Loring AFB in Presque Isle, Maine and I am sure some of my colleagues could argue the same for facilities in their states. The fact of the matter is that the BRAC made a recommendation and the Congress and the Administration accepted that recommendation with all of its consequences for national security and the economic impact on these communities.

Because of the implications of any change to 60/40 on excess capacity and concerns over DOD's direction on the privatization of defense depots, Congress asked the DOD to prepare a depot policy report. If Congress agreed with this policy, it would repeal the 60/40 rule. DOD ignored their deadline and sent up a policy just four weeks ago. The report did not meet the requirements that were outlined in last year's National Defense Authorization Act and was rejected by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The Department of Defense's depot policy report was non-responsive and it was clear from DOD's April 17th testimony before the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee that DOD's policy was not well developed or supported. DOD's definition of core capability is so general that it is virtually meaningless. The report did not address how new weapon systems would be introduced in depots, or how public depots would be kept cost-efficient. There was a complete lack of detailed statistical data supporting the Pentagon's policy decisions and no data on past depot maintenance performance in which to support privatization decisions. In addition, there were neither plans to assure effective competition in a market where 76 percent of contracts are now let on a sole-source basis, nor a risk assessment on how plans for privatization-in-place would affect existing excess capacity and overall maintenance costs.

With the move to 50/50, the Senate Armed Services Committee is now saying DOD does not have a depot policy and Congress does not have the data to adequately develop its own policy, but we are going to repeal 60/40 anyway because it meets the short-sighted political agenda of the day. By repealing 60/40 at this time, we are rewarding DOD for not adequately responding to a congressionally mandated requirement. DOD's policy and the repeal of 60/40 were inextricably linked. To reject DOD's policy as the Armed Services committee has done, is to reject DOD's call for a repeal of 60/40.

I do not believe we should give DOD any more flexibility in this area until DOD establishes a coherent policy on depot maintenance. It was apparent that this position was not universally accepted by my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Committee. When a compromise was offered to change the mix to 50/50, I reluctantly accepted it as I felt this was the best way to continue to maintain our nation's investment in the unique capabilities the public depots provide our armed forces in war and peace.

The committee report does provide some direction to require DOD to develop a rational depot policy. The final Committee agreement again asks DOD to report in detail on the provisions where it has failed to adequately respond. The committee directs DOD to provide answers to crucial questions needed by Congress in order to support an informed decision about maintaining a core logistics capability in the public sector. Some of the questions include:

What workloads should be "core" in each service?

What procedures will be used to conduct public-private and public-public competitions?

What is DOD's maintenance plan for new weapon systems?

What level of organic work is necessary to provide efficient capacity utilization of the public depots that remain?

How does DOD plan to improve the productivity of the remaining public depots?

What are the estimated savings that will result from increased privatization?

This last question is crucial as DOD is proclaiming savings from consolidating depots, but then plans to keep more excess capacity with its policy of privatization-in-place. While DOD risks future modernization on savings supposedly generated by privatization of depot maintenance, these savings are unproven. DOD's estimated savings of 20–30% from depot privatization rely on past studies of the privatization of commercial type functions in the government where there is significant competition for contacts. This is in stark contrast to the marketplace for depot maintenance activities. In fact, the General Accounting Office found the Air Force is implementing a privatization plan at facilities at the Newark AFB that will most likely increase maintenance costs and not save the taxpayer any money as promised.

I would have preferred to delay any decision on depot maintenance until we secured all of the facts from DOD. However, the Senate Armed Services Committee has agreed to a compromise that I fully supported. Given the fact that the commitee report allows DOD to shift to 50/50 while not obligating DOD to provide an adequate response to Congress, my continued support is dependent on the degree to which DOD satisfies the Committee's request for

information on DOD's depot policy between now and the conference with the House of Representatives over the Fiscal Year "97 National Defense Authorization bill. I look forward to the Chairman and Ranking Member's letter directing DOD to provide this information. The Senate Armed Services Committee rejected DOD's proposed policy this year and is offering DOD another opportunity to get it right. DOD does not plan to meet the 60/40 ceiling for several years, so I believe we have the time to ensure that a coherent depot maintenance plan that will truly save taxpayer dollars and effectively meet wartime surge requirements and readiness needs can be properly developed and implemented.

BILL COHEN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOHN McCAIN ON THE COMMITTEE-REPORTED FY 1997 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

I was pleased to join the overwhelming majority of the Committee in ordering reported favorably to the Senate the Committee's recommendations for the Fiscal Year 1997 National Defense Authorization Act. Overall, I believe this is an excellent bill, and I congratulate Chairman Thurmond for leading an efficient and productive markup process.

For the second year in a row, the Republican Congress has added money to the Administration's inadequate defense budget requests, slowing the too-rapid decline in defense spending which threatens to jeopardize the future readiness of our Armed Forces. The Committee-reported bill authorizes nearly $13 billion more than the President's budget request for defense programs, with more than $7 billion allocated for procurement of additional weapons systems.

Although I am not completely satisfied with some of the Committee's recommendations, the majority of this added funding is authorized for high-priority programs of the military Services. The bill provides much-needed funding for essential tactical aircraft and missiles, improved communications systems, theater and national missile defense systems, and other high-technology equipment which the Clinton Administration failed to fund.

I am also pleased that the Committee adopted most of the recommendations of the Readiness Subcommittee, including:

—A provision to dispose of unneeded stockpile items which will reduce the deficit by $650 million;

—A provision to terminate defense spending for a Justice Department-run center to gather intelligence on illegal drug activities; and

—A provision requiring organizers of civilian sporting events to agree to reimburse the Department of Defense for the cost of providing security and other support services, but only if the event makes a profit; and

—A provision requiring the military Service Chiefs to provide an analysis of an alternative readiness management system, called tiered readiness, which I proposed in a recent paper.

I appreciate very much the cooperation of my colleagues in formulating a compromise proposal to resolve the difficult issue of allocating workload between public and private maintenance depots. The provisions adopted by the Committee revise the current 60/40 public/private workload allocation to a 50/50 formula, pending receipt of core workload data from the Department of Defense. The Committee also adopted a requirement for competition at Kelly and McClellan Air Force Bases in advance of implementing any privatization-in-place proposal.

The Committee also adopted several other amendments dealing with policy matters of particular importance to me.

First, the Committee adopted an amendment to repeal provisions of the FY 1996 Defense Authorization Act related to missing service personnel. These provisions were identified by the military leadership as burdensome and unnecessary.

The Committee also adopted an amendment to provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to waive counter-productive "Buy America" restrictions which were adopted in last year's defense authorization bill. The new waiver may be exercised at the Secretary's discretion to allow the Department of Defense to purchase items from a firm located in a foreign country, if that country has a reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding with the U.S. The new waiver will once again allow free trade between the U.S. and our allies for defense contracts.

The Committee also adopted a proposal directing the Department of Defense to follow a uniform policy with respect to military personnel with illnesses that prevent them from serving overseas. In my view, it is outrageous that military personnel infected with the AIDS virus would be treated any differently than others who cannot deploy for health reasons. This provision would ensure uniformity in the Department's discharge policy for non-deployable personnel. I sincerely hope we are able to maintain this position in our conference with the House.

I will work closely with the Chairman and my Committee colleagues to ensure that these high-priority programs and important policy positions are retained on the Senate floor and in conference with the House.

Finally, I am sorry to note that the practice of pork-barrel spending is still evident in the Senate Armed Services Committee. In past years, defense bills have been filled with pork-barrel projects which did little to enhance our military capabilities. This year, I am pleased that the practice of adding funds for Members' special interests seems to have declined significantly. However, there are several programmatic recommendations in this bill which, in my view, constitute pork-barrel spending.

First, and most egregious, the Committee added $600 million in unrequested military construction projects. The close attention focused on military construction pork in the past at least forced greater scrutiny of the add-on list this year, with the result that the majority of the projects added by the Committee were included on the military Services' priority lists for increased funding. However, I cannot accept the apparent assumption that projects planned for construction in the next century are as high a priority as projects planned for next year's budget, and I had hoped that the Committee would focus on adding money for projects planned for 1998 or 1999.

Another perennial favorite is the addition of hundreds of millions of dollars for unrequested equipment for the National Guard and Reserve. This bill includes an additional $759.8 million in the National Guard and Reserve Equipment account, plus as much as $242 million in additional unrequested equipment earmarked for the Guard and Reserve in the regular Service procurement accounts. Within this amount is $284 million for 6 unrequested C–

130J aircraft for the Guard and Reserve—a tactical airlift aircraft that the active Air Force has not yet been able to buy. I am well aware of the argument that the active military Services do not adequately provide for the needs of the Guard and Reserve, but I do not believe the Congress, or the individual Adjutants General, can properly prioritize their needs. The Senate Armed Services Committee has repeatedly urged the Services to include Guard and Reserve requirements in their budget requests. I think we should enlist the obviously widespread support of our Senate colleagues and the state Adjutants General to ensure that the Guard and Reserve are included in the budget formulation process, rather than continuing to impose our own politicized judgments about specific weapons systems and projects on the Guard and Reserve.

The active Air Force did request funding to procure one C–130J tactical airlift aircraft. However, the Committee decided not to authorize this asset for the active Air Force. Instead, the Committee recommended an additional $204.5 million for an additional three C–130Js, including funding to modify these aircraft to a weather reconnaissance role, and then transferred all four aircraft to the WC–130 weather reconnaissance squadron in Mississippi. It is inexplicable to me why the Committee would choose to divert these aircraft from the active Air Force, where they were intended to replace aging C–130E models, and instead use them to replace newer C–130H models in a weather reconnaissance unit. Further, the Air Force plans to eliminate nearly 90 aircraft from its current C–130 fleet to conform with the Mobility Requirements Study, yet the Committee recommends adding these four aircraft plus an unspecified number of C–130s for the Guard and Reserve. Finally, neither WC–130 or C–130 aircraft appeared on any of the Service's priority lists for added funds. The Committee's rationale for adding these aircraft, reflected in the report language, appears to be that the weather reconnaissance mission could "benefit from near-term modernization". That argument, in my view, could easily apply to the thousands of Service priorities which were not included in this bill and which, in my view, would contribute much more to our national defense than an upgraded weather reconnaissance capability.

Another questionable add-on in this bill is a $15 million increase for the High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program, or HAARP. This program has benefited from Congressional add-ons since 1990, costing a total of $76 million in just seven years, with another $115 million required before the project can be completed in 2001. Yet it remains unclear what military benefit might accrue from the construction of a facility to study the aurora borealis. Proponents of the program argue that it should be a part of the counter-proliferation program of the Department of Defense because it will be able to detect underground tunnels and structures. However, the Air Force, which manages the program for the Department of Defense, noted in April of last year that "the research is not sufficiently mature to warrant its inclusion in the non-proliferation and counter-proliferation program." Proponents also argue that the program will have application for communications, navigation, and surveillance missions. Yet, the Department of Defense did not include this $15 million in its budget request for FY

1997, and it was not included on their priority lists for additional funds. That indicates to me that, in competition with other militarily relevant programs, HAARP is not a high priority for the military. In my view, the Congress should stop compelling the military Services to pursue research programs that do not meet their requirements. Spending hundreds of millions of defense dollars to study the energy of the aurora borealis is, in my view, an unconscionable waste of taxpayer dollars. This program should be turned over to a privately funded university, research institution, or other organization where it could be pursued as a purely scientific endeavor.

The Committee also included a provision in the bill that establishes a cumbersome and expensive new bureaucracy to coordinate the Navy's oceanographic research activities. The addition of $99.4 million for two new oceanographic ships does not trouble me, since these ships were included in the Navy's shipbuilding plan. Nor does the addition of $6 million to replace worn equipment used by the Navy in its oceanographic survey and research activities. In fact, I do not necessarily dispute the assertion that Navy oceanographic research is underfunded. However, I see no need to establish a multi-tiered organization to ensure that the Navy has access to all federal and civilian research in oceanography. The bill sets aside $13 million to fund a new bureaucracy which would, in my view, only hinder the efficient and effective expenditure of federal funds for militarily relevant oceanographic research. In addition, the criteria and processes for appointment to these various new entities seem vague, as do the particular responsibilities and authorities of these seemingly overlapping organizations. Finally, the outyear funding requirements for this new bureaucracy are unknown, and I question whether the Navy can afford this potential funding drain in the future. I believe the Committee would have been better served to increase the funding available to the Navy for its oceanography program, together with specific legislative authority for the Navy to explore private sector efforts which might be of utility to the Navy. In this way, the Navy would be spared the burden of a new bureaucracy and, at the same time, would be able to benefit from privately funded research and other activities.

Finally, again this year, the Committee included legislative language and additional funding for the New Attack Submarine program which is designed to ensure that the first two, and perhaps four, of these submarines are allocated equally between the two competing shipyards. The legislative language is essentially the same as that adopted last year, which earmarks at least one submarine each for Newport News and Electric Boat. The bill includes an additional $701 million for advance procurement for the second New Attack Submarine to ensure that Newport News receives its fair share of this program. I did not support this approach last year because it defeats any pretense at competition between the yards, earmarks multi-billions of dollars for each of the yards, and is based on a faulty assumption that the nation requires two shipyards to ensure its nuclear submarine industrial base. I still question why the Navy is retiring SSN–688 submarines early in order to accommodate the Seawolf and New Attack Submarines in a drastically reduced attack submarine fleet, and I do not understand

why we are buying New Attack Submarines, which are less capable than Seawolf submarines, when they cost as much as Seawolf submarines (about $2.5 billion each). I think the Committee should reconsider accelerating this funding until it is necessary and allocate this $701 million to other Navy priorities.

Again, I believe this is, overall, a very good defense bill, and I voted in favor of reporting the bill to the Senate. However, I fear that the additional $13 billion included in this bill may not survive the Congressional budget review process this year. In the event that this bill must be reduced by $3 or $4 billion, or even more, I hope my colleagues will look carefully at these pork-barrel add-ons. We must protect the high-priority military programs which contribute to the future readiness of our Armed Forces. If this bill must be reduced, we should cut out the pork first.

JOHN MCCAIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR BOB SMITH ON PROVISIONS RELATED TO MISSING PERSONS

In the Fiscal Year 1996 National Defense Authorization Act, Congress mandated critical reforms to the procedures and policies used by the Department of Defense (DoD) to fully account for military men and women who are captured or become missing in action in hostile territory. These changes will go a long way to address past criticisms that Defense Department officials have not always considered pertinent information in arriving at status determinations for unaccounted for American POWs or MIAs.

However, in the Fiscal Year 1997 Defense Authorization bill, the Committee has repealed several important sections of the Missing Persons law at the urging of the Department of Defense. I believe many of these proposed revisions to current law are unwarranted, and I do not believe the Committee received compelling reasons for the proposed changes described below.

First, the Committee adopted a recommendation to repeal the provision in last year's Act that requires DoD to appoint counsel whose sole purpose is to represent the interests of a missing person at status determination hearings. There has been criticism in the past, based on 1977 National Security Council and Department of Defense memoranda, that government officials had, at one time, considered declaring many MIAs as dead in order to advance political and foreign policy objectives. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that someone might question whether the Department of Defense has always held the interests of a missing person foremost in mind during status reviews. I believe it is appropriate to have DoD-appointed counsel at these board hearings who are required by law to represent the interests of a missing person.

Second, the Committee adopted a recommendation to repeal the provision in last year's Act concerning penalties for any wrongful withholding of information from the files of a missing person. Again, there have been instances over the years where POW/MIA family members have said that information was withheld from them which did not concern national security or privacy issues. Even the Final Report of the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs concluded in 1993 that DoD had not always been up front during the last two decades in providing relevant information to POW/MIA family members. The Missing Persons law passed last year had several exemptions for withholding classified information, privacy information, and information from the debriefings of former POWs. We need to keep the penalties under current law in place so POW/MIA families know that DoD will be held accountable if other relevant information is knowingly withheld from a missing person's file.

Third, the Committee adopted a recommendation to repeal the right of the primary next of kin of a missing person to seek judicial

review if there is reason to believe that information affecting the status of a missing person has not been adequately considered by the Department of Defense. The right to judicial review of a status determination contained in current law should be preserved. There is no compelling reason for Congress to alter this provision. Even veterans appealing disability benefits are entitled to such review, and it is hard to believe that we would want to apply a lesser standard to a decision on whether a missing person is alive or dead.

Fourth, the Committee adopted a recommendation to repeal a provision in current law that makes the new Missing Persons legislation applicable to cases of unaccounted for personnel from the Korean Conflict. Concern has been expressed that the Missing Persons law might force the Department of Defense to revisit status determinations made more than forty years ago for several thousand missing American personnel from the Korean Conflict. I understand the manpower and resource limitations which might give rise to this concern.

However, while I am pleased the Committee has retained preenactment applicability in current law for Vietnam-era and Cold War cases, I believe we will need to further consider the issue of fairness for Korean-era POW/MIA families with the following points in mind; First, under current law, cases from the Korean Conflict can only be reopened if new information is found or received that could change the status of a missing person; Second, given the passage of time, it is very unlikely that several thousand MIA cases from the Korean Conflict might be reopened on the basis of new information that could affect the status of a missing person; Third, the Department of Defense has lost contact with many of the primary next of kin for the 8,170 MIAs from the Korean War, and it is equally unlikely that several thousand of these family members would now contact the Department of Defense with information that would warrant a further review of their loved ones" cases.

Nonetheless, there are still efforts underway to obtain information on POW/MIAs from the Korean Conflict, and it is possible that some of this information could affect the status of a missing person. Finally, it is important that the definitions and procedures which constitute an accounting for missing persons under current law apply equally to personnel still missing from the Korean Conflict.

BOB SMITH.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN

This bill adopts policies that could increase the risk to the U.S. by undermining nuclear arms reduction agreements and provoking proliferation. It also continues a disturbing trend begun in last year's authorization act, providing the Pentagon with funding for weapons not requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense and the President, and at a time when there is no sudden increase in the external military threat to the U.S.

After adding $7 billion above the DOD's request for FY 1996, this bill would add nearly $13 billion more above the DOD's request for FY 1997. These additions are on top of the $25 billion added to the five-year defense plan in late 1994 and the $31.5 billion windfall in purchasing power the Pentagon captured in early 1996 from lower than expected inflation rates, a "dividend" that will be spread over six years.

Of the $12.9 billion this bill adds to the President's request, the vast majority goes to procurement of additional weapons. Some forty percent of those additional items are not even in the Pentagon's five-year defense plan.

This year, "wish lists" of items not approved for the FY 1997 budget by the JCS and the Secretary of Defense were solicited from the service chiefs. Those wish lists totaled more than $7 billion this year ($19.5 billion over five years) from the Army, $3 billion from the Navy for this year, $2.1 billion from the Marine Corps for this year, and $2.8 billion for this year ($12.8 billion over five years) from the Air Force. These figures do not include the "wish list" sums for equipment for the National Guard and Reserve forces—well over $1 billion for the Army Reserve alone.

While the Committee does place a high value on the personal views of the service chiefs, even indicating during the process of their confirmation that such views will be solicited, this practice of requesting "wish lists" for add-ons places at risk the very improvements in jointness and coordination among the services that the Committee has long championed, and also threatens the careful balancing of priorities that the Department's regular budget process establishes.

The Committee added hundreds of millions of dollars for items that were not even on the wish lists, let alone in the Pentagon's request for FY97.

For example, the Committee added $120 million to procure an additional 15 OH–58D Kiowa Warrior (also known as AHIP) scout helicopters that were not even on the Army's $7 billion wish list of 314 items. During Operation Desert Storm the Army used Apache helicopters as scouts to accompany our Apache attack helicopter forces instead of Kiowa scouts because the Kiowa cannot even keep up with the Apache. It doesn't have the speed or the range to operate with our front-line forces, and we should not buy

more. The Army is focusing its efforts on developing the new Comanche scout helicopter which will be significantly more capable than the OH–58D.

The Committee also added more than $50 million for two additional F–16s, above the number on the Air Force "wish list". The justification for more F–16s is suspect, since it was based on a sudden reduction in the service life estimate for F–16A/B fighters from 8,000 flying hours to just 4,000. Before we take these revised figures at face value, we should examine their validity, and consider other options that might be cheaper than buying new F–16s to fill the role of attrition reserve aircraft. Even so, it is excessive to buy more than the Air Force put on its wish list. The Air Force already has more than 280 F–16s stored in the desert, with additional useful service life remaining. Why buy new attrition reserve aircraft now which won't be needed until 2002 at the earliest?

Spending level

The Pentagon already consumes nearly 40 percent of the world's military budget, and we spend nearly as much as all of our allies combined. The U.S. spends 100 times as much annually as Iraq, the largest spender among nations the Pentagon considers potential threats. Even as other federal agencies continue to take sharp cuts in high-priority programs that directly contribute to the immediate and long-term security of Americans, including crime-fighting, education and environmental protection, the Committee added billions not requested by the Department of Defense, and in many cases not even included by the Services on the "wish lists" solicited by the Committee.

On top of the fact that this authorization has resorted to using ad hoc "wish lists" from the Services in order to decide where to spend the extra $13 billion, is the fact that the DOD financial systems necessary to account for the expenditure of this money are broken. We still haven't gotten a handle on it.

The General Accounting Office (GAO), in fact, says that "the Department does not yet have adequate financial management processes in place to produce the information it needs to support its decision." "No military service or other major DOD component," says GAO, "has been able to withstand the scrutiny of an independent financial statement audit.'

But the Committee's action would add another $13 billion to the pot without any concern for financial mismanagement issues.

If the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the Department of Health and Human Services were the subject of the same type of reports on their financial management systems that we're getting from the DOD Inspector General and GAO and the DOD Comptroller, himself, we would never be adding "wish list" money to their programs.

The GAO describes DOD's financial management problems as "serious" and "pervasive". GAO in testimony late last year listed the key problems as follows:

—"Serious problems in accounting for billions of dollars in annual disbursements."

—"Not identifying and disclosing future government costs."

—"Breakdowns in the Department's ability to protect its assets from fraud, waste and abuse."

—"Continuing problems in reliably reporting on the cost of its operations."

As long as Congress adds money like this, the Department will not have adequate incentive to solve these financial management problems. No major corporation in the United States would approve a subsidiary's budget at a "wish list" level if the subsidiary suffered from financial management failures like the Department of Defense.

While the Committee is critical of the level of procurement spending in the President's defense budget request, its answer is simply to add more money, much of which is not for the items that the Pentagon wants. This is a poor choice for several reasons.

First, Admiral William Owens, the former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) testified to the Committee at its first hearing this year that while DOD is seeking to increase its procurement funds, Congress should not add the money on top of the defense budget. Instead, he said that the Defense Department needs to create savings from within its own programs to provide additional funds for procurement. The Secretaries of the Military Departments provided valuable testimony in support of that notion. But the Committee did not pursue this avenue. Instead, it simply added money to the budget request, reducing incentives for the Department to operate more efficiently.

Second, the Committee's addition of nearly $13 billion is consistent with last year's congressional budget resolution, which added $7 billion in Fiscal Year 1996, and suggested a $13 billion add this year. But that budget resolution front-loads the defense increases in the near-term and short-changes the department in the outyears. After the year 2000, the budget resolution would provide the Pentagon with less money than planned the President's Future Years Defense Plan, and could substantially underfund the programs that the Committee says it supports.

In Fiscal Year 2001, the President's budget plan for the defense budget would be $2.5 billion above the current budget resolution number. And for Fiscal Year 2002, the President's defense budget figure is $7.9 billion higher than the budget resolution plan. So in those two years alone, the budget resolution would be more than $10 billion less than the President's defense budget plan.

The President's budget request and outyear plans provide a more stable and sustainable funding profile, while the plan of the congressional majority would jeopardize the long-term health and stability of defense funding. And the Committee's spending priorities are not the same as those of the Pentagon, so by funding other items, the Committee is funneling resources away from the programs that the Joint Chiefs and the Defense Secretary say are most needed.

The Defense Department is in an unusual position among federal agencies by virtue of its budget and the length of its future budgeting plans (six year plans are required). When inflation rises above the expected level, the Defense Department gets an upward inflation "adjustment". But when inflation is lower than expected, DOD

gets a large share of the "dividend" to plow back into additional programs. This year, DOD experienced a $45 billion lower inflation estimate. While some $15 billion went back to the Treasury, the other $31.5 billion went to the military to spend over six years. This fact was not even taken into account by the Committee in its addition of $13 billion.

While Congress has criticized the military for "inter-service rivalry", this bill's significant funding increases for the unfunded projects of the Services actually fuels such rivalry by providing items that could not gain approval in the jointly-oriented budget review by the Joint Chiefs and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We should not be surprised if the services compete with each other for additional funds—a result we should not be encouraging.

Missile Defense

This bill threatens our security arrangements with the Russians by unilaterally interpreting the ABM Treaty's demarcation between long and short-range missile defense systems, and it does so even as the U.S. and Russia are trying to negotiate that issue. This decision by a majority of the committee will undermine the treaty relationship between the U.S. and Russia that permits large reductions in nuclear weapons. The majority does so in order to commit to a premature and costly deployment of a "Star Wars" missile defense system. That decision is a mistake.

By insisting that the Senate must re-ratify the ABM Treaty if that treaty is extended to the Soviet successor states of Ukraine, Belarus and Khazakhstan, the majority will put at risk the deep reductions in former-Soviet nuclear warheads that would make the U.S. safer.

Those three former-Soviet republics agreed to give up their nuclear weapons with our encouragement, and did so with the expectation that they would be permitted to join the ABM Treaty as successor states. If we raise questions now about their joining, they will not feel bound to continue their nuclear reductions.

This could unravel the whole structure of ongoing nuclear arms reductions and the security improvements to the U.S. that have come with the end of the Cold War, which would decrease our security dramatically.

That could well also play into the hands of anti-democratic and ultra-nationalist forces in Russia who might want to resume aggressive policies against the West.

On April 8, President Clinton wrote back to Senator Thurmond and other Republican leaders about this issue of multilateralizing the ABM Treaty, and explained that Congress had urged him to do so:

> You indicate in your letter that you oppose our efforts to multilateralize the Treaty to include those former republics of the former Soviet Union that, like Russia, are successors to the Soviet Union and chose to participate in this Treaty. As you know, Congress in 1993 adopted legislation urging me "to pursue immediate discussions with Russia and other successor states of the former Soviet Union" on clarifying and updating the Treaty. Indeed, the Ballistic Missile Defense Act of 1995, which Congress approved and

> I signed into law last month, includes provisions on the demarcation issue that apply to any agreement or understanding between the United States and "any of the independent states of the former Soviet Union."
>
> More fundamentally, though, refusing to recognize Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan as coequal successors to the Soviet Union with regard to the ABM Treaty would undermine our own interest in seeing that these countries carry out their obligations as successors to the Soviet Union under other arms control treaties, such as START I and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

The huge increases in funding for missile defense programs in this bill are unsupported by any urgent emerging threat, but despite the testimony of the JCS and the Secretary of Defense, a majority on the Committee has decided now to fund deployment by the year 2003. They are pushing a crash program which is likely to crash and harm American security in the process. We should reject that plan and pursue a more prudent program, the one proposed by the Defense Department and supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In a letter dated May 1, 1996 to Sen. Nunn, Gen. John Shalikashvili—the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—explained his view of the issue of pursuing an ABM Treaty-compliant national missile defense system:

> * * * efforts which suggest changes to or withdrawal from the ABM Treaty may jeopardize Russian ratification of START II and, as articulated in the Soviet Statement to the United States of 13 June, 1991, could prompt Russia to withdraw from START I. I am concerned that failure of either START initiative will result in Russian retention of hundreds or even thousands more nuclear weapons thereby increasing both the costs and risks we may face.
>
> We can reduce the possibility of facing these increased cost and risks by planning an NMD system consistent with the ABM Treaty. The current National Missile Defense Deployment Readiness Program (NDRP), which is consistent with the ABM Treaty, will help provide stability in our strategic relationship with Russia as well as reducing future risks from rogue countries. * * * I have discussed the above position with the Joint Chiefs and the appropriate CINCs, and all are in agreement.

Our intelligence agencies estimate that there will be no new countries that can build missiles that could reach the continental United States for 15 years, and the Administration's plan is to develop our missile defense technology so that we can make a deployment decision in three years if needed, and then be able to deploy a system after three more years (as early as 2003) if there is a threat that warrants deployment. This so-called "3 plus 3" plan makes no commitment now to deploy, but does commit us to improve significantly our missile defense technology and capability so we could deploy if and when that makes sense in terms of threat and costs.

Pursuing a crash missile defense program, with plans to violate the ABM Treaty, not only would jeopardize START I and START II nuclear arms reductions, it could also threaten other important arms control and security efforts we have undertaken with Russia. For example, the Nunn-Lugar "Cooperative Threat Reduction" program is helping to secure, store and dismantle Russian nuclear warheads so they cannot again threaten any nation. And Russia is working with the United States to negotiate a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that seeks to ban all nuclear weapon tests. This treaty will help prevent the development of new nuclear weapons. Russia is also in a position to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) in the foreseeable future. This is important because Russia has the world's largest stockpile of chemical weapons and will have to eliminate them completely under the CWC.

Today, no U.S. or Russian nuclear missile is targeted on the other's soil. If there were an accidental missile launch, which our intelligence community believes to be a remote prospect, the missiles would land in the open ocean away from each other's countries. Our military is also engaged in a program of direct contacts with their Russian counterparts, a program that permits our military to demonstrate the qualities of civilian control, and to cooperate on such important matters as joint peacekeeping missions. These efforts all help improve U.S. security—a crash program on missile defense could relegate them to the scrap heap.

The Administration's funding request was premised on that plan. The Committee added nearly $900 million to move at a more reckless pace, including funding for systems that would eventually violate the ABM Treaty. Earlier this year the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, made up of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Vice Chiefs of Staff, wrote to Paul Kaminski, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology concerning the funding levels for missile defense. They prioritized Theater Missile Defense capability over a National Missile Defense capability. They also stated their belief that the funding level for NMD should not exceed $500 million per year, and that TMD funding should not exceed $2.3 billion per year over the course of the next five years.

The JROC memorandum stated: "These funding levels will allow us to continue to field critical TMD/NMD systems to meet the projected threats and, at the same time, save dollars that can be given back to the Services for critical recapitalization programs." In the view of the JROC, there are more important programs in which to invest defense resources.

The JROC memo concludes: "We believe the proposed TMD/NMD acquisition levels are balanced and proportional and offer great potential for achieving an affordable ballistic missile defense architecture that meets our joint warfighting needs." This is a clear indication that our senior military commanders believe that the Administration's requested level for missile defense is the right level.

Other provisions

The Committee provided over $700 million for equipment for the National Guard and Reserve forces, in addition to amounts requested in the President's budget request and on the Services'

"wish lists". This year the Committee moved back in the direction toward providing some generic categories of money for each of the guard and reserve components, rather than specifying each item to be bought based on the requests of Committee members, as we did last year. This is a change for the better, but I believe we can and should do better still.

As recently as two years ago, the Committee provided all funds for Guard and Reserve equipment in generic categories. That outcome was a bipartisan decision of the Committee and helped set a precedent with the House authorization committee and the appropriations committee which provided the Guard and Reserve components with the greatest possible discretion and flexibility in their equipment purchases.

The Department of Defense clearly and explicitly prefers that Congress should use the generic category if it adds funds. In a letter dated May 3, 1996, Assistant Secretary of Defense Deborah Lee stated the Pentagon's view: "The Department's preferred position is that add-ons, if made, be generic with regard to Reserve component equipment. This permits the Department to focus these funds toward the most pressing Reserve component readiness needs based on current requirements."

With the addition of new missions such as peace-keeping, enforcing no-fly zones and humanitarian relief, the Reserve components should have the flexibility to procure the equipment that will permit them to accomplish their missions.

Even though the Committee has kept roughly one-third of the funding in generic categories, when we get to conference with the House it will be difficult to retain any generic funding. Instead, the House will likely want its specific items funded, which would leave all specified and no generic funding. At a minimum, I hope the Senate will insist on keeping at least one-third of the funding in generic categories through conference, and will increase this ratio in the future. Our goal should be to go back to the bipartisan approach of using all generic categories of funding.

ASAT Program

The Committee included several provisions related to the kinetic energy anti-satellite (ASAT) program. One provision directs that the Defense Department's Space Architect shall include this ASAT system as part of our space control program. This direction is given before the Space Architect completes a comprehensive study of the systems needed for the space control mission. So the Committee is telling the Department what the answer will be—include the kinetic energy ASAT—even if the Space Architect determines it is not appropriate to do so. This is an unwise and inappropriate approach.

Two other provisions would withhold funding from certain DOD programs until the Secretary of Defense certifies that he has obligated the $30 million added by Congress last year and also the $75 million added in this bill.

These provisions are intended to force the Department to proceed with a program it does not support and which could cause problems for the United States. The United States depends more on the use of space than any other nation; this is especially true for our mili-

tary forces. If the U.S. commits to this ASAT program it could well serve as the impetus for other nations to do likewise, which could put our satellite systems at risk. We should not be interested in starting an ASAT competition, since we have the most to lose if our satellites are destroyed.

The Committee majority places this ASAT program under the Counter Proliferation Support Program. There are more pressing proliferation issues that require the attention and resources of the Department of Defense than the increase in satellite systems of foreign nations. The $75 million added to this ASAT program would be better spent on more serious proliferation problems, like improving the security of nuclear weapon materials in the states of the former Soviet Union, dismantling former Soviet nuclear warheads and countering nuclear smuggling.

Senator Bingaman offered a very reasonable substitute amendment to the majority's ASAT provisions, but it was defeated on a straight party-line vote.

Space based laser

This bill provides $70 million for continued research and development of a space-based laser system that could be used to shoot down intercontinental ballistic missiles. Deploying such a system is strictly prohibited by the ABM Treaty. There is no need to build such a system and we could not deploy it without violating the ABM Treaty, which would bring on a host of serious security problems for the U.S. The Department of Defense should explain clearly its view of this space-based laser anti-missile system so the Senate is clear on the implications of this bill's provisions.

CARL LEVIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

I want to commend the Chairman and Ranking Member for leading the fair and open committee process that has yielded this bill. The committee's action for the most part supports the President's budget request presented to the committee by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The President's budget balances near-term goals of force readiness and troop quality of life, with long-term needs for investment in weapons modernization and research into the military technologies of the future. The committee bill, with some notable exceptions, does likewise, which is why I voted to report it favorably.

The exceptions to which I refer, however, diverge greatly from the goals of the President and, in some cases, I believe will harm rather than serve our national security. These weaknesses in the bill should be corrected by the full Senate. If these improvements are not made, I will find it difficult to support the bill on the Senate floor.

Among these central weaknesses are the bill's provisions dealing with the ABM Treaty. Once again, the Majority has chosen to include provisions which undermine the ABM Treaty, the cornerstone of all strategic arms control between the U.S. and Russia. Failure to delete these provisions may doom the bill.

One of these provisions would write into statute technical standards demarcating the performance boundary between strategic missile defenses and theater missile defenses. Writing this dividing line into U.S. law ignores a central facet of the ABM Treaty, its ability to adapt to changing technical and political realities over time. The treaty negotiators purposely left ambiguous the dividing line between strategic and theater systems to allow the two sides to adapt and revise the standard as missile defense technologies developed and advanced. They also provided ample means for the signatories to revise standards that need change through discussions and clarifications in the Standing Consultative Commission, through amendments negotiated at treaty-mandated 5-year review conferences, or through special negotiating sessions. The Clinton Administration is using these features to negotiate a demarcation standard with the Russians.

The President has committed to achieving a standard which will allow the Department of Defense to deploy the tactical missile defense our military leaders believe are necessary to defend U.S. troops in the field. Apparently, this commitment is not sufficient for the Majority, which chooses to write a demarcation standard into law. To do so would undermine the cooperative spirit of the negotiations which will endanger not only this treaty, but any future arms control agreements we seek to conclude with Russia. The Senate should stick to its role of advise and consent to treaties and not try to negotiate them through statute.

The other objectionable provision in the bill dealing with the ABM Treaty is the requirement for the President to submit the treaty for Senate ratification if additional countries are added as parties to the treaty. With this provision, the Senate presumes that the addition of new states to the treaty, most likely Soviet successor states in addition to Russia, would necessarily represent a substantive change to the agreement. This is not necessarily the case, since these additional states might enter the treaty regime as adjuncts, not as principals with full rights to deploy 100 interceptors or to veto other amendments to the treaty negotiated between the U.S. and Russia.

When and if this or another Administration agrees to add new states to the Treaty, it will determine whether or not a substantive change has taken place and submit to the Senate if appropriate. If at that time the Senate disagrees with the Administration's action, it has many options for expressing and enforcing its view. This provision should be removed from the bill.

Finally, although the bill funds the basic military priorities in the President's budget, it does so at too high a level of overall spending. The committee bill adds $12.9 billion to the president's request of $255 billion. This huge addition in defense spending comes at a time of ongoing fiscal austerity. While other domestic discretionary programs are being cut to the bone, the committee has chosen to grant the Pentagon a 5 percent increase over the level the Joint Chiefs of Staff state is necessary to meet our nation's security needs.

Proponents of adding this funding cite testimony this year from several service chiefs indicating that although the President's budget was sufficient, additional funds could be used to strengthen important capabilities. These statements have been offered as justification for increasing the Department's allotment. I believe that the similar testimony would be readily forthcoming from the Administration officials responsible for education, job training, health care, student loans and child care funding. Nevertheless, the Republican majority is cutting their allotments further, not increasing them. A budget crisis means that all aspects of government must make do with less. This goes for the Defense Department too.

ED KENNEDY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOHN GLENN

I regret that the Committee again is reporting out a bill that is gravely flawed. It suffers from many of the defects associated with the bill reported out of the Committee last year. I voted to favorably report the bill out of Committee in the hope that the bill will be improved when it is considered by the Senate.

The bill includes troublesome language with respect to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, language that has broader arms control implications. The bill includes $12.9 billion in unrequested funding with unwarranted and huge increases in the missile defense accounts, the procurement and research and development accounts and the military construction accounts. Finally, the bill includes a provision affording special retirement benefits to a small class of government workers affected by the base closure process. These issues are addressed in more detail below.

The Committee proposes to place in statutory form a unilateral U.S. interpretation of the demarcation line between theater and strategic missiles for purposes of implementing the ABM Treaty. While I agree that this Treaty must adapt to technological change, the treaty has a formal bilateral procedure for amendments which the Senate, having voted to ratify the treaty, should respect. I do not believe that unilateral national legislation is the way to go about altering an interpretation of a key arms control agreement. If enacted, the proposal could open up a Pandora's box of new Russian unilateral interpretations not just of this treaty but of virtually any Russian arms control, disarmament, or nonproliferation convention.

Second, I see no compelling rationale to support the Majority's proposed $885 million increase in the missile defense budget over the level requested by the Administration. I believe the Administration's budget reflects a proper ranking of our missile defense priorities—it focuses on (a) reducing the strategic nuclear threat by continued progress on strategic arms reductions and assistance in removing the Russian strategic threat at its source, (b) developing defenses (fully allowed by the ABM Treaty) against current threats from theater missiles, and (c) preserving the technological capability to deploy a national missile defense system in the event a new missile threat should arise in the years ahead.

Third, the bill contains language requiring the re-ratification of the ABM Treaty if it is expanded to include additional countries formerly in the Soviet Union. It is my understanding that any such change of the treaty would not incur any new obligations for the United States, nor would it authorize new members to develop or deploy ABM systems. Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan have obligations under START I and the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty—we should similarly treat these states as coequal successors to the Soviet Union with respect to the ABM Treaty.

Fourth, I am uneasy with provisions in this bill dealing with the development of antisatellite (ASAT) weapons and the space-based laser. I believe that the Committee is pushing these systems along far faster than their technology justifies. I further believe that their deployment would have arms control implications that have not been fully considered by the Committee.

With respect to the $12.9 billion in unrequested funding, the Committee added about $8 billion in the procurement accounts and about $4 billion in the research and development accounts. For the most part, these additions are based on the Services" so-called "wish lists"—lists of programs the Services would like to see funded if additional funding were made available. I agree with some of the spending decisions, but I cannot support the magnitude of this increase, especially when we are spending billions of dollars on programs we do not need now and some we may not need ever.

The additions in procurement include $750 million for the DDG–51 destroyer program, $701 million for the New Attack Submarine program, $351 million for the V–22 program, $249 million for the C–17 program, $240 million for the E8–B program, $234 million for the F/A–18 C/D program, $204 million for the C–130J program, $183 million for the Apache Longbow program, $158.4 million for the Kiowa Warrior program, $147 million for the MLRS program and $107 million for the F–16 program. In the case of the Kiowa Warrior and 2 of the additional F–16s, these additions were not requested on the Services" wish lists, which means that the Services would not have funded these programs even if tens of billions of dollars were added to the budget request.

The additions in research and development include the $885 million for missile defense programs to which I already alluded, $100 million plus-ups for the Comanche program and Army Force XXI, $305 million for the National Defense Sealift Fund, $147 million for the Arsenal Ship and $116 for Advanced Submarine Technology.

The Committee also added $600 million in unrequested military construction projects, an annual temptation that members cannot seem to resist, even though there is no compelling reason to move these projects forward. I think it is particularly damning that at least $200 million of these projects not only did not make the initial cut of the budget request but also did not make the second cut of the Services" wish lists. We are authorizing an additional $600 million in military construction projects just so members can say that they have brought home the bacon. That is exactly what they are doing and in this case we are going whole hog.

Another rite of spring, the addition of hundreds of millions of dollars in Guard and Reserve equipment warrants mention. Some progress has been made in avoiding the earmarking problem we had last year. Only about $485 million of the $760 million in funding is earmarked. Unfortunately, no real progress has been made in eliciting a realistic budget request from the Defense Department for Guard and Reserve equipment. This failure invites earmarking funds for programs in members" districts and as a consequence, the funding decisions that become law only bear relation to the Guard and Reserves" requirements by happenstance. We should not be spending the taxpayers" money in this way.

I am concerned about the criteria the Committee used in allocating an additional $200 million for DOE's Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program. I could support, and, in fact, have long advocated increased funding for this program. However, rather than accept the recommendations provided by the Department of Energy which listed projects that, if given increased funding in the near term, could save substantial dollars in the outyears, the Committee chose to factor in additional criteria concerning site employment. I have grave concerns that the credibility of the entire DOE cleanup operation will be underminded if it is treated merely as a "jobs" program. A number of factors should be assessed when deciding to increase funding for cleanup projects such as: reducing the risk to the public, workers and the environment; lessening the long term "mortgage" costs of the program; mandates from federal and state laws; and stakeholder input. I do not believe that the effect on a given site's employment should be among these factors.

I disagree with the Committee's report langauge concerning the external regulation of the Department of Energy. I believe Secretary O'Leary's Advisory Committee on External Regulation established credible reasons for moving to external regulation, and I believe that this goal can be accomplished without significant increased costs to the taxpayer and without any detrimental impact on our nation's security. In my view, the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board will continue to play a key role in ensuring the safe operation of the defense nuclear facilities.

Finally, I would like to mention the Committee's action in adopting a special retirement provision for federal employees who happen to work at military bases where the work will be privatized as part of base closure. The Committee on Armed Services voted 11 to 9 to add nongermane legislation to the bill that appropriately is in the jurisdiction of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee. This amendment, offered by Senator Coats, was marketed as a "pilot program." It is aims to make privatization more likely to succeed by giving employees an incentive to stay at the base when a private employer takes over the workload. This amendment also was recently introduced as a bill, S. 1686, which is pending before the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Governmental Affairs Committee.

Under the terms of the amendment, federal civilian employees at two DoD bases, one in Indianapolis and one in Louisville, would enjoy Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) benefits that no other federal employee enjoys today. (I believe the authors of the amendment intended, but it is not clear whether, the amendment applies to a third base in Newark, Ohio.)

CSRS benefits are based on a formula that includes years of service and the average of the highest three years of salary. Under the amendment, the employees (of two bases), after their jobs are privatized, would continue to accrue "years of service credit" for CSRS benefits until they actually retired. In addition, their current "high-three" years of salary would be indexed to general increases in federal salaries. These benefits are independent of the employees' subsequent retirement benefits following privatization.

Under current law, the affected employees would be eligible for a CSRS pension at age 62 with the high 3 years of salary based on a 1996 salary. Under the bill, these employees could retire at an earlier age and their high 3 years of salary would be in current dollar terms.

Newark Air Force Base in Ohio is privatizing in the same way that the bases in Louisville and Indianapolis are scheduled to proceed, although it is not clear from the legislation whether Newark would be included in the pilot program. The privatization has been working because employees want to remain employed in the Newark area. Based upon Newark's experience, it is my view that the amendment, offered by Senator Coats, proposes a solution to a problem that does not really exist. Regrettably, given the nature of the proposed solution, I believe that this legislation will create a host of problems. Problems of equity and fairness that will fall straight into the lap of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Committee with jurisdiction over federal employment benefits.

We are in the process of downsizing the federal government. I note that through the efforts of the Armed Services and Governmental Affairs Committees, we have 200,000 fewer federal employees than when the Clinton Administration began. Many federal jobs are being privatized in place. Numerous federal jobs are also being eliminated. One Ohio constituent recently wrote to me and explained that his job was being eliminated in July. He said that if we could provide him with four additional months of service credit, he could apply and be eligible for early retirement under the Civil Service Retirement System. I cannot explain to this constituent why he should not be eligible for an additional four months of credit if we are providing years of service credit to other employees who are not even losing their jobs. They have the opportunity to continue working. They will be eligible to accrue private employer pension benefits.

Perhaps, the Congress should consider retirement inducements for employees affected by privatization and downsizing. However, if this needs to be done, it should be done in a studied fashion. Changing a system of universal retirement benefits—where everyone previously had participated under the same benefit rules—should be the subject of hearings in a bright light, where we understand exactly what equity problems are created as well as the long-term cost of providing such retirement credits.

JOHN GLENN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOSEPH LIEBERMAN

I congratulate the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator Thurmond, and the Ranking Member, Senator Nunn, for their leadership in guiding the committee through mark up of the Fiscal Year 1997 Defense Authorization Bill in an efficient and effective manner. This year's bill reflects the priorities of the committee to provide for the current readiness and quality of life of our men and women in uniform while looking ahead to the challenges of the new century which is about to unfold and providing for future readiness in the form of modernization and research and development.

Many of us on the committee continue to be concerned that neither Congress nor the Executive Branch has given adequate thought to what the security challenges of the future will be and how we must size, equip and shape our forces to meet those challenges. The committee has heard testimony on the dramatic progress which is taking place today in key areas of technology. While individual military Services have reported to the committee on their efforts to exploit these dramatic changes—most notably the Marine Corps with its Sea Dragon program and the Army with Force XXI—it is not evident that the Department of Defense has adequately addressed the way changes in technology and changes in the security challenges we will face in the years ahead must be adapted through changes in US military force structure, modernization programs, training, doctrine and operations. Such changes are, in my view, essential if the United States is to maintain armed forces which can defend and advance our national interests with the range of threats which will confront us.

In the weeks prior to marking up this defense bill, a bipartisan group from the Armed Services Committee crafted a provision to the bill requiring the Department of Defense to study and report on these very important issues. Although the measure had been developed by Senators Coats, Robb, McCain and I with the support of others, we withheld the provision from the bill so that all members of the committee could become better informed of its contents and give it their strong support. It is our intention to offer this provision as an amendment to the bill, with additional cosponsors from the committee, when it is considered by the full Senate.

We are on the verge of a new century. The decisions we make today and in the next few years about defense programs will have a profound impact on our ability to perform vital national security functions during that century. The Congress has a responsibility to make sure the Department of Defense is thinking and acting in a far-sighted and innovative way to exploit our national advantages and minimize our vulnerabilities. The Congress also requires the benefit of the Department's experience, expertise and analytical capabilities so that we will make the most informed judgments pos-

sible on these critical issues. Thus, I have joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to craft this important provision to the Defense Authorization Bill.

JOE LIEBERMAN.

○