

105TH CONGRESS }
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT
105-532

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 3616

together with

ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND
SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]



MAY 12, 1998.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

105TH CONGRESS }
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT
105-532

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 3616

together with

ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND
SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]



MAY 12, 1998.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

48-245

WASHINGTON : 1998

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB STUMP, Arizona	IKE SKELTON, Missouri
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
JOHN R. KASICH, Ohio	JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr., South Carolina
HERBERT H. BATEMAN, Virginia	SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah	OWEN PICKETT, Virginia
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania	LANE EVANS, Illinois
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado	GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey	NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
STEVE BUYER, Indiana	MARTIN T. MEEHAN, Massachusetts
TILLIE K. FOWLER, Florida	ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York	JANE HARMAN, California
JAMES TALENT, Missouri	PAUL McHALE, Pennsylvania
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama	PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland	ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California	SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
RON LEWIS, Kentucky	TOM ALLEN, Maine
J.C. WATTS, Jr., Oklahoma	VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas	JIM TURNER, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana	F. ALLEN BOYD, Jr., Florida
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia	ADAM SMITH, Washington
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida	JAMES H. MALONEY, Connecticut
WALTER B. JONES, Jr., North Carolina	MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina	CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
JIM RYUN, Kansas	CYNTHIA A. McKINNEY, Georgia
MICHAEL PAPPAS, New Jersey	(VACANCY)
BOB RILEY, Alabama	
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada	
BILL REDMOND, New Mexico	
KAY GRANGER, Texas	

ANDREW K. ELLIS, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	1
Purpose	2
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	2
Summary of Authorization in the Bill	2
Summary Table of Authorizations	3
Rationale for the Committee Bill	9
The Strains of Shaping	10
Preparing for an Uncertain Future	11
Responding to a Crisis	13
Managing Risk	15
Hearings	17
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION	19
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	19
OVERVIEW	19
Aircraft Procurement, Army	22
Overview	22
Items of Special Interest	25
Airborne avionics	25
Airborne reconnaissance low (ARL)	25
Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)	25
Army airborne command and control system (A2C2S)	26
Army helicopter modernization plan	26
C-12 modifications	27
CH-47 cargo helicopter modifications	27
Endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)	27
Kiowa warrior modifications	28
UH-60L blackhawk	28
Missile Procurement, Army	28
Overview	28
Items of Special Interest	31
Enhanced fiber optic guided missile (EFOGM)	31
Javelin	31
Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) launcher systems	31
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	31
Overview	31
Items of Special Interest	34
Bradley base sustainment	34
Bradley base sustainment/command and control vehicle (C2V)	34
M1 abrams tank modification	34
M-240 series machine gun	35
M4 carbine	35
Ammunition Procurement, Army	35
Overview	35
Items of Special Interest	39
Ammunition	39
Arsenals	39
Non-toxic frangible ammunition	39
Other Procurement, Army	40
Overview	40
Items of Special Interest	48
Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)	48
Close combat tactical trainer (CCTT)	48
Co-site interference mitigation technology	48

IV

	Page
Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV)	48
Forward entry device (FED)	49
Ground based common sensor (GBCS)	49
High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)/HMMWV extended service plan (ESP)	49
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system (Joint STARS) common ground station (CGS)	50
Joint tactical terminal	50
Land warrior	50
Lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME)	51
Night vision devices	51
Nonsystem training devices	51
Shortstop	52
Small pusher tug	52
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	52
Overview	52
Item of Special Interest	54
Chemical agents and munitions destruction	54
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	54
Overview	54
Items of Special Interest	58
AV-8B	58
AH-1W night targeting system (NTS)	58
EA-6B modifications	58
EP-3E flat panel display	59
ES-3 modifications	59
F-14 modifications	59
F/A-18E/F	59
Joint primary air training system (JPATS)	60
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA)	60
T-45TS	61
V-22	61
Weapons Procurement, Navy	61
Overview	61
Items of Special Interest	66
Close-in weapon system (CIWS) surface mode upgrade	66
Standard missile	66
Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps	66
Overview	66
Item of Special Interest	69
Marine corps ammunition	69
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	69
Overview	69
Items of Special Interest	72
Landing craft air cushion (LCAC) service life extension program (SLEP)	72
LPD-17	72
National defense features	72
New attack submarine (NSSN)	73
Strategic sealift	73
Other Procurement, Navy	73
Overview	73
Items of Special Interest	82
AN/BPS-15(H) submarine navigation radar upgrade	82
AN/SQQ-89 surface anti-submarine warfare (ASW) combat system	82
AN/USC-42 mini-demand assigned multiple access (DAMA) ultra-high frequency (UHF) satellite communications (SATCOM) terminals	82
Beamhit laser marksmanship training system (LMTS)	83
Cooperative engagement capability (CEC)	83
Weapons range support	83
WSN-7 ring laser gyro (RLG) and WQN-2 doppler sonar velocity log (DSVL)	84
Procurement, Marine Corps	85
Overview	85
Items of Special Interest	89
Marine corps electronic warfare support system	89

	Page
Marine corps tactical intelligence equipment	89
Medium tactical vehicle replacement (MTVR)	89
Unit cost growth	90
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	90
Overview	90
Items of Special Interest	95
Bomber modernization	95
C-130J	95
CV-22	95
E-8C joint surveillance and target attack radar system (STARS)	96
F-15 modifications	96
F-16	97
F-16 modifications	97
Global hawk	97
Joint primary aircraft training system (JPATS)	98
Miscellaneous production charges	98
Navigational safety upgrades	98
Pacer coin	99
Ammunition Procurement, Air Force	99
Overview	99
Missile Procurement, Air Force	102
Overview	102
Items of Special Interest	105
AGM-165 maverick modifications	105
Global positioning system	105
Inertial upper stage	105
Medium launch vehicle	105
Minuteman gyro stabilized platform	105
Minuteman III modifications	106
Titan space boosters	106
Other Procurement, Air Force	106
Overview	106
Items of Special Interest	113
Base information infrastructure	113
Rangeless air combat training system (RACTS)	113
Tactical communications-electronics (CE) equipment	113
Procurement, Defense-Wide	114
Overview	114
Items of Special Interest	119
Automated document conversion system (ADCS)	119
Chemical-biological defense equipment for rapid assessment and initial detection teams	119
Defense support program office training and exercise	119
Flat panel night vision heads-up display system	120
Mentor protege	120
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	120
Overview	120
Items of Special Interest	123
Air reserve forces	123
Senior scout	123
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense	124
Overview	124
Defense Export Loan Guarantees	126
Overview	126
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	128
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	128
Sections 101-109—Authorization of Appropriations	128
Subtitle B—Army Programs	128
Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Longbow Hellfire Missile Program	128
Section 112—M1A2 System Enhancement Program Step 1 Program	128
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	128
Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for the Department of the Navy	128
Subtitle D—Other Matters	128
Section 141—Funding, Transfer and Management of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Program	128

VI

	Page
Dialogue on assembled chemical weapons assessment	129
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION	130
OVERVIEW	130
Department of Defense Basic Research/Science and Technology Program ..	131
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency	131
Information Systems Technology, Superiority and Security	132
Army RDT&E	134
Overview	134
Items Of Special Interest	142
Aerostat	142
All source analysis system	142
Army after next combat vehicle initiative	142
Advanced combat vehicle and automotive technology	142
Digital fire control system	143
Hardened materials	143
Industry and academia alternative vehicle propulsion initiative	143
Innovative engine technology	144
Crusader self-propelled howitzer	144
Aviation advanced technology development	144
Comanche	145
Command, control, communications technology	145
Defense healthcare information assurance program	146
Defense information technology test bed	146
Environmental development and management programs	146
Environmental quality technology	146
Future direct support weapon system	147
Future missile technology integration program	147
Helmet-mounted retinal display technology	147
High mobility artillery rocket system	147
Improved fuel pumps and fuel controls	147
Joint service small arms program	148
Joint surveillance and target attack radar system (Joint STARS)	148
Lighter more lethal weapons	148
MedTeams	149
Missile and rocket advanced technology	149
Missile defense battle integration center/battle lab	149
Plasma energy pyrolysis system	150
Precision guided mortar munitions	150
Starstreak	150
Stinger missile block two upgrades	150
Stinger universal launcher	151
Strategic environmental research and development program	151
Tactical high energy laser	151
Tactical exploitation of national capabilities	151
Trajectory correctable munitions development	152
Ultra lightweight camouflage net system	152
Navy RDT&E	152
Overview	152
Items Of Special Interest	160
ADC(X) auxiliary cargo ship development	160
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle	160
Advanced anti-radiation guided missile	160
Arctic oceanographic observation program	161
Automatic target tracker	161
Autonomous underwater robotics technology	161
Autonomous underwater vehicle and sonar development	162
Aviation depot maintenance technology	162
Carbon-carbon materials for reentry bodies	162
Common support aircraft	162
Cooperative engagement capability	163
Cooperative engagement capability frequency spectrum require- ments	163
Cryogenic electronics technology	164
Distributed surveillance system	164
DD-21 land attack destroyer	164
DP-2 thrust vectoring system proof of concept demonstration	165
Environmentally safe energetic materials	165

VII

	Page
Escape system dynamic flow test facility	166
Hybrid electronically scanned antenna	166
Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications system technology	166
Inter-cooled recuperated gas turbine engine	167
Link 16 improvement program	167
LPD-17 amphibious assault ship self-defense	168
Man overboard indicator technology	168
Marine Corps ground combat/support system	169
Marine mammal research	169
Molecular design materials science	169
Multi-function self aligned gate technology	169
Multipurpose processor	170
Navy land attack missile program	170
Navy theater missile defense	171
NSSN advanced technology insertion	172
Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamformer	172
Parametric airborne dipping sonar	172
Power electronic building blocks and power node control centers	173
Project M	173
Reduction to fiscal year 1999 budget request programs	174
Remote minehunting system	174
Shallow water influence minesweeping system	174
Shipboard system component development	174
Shortstop electronic protection system	175
Silicon carbide semiconductor substrates	175
Standoff land attack missile—expanded response (SLAM-ER)	175
Submarine sonar domes	176
Tactical combat training systems development	176
Tactical Tomahawk	177
Ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers	178
Undersea warfare advanced technology	178
Vacuum electronics	178
Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter technology demonstration	179
Vectoring ESTOL control tailless operation research	179
Vertical gun for advanced ships	180
Air Force RDT&E	180
Overview	180
Items Of Special Interest	189
Advanced low observable coatings	189
Advanced military satellite communications	189
Aircrew laser eye protection	189
ALR-69 radar warning receiver	189
Ballistic missile technology	190
Distributed agent information warfare	190
Ejection seats	190
F-16 squadrons	191
Flight test safety enhancements	191
Integrated high payoff rocket propulsion technology	191
Integrated powerhead demonstration	192
Longshot	192
Low cost launch technology	192
Microsatellite technology	192
Military spaceplane	193
More electric aircraft program	193
Panoramic night vision goggle	193
Protein-based memory development	193
Rocket system launch program	194
Defense Agencies RDT&E	194
Overview	194
Items Of Special Interest	202
Advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD)	202
Advanced synthetic aperture radar system improvement program	202
Ballistic missile defense	202
Advanced technology development	203
Atmospheric interceptor technology	203
BMD research and development	203

VIII

	Page
Ballistic missile defense testing	204
Cooperative ballistic missile defense	205
Joint theater missile defense	205
National missile defense	205
Navy theater wide	206
Patriot advanced capability	206
Space based laser	207
Support technology—applied research	207
Technical operations	208
Theater high altitude area defense (THAAD)	208
Chemical-biological defense program	209
Counterproliferation support	209
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency	209
DARPA marine technology program	210
Defense airborne reconnaissance program management	210
Defense manufacturing, technology program (MANTECH)	211
Demilitarization of non-nuclear military explosives	212
Electro-optic framing technologies	212
Endurance unmanned aerial vehicle	212
Facial recognition technology	213
Flat panel displays	213
Global positioning system guidance package	214
Humanitarian demining	214
International medical programs global satellite system	214
Joint signals intelligence avionics family	215
Live fire testing of vulnerability to asymmetric threats	215
Medical free electron laser	216
National Technology Alliance	216
Next Generation Internet revolutionary applications	216
Polymer-cased ammunition	217
Operational field assessment program	217
Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition	218
Seismic sensor technology	218
Specialty aerospace metals initiative	219
Special operations intelligence systems	219
Tactical unmanned aerial vehicles funding	219
Thermionics	220
University research initiatives	220
Unmanned aerial vehicle systems integration laboratory	220
Verification technology demonstration	221
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	221
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	221
Section 201—Authorization Of Appropriations	221
Section 202—Amount For Basic And Applied Research	221
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations	221
Section 211—Management Responsibility for Navy Mine Countermeasures Programs	221
Section 212—Future Aircraft Carrier Transition Technologies	222
Section 213—Manufacturing Technology Program	222
Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense	223
Section 231—National Missile Defense Policy	223
Section 232—Limitation on Funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System	223
Section 233—Limitation on Funding for Cooperative Ballistic Missile Defense Programs	223
Section 234—Limitation on funding for Counterproliferation Support	224
Section 235—Ballistic Missile Defense Program Elements	224
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	225
OVERVIEW	225
Funding Realities	225
Readiness Realities	225
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	254
Budget Request Increases	254
Critical Readiness Accounts Increases	254
Mobility Enhancement Funding	254
Training Accounts	254
United States Marine Corps Cold Weather Clothing	255

IX

	Page
Budget Request Reductions	255
Administration and Support Accounts	255
Advisory and Assistance Services	256
Bulk Fuel Reductions	256
Civilian Personnel Overstatement Reductions	257
Foreign Currency Reductions	257
Environmental Issues	257
Air Force Plant #3, Tulsa, Oklahoma	257
Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation	258
Navy Environmental Leadership Program	258
Pollution Prevention Program	258
Scrapping of Naval Vessels	258
Information Technology Issues	259
Overview	259
Automatic Identification Technology	259
Computer Crimes and Information Technology Security	259
Information Technology Management	260
Information Technology Priorities	260
Joint Information Technology Systems	261
Redundant Information Technology Programs	262
Utilizing Commercial Information Technology	262
Intelligence Matters	263
Integrated Architecture Plan	263
Joint Reserve Intelligence Program	263
Intelligence Congressional Justification Books	263
Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Issues	264
Defense Commissary Agency Information Technology Acquisition	264
Libraries	264
Performance Based Agreements	265
Public-Private Ventures	265
Uniform Health Benefit for Nonappropriated Fund Employees	265
Other Issues	266
Appropriated Funds Used to Pay for Defense Information System Agency Costs	266
Army Civilian Personnel Management	267
Automatic Document Conversion Technology	268
Budget Justification Materials	268
Classified Materials Containers	269
Corrosion Control Programs	269
Defense Automated Printing Service	269
Depleted Uranium Penetrators	270
Infrastructure Reduction Initiatives	270
Military Affiliate Radio System	271
Prime Vendor Contracts	272
Ship Repair Industrial Base	272
Tagging System for Hydrocarbon Fuels	272
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	273
Subtitle A—Authorization Of Appropriations	273
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding	273
Section 302—Working Capital Funds	273
Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home	273
Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund	273
Section 305—Refurbishment of M1-A1 Tanks	273
Section 306—Operation of Prepositioned Fleet, National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California	273
Section 307—Relocation of USS Wisconsin	274
Section 308—Fisher House Trust Funds	274
Subtitle B—Information Technology Issues	274
Section 311—Additional Information Technology Responsibilities of Chief Information Officers	274
Section 312—Defense-Wide Electronic Mail System for Supply Purchases	274
Section 313—Protection of Funding Provided for Certain Information Technology and National Security Programs	274

	Page
Section 314—Priority Funding to Ensure Year 2000 Compliance of Mission Critical Information Technology and National Security Systems	274
Section 315—Evaluation of Year 2000 Compliance as Part of Training Exercises Programs	274
Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions	275
Section 321—Authorization to Pay Negotiated Settlement for Environmental Cleanup at Former Department of Defense Sites in Canada ...	275
Section 322—Removal of Underground Storage Tanks	275
Subtitle D—Defense Infrastructure Support Improvement	275
Section 331—Reporting and Study Requirements Before Change of Commercial and Industrial Type Functions to Contractor Performance	275
Section 332—Clarification of Requirement to Maintain Government-Owned and Government-Operated Core Logistics Capability	276
Section 333—Oversight of Development and Implementation of Automated Identification Technology	276
Section 334—Conditions on Expansion of Functions Performed Under Prime Vendor Contracts	276
Section 335—Clarification of Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair	276
Section 336—Clarification of Commercial Item Exception to Requirements Regarding Core Logistics Capabilities	276
Section 337—Development of Plan for Establishment of Core Logistics Capabilities for Maintenance and Repair of C-17 Aircraft	276
Section 338—Contractor-Operated Civil Engineering Supply Stores Program	277
Section 339—Report on Savings and Effect of Personnel Reductions in Army Materiel Command	277
Subtitle E—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities ..	277
Section 341—Continuation of Management and Funding of Defense Commissary Agency through the Office of the Secretary of Defense	277
Section 342—Expansion of Current Eligibility of Reserves for Commissary Benefits	277
Section 343—Repeal of Requirement for Air Force to Sell Tobacco Products to Enlisted Personnel	278
Section 344—Restrictions on Patron Access to, and Purchases in, Overseas Commissaries and Exchange Stores	278
Section 345—Extension of Demonstration Project for Uniform Funding of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Activities	278
Section 346—Prohibition on Consolidation or Other Organizational Changes of Department of Defense Retail Systems	278
Section 347—Authorized Use of Appropriated Funds for Relocation of Navy Exchange Service Command	279
Section 348—Evaluation of Merit of Selling Malt Beverages and Wine in Commissary Stores as Exchange System Merchandise	279
Subtitle F—Other Matters	279
Section 361—Eligibility Requirements for Attendance at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools ..	279
Section 362—Specific Emphasis of Program to Investigate Fraud, Waste, and Abuse within Department of Defense	280
Section 363—Revision of Inspection Requirements Relating to Armed Forces Retirement Home	280
Section 364—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees	280
Section 365—Strategic Plan for Expansion of Distance Learning Initiatives	281
Section 366—Public Availability of Operating Agreements Between Military Installations and Financial Institutions	281
Section 367—Department of Defense Readiness Reporting System	281
Section 368—Travel by Reservists on Carriers under Contract with General Services Administration	285
Subtitle G—Demonstration of Commercial-Type Practices to Improve Quality of Personal Property Shipments	285
Section 381—Demonstration Program Required	285
Section 382—Goals of Demonstration Program	286

XI

	Page
Section 383—Program Participants	286
Section 384—Test Plan	286
Section 385—Other Methods of Personal Property Shipping	286
Section 386—Duration of Demonstration Program	286
Section 387—Evaluation of Demonstration Program	286
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS	287
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	287
Subtitle A—Active Forces	287
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces	287
Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Levels	287
Section 403—Date for Submission of Annual Manpower Requirements Report	288
Section 404—Extension of Authority for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Designate Up to 12 General and Flag Officer Positions to Be Excluded from General and Flag Officer Grade Limitations	288
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces	288
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve	288
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves	289
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)	289
Section 414—Increase in Number of Members in Certain Grades Authorized to Serve on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves	290
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations	290
Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel	290
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY	292
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	292
National Guard Youth Challenge	292
Recruiting	292
Reserve Component Full-time Support Force	293
Reserve Component Joint Professional Military Education	294
Sustaining Education and Teaching Excellence at the National Defense University	295
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	296
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy	296
Section 501—Codification of Eligibility of Retired Officers and Former Officers for Consideration by Special Selection Boards	296
Section 502—Communication to Promotion Boards by Officers under Consideration	296
Section 503—Procedures for Separation of Regular Officers for Substandard Performance of Duty or Certain Other Reasons	296
Section 504—Posthumous Commissions and Warrants	296
Section 505—Tenure of Chief of the Air Force Nurse Corps	296
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Matters	297
Section 511—Composition of Selective Early Retirement Boards of Reserve General and Flag Officers of the Navy and Marine Corps	297
Section 512—Active Status Service Requirement for Promotion Consideration for Army and Air Force Reserve Component Brigadier Generals	297
Section 513—Revision to Educational Requirement for Promotion of Reserve Officers	297
Subtitle C—Military Education and Training	297
Section 521—Requirements Relating to Recruit Basic Training	297
Section 522—After-Hours Privacy for Recruits During Basic Training	298
Section 523—Extension of Reporting Dates for Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues	298
Section 524—Improved Oversight of Innovative Readiness Training	298
Subtitle D—Decorations, Awards and Commendations	299
Section 531—Study of New Decorations for Injury or Death in Line of Duty	299
Section 532—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Certain Decorations to Specified Persons	299
Section 533—Commendation of the Navy and Marine Corps Personnel who Served in the United States Navy Asiatic Fleet from 1910-1942	299
Section 534—Appreciation for Service during World War I and World War II by Members of the Navy Assigned on Board Merchant Ships as the Naval Armed Guard Service	299

	Page
Section 535—Sense of Congress Regarding the Heroism, Sacrifice, and Service of the Military Forces of South Vietnam and Other Nations in Connection with the United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam Conflict	299
Section 536—Sense of Congress Regarding the Heroism, Sacrifice, and Service of Former South Vietnamese Commandos in Connection with United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam Conflict	300
Subtitle E—Administration of Agencies Responsible for Review and Correction of Military Records	300
Sections 541-544—Corrections of Military Records	300
Subtitle F—Other Matters	301
Section 551—One-Year Extension of Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities Relating to Personnel Management and Benefits	301
Section 552—Leave Without Pay for Academy Cadets and Midshipmen	301
Section 553—Provision for Recovery, Care, and Disposition of the Remains of All Medically Retired Members	302
Section 554—Continued Eligibility under Voluntary Separation Incentive Program for Members who Involuntarily Lose Membership in a Reserve Component	302
Section 555—Definition of Financial Institution for Direct Deposit of Pay	302
Section 556—Increase in Maximum Amount for College Fund Program	302
Section 557—Central Identification Laboratory, Hawaii	302
Section 558—Honor Guard Details at Funerals of Veterans	303
Section 559—Applicability to All Persons in Chain of Command of Policy Requiring Exemplary Conduct by Commanding Officers and Others in Authority in the Armed Forces	303
Section 560—Report on Prisoners Transferred from United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to Federal Bureau of Prisons	303
Section 561—Report on Process for Selection of Members for Service on Courts-Martial	304
Section 562—Study of Revising the Term of Service of Members of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	304
Section 563—Status of Cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy	304
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS	305
OVERVIEW	305
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	305
Military Retirement	305
Survivor Benefit Plan	306
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	306
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances	306
Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 1999	306
Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing Outside the United States ...	306
Section 603—Basic Allowance for Subsistence for Reserves	306
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays	307
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces	307
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses, and Nurse Anesthetists	307
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays	307
Section 614—Aviation Career Incentive Pay and Aviation Officer Retention Bonus	307
Section 615—Special Pay for Diving Duty	307
Section 616—Selective Reenlistment Bonus Eligibility for Reserve Members Performing Active Guard and Reserve Duty	308
Section 617—Removal of Ten Percent Restriction on Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	308
Section 618—Increase in Maximum Amount of Army Enlistment Bonus	308
Section 619—Equitable Treatment of Reserves Eligible for Special Pay for Duty Subject to Hostile Fire or Imminent Danger	308
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances	308
Section 631—Exception to Maximum Weight Allowance for Baggage and Household Effects	308

XIII

	Page
Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Travel Performed by Members in Connection with Rest and Recuperative Leave from Overseas Stations	308
Section 633—Storage of Baggage of Certain Dependents	308
Subtitle D—Retired Pay, Survivor Benefits, and Related Matters	309
Section 641—Effective Date of Former Spouse Survivor Benefit Coverage	309
Subtitle E—Other Matters	309
Section 651—Deletion of Canal Zone from Definition of United States Possessions for Purposes of Pay and Allowances	309
Section 652—Accounting of Advance Payments	309
Section 653—Reimbursement of Rental Vehicle Costs when Motor Vehicle Transported at Government Expense Is Late	309
Section 654—Education Loan Repayment Program for Certain Health Profession Officers Serving in Selected Reserve	309
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS	311
OVERVIEW	311
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	312
Depleted Uranium Training and Health Surveillance	312
Graduate Medical Education Programs	313
Medical Readiness Learning Initiative	314
TRICARE Contract Performance	314
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	315
Subtitle A—Health Care Services	315
Section 701—Expansion of Dependent Eligibility Under Retiree Dental Program	315
Section 702—Plan for Provision of Health Care for Military Retirees and Their Dependents Comparable to Health Care Provided Under TRICARE Prime	315
Section 703—Plan for Redesign of Military Pharmacy System	316
Section 704—Transitional Authority to Provide Continued Health Care Coverage for Certain Persons Unaware of Loss of CHAMPUS Eligibility	317
Subtitle B—TRICARE Program	318
Section 711—Payment of Claims for Provision of Health Care Under the TRICARE Program for which a Third Party May be Liable	318
Section 712—Procedures Regarding Enrollment in TRICARE Prime	319
Subtitle C—Other Matters	319
Section 721—Inflation Adjustment of Premium Amounts for Dependents Dental Program	319
Section 722—System for Tracking Data and Measuring Performance in Meeting TRICARE Access Standards	319
Section 723—Air Force Research, Development, Training and Education on Exposure to Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Hazards	320
Section 724—Authorization to Establish a Level 1 Trauma Training Center	320
Section 725—Report on Implementation of Enrollment-based Capitation for Funding for Military Medical Treatment Facilities	320
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS	322
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST	322
Payments to Subtier Contractors	322
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	322
Section 801—Limitation on Procurement of Ammunition and Components	322
Section 802—Acquisition Corps Eligibility	322
Section 803—Amendments Relating to Procurement from Firms in Industrial Base for Production of Small Arms	322
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT	323
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	323
Section 901—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition Workforce	323
Section 902—Limitation on Operation and Support Funds for the Office of the Secretary of Defense	323

XIV

	Page
Section 903—Revision to Defense Directive Relating to Management Headquarters and Headquarters Support Activities	324
Section 904—Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to Have Responsibility with Respect to Export Control Activities of the Department of Defense	324
Section 905—Independent Task Force on Transformation and Department of Defense Organization	326
Section 906—Improved Accounting for Defense Contract Services	326
Section 907—Repeal of Requirement Relating to Assignment of Tactical Airlift Mission to Reserve Components	327
Section 908—Repeal of Certain Requirements Relating to Inspector General Investigations of Reprisal Complaints	328
Section 909—Consultation with Commandant of the Marine Corps Regarding Marine Corps Aviation	328
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS	329
Counter-Drug Activities	329
Overview	329
Items of Special Interest	330
Gulf states counter-drug initiative command, control, communications and computer network	330
Gulf states counter-drug initiative regional counter-drug training academy	330
Joint interagency task force south	331
Joint military intelligence program	331
Multi-jurisdictional task force	331
National guard state plans	331
Southern air forces counter-drug support	332
Southwest border fence project	332
Support for counter-drug activities of Peru and Colombia	332
Other Matters	333
Counterterrorism and Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction ..	333
Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)	335
Intelligence Community Access to Export Control Information	335
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	336
Subtitle A—Financial Matters	336
Section 1001—Transfer Authority	336
Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex	337
Section 1003—Outlay Limitations	337
Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards	337
Section 1011—Revision to Requirement for Continued Listing of Two Iowa-Class Battleships on the Naval Register	337
Section 1012—Transfer of the USS New Jersey	337
Section 1013—Long-Term Charter of Three Vessels in Support of Submarine Rescue, Escort, and Towing	337
Section 1014—Transfer of Obsolete Army Tugboat	337
Section 1015—Long-Term Charter Contracts for Acquisition of Auxiliary Vessels for the Department of Defense	337
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Counter Drug Activities	338
Section 1021—Department of Defense Support for Counter-Drug Activities	338
Section 1022—Support for Counter-Drug Operation Caper Focus	338
Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Report Requirements and Repeals	340
Section 1031—Annual Report on Resources Allocated to Support and Mission Activities	340
Subtitle E—Other Matters	340
Section 1041—Clarification of Land Conveyance Authority, Armed Forces Retirement Home, District of Columbia	340
Section 1042—Content of Notice Required to be Provided Garnishees Before Garnishment of Pay or Benefits	340
Section 1043—Training of Special Operations Forces with Friendly Foreign Forces	341
TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL	342
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	342
Section 1101—Authority for Release to Coast Guard of Drug Test Results of Civil Service Mariners of the Military Sealift Command	342
Section 1102—Limitations on Back Pay Awards	342

	Page
Section 1103—Restoration of Annual Leave Accumulated by Civilian Employees at Installations in the Republic of Panama to be Closed Pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977	342
Section 1104—Repeal of Program Providing Preference for Employment of Military Spouses in Military Child Care Facilities	343
Section 1105—Elimination of Retained Pay as a Basis for Determining Locality Based Adjustments	343
Section 1106—Observance of Certain Holidays at Duty Posts Outside the United States	343
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS	344
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	344
Arms Control Implementation	344
Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States	345
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	345
Section 1201—Limitation on Funds for Peacekeeping in the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina	345
Section 1202—Reports on the Mission of United States Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina	346
Section 1203—Report on Military Capabilities of an Expanded NATO Alliance	347
Section 1204—One-Year Extension of Counterproliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Special Commission on Iraq	347
Section 1205—Repeal of Landmine Moratorium	348
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION	349
OVERVIEW	349
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	349
Arms Elimination Projects in Russia	349
Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine	350
Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia	350
Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia	352
Fissile Material Storage Facility	353
Nuclear Reactor Core Conversion	354
Nuclear Warhead Dismantlement Processing in Russia	354
Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia	354
Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security	355
Other Support Programs	355
Program Overhead	355
Prohibition of Specified Activities	356
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	357
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds	357
Section 1302—Funding Allocations	357
Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Specified Purposes	357
Section 1304—Limitation on Use of Funds for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility	357
Section 1305—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for a Specified Period	357
Section 1306—Requirement to Submit Breakdown of Amounts Requested by Project Category	357
Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Completion of Fiscal Year 1998 Requirements	357
Section 1308—Report on Biological Weapons Programs in Russia	357
Section 1309—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention Activities in Russia	358
Section 1310—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds for Strategic Arms Elimination in Russia or Ukraine	358
Section 1311—Availability of Funds	358
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS	359
PURPOSE	359
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW	359
TITLE XXI—ARMY	378
SUMMARY	378
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	378
Improvements of Military Family Housing	378
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	378

	Page
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects	378
Section 2102—Family Housing	378
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units	378
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army	378
Section 2105—Increase in Fiscal Year 1998 Authorization for Military Construction Project at Fort Drum, New York, and Fort Sill, Okla- homa	379
TITLE XXII—NAVY	380
SUMMARY	380
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	380
Condition of Laboratory Facilities, Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey	380
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	380
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects	380
Section 2202—Family Housing	380
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units	381
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy	381
Section 2205—Authorization to Accept Road Construction Project, Ma- rine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	381
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE	382
SUMMARY	382
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	382
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects	382
Section 2302—Family Housing	382
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units	382
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force	382
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES	383
SUMMARY	383
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST	383
Department of Defense Education Activity, Guam	383
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	383
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Ac- quisition Projects	383
Section 2402—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units	384
Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects	384
Section 2404—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies	384
Section 2405—Increase in Fiscal Year 1995 Authorization for Military Construction Projects at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, and Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon	384
Section 2406—Increase in Fiscal Year 1990 Authorization for Military Construction Project at Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia	384
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRA- STRUCTURE	385
SUMMARY	385
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	385
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects	385
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO	385
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES	386
SUMMARY	386
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	386
Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects	386
Section 2602—Army Reserve Construction Project, Salt Lake City, Utah	386
TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS	387
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	387
Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law	387
Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1996 Projects	387
Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1995 Projects	387

XVII

	Page
Section 2704—Effective Date	387
TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS	388
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	388
Incorporation of Energy Conservation Criteria in the Planning and Design of Facilities	388
Military Family Housing Referral and Set-Aside Programs	388
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	389
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes	389
Section 2801—Definition of Ancillary Supporting Facilities under the Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing	389
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration	389
Section 2811—Restoration of Department of Defense Lands Used by Another Federal Agency	389
Section 2812—Outdoor Recreation Development on Military Installa- tions for Disabled Veterans, Military Dependents with Disabilities, and Other Persons with Disabilities	389
Section 2813—Report on Use of Utility System Conveyance Authority ..	389
Subtitle C—Defense Base Closure and Realignment	390
Section 2821—Payment of Stipulated Penalties Assessed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liabil- ity Act of 1980 in Connection with McClellan Air Force Base, Califor- nia	390
Section 2822—Elimination of Waiver Authority Regarding Prohibition Against Certain Conveyances of Property at Naval Station, Long Beach, California	390
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances	390
Part I—Army Conveyances	390
Section 2831—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Massena, New York	390
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Ogdensburg, New York	390
Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Jamestown, Ohio	391
Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Stewart Army Sub-Post, New Wind- sor, New York	391
Section 2835—Land Conveyance, Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Charlestown, Indiana	391
Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee	391
Section 2837—Release of Reversionary Interest of United States in Former Redstone Army Arsenal Property Conveyed to Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission	392
Part II—Navy Conveyances	392
Section 2841—Easement, Camp Pendleton, Marine Corps Base, Califor- nia	392
Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Readiness Center, Portland, Maine	392
Part III—Air Force Conveyances	392
Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Lake Charles Air Force Station, Lou- isiana	392
Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Air Force Housing Facility, La Junta, Colorado	393
Subtitle E—Other Matters	393
Section 2861—Repeal of Prohibition on Joint Use of Gray Army Air- field, Fort Hood, Texas, with Civil Aviation	393
Section 2862—Designation of Building Containing Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Augusta, Georgia	393
Section 2863—Expansion of Arlington National Cemetery	393
Section 2864—Reporting Requirements Under Demonstration Project for Purchase of Fire, Security, Police, Public Works, and Utility Serv- ices from Local Government Agencies	393
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AU- THORIZATION AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	395

XVIII

	Page
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS	395
OVERVIEW	395
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST	407
Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative	407
Advanced Manufacturing, Design and Production Technologies	407
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Safeguards	408
Core Stockpile Management Weapons Program	408
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Science and Technology	408
Defense Programs Construction Projects	409
Emergency Management	409
Hanford Tank Safety and Remediation Projects	409
Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Privatization Phase I	410
Hazardous Material Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) Program	410
Heavy Water Processing	410
Inertial Confinement Fusion	411
In-Tank Precipitation Process	411
International Nuclear Safety	411
Laboratory Collaboration With the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	411
Naval Reactors	412
Office of Environment, Safety, and Health	412
Program Direction	413
Reactor Decontamination and Decommissioning	413
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project	413
Savannah River Site Infrastructure Investment	413
Stockpile Management at Y-12 Plant	413
Technology Partnerships	414
Tritium production	414
Uncosted Obligations and Unobligated Balances	414
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Waste Transportation	415
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	415
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorization	415
Section 3101—Weapons Activities	415
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	416
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities	416
Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	416
Subtitle B—Recurring General Provisions	416
Section 3121—Reprogramming	416
Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects	416
Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects	416
Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority	417
Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design	417
Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities	417
Section 3127—Funds Available for all National Security Programs of the Department of Energy	417
Section 3128—Availability of Funds	417
Section 3129—Transfers of Defense Environmental Management Funds	417
Subtitle C—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations	418
Section 3131—Prohibition on Federal Loan Guarantees for Defense Environmental Management Privatization Projects	418
Section 3132—Extension of Funding Prohibition Relating to International Cooperative Stockpile Stewardship	418
Section 3133—Use of Certain Funds for Missile Defense Technology Development	418
Section 3134—Selection of Technology for Tritium Production	418
Section 3135—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds at Hanford Site	419
Subtitle D—Other Matters	419
Section 3151—Termination of Worker and Community Transition Assistance	419

XIX

	Page
Section 3152—Requirement for Plan to Modify Employment System Used by Department of Energy in Defense Environmental Manage- ment Programs	419
Section 3153—Report on Stockpile Stewardship Criteria	420
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	421
LEGISLATIVE PROVISION	421
Section 3201—Authorization	421
TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE	422
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST	422
Materials Research	422
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	422
Section 3301—Definitions	422
Section 3302—Authorized Uses Of Stockpile Funds	422
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLUUM RESERVES	423
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	423
Section 3401—Definitions	423
Section 3402—Authorization of Appropriations	423
Section 3403—Price Requirement on Sale of Certain Petroleum During Fiscal Year 1999	423
Section 3404—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2	423
Section 3405—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3	423
Section 3406—Disposal of Naval Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2	423
Section 3407—Administration	423
TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION	424
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	424
Section 3501—Short Title; References to Panama Canal Act of 1979	424
Section 3502—Authorization of Expenditures	424
Section 3503—Purchase of Vehicles	424
Section 3504—Expenditures Only in Accordance with Treaties	424
Section 3505—Donations to the Commission	424
Section 3506—Sunset of United States Overseas Benefits Just Before Transfer	424
Section 3507—Central Examining Office	425
Section 3508—Liability for Vessel Accidents	425
Section 3509—Panama Canal Board of Contract Appeals	425
Section 3510—Technical Amendments	425
TITLE XXXVI—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION	426
ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST	426
Merchant Marine Academy	426
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS	426
Section 3601—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999	426
Section 3602—Conveyance of NDRF Vessel M/V Bayamon	426
Section 3603—Conveyance of NDRF Vessels Benjamin Isherwood and Henry Eckford	426
Section 3604—Clearinghouse for Maritime Information	426
Section 3605—Conveyance of NDRF Vessel Ex-USS Lorain County	427
Departmental Data	428
Department of Defense Authorization Request	428
Military Construction Authorization Request	429
Committee Position	429
Communications From Other Committees	429
Fiscal Data	439
Congressional Budget Office Estimate	439
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	439
Authorization of Appropriations	440
Committee Cost Estimate	449
Inflation-Impact Statement	450
Oversight Findings	450
Constitutional Authority Statement	450
Statement of Federal Mandates	450
Roll Call Votes	450
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	459
Additional, Dissenting, and Supplemental Views:	
Additional views of Lane Evans, Martin T. Meehan, Robert A. Underwood, Jane Harman, Thomas H. Allen, Loretta Sanchez and Cynthia McKinney	559
Additional views of Robert A. Underwood	561

	Page
Supplemental views of Tillie Fowler, Jane Harman, Martin T. Meehan, Lane Evans, Neil Abercrombie, Loretta Sanchez, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Patrick J. Kennedy, James H. Maloney and Cynthia A. McKinney	562
Additional views of Jane Harman, Patrick Kennedy, Martin Meehan, Lane Evans, Loretta Sanchez, Ciro Rodriguez, James Maloney, Cynthia McKinney and Tillie Fowler	565
Additional views of James M. Talent	567
Additional views of Patrick Kennedy	569
Additional views of Roscoe G. Bartlett	571
Additional views of Tom Allen, Paul McHale, Mike Pappas, Jim Saxton and Gene Taylor	573
Additional views of Loretta Sanchez, Lane Evans, Vic Snyder, Jane Harman, Adam Smith and Cynthia McKinney	576
Additional views of Mr. Ryun, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Saxton, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Watts, Mr. Hostettler, Mr. Hilleary and Mr. Pappas	577
Dissenting views of Cynthia McKinney	579

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1999

MAY 12, 1998.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on National Security,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL, DISSENTING, AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 3616]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on National Security, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 3616) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

The amendment to the text of the bill is a complete substitute therefor and appears in italic type in the reported bill.

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 3616. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

PURPOSE

The bill would—(1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for procurement and for research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 1999: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each reserve component of the armed forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and reserve components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (7) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the operation of the Panama Canal Commission; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the Maritime Administration.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

SUMMARY OF AUTHORIZATION IN THE BILL

The President requested budget authority of \$270.9 billion for the national defense budget function for fiscal year 1999. Of this amount, the President requested \$257.5 billion for the Department of Defense (including \$7.8 billion for military construction and family housing) and \$12.3 billion for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

The committee recommends an overall level of \$270.4 billion in budget authority. This amount is consistent with the discretionary defense spending limitations imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and it represents an increase of approximately \$2.2 billion from the amount authorized for appropriation by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). Overall, the committee's recommendation is largely consistent with the amounts the committee expects to be established in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1999 for the national security budget function.

SUMMARY TABLE OF AUTHORIZATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1999
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 1999 Authorization Request	FY 1999 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1999 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,325,943	1,325,943	94,816	1,420,759	1,420,759
Missile Procurement, Army	1,205,768	1,205,768	26,517	1,232,285	1,232,285
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,433,608	1,433,608	74,030	1,507,638	1,507,638
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,008,855	1,008,855	44,600	1,053,455	1,053,455
Other Procurement, Army	3,198,811	3,198,811	(61,893)	3,136,918	3,136,918
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army Procurement	140,670	140,670	(140,670)	-	-
Operation & Maintenance Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	531,650	531,650	(531,650)	-	-
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	182,780	182,780	(182,780)	-	-
Weapons Procurement, Navy	7,466,734	7,466,734	(45,887)	7,420,847	7,420,847
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy	1,327,545	1,327,545	(135,350)	1,192,195	1,192,195
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	429,539	429,539	22,429	451,968	451,968
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	6,252,672	6,252,672	(260,311)	5,992,361	5,992,361
Other Procurement, Navy	3,937,737	3,937,737	31,770	3,969,507	3,969,507
Procurement, Marine Corps	745,858	745,858	(53,990)	691,868	691,868
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	7,756,475	7,756,475	462,602	8,219,077	8,219,077
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,359,803	2,359,803	(125,135)	2,234,668	2,234,668
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	384,161	384,161	(534)	383,627	383,627
Other Procurement, Air Force	6,974,387	6,974,387	71,985	7,046,372	7,046,372
Procurement, Defense-wide	2,041,650	2,041,650	(78,784)	1,962,866	1,962,866
Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment	-	-	300,000	300,000	300,000
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense Procurement	-	-	134,670	134,670	134,670
Operation & Maintenance Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	-	-	528,450	528,450	528,450
Procurement, Defense Health Program	402,387	-	170,880	170,880	170,880
Procurement, Office of the Inspector General	1,300	-	-	402,387	-
Indian Financing Incentive	-	2,000	-	1,300	-
Defense Export Loan Guarantee Program Account	1,250	1,250	-	1,250	2,000
Total Procurement	49,109,583	48,707,896	345,765	49,455,348	49,063,661

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1999
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 1999 Authorization Request	FY 1999 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1999 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	4,780,545	4,780,545	12,452	4,792,997	4,792,997
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	8,108,923	8,108,923	294,636	8,403,559	8,403,559
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	13,598,093	13,598,093	(20,884)	13,577,209	13,577,209
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-wide	9,314,665	9,314,665	(140,733)	9,173,932	9,173,932
Developmental Test & Evaluation, Defense	251,106	251,106	-	251,106	251,106
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	25,245	25,245	4,000	29,245	29,245
Total Research, Development, Test & Evaluation	36,078,577	36,078,577	149,471	36,228,048	36,228,048
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE & REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Operation and Maintenance	17,273,063	17,273,063	(933,363)	16,339,700	16,339,700
Operation and Maintenance, Army	21,927,202	21,927,202	(67,874)	21,859,328	21,859,328
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	2,523,703	2,523,703	16,000	2,539,703	2,539,703
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	19,177,004	19,177,004	(960,896)	18,816,108	18,816,108
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	10,750,701	10,750,701	(396,485)	10,354,216	10,354,216
Office of the Inspector General	130,764	130,764	-	130,764	130,764
Defense Health Program	9,653,435	10,065,822	9,600	9,663,035	10,065,422
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,202,622	1,202,622	(5,000)	1,197,622	1,197,622
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	928,639	928,639	20,000	948,639	948,639
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	114,593	114,593	2,400	116,993	116,993
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,744,696	1,744,696	3,000	1,747,696	1,747,696
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,436,815	2,436,815	28,000	2,464,815	2,464,815
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,093,933	3,093,933	3,000	3,096,933	3,096,933
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	7,324	7,324	-	7,324	7,324
Environmental Restoration, Army	377,640	377,640	-	377,640	377,640
Environmental Restoration, Navy	281,600	281,600	-	281,600	281,600
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	379,100	379,100	-	379,100	379,100
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	26,091	26,091	-	26,091	26,091
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	195,000	195,000	-	195,000	195,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense	727,582	727,582	-	727,582	727,582
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	442,400	442,400	(25,000)	417,400	417,400
Overseas Military Investment Recovery	-	38,006	-	-	38,006

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1999
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 1999 Authorization Request	FY 1999 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1999 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Disposal of DoD Real Property	-	6,413	-	-	6,413
Lease of DoD Real Property	-	18,200	-	-	18,200
Payment to Kaho' Olawe Island Restoration Fund	15,000	15,000	-	15,000	15,000
Kaho' Olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	-	15,000	-	-	15,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, & Civic Aid	63,311	63,311	(16,000)	47,311	47,311
National Science Center, Army	-	120	-	-	120
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	746,900	746,900	-	746,900	746,900
Subtotal Operation and Maintenance	94,219,118	94,709,544	(1,742,618)	92,476,500	92,957,928
Revolving and Management Funds					
Defense Working Capital Fund (Includes DECA Commissary funding)	94,500	94,500	982,071	1,076,571	1,076,571
National Defense Sealift Fund	418,166	418,166	251,400	669,566	669,566
Reserve Mobilization Insurance Fund	37,300	37,300	(37,300)	-	-
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Routine & Ongoing Sales)	-	(150,000)	-	-	(150,000)
National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund (Transfer to WCF Cash)	350,000	350,000	(350,000)	-	-
Subtotal Revolving and Management Funds	899,966	749,966	846,171	1,746,137	1,596,137
Total Operation and Maintenance & Revolving and Management Funds	95,119,084	95,459,510	(896,447)	94,222,637	94,554,063
MILITARY PERSONNEL		70,777,086			70,697,086
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION					
Military Construction, Army	790,876	790,876	(10,277)	780,599	780,599
Military Construction, Navy	468,150	468,150	102,493	570,643	570,643
Military Construction, Air Force	454,810	454,810	95,665	550,475	550,475
Military Construction, Defense-wide	491,675	491,675	119,400	611,075	611,075
Military Construction, Army National Guard	47,675	47,675	22,863	70,538	70,538
Military Construction, Air National Guard	34,761	34,761	62,940	97,701	97,701
Military Construction, Army Reserve	71,287	71,287	607	71,894	71,894
Military Construction, Naval Reserve	15,271	15,271	18,450	33,721	33,721
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	10,535	10,535	24,836	35,371	35,371
Base Realignment and Closure III, IV	1,730,704	1,730,704	-	1,730,704	1,730,704

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1999
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 1999 Authorization Request	FY 1999 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1999 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
NATO Security Investment Program	185,000	185,000	(16,000)	169,000	169,000
Total Military Construction	4,300,744	4,300,744	420,777	4,721,521	4,721,521
<u>FAMILY HOUSING</u>					
Family Housing Construction, Army	103,440	103,440	20,800	124,240	124,240
Family Housing Support, Army	1,104,733	1,104,733	(7,036)	1,097,697	1,097,697
Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	280,790	280,790	10,000	290,790	290,790
Family Housing Support, Navy and Marine Corps	915,293	915,293	-	915,293	915,293
Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps (Appropriation of Receipts)	-	6,000	-	-	6,000
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	226,035	226,035	15,550	241,585	241,585
Family Housing Support, Air Force	789,995	789,995	(4,791)	785,204	785,204
Family Housing Construction, Defense-wide	345	345	-	345	345
Family Housing Support, Defense-wide	36,899	36,899	-	36,899	36,899
Homeowners Assistance Fund	12,800	12,800	(5,300)	7,500	7,500
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund	7,000	7,000	-	7,000	7,000
Total Family Housing	3,477,330	3,483,330	29,223	3,506,553	3,512,553
<u>OTHER DoD MILITARY</u>					
Other Legislation	-	3,338	-	-	3,338
General Transfer Authority (non-additive)	-	(2,000,000)	-	-	(2,000,000)
National Security Education Trust Fund	-	5,000	-	-	5,000
Other Trust Funds (includes interfund transfers)	-	138,322	-	-	138,322
Offsetting Receipts & Other	-	(1,427,310)	-	-	(1,427,310)
Total Other DoD Military	-	(1,280,650)	-	-	(1,280,650)
Total Department of Defense Military (051)	188,085,318	257,517,493	48,789	188,134,107	257,486,282
<u>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)</u>					
Weapons Activities	4,500,000	4,500,000	(357,900)	4,142,100	4,142,100
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,259,903	4,259,903	113,650	4,373,553	4,373,553
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	516,857	516,857	(230,000)	286,857	286,857
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	190,000	190,000	-	190,000	190,000
Other Defense Activities	1,667,160	1,667,160	33,600	1,700,760	1,700,760

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FY 1999
(Dollars in Thousands)

Account Title	FY 1999 Authorization Request	FY 1999 Budget Authority Request	Committee Change From Request	FY 1999 Committee Recommendation	Budget Authority Implication of Committee Recommendation
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,006,240	1,006,240	40,000	1,046,240	1,046,240
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	140,000	140,000	-	140,000	140,000
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	17,500	17,500	-	17,500	17,500
Total Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	12,297,860	12,297,860	(400,650)	11,897,010	11,897,010
DEFENSE RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)					
Department of Justice - Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund					
Payments to Individuals		11,717	-	-	11,717
Administrative Expenses		2,000	-	-	2,000
Department of Justice - Federal Bureau of Investigation Special Program		170,283	-	-	170,283
Department of Transportation - Coast Guard Operations		309,000	-	-	309,000
Department of Transportation - MARAD Maritime Security Program		97,650	-	-	97,650
Department of Commerce - Export Administration		3,877	-	-	3,877
Federal Emergency Management Agency					
Salaries and Expenses	25,000	25,000	(25,000)	-	-
Planning and Assistance	18,000	18,000	(18,000)	-	-
CIA Retirement and Disability System		201,500	-	-	201,500
National Science Foundation - Antarctic research activities		62,600	-	-	62,600
Selective Service System - Salaries and Expenses		24,940	-	-	24,940
Intelligence Community Management Account		111,623	-	-	111,623
Telecommunications Carrier Compliance Fund		50,000	-	-	50,000
Total Defense Related Activities (054)	43,000	1,088,190	(43,000)	-	1,045,190
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNCTION (050)	200,425,978	270,903,343	(394,861)	200,031,117	270,428,482

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

The President's fiscal year 1999 defense budget request fully reflects last year's Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The QDR was mandated by Congress as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1997 (Public Law 104-201), as a result of growing dissatisfaction with the Clinton Administration's 1993 Bottom-Up Review (BUR). In addition to being dramatically underfunded, the BUR also reflected far too narrow a view of America's strategic interests and military requirements in the post-Cold War world. In particular, the BUR failed to account for the increasing number and duration of peacekeeping, peacemaking and contingency "operations other than war," as well as for the possibility of conflicts between powerful states in the future.

The QDR's declared strategy, in the committee's judgment, more accurately reflects the true scope of America's post-Cold-War defense strategy. The QDR's central strategic vision of shaping the international environment in ways that will protect and advance U.S. national security interests, preparing U.S. military forces for future challenges to those interests, and responding to current threats—is broadly shared by the committee. Although the QDR fails to prioritize among the three elements of the "shape-prepare-respond" approach, its acknowledgment of today's strategic realities represents a step forward from the BUR.

Ironically, the increased clarity of the QDR's strategic vision only serves to highlight the disparities between requirements, forces and resources. The mismatches and shortfalls inherent in the BUR are more severe when measured by the QDR's standards. While the QDR retains the requirement to fight and win two nearly simultaneous regional theater wars, persuasively arguing that such a capability "is the sine qua non of a superpower and is essential to the credibility of our overall national security strategy," it also requires that U.S. armed forces "be prepared to conduct successfully multiple, concurrent [smaller-scale contingency] operations worldwide, in any environment, including one in which an adversary uses asymmetric means, such [nuclear, biological, or chemical] weapons." In addition, the QDR demands that the Department of Defense prepare now for an uncertain future that may include "significant" future threats from a rising China or a reinvigorated and aggressive Russia, and where military technologies, doctrine and organizations will have changed radically. The QDR's strategic vision for the post-Cold War world places much greater demands on the Department of Defense than did the BUR.

Despite the QDR's expansive strategy, the Administration continues to recommend real decline in defense spending. The President's fiscal year 1999 defense budget request of \$270.6 billion in budget authority represents a real decline of 1.1 percent from current defense spending levels, is more than \$54.0 billion short of keeping pace even with today's record low inflation over the next five years, and continues a 14-year trend of real decline in defense spending. Overall, the request represents a 39 percent reduction from defense spending levels of the mid-1980s. Indeed, the fiscal year 1999 defense budget request represents the lowest real level of U.S. defense spending since before the Korean War. Today, the unofficial

motto of the U.S. military is “doing more with less” for good reason: missions increase as forces and resources decline.

In the committee’s judgment, there is a dangerously widening gap between strategic requirements of the post-Cold War world and the levels of resources this nation is committing to its national security. As senior committee members of both parties recently wrote to the President and leaders of Congress, “[I]t is our collective judgment that, short of an unwise retrenchment and overhaul of U.S. national security strategy, fixing the nation’s long-term defense program will require increased defense spending.” Measured by any of the QDR’s benchmarks—shaping, preparing, or responding—the current defense program is seriously underresourced.

The Strains of Shaping

The QDR asserts that the Department of Defense “has an essential role to play” in shaping the international environment in ways beneficial to American national interests. Yet the review’s treatment of the military capabilities essential to this shaping effort serves to understate the magnitude of the task. The current moment in history, one which finds the United States as the world’s sole superpower, imposes unique responsibilities upon our armed forces. However, as recent trends indicate, the constant employment of military power quickly strains the reduced forces of today. The Administration’s propensity to use U.S. military forces in a multitude of nontraditional roles around the world has merely added to and accelerated the strains of downsizing.

To fully understand the challenge implicit in trying to shape the international environment, it is necessary to consider recent events in broad perspective. The collapse of the Soviet Union, almost a decade ago, has been one of this century’s and perhaps history’s great turning points. Even should a revitalized and revanchist Russia reassert itself in the future, the retreat of the Red Army has left in its wake a security vacuum stretching from Europe to Africa to Asia. Dozens of nations, many of them tied to U.S. national interests in one way or the other, now live in a state of uncertainty—freed from Soviet tyranny but unable to guarantee their own independence and security.

The result for the United States is both new opportunity and new challenge. In their desire for both freedom and security, many of these fledgling states turn to the United States as their best hope. Nowhere is this more in evidence than the desire of the newly independent nations of Central and Eastern Europe to join the NATO alliance.

While the committee strongly supports the NATO alliance, concerns remain about the Administration’s inability or unwillingness to explain what a fully expanded NATO alliance will mean in terms of function, structure, and membership. The United States is on the verge of assuming substantial new commitments to protect and shape the future security of Europe without a firm understanding of the political purpose or financial cost, let alone the military requirements or how to meet the requirements.

Yet for all the uncertainties and concerns raised by the incorporation of Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and perhaps, in time, additional Central and Eastern European nations into the At-

lantic alliance, NATO expansion is well understood in comparison to challenges of shaping the international environment elsewhere around the globe. As indicated above, the demise of the Soviet Union has brought turmoil and uncertainty hand in hand with independence. The United States' interests in protecting the world's energy supplies and distribution network, the basis for the quasi-permanent American military presence in the Persian Gulf, will be complicated as new supplies and routes are developed to deliver Caspian Sea and Central Asian gas and oil to market. Likewise, the loss of the common security goal of containment of the Soviet Union will continue to complicate American relations with China. Although China did not repeat its 1996 missile blockade of Taiwan, in 1997 it reacquired Hong Kong and continued its aggressive policy of acquiring advanced military technologies. Moreover, the financial crisis in East Asia, threatening even the stability of Japan, may have unpredictable political consequences and could further complicate shaping of the international environment.

The committee is concerned that while the QDR's requirement to "shape the international environment" is essential to the protection of American security interests, its full implications are not yet well understood. Trying to achieve the QDR's goal of "promoting regional stability" will require continued global military presence. From protecting against threats to the American homeland; to projecting power to Europe, the Gulf and the expanding region responsible for the world's energy supplies, and the Pacific Rim; to defending the international system from a wide variety of transnational threats from proliferation to information warfare, shaping the complex and increasingly dangerous post-Cold War international environment is one of the central reasons American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines are "doing more with less."

Preparing for an Uncertain Future

Beyond shaping today's security environment, the QDR rightly recognizes that the security environment of the future will pose entirely new problems. The geopolitical uncertainties alone are daunting. The United States' status as the world's only superpower is an anomaly of history. No single nation has ever enjoyed such unchallenged global influence, but it would be folly to assume that American preeminence will last indefinitely.

Much of the basis of U.S. military superiority rests upon the technological edge enjoyed by American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, and the organizational and doctrinal advantages that this technological edge allows. The significant investment made in the nation's armed forces in the 1980s brought to the battlefield a generation of weapons systems without rival, as revealed so strikingly in Operation Desert Storm. Yet the "procurement holiday," beginning in the early 1990s and continuing still, is eroding this U.S. technological edge. In some areas, lack of investment has allowed vulnerabilities to remain unaddressed. For example, Scud missiles of the kind that caused significant American casualties in the Gulf War have become even more of a threat to U.S. forces and American allies today than they were in 1991. Despite Congressional increases in funding for theater missile defense programs

over the past three years, this vulnerability remains. And it is a vulnerability that is well understood by our potential enemies.

Moreover, weapons platforms and systems procured during the 1980s, based on 1970s technology, are prematurely aging due to the high operational tempo associated with repeated extended contingency operations. The same M1A1 tanks and Apache helicopters, sophisticated F-15E strike fighters and carrier battle groups that defeated the Iraqi military are too often found today at checkpoints in Bosnia, flying lazy figure-8s enforcing no-fly zones, or steaming from ocean to ocean to react to the crisis of the day. Military equipment is simply getting older and wearing out faster than planned.

Finally, the battlefield advantages conferred by the application of information technologies and similar innovations to military systems promise to transform warfare in the near future. The United States has heretofore set the pace in the practical application of the so-called "Revolution in Military Affairs," during the innovation in "smart" and "brilliant" munitions; battlefield surveillance, reconnaissance, and intelligence; and the rapid dissemination of information in ways that we now take for granted. But the U.S. military's "innovation edge" is eroding as well. Increasingly inexpensive and accessible technologies of computing power, communications, surveillance from space—indeed, the overall advance and proliferation of high technology, much of it commercially available—will certainly enhance the military capabilities of future enemies of the United States. The task for the United States is to retain its edge across the broad spectrum of military technology, through modernization and innovation.

Faced with these realities, the QDR calls for the Department of Defense to pursue a "focused modernization effort" and to "increase procurement spending now so that we can ensure tomorrow's forces are every bit as capable as today's." Once again, the committee generally agrees with the QDR's declared objectives. However, as with the costs and risks associated with shaping the international environment, the committee is concerned with the lack of adequate attention being paid to preparing for a strategically and technologically uncertain future. The gap between resources being committed to research, development and procurement is as great as or greater than the shortfalls in requirements for the shaping missions described above. This has been apparent from the outset of the QDR process. In the legislation creating the QDR, the Congress also created the independent National Defense Panel (NDP). The NDP's assessment of the QDR highlighted the "risk in defense resources," stating that "the Panel considers the [QDR] modernization plan to have more budget risk than is acknowledged by the QDR. The funding necessary to attain the procurement goal * * * rests on several key assumptions * * * The Panel considers each of these assumptions to be somewhat tenuous. Collectively, they represent a budget risk which could potentially undermine the entire Defense Strategy."

In recent years, the committee consistently has expressed its concerns about the continued decline in modernization funding. Defense procurement spending has declined by two-thirds since fiscal year 1985, even taking into account Congress' significant increases of the past three years. In 1996, the Joint Chiefs of Staff estab-

lished that \$60.0 billion in constant-dollar procurement funding was the minimum amount required to modernize the force, and set a goal to achieve that level of funding by fiscal year 1998. Unfortunately, for the fourth consecutive year, the President's defense budget request again postpones attainment of this modernization funding goal. At \$48.7 billion, the procurement request is \$2.0 billion less than was projected for fiscal year 1999 just last year, and is approximately \$5.0 billion less than was projected for the two-year period from fiscal years 1999 through fiscal year 2000. The shortfall is actually worse when the fact that the Administration's fiscal year 1999 procurement request for the first time includes programs not traditionally funded in procurement accounts, such as strategic sealift, is considered.

Whether in modernizing today's military or in preparing for tomorrow's force, the committee believes the current level of investment is inadequate. Sustaining the technological advantages that give U.S. military forces an unquestioned edge wherever they operate is a keystone in national security strategy. Indeed, it is a central foundation upon which that strategy is built.

The committee is concerned that the Administration is building a strategy for an uncertain future upon an eroding foundation. For what is uncertain about the future is not whether there will be threats to U.S. national security interests, but what form these threats will take. Threats may come from regional rogue states like Iraq or Iran, newly armed with more accurate ballistic missiles, weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional weapons; they may come from other large and powerful nations like a retrenched Russia or an ascendant China; they may come from terrorist groups, drug traffickers or other ruthless and well-resourced international organizations; they may come from ethnic nationalists for whom war is itself an end as a means. Yet wherever these future threats originate, the committee has no doubt that a failure to prepare to meet them can only encourage America's enemies.

Responding to a Crisis

In "shaping the international environment," U.S. military forces are linked to American diplomacy, business, and culture. In "preparing for an uncertain future," the Department of Defense is mortgaging its technological future by robbing long-term investment accounts to pay short-term operational bills and may, even under the best of circumstances, be hard-pressed to keep pace with commercial enterprise. Yet some tasks are, will, and must remain unique to the military. The military's unique capability, indeed its *raison d'être*, is its role in response to international crisis or the outbreak of war. The collapse of the Soviet Union has not changed this fundamental reality.

As the QDR acknowledges, today's armed forces must be ready to respond to the full spectrum of crises, from deterrence, to coercion, to the conduct of an increasing number of "smaller-scale contingencies" or "military operations other than war," and to fighting and winning the major theater wars that would pose the greatest threat to U.S. national security interests. The committee considers the crisis response requirement to be the essential element of the QDR's strategy, indeed of any proper U.S. national military strat-

egy. As important as the requirements are to “shape the international environment” and to “prepare for an uncertain future,” the primary responsibility of U.S. armed forces is to defend America and its global interests against today’s and tomorrow’s threats.

As the post-Soviet period has evolved, the number and duration of what the QDR recognized as smaller-scale contingencies has increased. Yet the core of U.S. national military strategy remains—and in the committee’s view, must remain—the requirement to maintain the capability to fight and to win two nearly simultaneous major theater wars. This benchmark has served the United States military well during the post-Cold War era. Absent a well understood and precisely defined threat such as the Soviet military, the two-war standard has been the only means for preserving the kind of flexible and global military capability required for the vast array of security responsibilities that the United States maintains. According to the QDR, “If the United States were to forego its ability to defeat aggression in more than one theater at a time, our standing as a global power, as the security partner of choice and the leader of the international community, would be called into question.”

The committee continues to believe that this two-war benchmark is an appropriate peacetime force-sizing mechanism that follows clearly from an appreciation of the kinds of potential conventional commitments and conflicts that confront the United States today. Our adversaries are at all times acutely aware of the proximity and presence of U.S. forces. General Anthony Zinni, commander-in-chief of U.S. Central Command, recently testified before the committee that Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein clearly times his provocative actions to those occasions when U.S. military force presence in the Gulf is lower. Likewise, the continuing economic and humanitarian crisis in North Korea, combined with that regime’s continuing investment in its military capability, could easily provide the spark to renewed conflict. In these and other vital regions, the presence of strong U.S. forces, credited with overwhelming conventional combat capability, provide a convincing deterrent force, and a lethal fighting force.

Unfortunately, the de facto motto of the U.S. military—“doing more with less”—has become today’s reality. American soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are in fact doing much more than protecting the nation’s interests and preparing to fight the nation’s wars. Indeed, the burdens of peacekeeping, peacemaking and the variety of other operations other than war that increasingly occupy our military’s time are preventing them from properly and adequately training.

This is the unspoken reality underlying the QDR’s recognition of smaller-scale contingencies; “the demand for [smaller-scale contingency] operations is expected to remain high over the next 15 to 20 years.” Yet even while acknowledging the burdens imposed by multiple, concurrent peacekeeping operations, the QDR underestimates the high political profile, import and even permanence they assume over time. The QDR’s assertion that “U.S. forces must also be able to withdraw from [such] operations, reconstitute, and then deploy to a major theater war in accordance with required

timelines” is, in the committee’s judgment, an unrealistic, even naïve, expectation.

A textbook example of the complexities of meeting both warfighting requirements and peacekeeping missions was clearly illustrated several weeks ago. When the Army announced that the 1st Cavalry Division would be deployed from Fort Hood, Texas, to Bosnia as the U.S. follow-on force, the conflict between peacekeeping and warfighting was revealed starkly. The 1st Cavalry Division is the most modern, best equipped and best trained heavy division in the entire Army, and would be among the first two divisions to deploy in the event of a major theater war. Yet the debilitating demand of constant rotation of forces to Bosnia—resulting from the President’s commitment to an increasingly open-ended mission in the Balkans—has compelled the Army to start beating its sharpest sword into a plowshare. The Army has yet to explain how it will meet its requirement to rapidly deploy heavy forces in the event of a major theater war while the 1st Cavalry Division is in Bosnia. What is true of the Army applies equally to the other services: to Air Force fighter squadrons employed in no-fly zones; to Navy aircraft carriers transferred from the Pacific, where they would support a Korea contingency, to the Persian Gulf; to the Marine Corps which, in the recent testimony of Commandant Gen. Charles Krulak is “not a two [major theater war] force.”

In sum, the pervasive mismatch between strategic objectives and defense resources that undermines the QDR’s vision of shaping the international environment and preparing for an uncertain future most seriously affects the ability of the U.S. military to respond to current crises. This is a potentially catastrophic mismatch, and one with very real consequences, as foretold in the QDR: shortfalls in warfighting capacity “risk undermining both deterrence and the credibility of U.S. security commitments in key regions of the world. This, in turn, could cause allies and friends to adopt more divergent defense policies and postures, thereby weakening the web of alliances and coalitions on which we rely to protect our interests abroad.” The committee agrees with this assessment. Indeed, in Europe, in the Gulf and in East Asia, the ability of America to defend its interests by responding to multiple crises remains an open question.

Managing Risk

Caught between an international geopolitical environment that requires an expansive U.S. national security strategy and a domestic political environment bounded by the declining defense budgets locked in place by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the committee is left to try and figure out how best to manage risks. No one should have any illusions about the growing risk: the committee finds itself in accord with the Joint Chiefs of Staff who, in their monthly reviews of the ability of U.S. forces to execute the National Military Strategy, have recently concluded that the level of risk is “moderate to high.”

Thus the committee’s actions with regard to the fiscal year 1999 defense authorization bill are intended to protect those programs that will help to lower the risks to U.S. national security interests by protecting core readiness, enhancing quality of life and increas-

ing the pace at which rapidly aging equipment is modernized or replaced.

Central to these efforts are the committee's initiatives related to force readiness. Over recent months, the committee conducted a series of field hearings at military installations in addition to its traditional budget oversight hearings. These hearings confirmed the pattern, revealed in past committee readiness reports and reviews, of shortages of spare parts, a high operations tempo and continued deterioration of military infrastructure and facilities. For example, in response to a request from the committee, the service chiefs of staff identified approximately \$10.0 billion in unfunded requirements in fiscal year 1999 requests alone. Tellingly, the largest portion of these unfunded requirements pertained to core readiness needs—training, spare parts and other basics. Indeed, almost the entire Air Force unfunded requirements list reflected readiness shortfalls. Therefore, the committee has closely scrutinized the operation and maintenance accounts in the President's budget request. The request includes programs that previously were contained in other accounts and a variety of programs that have little if anything to do with core force readiness requirements. In general, the committee's actions have aimed to increase spending in core readiness accounts at the expense of lower priority spending on administrative and support functions.

Likewise, the committee believes that in addition to forming an essential element in the basic compact between the nation and those who defend it, the quality of military life is inextricably tied to force readiness. This is particularly true in today's force projection environment characterized by its high pace of operations and the stress it places on both individuals and families. Thus, the committee continues a five-part approach to maintaining a decent quality of life for service members and their families: providing fair compensation; improving the military health care system; maintaining the value of retirement benefits; supporting key morale, welfare and recreation programs; and ensuring that military personnel and their families live and work in the best possible facilities.

Finally, the committee has had to manage risk within the modernization accounts. Although the President's fiscal year 1999 procurement budget request of \$48.7 billion grows modestly in real terms for the first time in 13 years, it is still well short of the required level. The research and development request—the key not only to robust modernization but to innovation in the next century—falls even shorter of the requirement to prepare for an uncertain future. Over the next five years, defense spending for research and development accounts is projected to fall by at least 14 percent. The committee believes these levels of investment to be wholly inadequate.

Thus, in comparison with the substantial addition of funds for modernization over the past three years, this year's bill reflects an effort to protect what the committee considers to be critical modernization projects, as it protected core readiness accounts. Although budget constraints have prevented the committee from providing the large funding increases needed in the modernization accounts, the committee bill does contain additional procurement

funding above the President's request, and protects the \$36.1 billion requested for research and development. Selected programs have received increases. For example, the committee has added \$72.0 million for advanced procurement of an additional two Joint STARS aircraft. These reconnaissance and surveillance aircraft are among the most sought-after assets by regional commanders-in-chief for a range of operations, from peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia to the regular crises with Iraq. Though considered "low-density, high-demand" assets and thus tightly managed by the Department of Defense, the Administration through the QDR chose to terminate the program at 13 aircraft, six short of the 19 required. The committee has concluded that the Joint STARS aircraft is precisely the sort of "focused modernization" effort essential to today's and tomorrow's forces.

The committee has tried to prudently manage risks for tomorrow as well. In particular, the committee continues to believe that robust theater and national missile defenses are a key to future U.S. national security. Whether for the protection of U.S. forces deployed abroad or the ultimate safety of Americans at home, effective missile defenses will become an even more important requirement in the future. Thus, the committee has added \$132.8 million to the President's request for missile defense spending.

Yet despite its best efforts to manage risk, the committee remains concerned that its actions can only compel improvements at the margin. The magnitude of the shortfalls, as outlined above, is so great that it cannot be eliminated by a wiser allocation of resources alone. Nor can any foreseeable defense reform, including new rounds of base closures proposed by the Administration, provide sufficient savings to reapply towards critical shortfalls in a timely manner. In short, the committee has attempted to ensure, within the severe constraints of a declining defense budget, the most effective U.S. military force possible. By reprioritizing the Administration's budget request, the committee has provided the Department of Defense with some of the additional tools and resources required to recruit and retain the best people, train them to the highest standard, equip them with the most advanced military technology and provide them with a standard of life more commensurate with that of the American citizens they are sworn to protect. Having done so, the committee nonetheless finds itself deeply troubled that the world's "sole superpower" is running a "moderate to high" risk when it comes to its ability to promote and protect vital national security interests.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 results from extensive hearings that began on January 29, 1998 and that were completed on April 1, 1998. The full committee conducted 9 sessions. In addition, a total of 36 sessions were conducted by five different subcommittees and two panels of the committee on various titles of the bill.

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION**

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The fiscal year 1999 procurement budget request continues the Department's pattern of neglecting long-term modernization of aging equipment to pay for near-term readiness- and personnel-related shortfalls. Although the \$48.7 billion request finally grows modestly in real terms for the first time in 13 years, it is nevertheless \$2.0 billion less than was projected to be just a year ago, and the forecast for fiscal year 2000 is an additional \$2.9 billion below last year's forecast. Additionally, the request has been artificially inflated by the inclusion of items not traditionally funded in procurement accounts, such as strategic sealift.

However, the committee is pleased the Department has finally "turned the corner" on procurement spending after having established a pattern of promising year-after-year to do so, only to back-track from its commitment each succeeding year. The committee has added \$15.0 billion to the procurement accounts over the past three fiscal years and, despite the severe fiscal limitations, for a fourth consecutive year, it was able to continue its own established pattern of increasing these accounts. The following increases are of note:

[In millions of dollars]

Army:	
UH-60 blackhawk-	\$66.4
ARL-	35.0
Kiowa warrior safety mods-	16.0
Javelin-	20.0
MLRS launchers-	50.0
Bradley base sustainment-	75.0
Ammunition-	44.6
HMMWV-	10.0
Shortstop-	15.0
Navy/Marine Corps:	
V-22-	78.0
JPATS-	12.2
KC-130J-	112.4
EA-6B modifications-	39.0
Ammunition-	25.0
LCAC SLEP-	16.0
CEC-	35.0
Air Force:	
F-16-	60.0
Joint stars advance procurement-	72.0
Global hawk unmanned aerial vehicle-	32.5
F-15 modifications-	45.0
TCAS/EGPWS navigation safety modifications-	50.0
B-2 post production support-	86.0

Minuteman III modifications-	23.0
Theater deployable communications-	20.0
National Guard and Reserve:	
Various equipment items-	300.0
WC-130J-	59.7
EC-130J-	51.5
C-130J-	174.0

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
TOTAL ARMY	9,028,085	(677,030)	8,351,055
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,325,943	94,816	1,420,759
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,205,768	26,517	1,232,285
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,433,608	74,030	1,507,638
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,008,855	44,600	1,053,455
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	3,198,811	(61,893)	3,136,918
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY	855,100	(855,100)	-
TOTAL NAVY	20,160,085	(441,339)	19,718,746
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	7,466,734	(45,867)	7,420,847
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	1,327,545	(135,350)	1,192,195
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	429,539	22,429	451,968
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	6,252,672	(260,311)	5,992,361
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,937,737	31,770	3,969,507
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	745,858	(53,990)	691,868
TOTAL AIR FORCE	17,474,828	408,918	17,883,744
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	7,756,475	462,602	8,219,077
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	384,161	(534)	383,627
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	2,359,803	(125,135)	2,234,668
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	6,974,387	71,985	7,046,372
DEFENSE-WIDE	2,041,650	(78,764)	1,962,866
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	-	300,000	300,000
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-RDT&E	-	170,880	170,880
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-PROC	-	134,670	134,670
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-O&M	-	528,450	528,450
DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEES, PROGRAM ACCOUNT	1,250	-	1,250
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	402,387	-	402,387
DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL	1,300	-	1,300
GRAND TOTAL DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	49,109,583	345,765	49,455,348

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$1,325.9 million for Aircraft Procurement, Army in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,420.8 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
AIRCRAFT						
001 ARL (TIARA)	-	1	1	35,000	-	48,133
002 C-XX (MEDIUM RANGE) AIRCRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
003 GUARDRAIL COMMON SENSOR (TIARA)	-	-	-	1,931	-	1,931
004 UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	22	8	8	243,820	30	310,220
004 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	(25,000)	-	(25,000)
005 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AIRCRAFT				233,884		336,284
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
006 GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	-	-	-	36,079	-	36,079
007 AH1F MODS	-	-	-	512	-	512
008 AH-64 MODS	-	-	-	52,902	-	52,902
009 CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	-	-	-	101,176	-	88,476
010 C-12 CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	-	-	-	2,658	-	9,658
011 OH-58 MODS	-	-	-	90	-	90
012 C-20 AIRCRAFT MODS	-	-	-	799	-	799
013 LONGBOW	-	-	-	607,028	-	607,028
013 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	(36,932)	-	(36,932)
014 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	41,683	-	41,683
015 UH-1 MODS	-	-	-	3,789	-	3,789
016 UH-60 MODS	-	-	-	21,657	-	21,657
017 KIOWA WARRIOR	-	-	-	40,446	-	56,446
018 EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	-	-	-	3,015	-	3,015
019 AIRBORNE AVONICS	-	-	-	56,335	-	46,335
020 ASE MODS	-	-	-	2,743	-	2,743
021 MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M	-	-	-	1,660	-	1,660
TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				935,840		935,940

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
022 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	36,047	-	-	-	36,047
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
023 GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS	-	5,144	-	7,400	-	12,544
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT						
024 AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL	-	24,421	-	(11,000)	-	13,421
025 AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,555	-	-	-	2,555
026 TRAINING DEVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-
027 COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	30,107	-	-	-	30,107
028 AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	-	9,050	-	-	-	9,050
029 AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	5,691	-	-	-	5,691
030 INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	1,493	-	-	-	1,493
031 AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	-	41,911	-	-	-	41,911
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		166,419		(3,600)		162,819
032 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES						
				(3,284)		(3,284)
TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,326,943		94,816		1,420,759

Items of Special Interest

Airborne avionics

The budget request contained \$56.3 million for the procurement of various airborne avionics upgrades to Army aircraft, of which \$20.1 million was for engineering change orders (ECO) for 51 improved data modems (IDM).

The IDM is a digital data link modem, which exchanges targeting data between an aircraft and various ground-based weapons systems in support of tactical combat and forward air control missions. The committee notes that there is an 84 percent increase in the amount requested for ECOs in fiscal year 1999 over the amount appropriated for the same number of IDMs in fiscal year 1998 and a 93 percent increase over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 for 94 IDMs. Although the committee understands the importance of this system to the Army's digital battlefield effort, the committee believes this large increase for ECOs is unjustified and recommends \$46.3 million, a decrease of \$10.0 million.

Airborne reconnaissance low (ARL)

The budget request contained \$13.1 million for fielding two ARL-Multifunction (M) aircraft, Commanders Tactical Terminal (CTT) installations and upgrades of imagery intelligence (IMINT) payloads with second generation forward looking infrared radars into three ARL-M aircraft. However, no funds were requested for the procurement of additional aircraft or for wide-area search moving target indicators (MTI) and synthetic aperture radars (SAR).

The ARL supports intelligence collection requirements for forward deployed force projection, operations other than war, and mid-intensity conflicts. The committee notes that the final Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC)-validated ARL-M aircraft remains unfunded and that this aircraft would be U.S.-based to support theater-level worldwide contingency operations.

The ARL-M possesses an integrated IMINT, communications intelligence (COMINT), and MTI/SAR and offers a broader intelligence collection capability than the previously fielded specific mission type aircraft, such as the ARL-C (COMINT) and ARL-I (IMINT) platforms. The committee understands that the MTI/SAR vastly improves the capability of the aircraft to detect, classify and track moving targets on the ground and is critical to daily support of Joint Chiefs of Staff sensitive reconnaissance operations, United States Forces Korea indications and warning requirements, and various non-Department of Defense government agencies, including the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Therefore, the committee recommends \$48.1 million, an increase of \$30.0 million for an additional aircraft to fulfill the JROC requirement and \$5.0 million for an additional MTI/SAR to upgrade a previously fielded ARL-C aircraft.

Aircraft survivability equipment (ASE)

The budget request contained \$5.1 million for nonrecurring engineering and engineering change orders for the Suite of Integrated Radio Frequency Countermeasures, but no funds were included for

upgrades to the Aircraft Survivability Equipment Trainer IV (ASET IV).

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

Congress authorized and appropriated an increase of \$7.4 million for ASET IV upgrades in fiscal year 1998. Nevertheless, additional validated requirements exist and several systems in their present configuration still lack the capability to locate, identify, or track aircraft at night and cannot simulate the most current infrared (IR) SAM threats, thereby limiting aircrews to daylight training against older IR SAM threats—a situation which is not representative of the Army's "train as you fight concept."

The committee believes that the Army should continue to upgrade the ASET IV system in order for aircrews to have access to realistic training through the incorporation of additional night vision cameras and up-to-date IR SAM threat emitter simulation capabilities at several additional training centers. Consistent with committee actions taken in fiscal year 1998 and based on the Army's requirement for forces to train in realistic threat environments, the committee recommends an increase of \$7.4 million for upgrading ASET IV systems with IR SAM threat simulators and night vision cameras.

Army airborne command and control system (A2C2S)

The budget request contained \$24.4 million to procure 11 A2C2Ss.

The A2C2S is a UH-60 deployable command post, which provides a highly mobile data, voice, and imagery command and control (C2) capability in support of Corps through Brigade level commanders. While the committee is supportive of improved C2 systems, it believes that programs entering initial procurement under the Warfighter Rapid Acquisition Program (WRAP) should be procured at a more modest rate than planned for the A2C2S in order to validate the success of the WRAP research and development efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends \$13.4 million, a decrease of \$11.0 million.

Army helicopter modernization plan

The committee notes that the recently completed congressionally mandated Army Helicopter Modernization Plan did not include a strategy for fielding the next light utility helicopter (LUH), arguably one of the basic aircraft for performing the Army's mission. The committee is concerned with the condition of the Vietnam war-era Army and Army National Guard (ARNG) UH-1 Huey helicopters—the aircraft that currently performs the LUH mission—and the Army's plan to maintain over 500 of these aircraft in the fleet beyond fiscal year 2010. The recent worldwide grounding of all Army and ARNG UH-1 Hueys due to the potential for engine spur gear fractures only heightens this concern. The committee is aware

of the ongoing development of a LUH operational requirements document and strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to complete it by the December 1998 scheduled completion date. The committee also urges the Secretary to fund the LUH in the future years defense program.

C-12 modifications

The budget request contained \$2.7 million for avionics and cockpit upgrades to C-12 aircraft.

The C-12 is based throughout the world and is one of the Army's primary passenger-carrying aircraft. This aircraft is expected to continue in active service for at least the next 20 years and will be one of four types that will remain in the Army's fixed wing utility aircraft fleet after a major consolidation of the inventory is completed.

The committee notes that the majority of the Army's C-12 aircraft continue to operate with the same avionics and navigation equipment that was installed when they were purchased in the 1970s and 1980s. While this equipment may have been state-of-the-art at that time, today it is obsolete. Based on the need for passenger-carrying military aircraft to have the latest technology for safe flight operations, Congress authorized and appropriated an increase of \$6.0 million in fiscal year 1998 for C-12 avionics and cockpit modifications. The committee believes these upgrades should continue to be accelerated and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$7.0 million for this purpose.

CH-47 cargo helicopter modifications

The budget request contained \$101.2 million for CH-47 cargo helicopter modifications, of which \$87.3 million was for T55 engine upgrades.

The T55 engine upgrade includes engine conversion kits, engine fielding kits, and engine conversions. Engine conversion kits improve fuel, torque and rotor performance and include newer metal alloy parts to reduce corrosion. Engine fielding kits assist in torque management and engine temperature reduction. Engine conversions allow for cockpit instrumentation, associated wiring, and structural modifications for new engines to prevent them from ejecting toward crew and passengers in the event of a crash.

While the committee is aware of the importance of these modifications, it notes that 87 individual engine conversion kits and engine conversions were included in the fiscal year 1999 budget request, while only 70 engine fielding kits were requested. To adjust the procurement of these three items to the fiscal years 1997 and 1998 level, the committee recommends a decrease of \$8.2 million for engine conversion kits and a decrease of \$4.5 million for engine conversions in order to make them consistent with the number of engine fielding kits being procured.

Endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV)

The budget request did not contain funds for procurement of endurance UAVs for the Army.

The committee notes that the operational performance of the Predator UAV in support of U.S. operations in Bosnia has been im-

pressive in all respects and understands that a draft Operational Requirements Document indicates that the Predator will meet the Army's endurance UAV criteria. Since the Predator is the only operational endurance UAV that can support the Army's tactical intelligence requirements, the committee encourages the Army to procure this system.

Kiowa warrior modifications

The budget request contained \$40.4 million for Kiowa Warrior system safety enhancement program (SSEP) modifications.

Included in the SSEP are new crashworthy crew seats; an inflatable air bag body and head restraint system; a new handheld fire extinguisher; a full authority digital electronic control engine upgrade; and an improved master controller processor unit, which will replace three existing processors with two state-of-the-art units providing considerable memory growth while reducing aircraft weight and operating and support costs. Similar to congressional action in fiscal year 1998, which authorized and appropriated an additional \$15.0 million for these upgrades, the committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million for this purpose.—

UH-60L blackhawk

The budget request contained \$218.8 million for the procurement of 22 UH-60L Blackhawk helicopters, 10 of which are for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The UH-60 Blackhawk is the Army's primary utility helicopter for both the active and reserve components. As a result of the fiscal year 1998 congressionally mandated Army Modernization Plan, the Army determined that an additional 90 Blackhawks should be fielded to the ARNG. Beginning with the fiscal year 1999 budget request, the Army plans to include funding to procure 10 aircraft per year for 5 years toward the additional 90 aircraft requirement. The committee notes that 40 aircraft remain unfunded and that additional Blackhawks are one of the Army Chief of Staff's unfunded priorities for fiscal year 1999. Therefore, the committee recommends \$285.2 million, an increase of \$66.4 million, for eight additional aircraft for the ARNG in order to reduce the shortfall.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$1,205.8 million for Missile Procurement, Army in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,232.3 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
OTHER MISSILES						
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM	96	13,716		(13,200)	-	516
ENHANCED FIBER OPTIC GUIDED MISSILE (EFOGM)	18	35,269		-	18	35,269
AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY						
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM	2,000	360,825		(3,000)	2,000	357,825
HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY						
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM	3,316	319,888		20,000	-	339,888
JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY						
LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (FY)	-	-		-	-	-
ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-		-	-	-
TOW/2 SYSTEM SUMMARY						
MLRS ROCKET	522	16,513		-	522	16,513
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	24	85,387		40,000	24	125,387
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	96	90,585		-	96	90,585
ATACMS/BAT	30	49,083		-	30	49,083
BAT	420	100,425		-	420	100,425
TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		1,071,891		43,800		1,116,391
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
PATRIOT MODS	-	15,259		-	-	15,259
STINGER MODS	-	13,924		-	-	13,924
AVENGER MODS	-	8,425		-	-	8,425
ITASITOW MODS	-	62,478		-	-	62,478
DRAGON MODS	-	-		-	-	-
MLRS MODS	-	2,193		-	-	2,193
TOTAL MODIFICATIONS OF MISSILES		102,279				102,279
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	23,718		-	-	23,718
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		23,718				23,718

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
019 AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	-	2,534	-	-	-	2,534
020 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (MISSILES)	-	922	-	-	-	922
021 MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	-	1,466	-	-	-	1,466
022 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	-	3,258	-	-	-	3,258
023 CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		8,180				8,180
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
024 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES			(17,283)			(17,283)
TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,205,758		28,517		1,232,265

Items of Special Interest

Enhanced fiber optic guided missile (EFOGM)

The budget request contained \$13.7 million, of which \$13.2 million was for the procurement of 96 EFOGMs.

Both the committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) and the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-340) specifically state that production EFOGMs would not be procured until successful flight tests of prototype missiles occur. The committee notes elsewhere in this report that the EFOGM has been plagued with technical difficulties and has not demonstrated a successful flight to date. Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for EFOGM procurement.

Javelin

The budget request contained \$320.0 million for the procurement of 3,316 Javelin missiles for the Army.

The Javelin is a medium range, man-portable, fire-and-forget, anti-tank missile, which can defeat all known and projected armor threats and is employed by infantrymen, scouts and combat engineers. The committee believes that this anti-armor system is essential for light forces to maintain battlefield dominance and has consistently supported accelerating the fielding of this missile to both the Army and the Marine Corps. Consistent with past actions, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to continue accelerated fielding of Javelin missiles.—

Multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) launcher systems

The budget request contained \$85.4 million for the procurement of 24 MLRS launchers, of which \$20.9 million was for engineering services. However, no funds were included for procurement of launchers for the Army National Guard (ARNG).

The committee notes that the funding for engineering services in the budget request is excessive. The committee believes such an increase is unjustified and, therefore, recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million.

Although the ARNG provides nearly 70 percent of the artillery fire support for the total Army, the committee is aware that additional launchers are required to fill a shortfall in ARNG MLRS battalions. Therefore, the committee recommends \$125.4 million, an increase of \$50.0 million, for additional MLRS launchers for the ARNG.

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$1,433.6 million for procurement of Army weapons and tracked combat vehicles for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,507.6 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001 ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	-	8,536	-	-	-	8,536
002 BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	-	285,844	-	75,000	-	360,844
003 BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	-	12,728	-	-	-	12,728
004 HAB TRAINING DEVICES	-	386	-	-	-	386
005 BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	-	2,075	-	-	-	2,075
006 FIELD ARTILLERY AMMUNITION SUPPORT VEH	-	-	-	-	-	-
007 ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	-	13,411	-	-	-	13,411
008 COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	10	44,241	-	-	10	44,241
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
009 CARRIER, MOD	-	54,454	-	-	-	54,454
010 FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	-	20,720	-	-	-	20,720
011 BFVS SERIES (MOD)	-	58,988	-	-	-	58,988
012 HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	-	11,339	-	-	-	11,339
013 HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A5 (MOD)	-	-	-	-	-	-
014 FAASVPIP TO FLEET	-	3,157	-	-	-	3,157
015 IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M89 MOD)	-	38,175	-	-	-	38,175
016 HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	-	50,401	-	-	-	50,401
017 ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	-	969	-	-	-	969
018 M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	-	53,301	-	-	-	53,301
019 ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	-	666,195	-	-	-	666,195
020 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(253,534)	-	-	-	(253,534)
021 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	262,942	-	-	-	262,942
022 MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
023 SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	-	132	-	-	-	132
024 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TCV-WTCV)	-	8,861	-	-	-	8,861
025 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
026 REGIONAL MAINTENANCE TRAINING SITES-EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		1,343,331		75,000		1,418,331
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
025 ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	673	6,496	-	-	673	6,496

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989		FY 1989		FY 1989		
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
026 MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	1,525	-	1,525	-	4,484	-	4,484
027 GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	897	-	897	-	12,191	-	12,191
028 M16 RIFLE	16,067	-	16,067	-	6,829	-	6,829
029 5.56 CARBINE M4	6,310	1,000	-	1,000	5,230	-	5,230
030 M4 CARBINE MODS	-	-	-	-	5,149	-	5,149
031 M19 MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	4,812	-	4,812
032 M16 RIFLE MODS	-	-	-	-	6,241	-	6,241
033 MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV) SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	-	-	-	-	1,128	-	1,128
034 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	1,164	-	1,164
035 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	-	-	-	-	5,140	-	5,140
036 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	-	-	-	3,959	-	3,959
037 SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	-	-	-	-	5,233	-	5,233
038 CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES	67,066	1,000	67,066	1,000	68,066		68,066
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS							
039 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	-	-	-	-	23,211	-	23,211
TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS					23,211		23,211
040 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES	-	-	-	-	(1,970)	-	(1,970)
TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,433,608	74,030	1,433,608	74,030	1,567,638		1,567,638

Items of Special Interest

Bradley base sustainment

The budget request contained \$285.8 million for the procurement of 73 Bradley M2A3 fighting vehicles, but no funds were included for upgrading Bradley "A0" vehicles to the "A2" Operation Desert Storm (ODS) variant.

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

When the Army completes all of its planned modifications to the Bradley, the active fleet will include a mix of the most advanced "A3" variant, along with A2 and A2ODS versions. The Army National Guard (ARNG), however, will be left with unmodified, first-generation "A0" vehicles, which, because of major survivability deficiencies, were not used in the Persian Gulf War and will not likely be taken into future combat.

Because the ARNG comprises an increasing percentage of the Army's warfighting capability as a result of active component force reductions and consistent with actions taken in fiscal year 1998, the committee recommends \$360.8 million, an increase of \$75.0 million, for modifying Bradley "A0" vehicles to the ODS variant for the ARNG.

Bradley base sustainment/command and control vehicle (C2V)

The budget request contained \$285.8 million for the procurement of 73 Bradley M2A3 fighting vehicles and \$44.2 million for the procurement of 10 C2V.

The committee understands that the Army is considering the savings and benefits associated with a multi-program multiyear procurement contract for the Bradley M2A3 and the C2V. The committee urges the Army to consider this contracting opportunity beginning in fiscal year 2000 and recommends that the Army consider additional vehicles in the contract, such as the Bradley A3 Fire Support Team Vehicle, the Improved Recovery Vehicle and the Multiple Launch Rocket System launcher remanufacture program, thereby providing the Army with the flexibility to change the vehicle mix from year-to-year as the need arises.

M1 abrams tank modifications

The budget request contained \$53.3 million for modifications to improve the M1 Abrams tank's lethality, safety and survivability, of which \$20.3 million was for M1A1-D integration kits.

The committee notes that the Army is in the third year of a five-year multiyear procurement (MYP) contract to upgrade M1A1 tanks to the M1A2 system enhancement program (SEP) variant. The committee fully supports this upgrade and believes that a full complement of M1A2 SEP tanks will provide a more lethal armor force in future digitized divisions compared to a mixed fleet of lesser capable M1A1-Ds and M1A2 SEP variants. The committee finds no compelling need for both the M1A1-D and M1A2 SEP upgrades,

and, therefore, recommends no funds for the M1A1–D upgrade. The committee has included a provision (sec. 112) that directs the Secretary of the Army to obligate the \$20.3 million requested for M1A1–D integration kits for M1A2 SEP Step One digital communications upgrades.

Additionally, the committee understands that the Army intends to reduce the size of M1 tank battalions from 60 to 45 tanks in the near-term and that this force structure reduction is possible due to the increased lethality, survivability and command and control capability that the M1A2 SEP tank provides. While the committee concurs with the National Defense Panel's recommendation to develop a lighter, more deployable tank for the Army After Next, it does not foresee technological advances that would warrant the fielding of a follow-on tank to the M1A2 before 2015. Accordingly, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of the Army to request authorization for a three-year follow-on MYP contract in fiscal year 2000 with an annual production rate of 120 tanks per year.

M-240 series machine gun

The budget request contained \$6.5 million to procure 673 M-240 machine guns, and the committee recommends the requested amount.

The committee understands that the Army is planning to modernize its UH-60 and CH-47 helicopter fleets with the M-240D machine gun. Because it believes that this initiative will provide unprecedented commonality in medium machine gun equipage across the force, the committee encourages the Army to expeditiously provide the resources for its implementation.

M4 carbine

The budget request contained \$4.2 million for the procurement of 6,310 M4 carbines.

The M4 carbine is a shoulder-fired 5.56 millimeter round weapon for light forces designed to replace all M3A1 World War II era .45 caliber machine guns and certain M16 rifles and M9 pistols. The committee recommends \$5.2 million, an increase of \$1.0 million, for additional M4 carbines for light forces.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$1,008.9 million for Ammunition Procurement, Army in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,053.5 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
AMMUNITION						
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001 CTG 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	1,314	91,620			5,600	97,220
002 CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M985		1,926				1,926
003 CTG 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		10,463			4,000	14,463
004 CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM893	922	1,926				1,926
005 CTG 9MM, ALL TYPES		1,907				1,907
006 CTG .45 CAL, ALL TYPES		2				2
007 CTG .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		18,544				18,544
008 CTG CAL 50 API MK211 MOD 0						
009 CTG 20MM, ALL TYPES						
010 CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		59,618			10,000	69,618
011 CTG 30MM, ALL TYPES		9,061				9,061
012 CTG 40MM, ALL TYPES		35,618				35,618
MORTAR AMMUNITION						
013 CTG MORTAR 60MM 1/10 PRAC M766						
014 CTG MORTAR 60MM ILLUM M721M767					5,000	5,000
015 CTG MORTAR 60MM SMOKE WP M722		375				375
016 CTG MORTAR 60MM HE M720/M720A1 W/M734 FUZE	47	20,528				20,528
017 CTG 81MM INFRARED (IR) ILLUM XM816	10	9,366			47	9,366
018 CTG MORTAR 120MM FULL RANGE PRACTICE M831	97	39,703			10	39,703
019 CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M834 W/MO FUZE	33	28,087			97	39,703
020 CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM850 W/MTSQ FZ					33	28,087
021 CTG MORTAR 120MM SMOKE M829 W/MO FUZE						
TANK AMMUNITION						
022 CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	2	9,732				9,732
023 CTG 120MM HEAT-HP-T M830A1					2	9,732
024 CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	105	60,386				10,000
025 CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	240	129,914				60,386
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
026 CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	34	1,566				1,566
027 CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915						
028 CTG ARTY 105MM HERA M913		532				532
029 PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825						
030 PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795						

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
031 PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	550	56,542	-	-	550	56,542
032 PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	124	25,650	-	-	124	25,650
ARTILLERY FUZES						
033 FUZE ARTY ELEC TIME M787	-	-	10,000	10,000	-	10,000
034 FUZE MULTI OPTION	2	1,514	-	-	2	1,514
MINES						
035 MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	-	-	-	-	-	-
036 MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	-	973	-	-	-	973
037 WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	65	9,625	-	-	65	9,625
ROCKETS						
038 BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	-	-	-	-	-	-
039 ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	-	126,055	-	-	-	126,055
OTHER AMMUNITION						
040 DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	8,800	-	-	-	8,800
041 GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	21,382	-	-	-	21,382
042 SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	-	12,985	-	-	-	12,985
043 SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	-	4,651	-	-	-	4,651
MISCELLANEOUS						
044 AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	-	7,241	-	-	-	7,241
045 CADPAD ALL TYPES	-	2,320	-	-	-	2,320
046 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION	-	1,008	-	-	-	1,008
047 AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	-	10,388	-	-	-	10,388
048 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (AMMO)	-	-	-	-	-	-
049 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	-	6,174	-	-	-	6,174
050 CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AMMUNITION		827,183		44,800		871,763
AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
051 PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	47,660	-	-	-	47,660
052 COMPONENTS FOR PROVE-OUT	-	-	-	-	-	-
053 LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	15,362	-	-	-	15,362
054 MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	-	15,826	-	-	-	15,826
055 CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	-	97,963	-	-	-	97,963
056 ARMS INITIATIVE	-	4,861	-	-	-	4,861

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
057 POST RETIREMENT BENEFITS						
TOTAL AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		181,892				181,892
058 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES						
TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,008,865		44,800		1,053,465

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Ammunition

The budget request contained \$827.2 million for procurement of ammunition. The committee recommends \$871.8 million, an increase of \$44.6 million for the following types of ammunition:

[In millions of dollars]

Small/Medium Cal Ammunition:	
CTG 5.56mm All Types-	\$5.6
CTG 7.62mm All Types-	4.0
CTG 25mm All Types-	10.0
Mortar Ammunition:	
CTG Mortar 60mm Illum M761/767-	5.0
Tank Ammunition:	
CTG Tank 120mm HEAT-MP-T M830A1-	10.0
Artillery Fuzes:	
M767A1 Electronic Artillery Fuze-	10.0

Items of Special Interest

Arsenals

The committee notes the historical importance of and unique contributions made by U.S. Army arsenals as part of the defense industrial base. Their support to the military under title 10, United States Code, section 4532 (The Arsenal Act), aided immeasurably in the demise of the Cold War and will continue into the 21st century. However, with the decrease in defense spending over the last decade, the committee is concerned over the dramatic decrease in workload at these government-owned, government-operated industrial facilities. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of the Army to identify and evaluate processes and economical practices that would enable arsenals to remain viable and critical components of the defense industrial base.

Non-toxic frangible ammunition

The budget request contained no funds for the procurement of non-toxic frangible ammunition.

Non-toxic frangible ammunition rounds are environmentally-friendly, lead-free munitions for indoor or urban small arms training. These rounds disintegrate on impact with hard surface targets and reduce or eliminate lead contamination to the environment while providing safer and cleaner training scenarios than currently available. The committee notes the Army's recent evaluation and safety certification of certain commercial-off-the-shelf, non-toxic frangible 9 millimeter (mm) and 5.56mm ammunition under the Joint Service Small Arms Program (JSSAP). The committee understands, however, that the certifications were granted with certain limitations and restrictions. Nevertheless, the committee is encouraged by the Army's efforts under the JSSAP. Since non-toxic frangible ammunition is currently procured on a limited basis for training requirements, the committee believes that continued procurement is warranted for these unique requirements while performance deficiencies are addressed.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$3,198.8 million for Other Procurement, Army in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$3,136.9 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001 TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	97	11,948	-	-	-	11,948
002 SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	23	2,917	-	-	23	2,917
003 SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	32	3,865	-	-	32	3,865
004 SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	86	4,212	-	-	86	4,212
005 SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	71	6,401	-	-	71	6,401
006 SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	110	12,144	-	10,000	-	22,144
007 HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	2,038	332,044	-	-	2,038	332,044
008 FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	-	189,617	-	-	-	189,617
009 FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
010 ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
011 TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	440	59,503	-	-	440	59,503
012 TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (CS)	57	4,852	-	-	57	4,852
013 MEDIUM TRUCK EXTENDED SVC PGM (ESP)	1,085	37,247	-	-	1,085	37,247
014 LINE HAUL, ESP	62	4,883	-	-	62	4,883
015 HMMWV ESP	387	24,832	-	(24,832)	-	-
016 MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	-	13,306	-	-	-	13,306
017 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TAC VEH)	-	186	-	-	-	186
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
018 HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	54	5,956	-	-	54	5,956
019 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	37	867	-	-	37	867
020 GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,059	-	-	-	1,059
021 SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	1,060	-	-	-	1,060
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
022 SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT PEO	-	311	-	-	-	311
023 PROJECT MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	-	2,437	-	(1,000)	-	1,437
024 SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (TACOM)	-	4,166	-	(1,200)	-	2,966
TOTAL TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		726,438		(17,032)		709,406
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
025 COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	-	4,890	-	-	-	4,890
026 JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	-	3,148	-	-	-	3,148

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
027 COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	-	94,616	-	(1,300)	-	93,316
028 DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	25,328	-	(2,010)	-	23,318
029 SHF TERM	-	2,485	-	-	-	2,485
030 SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	-	6,866	-	-	-	6,866
031 NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
032 GROUND COMMAND POST	-	-	-	-	-	-
033 SMART-T (SPACE)	-	57,743	-	-	-	57,743
034 SCAMP (SPACE)	-	4,708	-	-	-	4,708
035 GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	-	5,873	-	-	-	5,873
036 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	-	1,474	-	-	-	1,474
037 COMM - COMBAT SUPPORT COMM	-	-	-	-	-	-
038 WISE MOD IN SERVICE	-	-	-	-	-	-
039 COMM - C3 SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
040 COMMAND CENTER IMPROVEMENT PROG (CCIP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
041 SOUTHCOM HQ RELOCATION	-	-	-	-	-	-
042 ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	-	20,562	-	-	-	20,562
043 COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
044 ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (ADDS)	-	24,048	-	5,000	-	29,048
045 MOBILE SUBSCRIBER EQUIP (MSE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
046 SINGARS FAMILY	-	13,212	-	-	-	13,212
047 JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMS SYS	-	9,925	-	-	-	9,925
048 ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN-TT)	-	97,080	-	-	-	97,080
049 TAC RADIO	-	-	-	-	-	-
050 C-E CONTINGENCY/FIELDING EQUIP	-	2,166	-	-	-	2,166
051 SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMMELECTRONICS	-	4,593	-	-	-	4,593
052 COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	-	13,712	-	-	-	13,712
053 MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MCA)	-	9,440	-	-	-	9,440
054 COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM	-	-	-	-	-	-
055 JWICS CONNECTIVITY	-	2,319	-	-	-	2,319
056 CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	-	-	-	-	-	-
057 CI CONJUS BASED LAN	-	-	-	-	-	-
058 INFORMATION SECURITY	-	-	-	-	-	-
059 TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	-	10,315	-	-	-	10,315
060 INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM - ISSP	-	28,714	-	-	-	29,714
061 COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
062 TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	-	1,953	-	-	-	1,953

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
056 BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	-	1,124	-	-	-	1,124
057 ARMY DISIN ROUTER	-	3,614	-	-	-	3,614
058 ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	-	452	-	3,000	-	3,452
059 VAVTECH CON IMP PROG (VAVTICIP) COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS	-	2,031	-	-	-	2,031
060 INFORMATION SYSTEMS	-	91,213	-	-	-	91,213
061 DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	-	16,723	-	-	-	16,723
062 LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	-	9,978	-	-	-	9,978
063 PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)	-	39,195	-	-	-	39,195
064 FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	-	876	-	-	-	876
065 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	-	21,562	-	-	-	21,562
066 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (INTEL SPT) - TIARA	-	-	-	-	-	-
067 ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)	-	24,117	-	-	-	24,117
068 ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	-	5,340	-	-	-	5,340
069 JTTCIBS-M (TIARA)	56	25,388	-	(11,200)	56	14,188
070 IEM - GND BASE COMMON SENSORS (TIARA)	-	87,229	-	10,000	-	97,229
071 JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
072 NATO-AGS	-	6,487	-	5,000	-	11,487
073 INTEGRATED BROADCAST TERMINAL MODS (TIARA)	12	21,230	-	-	12	21,230
074 DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	-	1,690	-	-	-	1,690
075 DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)	-	2,638	-	-	-	2,638
076 TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITY	-	3,981	-	-	-	3,981
077 TACTICAL GROUND STATION MODS	-	4,891	-	-	-	4,891
078 TROJAN (TIARA)	-	3,700	-	2,508	-	6,208
079 CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA)	-	530	-	-	-	530
080 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
081 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (TIARA)	-	-	-	-	-	-
082 ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)	-	1,725	-	15,000	-	16,725
083 SHORTSTOP	-	-	-	-	-	-
084 COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	-	-	-	-	-	-
085 ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV (TAC SURV)	23	58,247	-	-	23	58,247
086 SENTINEL (FAAD GBS)	238	11,787	-	-	238	11,787
087 TARGET LOCATION/OBSERVATION SYSTEM (TLOS)	-	29,636	-	9,000	-	38,636
088 NIGHT VISION DEVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	QUANTITY	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	QUANTITY	COST
					COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
086 LTVT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	110		3,364	-	110	3,364
087 NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	1,522		36,110	-	1,522	36,110
088 ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	-		11,004	-	-	11,004
089 MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	-		5,477	-	-	5,477
090 COMPUTER BALLISTICS, XM-30	-		-	-	-	-
091 INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	5		4,890	-	5	4,890
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
092 TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	-		26,703	-	-	26,703
093 ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	212		36,671	-	212	36,671
094 FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	-		-	-	-	-
095 CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSCCS)	122		9,332	-	122	9,332
096 FAAD C2	2		14,204	-	2	14,204
097 FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	-		25,040	(10,000)	-	15,040
098 STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	15		6,025	-	15	6,025
099 LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	-		1,174	-	-	1,174
100 LOGTECH	-		3,238	-	-	3,238
101 TC AIMS II	-		445	-	-	445
102 GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	126		11,781	-	126	11,781
103 ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	-		34,175	-	-	34,175
104 MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	96		13,033	-	96	13,033
105 STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	1,633		48,248	-	1,633	48,248
106 STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	-		26,827	-	-	26,827
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
107 ARMY TRAINING XXI MODERNIZATION	-		32,635	-	-	32,635
108 AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-		130,712	(19,100)	-	111,612
109 RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	-		108,192	-	-	108,192
ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
110 AFRTS	-		487	-	-	487
111 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0K (A/V)	-		4,597	-	-	4,597
ELECT EQUIP-TEST MEAS&DIAG EQUIP (TWDE)						
112 CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	-		-	-	-	-
113 INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIP (IFTE)	-		-	-	-	-
114 TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	-		-	-	-	-
ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
115 INSTALLATION C4 UPGRADE (ICU)	-		-	-	-	-
116 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	-		403	-	-	403

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1969		FY 1969		FY 1969	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	QUANTITY	COST	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	QUANTITY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		1,616,331		5,688		1,622,229
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
117 GEN SMK MECH-MTRZD DUAL PLURP M56	76	15,110			76	15,110
118 GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	38	10,622			38	10,622
119 GEN SET, SMOKE, MECH, PUL JET, M157 SERIES						
120 LT VEH OBSCURANT SMK SYS	2,363	4,633			2,363	4,633
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
121 RIBBON BRIDGE		8,824				8,824
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
122 METALLIC MINE DETECTOR, VEHICLE MOUNTED	2	3,775			2	3,775
123 BN COUNTERMINE SIP		3,670				3,670
124 M-9 ARMORED COMBAT EARTHMOVER (ACE)						
125 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M(ENG NON-CONST)						
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
128 AIR CONDITIONERS VARIOUS SIZE/CAPACITY		4,650				4,650
127 KITCHEN, CONTAINERIZED, FIELD (CK)	77	7,435			77	7,435
128 SANITATION CENTER, FIELD FEEDING (FSC)	106	1,364			106	1,364
129 FIRETRUCKS		15,000				15,000
130 TRUCK, FIREFIGHTING, MULTI-PURPOSE	6	1,708			6	1,708
131 ARMY SPACE HEATER, 120,000 BTU (ASH)	110	1,061			110	1,061
132 LAUNDRY ADVANCED SYSTEM (LADS)	19	7,216			19	7,216
133 FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS	113	1,944			113	1,944
134 SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		4,832				4,832
135 LAND WARRIOR	255	51,380		5,000	255	56,380
136 FORCE PROVIDER	4	24,418			4	24,418
137 REFRIGERATION EQUIPMENT		1,930				1,930
138 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (CSS-EQ)		4,749		2,000		6,749
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
139 TANK ASSEMBLY FAB COLL, POL, 50000 G	17	7,393		(3,000)		4,393
140 PUMP ASSY, REGULATED, 360 GPM	10	358			10	358
141 INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM		8,342		(4,000)		4,342
142 FORWARD AREA REFUELING SYS ADV AVIATION	18	5,329			18	5,329
143 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (POL)		4,657				4,657

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
WATER EQUIPMENT						
144 SMALL MOBILE WATER CHILLER (SMWC)	310	2,987			310	2,987
145 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (WATER EQ)	-	1,255			-	1,255
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
146 COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	-	25,807			-	25,807
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
147 SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	180	7,897		(4,000)		3,897
148 WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	55	3,044		(1,500)		1,544
149 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (MAINT EQ)	-	4,754			-	4,754
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
150 DIST. BITUM MATERIAL 15000G TRK MTD	20	4,377			20	4,377
151 ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	-	6,402			-	6,402
152 HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	23	9,388			23	9,388
153 DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	66	13,305			66	13,305
154 TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	2	3,801			2	3,801
155 CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	47	11,553			47	11,553
156 CRANE, WHEEL MTD, 25T, 3/4 CU YD, RT	-	1,929			-	1,929
157 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (CONST EQUIP)	-				-	
RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
158 PUSHER TUG, SMALL	1	4,269		4,300	3	8,569
159 FLOATING CRANE, 100-250 TON	-		2		-	
160 CONTAINERIZED MAINTENANCE FACILITY	1	5,300			1	5,300
161 CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	-	17,083			-	17,083
162 RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 100 TON	148	12,804			148	12,804
163 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	-	3,235			-	3,235
GENERATORS						
164 GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	-	82,749			-	82,749
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
165 TRUCK FORK LIFT, DE, RT, 50000 LB	101	20,588		(10,000)		10,588
166 ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARTICULATING SYSTEM	47	15,228		(5,000)		10,228
167 ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	30	13,515			30	13,515
168 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2.0M (MHE)	-	1,672			-	1,672
TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
169 COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	-	47,395			-	47,395
170 TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	-	56,755		4,000	-	60,755
171 SIMNET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	-	113,927		(29,400)	-	84,527

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
172 FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	-	28,124	-	-	-	28,124
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)	-	-	-	-	-	-
173 CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	-	9,984	-	-	-	9,984
174 INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	-	54,051	-	-	-	54,051
175 TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	-	13,797	-	-	-	13,797
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
176 RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	-	1,967	-	-	-	1,967
177 PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	-	16,164	-	-	-	16,164
178 SYSTEM FIELDING SUPPORT (OPA-3)	-	7,143	-	-	-	7,143
179 BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	-	9,697	-	-	-	9,697
180 TRANSPORTATION AUTOMATED MEASURING SYS (TRAMS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
181 ELECTRONIC REPAIR SHELTER	2	3,694	-	-	2	3,694
182 MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	-	17,667	-	-	-	17,667
183 PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	-	2,274	-	-	-	2,274
184 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	-	15,062	-	-	-	15,062
185 OPA INITIAL SPARES	-	-	-	-	-	-
186 MA8975	-	6,020	-	-	-	6,020
187 CLOSED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		877,073		(41,600)		835,473
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
OPA1	-	-	-	-	-	-
188 INITIAL SPARES - TSV	-	4,433	-	-	-	4,433
OPA2	-	-	-	-	-	-
189 INITIAL SPARES - C&E	-	73,362	-	-	-	73,362
OPA3	-	-	-	-	-	-
190 INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	-	1,174	-	-	-	1,174
TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		78,969				78,969
191 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES	-	-	(9,159)	(9,159)	-	(9,159)
TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		3,196,811		(61,853)		3,136,918

Items of Special Interest

Automated data processing equipment (ADPE)

The budget request contained \$130.7 million for procurement of ADPE, of which \$44.0 million was for the procurement of the Joint Computer Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support (JCALS) system.

The committee notes a nearly 25 percent increase in the amount requested for JCALS over both the amount authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1998 and the amount projected for fiscal year 2000. Additionally, the committee notes that the system recently failed approval for Milestone III low rate initial production for the second time. Therefore, the committee recommends \$24.9 million, a decrease of \$19.1 million, for continued limited procurement of this system.

Close combat tactical trainer (CCTT)

The budget request contained \$113.9 million for continued low rate initial production (LRIP) of the CCTT system, to include 77 fixed site modules and 18 mobile modules.

The CCTT is a networked system of manned simulators for the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle, and M113A3 carrier and will train both active and reserve component crews of armored and mechanized infantry combat units. Although the committee is aware of cost savings that can be achieved through simulation training, it is concerned with delays that have been experienced by this system as a result of the one-year slip in initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E). Moreover, the committee is concerned with the 53 percent increase in the request over the amount authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1998 prior to the system's having successfully completed IOT&E. Therefore, the committee recommends \$84.5 million, a decrease of \$17.0 million for modules and site equipment, \$2.4 million for commercial trainers, and \$10.0 million for commercial image generators.

Co-site interference mitigation technology

The budget request did not contain funds for the procurement of co-site interference mitigation technology.

Co-site interference mitigation technology limits electronic interference created by multiple, co-located radio transmission antennae when radios transmit simultaneously, thereby producing "bleed over" of conversations from one channel to another. The committee is aware of currently available electronically-tuned helix antennae and interference-canceling technologies that may provide a solution to co-site interference and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to procure these technologies for evaluation by Force XXI experimental units.

Family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV)

The budget request contained \$332.0 million for the procurement of 2038 FMTVs.

The committee is aware that these vehicles will be procured under a four-year multiyear procurement (MYP) contract, with a

fifth one-year option, beginning in fiscal year 1998. The committee is also aware of the Army's plan to develop a second production source to achieve savings through competition. However, the committee is concerned that the Army may not be able to budget sufficient resources for medium trucks in its future years defense program to justify two sources and questions whether the Army's plan to develop a second source is necessary.

Therefore, the committee expects that the Secretary of the Army will not enter into production qualification contracts with potential second source suppliers until he certifies to the congressional defense committees that a second source acquisition strategy is cost effective, that sufficient funds are programmed in the future years defense program to execute that strategy and provides analysis supporting his certification.

Forward entry device (FED)

The budget request contained \$25.0 million for the procurement of 852 FEDs. The FED is a hand-held computer used in heavy divisions by forward observers, field artillery battery commanders, and fire support teams for transmitting artillery fire requirements to field artillery units.

The committee notes that the unit cost for the 852 FEDs requested is three thousand dollars higher than the unit cost for the 45 units procured in fiscal year 1998. The committee is aware of some enhancements incorporated into the system, which might explain a modest increase in unit cost. However, since the proliferation of information technologies (IT) in both the public and private sectors has greatly decreased IT costs, the committee believes that the unit cost increase for the procurement of 800 more units than were procured in fiscal year 1998 is unwarranted and recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million.

Ground based common sensor (GBCS)

The budget request contained \$25.4 million for the GBCS-Light (L) system, of which \$1.5 million is for the Common Modules Electronic Intelligence Subsystem (CMES).

The committee notes that the GBCS-L system has had numerous technical difficulties and experienced a significant fielding delay as a result of a two-year slip in initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E). This delay has resulted in the Department's twice having used GBCS as a source of funds for reprogramming requests. The committee understands that the GBCS-L may now begin IOT&E in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1998, however, as a result of the sensor's past performance, it believes that all of the requested funding may not be executable because of further delays. Therefore, the committee recommends \$14.2 million, a decrease of \$9.7 million for GBCS-L hardware and \$1.5 million due to the duplicate entries for CMES in the budget request.

High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV)/HMMWV extended service plan (ESP)

The budget request contained \$12.1 million to procure 110 HMMWVs, 100 of which were up-armored variants, and \$24.8 million to extend the life of 387 HMMWVs.

The committee notes that subsequent to the submission of the budget request, the Army decided to only procure new HMMWVs rather than extend the life of older vehicles and that the new HMMWVs are a top unfunded priority of the Army Chief of Staff. Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for the HMMWV ESP and recommends \$22.1 million, an increase of \$10.0 million, for procurement of new up-armored HMMWVs.

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

The budget request contained \$87.2 million for the procurement of 20 Joint STARS CGSs.

The committee is aware of the lack of adequate joint Army/Air Force air-land battlefield sensor assets to detect, locate, track, and classify both moving and stationary targets beyond the forward line of troops. The CGS improves ground commanders' battlefield command and control (C2) capability by integrating into a single station the processing of signals, imagery and other intelligence received through a data link from the Air Force's E-8 Joint STARS aircraft radar. The committee is aware of the proven success of the CGS in Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia, and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for the procurement of 24 additional CGS workstations.

Joint tactical terminal

The budget request contained \$6.5 million in other procurement, Army, and \$4.2 million in other procurement, Air Force, for the Joint Tactical Terminal intelligence broadcast transceivers.

These radios are an integral part of the Integrated Broadcast Service that the committee fully supports. The committee is concerned that, because of contract protests that have resulted in delays in final contract award, the fielding of these radios has slipped, leaving operational users without the ability to receive tactical intelligence data broadcasts. In order to correct this problem, the committee recommends \$11.5 million and \$7.2 million, an increase of \$5.0 million for the Army and \$3.0 million for the Air Force, respectively, for accelerating the purchase and fielding of these radios.

Land warrior

The budget request contained \$51.4 million for initial procurement of Land Warrior dismounted combat soldier weapon systems, but no funds were included for all-torso body armor.

In its report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132), the committee noted that the effectiveness of modern all-torso body armor was aptly demonstrated during Operation Provide Hope in Somalia and that subsequent Army studies and analyses indicated more than 50 percent of all life-threatening wounds received in combat could be prevented by using such body armor. The committee believes that the medical expenses and loss of human life that could be avoided by employing this type of armor far outweigh the costs of procuring and fielding it; therefore, the committee recommends \$56.4 million, an increase of \$5.0 million, for the procurement of all-torso body armor.

Lightweight maintenance enclosure (LME)

The budget request contained \$545 thousand for 50 LMEs.

The LME is a lightweight, frame-supported, mobile tent designed to provide rapid deployed and forward maintenance units a quick setup-and-takedown enclosed shelter in which to perform field maintenance operations on tracked and wheeled vehicles and other equipment in all climatic conditions. The committee notes that light forces will be more mobile in the future and must therefore be capable of rapidly repairing and maintaining equipment while deployed. However, because the Army identified a new requirement for LMEs after the budget request was submitted to Congress, it was not adequately funded. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.0 million for the procurement of additional LMEs.

Night vision devices

The budget request contained \$29.6 million for procurement of AN/PVS-7 night vision goggles, but no funds were included for the procurement of AN-PEQ-2A infrared aiming target pointers/infrared aiming lights.

The AN-PEQ-2A infrared aiming target pointer/infrared aiming light is a target designator mounted either on individual or crew served weapons. Its eyesafe laser output is visible only when used with image intensifier night vision goggles, such as the AN/PVS-7. The committee notes that the "Own the Night" initiative—the Army's concept of fighting, dominating and winning battles during nighttime operations—is one of the Army Chief of Staff's top five priorities. However, the committee is concerned that adequate funding for night vision equipment is not included in the budget request, despite its having proved to be a highly successful "over match" capability and "force multiplier" for light forces in the Task Force XXI Advanced Warfighting Experiments. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$9.0 million for AN-PEQ-2A infrared aiming target pointers/infrared aiming lights.

Nonsystem training devices

The budget request contained \$56.8 million for procurement of nonsystem training devices, but no funds were included for firefighter trainers. This training device is a computer-controlled, natural-gas-fueled system, which provides safe, realistic, and environmentally-friendly training for firefighters at airports and training academies throughout the country.

The committee understands that Army firefighter training sites have been or will be closed in the future because most are not in compliance with environmental regulations. Because of the site closures, the Army has established a program to provide regional firefighter training and has awarded a contract to procure 28 firefighter trainers over a five-year period for this purpose. However, it will have procured only 12 of these trainers by the end of fiscal year 1998. The committee continues to believe that these trainers provide a safe, unique and fundamental fire prevention and teaching function for Army firefighters. Therefore, consistent with action taken in fiscal year 1998, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to procure four additional firefighter trainers. The committee also urges the Secretary of the Army to provide funds

for the remaining trainer requirements in the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Shortstop

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of the Shortstop Electronic Protection System (SEPS).

The SEPS is a commercial electronics radio frequency counter-measure system that protects personnel and high value assets from artillery, mortar rounds and rockets by detonating their proximity fuzes well before they impact in the target area. The committee understands that initial Army testing of 5,000 rounds fired at the SEPS resulted in a 100 percent pre-detonation success rate and that follow-on tests with both artillery and rockets were also highly successful. However, for the third straight year, the Army has failed to include funding for SEPS in the budget request.

SEPS, developed as a quick reaction capability system, was deployed during Operation Desert Storm and more recently in Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia. The committee authorized \$9.0 million (of which \$6.0 million was appropriated) in fiscal year 1998 for procurement of 30 units for forward-deployed forces in Korea. Similar to prior year action, the committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million for the procurement of additional SEPS in order to complete the fielding of systems to Korea and to begin fielding systems to Kuwait.

Small pusher tug

The budget request contained \$4.3 million for the procurement of one small pusher tug.

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

The committee is aware of the unreliable performance of the Army's 40 year-old small tugs during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm and understands that the Army has a requirement for eight new tugs to replace these older vessels. The committee understands that two additional tugs can be procured at a cost of \$4.7 million. Since the Army has only budgeted for six of these tugs in its future years defense program, the committee recommends \$8.6 million, an increase of \$4.3 million, for a total of three vessels, which would fulfill the Army requirement and complete the program.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained \$855.1 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions, Army, for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of no funds for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	QUANTITY	COST	COST
001 CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	-	182,780	(182,780)	-	-	-
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E	182,780	(182,780)				
002 CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC PROCUREMENT CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	-	140,870	(140,870)	-	-	-
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC	140,870	(140,870)				
003 CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-OSM OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - OSM	-	531,650	(531,650)	-	-	-
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-OSM	531,650	(531,650)				
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT, ARMY	855,100	(855,100)				

Item of Special Interest

Chemical agents and munitions destruction

The budget request contained \$855.1 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, including \$182.8 million for research and development, \$140.7 million for procurement, and \$531.7 million for operations and maintenance.

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

The committee is aware of delays associated with the construction of the chemical demilitarization site at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, that should result in a reduced level of expenditures at that installation during fiscal year 1999. The committee also notes projected increases that it does not consider are warranted in the research and development request for the destruction of stockpile and for non-stockpile agents and munitions.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, and \$834.0 million for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense. The recommendation includes a decrease of \$11.9 million in research and development, a decrease of \$6.0 million in procurement, and a decrease of \$3.2 million in operations and maintenance.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained \$7,466.7 million for Aircraft Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$7,420.8 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
001 AV-8B (V/STOL) HARRIER	12	300,192		(3,200)	12	296,992
002 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(17,479)		-	-	(17,479)
003 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	55,686		-	-	55,686
004 F/A-18C/D (FIGHTER) HORNET	30	2,876,129	(3)	(204,700)	27	2,671,429
005 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(88,346)		-	-	(88,346)
006 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	109,438		-	-	109,438
007 V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	7	671,428	1	64,000	8	735,428
008 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(60,662)		-	-	(60,662)
009 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	54,020		-	-	54,020
010 SH-60B (ASW HELICOPTER) SEAHAWK	3	225,407		-	3	225,407
011 E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	-	(19,023)		-	-	(19,023)
012 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	182,947		-	-	182,947
013 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-		-	-	-
TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		4,289,737		(143,900)		4,145,837
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
011 CH-53	4	106,027		-	4	106,027
012 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	26,160		-	-	26,160
TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		132,187		-		132,187
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
013 T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	15	288,755		(15,500)	15	273,255
014 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(6,088)		-	-	(6,088)
015 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	60,159		-	-	60,159
014A JPATS	-	-	4	12,200	4	12,200
TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		342,826		(3,300)		339,526

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1969		FY 1968		FY 1968	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
015 KC-130J		-	2	112,400	2	112,400
TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		-		112,400		112,400
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
016 EA-4 SERIES		75,735		39,000		114,735
017 AV-8 SERIES		96,109		-		96,109
018 F-14 SERIES		223,661		(7,300)		216,361
019 ADVERSARY		1,292		(5,172)		1,292
020 ES-3 SERIES		5,172		(3,900)		-
021 F-16 SERIES		198,049		-		194,149
022 H-46 SERIES		31,863		-		31,863
023 AH-1W SERIES		22,394		11,000		33,394
024 H-53 SERIES		37,829		-		37,829
025 SH-60 SERIES		137,997		(1,300)		136,697
026 H-1 SERIES		18,220		-		18,220
027 H-3 SERIES		34		-		34
028 EP-3 SERIES		5,437		3,000		8,437
029 P-3 SERIES		268,633		15,000		283,633
030 S-3 SERIES		45,997		-		45,997
031 E-2 SERIES		91,502		7,000		98,502
032 TRAINER AC SERIES		7,399		-		7,399
033 C-2A		18,113		-		18,113
034 C-130 SERIES		4,040		-		4,040
035 FEWSG		557		-		557
036 CARGO/TRANSPORT AC SERIES		27,179		-		27,179
037 E-6 SERIES		64,660		(4,600)		60,060
038 EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		26,147		-		26,147
039 SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		17,729		-		17,729
040 T-45 SERIES		8,499		-		8,499
041 POWER PLANT CHANGES		15,283		-		15,283
042 MISC FLIGHT SAFETY CHANGES		-		-		-
043 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		37,375		-		37,375

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
044 COMMON AVONICS CHANGES	-	104,697	(2,000)		-	102,697
TOTAL MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		1,594,602		50,726		1,645,330
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	727,838	(8,400)		-	719,438
045 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		727,838		(8,400)		719,438
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
046 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (M)	-	-	-		-	-
047 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (68)	-	-	-		-	-
048 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89)	-	-	-		-	-
049 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (87)	-	-	-		-	-
050 COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	-	330,952	(15,400)		-	315,552
051 AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	13,753	(1,800)		-	11,953
052 WAR CONSUMABLES	-	11,197	-		-	11,197
053 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	7,552	-		-	7,552
054 SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	14,377	-		-	14,377
055 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,713	-		-	1,713
TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		379,544		(17,200)		362,344
056 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES						
			(36,215)			(36,215)
TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		7,466,734		(48,887)		7,420,847

Items of Special Interest

AV-8B

The budget request contained \$282.7 million to procure 12 remanufactured AV-8B aircraft and \$55.7 million for advance procurement of 12 remanufactured aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

Consistent with its recommendations in fiscal years 1997 and 1998, the committee continues to support accelerated mission capability and safety-related improvements to the AV-8B. The committee notes that the Department's legislative proposal requests authorization for multiyear procurement of these aircraft and recommends a provision (sec. 121) that would support this request. However, the committee also notes unexplained growth in integrated logistics support and government furnished avionics compared to fiscal year 1998, and concludes such increase is unwarranted. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$279.5 million, a decrease of \$3.2 million, and believes that this decrease will not affect the ability of the Department to proceed with a multiyear contract.

The committee understands that an unfunded option exists in the proposed 72-aircraft multiyear contract that would remanufacture the remaining 24 aircraft in the fleet and encourages the Department to negotiate such an option.

AH-1W night targeting system (NTS)

The budget request contained \$22.4 million for AH-1W helicopter modifications, and included \$9.1 million for the AH-1W NTS. According to the budget justification documents, fiscal year 1999 is the final procurement year for this system.

The NTS provides a night and adverse weather capability to employ the Hellfire and tube-launched, optically-tracked, wire guided (TOW) missiles. In addition, NTS will provide enhanced conventional weapons delivery by utilizing the system's laser ranging capability. The Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded requirements list for fiscal year 1999 identified the procurement of 10 additional systems among his highest priorities so that the Marine Corps could achieve its objective of 188 systems to modify training and attrition aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million for 10 NTSs.

EA-6B modifications

The budget request contained \$75.7 million for EA-6B modifications but included no funds for the band 9/10 transmitter/receiver upgrade.

The committee understands that the Department faces an emergent requirement to counter high frequency radar techniques of a new family of electronic threats. The committee further understands that the EA-6B is not currently equipped to counter these threats and notes that the Joint Tactical Electronic Warfare Study identified a need for improving the aircraft's jamming capability in the high frequency (band 9/10) ranges. In recognition of this situation, the committee recommends an increase of \$39.0 million to meet this requirement.-

EP-3E flat panel display

The budget request contained \$5.4 million for modifications to the EP-3E aircraft, but included no funds to procure flat panel displays.

The EP-3E is a land-based, long-range aircraft with electronic intercept devices for detection and tracking of enemy radars and radios. The committee understands that, as new combat threats have emerged over the years, the fleet of EP-3E aircraft has undergone numerous equipment upgrades that have increased its weight. As a result, the committee also understands that critical operational and safety equipment has been removed in order to maintain the aircraft within its designed weight limit. The much lighter-weight flat panel display is a form, fit and function replacement for existing displays and would save nearly 600 pounds per aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to replace existing displays with the flat panel displays in the Navy's EP-3E fleet of 12 aircraft.

ES-3 modifications

The budget request contained \$5.2 million for ES-3 series modification kits. The Navy has informed the committee that it intends to terminate the ES-3 program in fiscal year 2000. Based on this decision, the committee sees no need for modifying these aircraft prior to their removal from the fleet. The committee, therefore, recommends no funding for these modifications.

F-14 modifications

The budget request contained \$223.7 million for F-14 modifications, including \$81.1 million for structural improvements.

The committee notes excessive cost growth related to modifications for structural improvements and, therefore, recommends a decrease of \$7.3 million.

F/A-18E/F

The budget request contained \$2,787.8 million for 30 F/A-18E/F aircraft and \$109.4 million for advance procurement of 36 aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

Based on the results of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the committee notes that the Department has reduced the total procurement objective from 1,000 to 548 aircraft and has also reduced procurement in the future years defense program (FYDP) from 248 to 224. The committee notes that the Department plans to request increases of six aircraft per year for each of the next three fiscal years until its maximum production rate of 48 aircraft per year is attained in fiscal year 2002. However, for fiscal year 1999, the requested increase from fiscal year 1998 is 10 aircraft.

The committee is also aware that the Department has increased the number of low rate initial production (LRIP) aircraft in fiscal years 1997, 1998 and 1999 from 42, as approved in 1992 by the Defense Acquisition Board (DAB), to its current plan of 62 aircraft. The Department's Selected Acquisition Reports indicate that both its initial plan of 42 LRIP aircraft and its current plan of 62 LRIP aircraft were predicated on a procurement objective of 1,000 aircraft. The committee notes that were the Department to comply

with the 10 percent LRIP guideline contained in section 2400 of title 10, United States Code, 55 LRIP aircraft should be sufficient.

During the past year, the committee has followed the Department's challenges in solving an uncommanded rolling motion problem that occurs at altitudes and angles of attack in that portion of the flight envelope where the F/A-18E/F performs air combat maneuvers. The Department's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation recently testified that the most promising solution to this problem—a porous wing fairing—causes unacceptable airframe buffeting and that the final solution to the problem may include other combinations of aerodynamic alterations to the wing surface. According to the Director, the root cause of the problem and modifications to the porous wing fairing are still being investigated, and the wing fairing configuration flown during developmental testing does not incorporate the production representative wing fold mechanism. Additionally, the Director stated that the Department would not have a complete understanding of the impact of the design fix, including uncertainty over air flow effects around the weapons pylons, until the conclusion of operational testing in 1999. Moreover, the Director also noted other concerns with the aircraft such as deficiencies in the performance of its survivability and radar jamming systems.

In light of the significantly higher increase in production proposed for fiscal year 1999, the apparent excess number of LRIP aircraft, and the development and testing issues yet to be fully resolved, the committee recommends a reduction of \$213.1 million and three aircraft. Of the total \$213.1 million reduction, initial spares is reduced by \$8.4 million. The committee believes that an increase of seven aircraft from the approved fiscal year 1998 level is appropriate and further believes that a total of 59 LRIP aircraft, approximately 11 percent of the total procurement objective, will meet requirements for operational testing and evaluation and will also be sufficient to meet both initial training requirements and the first operational deployment scheduled for fiscal year 2002.

Joint primary air training system (JPATS)

The budget request contained no funds for the Navy JPATS.

The JPATS, consisting of both the T-6A aircraft and a ground-based training system, will be used by the Navy and Air Force for primary pilot training. The T-6A will replace both the Navy's T-34 and Air Force's T-37B fleets, providing safer, more economical and more effective training for future student pilots. The Air Force began procurement of the T-6A in fiscal year 1995, and the committee understands that the Navy plans to begin procurement in fiscal year 2000. The committee believes that accelerating T-6A procurement for the Navy would not only reduce procurement costs for both the Navy and the Air Force but would reduce operations and maintenance costs for both services as well. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.2 million for four T-6A aircraft to initiate the Navy's procurement of JPATS.

Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly (LESPA)

The budget request contained no funds for the LESPA.

The committee continues to support the LESPA to replace old parachutes in the P-3 and E-2C aircraft. Due to its longer repack cycle and extended service life, the committee believes that the Navy will realize substantial life cycle cost savings by procuring LESPA compared to continued use of existing parachutes. Consistent with previous actions, the committee recommends \$22.0 million to procure LESPA, including \$15.0 million for the P-3 and \$7.0 million for the E-2C.

T-45TS

The budget request contained \$282.7 million for 15 T-45C aircraft and \$60.2 million for advance procurement of 15 aircraft in fiscal year 2000. The committee notes that fiscal year 1999 is the first year of a planned five-year multiyear procurement.

The committee supports the Department's replacement of its TA-4J and T-2C training aircraft fleets due to their decreasing reliability and increasing maintenance costs. In fiscal year 1998, the committee recommended additional funding for procurement of the T-45C from 12 to 15 aircraft in order to accelerate the replacement process. Consequently, the committee supports the Department's plan to procure this aircraft using a multiyear contract. However, the committee notes unexplained cost growth in airframe ground support and peculiar training equipment. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$15.5 million for these items and understands that this reduction will not impact the airframe multiyear contract.

V-22

The budget request contained \$610.8 million to procure 7 V-22 tiltrotor aircraft and \$54.0 million for advance procurement of 10 aircraft in fiscal year 2000.

The committee continues to support accelerated V-22 procurement and endorses the Quadrennial Defense Review's (QDR) recommendation to achieve a long-term production rate of 30 aircraft per year by 2004. Additionally, the committee notes that the procurement of an additional MV-22 aircraft in fiscal year 1999 is the Commandant of the Marine Corps' highest unfunded aviation acquisition priority. However, the committee also notes excessive cost growth for peculiar ground support equipment. Therefore, consistent with its prior actions, the recommendations of the QDR, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities for fiscal year 1999, the committee recommends an increase of \$78.0 million to procure one additional aircraft. The committee also recommends a decrease of \$14.0 million for peculiar ground support equipment, resulting in a net increase of \$64.0 million.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained \$1,327.5 million for Weapons Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,192.2 million for fiscal year 1999.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise

specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
BALLISTIC MISSILES						
BALLISTIC MISSILES						
001 TRIDENT II	5	284,236	-	-	5	284,236
001 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(23,584)	-	-	-	(23,584)
002 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	62,800	-	-	-	62,800
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
003 MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	198	-	-	-	198
TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		323,660				323,660
OTHER MISSILES						
STRATEGIC MISSILES						
004 TOMAHAWK	114	129,758	(96,500)	-	-	33,258
005 ESSM	28	35,672	-	-	28	35,672
TACTICAL MISSILES						
006 AMRAAM	115	62,641	-	-	115	62,641
007 JSOW	328	125,207	-	-	328	125,207
008 STANDARD MISSILE	120	225,702	(20,000)	-	120	205,702
009 RAM	100	44,766	-	-	100	42,166
010 HELLFIRE	-	-	-	-	-	-
011 PENGUIN	-	-	-	-	-	-
012 AERIAL TARGETS	-	75,474	(2,700)	-	-	72,774
013 DRONES AND DECOYS	-	298	-	-	-	298
014 OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	-	15,238	-	-	-	15,238
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
015 TOMAHAWK MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
016 SPARROW MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
017 SIDEWINDER MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
018 HARPOON MODS	-	39,506	-	-	-	39,506
019 STANDARD MISSILE MODS	-	45,303	-	-	-	45,303
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
020 WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	27,133	(2,800)	-	-	24,333
021 FLEET SATELLITE COMM (MYP) (SPACE)	-	-	-	-	-	-
022 ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,210	-	-	-	6,210

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION -- REQUEST --		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		832,968		(124,900)		708,308
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
023 ASW TARGETS	-	4,152	-	-	-	4,152
024 VERTICAL LAUNCHED ASROC (VLA) MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
025 MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	-	15	-	-	-	15
026 MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	52,813	-	(2,200)	-	50,613
027 TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	24,206	-	-	-	24,206
028 ASW RANGE SUPPORT DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	14,672	-	-	-	14,672
029 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,979	-	-	-	1,979
TOTAL TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		97,837		(2,200)		95,637
OTHER WEAPONS						
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
030 SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	-	874	-	-	-	874
031 CIWS MODS	-	2,778	-	4,000	-	6,778
032 5/64 GUN MOUNT MODS	-	909	-	-	-	909
033 MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	-	1,951	-	-	-	1,951
034 MODS UNDER \$2 MILLION OTHER	-	1,279	-	-	-	1,279
035 PIONEER	-	19,441	-	-	-	19,441
036 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
037 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
038 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
039 JUDGEMENT FUND	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OTHER WEAPONS		27,232		4,000		31,232
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	45,918		(3,171)	-	42,747
040 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				(3,171)		42,747
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		46,918		(3,171)		42,747
041 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(9,379)		(9,379)
TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,327,645		(136,360)		1,192,195

Items of Special Interest

Close-in weapon system (CIWS) surface mode upgrade

The budget request contained \$2.8 million for CIWS modifications but included no funds for the surface mode upgrade for amphibious ships.

The CIWS is a fully autonomous, radar-directed gun system designed for anti-ship missile defense. While the existing system is effective against its designed threat, the Navy's new focus on littoral operations requires an ability to defend against small, fast surface craft for which most Navy ships have a limited defense. The surface mode upgrade adds an electro-optical infra-red radar that provides this capability. To address this deficiency, the committee recommended an increase of \$20.0 million in fiscal year 1998, of which Congress appropriated an increase of \$15.0 million. Consistent with its prior actions, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million to procure CIWS surface mode upgrade kits for amphibious ships.

The committee is concerned that continued manpower and budget reductions threaten the readiness and performance of the CIWS, which the committee understands will be maintained in the fleet beyond 2010. As a result, the committee has been advised that the Department is considering proposals that would reduce life-cycle costs of this system, including a single agency support concept. Under this concept, the Navy would contract with a single agency to integrate ordnance alteration kit production and installation with overhauls, maintenance, spares, warehousing, and shipping activities. The committee encourages the Department to conduct a fleet demonstration of this concept to assess its utility to the CIWS and other systems.

Standard missile

The budget request contained \$225.7 million for 70 Block III and 45 Block IV Standard missiles.

The committee notes a 41 percent increase in support costs, despite the fact that the total number of missiles would only increase by 15 percent from fiscal year 1998 levels. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$205.7 million, a decrease of \$20.0 million, and believes that the Department can procure the requested number of missiles within this amount.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, NAVY/MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained \$429.5 million for Ammunition Procurement, Navy/Marine Corps in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$452.0 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST --		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORP						
PROC AMMO, NAVY						
NAVY AMMUNITION						
001 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	-	22,904	-	(900)	-	22,904
002 JDAM	898	41,363	-	-	898	40,463
003 2.75 INCH ROCKETS	-	16,147	-	-	-	16,147
004 MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	-	8,816	-	-	-	8,816
005 PRACTICE BOMBS	-	40,134	-	-	-	40,134
006 CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	-	25,982	-	-	-	25,982
007 AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	-	10,370	-	-	-	10,370
008 AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	-	28,059	-	-	-	28,059
009 MARINE LOCATION MARKERS	-	1,350	-	-	-	1,350
010 JATOS	-	3,893	-	-	-	3,893
011 5 INCH/64 GUN AMMUNITION	-	21,853	-	-	-	21,853
012 EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	-	27,452	-	-	-	27,452
013 CIWS AMMUNITION	-	660	-	-	-	660
014 76MM GUN AMMUNITION	-	3,761	-	-	-	3,761
015 OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	-	4,548	-	-	-	4,548
016 SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	-	7,752	-	-	-	7,752
017 PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	-	8,938	-	-	-	8,938
018 MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	-	7,884	-	-	-	7,884
019 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL PROC AMMO, NAVY		262,866		(900)		281,966
PROC AMMO, MC						
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
020 5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	-	25,750	-	600	-	26,350
021 7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	-	196	-	700	-	896
022 LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	-	7,803	-	-	-	7,803
023 .50 CALIBER	-	1,180	-	-	-	1,180
024 40 MM, ALL TYPES	-	11,565	-	-	-	11,565
025 60 MM HE M888	-	-	-	-	-	-
026 81 MM HE	-	-	-	-	-	-
027 81MM, ALL TYPES	-	16,076	-	-	-	16,076
028 81 MM SMOKE SCREEN	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
029 120MM ALL TYPES	-	14,054	-	-	-	14,054
030 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	-	-	-	500	-	500
031 120 MM TP-T M831	-	-	-	700	-	700
032 CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	-	3,860	-	900	-	4,760
033 9 MM ALL TYPES	-	2,332	-	800	-	3,132
034 GRENADES, ALL TYPES	-	4,883	-	3,200	-	8,083
035 ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	-	21,346	-	17,000	-	38,346
036 DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	-	7,737	-	600	-	8,337
037 FUZE, ALL TYPES	-	13,645	-	-	-	13,645
038 NON LETHALS	-	984	-	-	-	984
039 AMMO MODERNIZATION	-	12,007	-	-	-	12,007
040 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL	-	3,445	-	-	-	3,445
TOTAL MARINE CORP'S AMMO, MC		148,873		25,000		171,873
041 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(1,671)		(1,671)
TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY & MARINE CORP		429,159		22,429		451,968

Item of Special Interest

Marine corps ammunition

The budget request contained \$146.7 million for procurement of ammunition.

The committee recommends \$171.7 million, an increase of \$25.0 million for the following types of ammunition:

[In millions of dollars]	
9mm all types-	\$0.8
CTG 5.56mm all types-	0.6
CTG 7.62mm all types-	0.7
CTG 25mm all types-	0.9
120mm TPCSDS-T M865-	0.5
120mm TP-T M831-	0.7
Rocket, 83mm Dual Mode PIP-	17.0
Fuze, Hand Grenade, practice-	2.5
Grenade, Hand Smoke Green-	0.5
Grenade, Hand Practice Smoke TA M83-	0.2
Igniter, Time Fuze Blasting-	0.6

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained \$6,252.7 million for Shipbuilding and Conversion,

Navy in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$5,992.4 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
OTHER WARSHIPS						
001 CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
002 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	124,515	-	-	-	124,515
003 SSN-21	-	-	-	-	-	-
004 NEW SSN	1	2,195,783	-	10,000	1	2,205,783
004 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(697,618)	-	-	-	(697,618)
005 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	504,736	-	-	-	504,736
006 CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	-	-	-	-	-	-
006 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
007 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	274,980	-	-	-	274,980
008 DDG-51	3	2,799,029	-	(5,000)	3	2,794,029
008 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(126,951)	-	-	-	(126,951)
009 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	7,396	-	-	-	7,396
010 LCAC	-	-	-	16,000	-	16,000
TOTAL OTHER WARSHIPS		5,081,870		21,000		5,102,870
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
010 LPD-17	1	734,886	-	-	1	734,886
010 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(96,106)	-	-	-	(96,106)
011 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
011A LHD-8 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
TOTAL AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		638,780		10,000		648,780
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YEAR PROGRAM						
012 AE(CONV)	-	-	-	-	-	-
013 OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	1	75,936	-	-	1	75,936
013 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(15,595)	-	-	-	(15,595)
014 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
015 SERVICE CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
016 STRATEGIC SEALIFT	1	251,400	-	(251,400)	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
017 LCAC LANDING CRAFT	-	-	-	-	-	-
018 OUTFITTING	-	95,680	-	(7,700)	-	87,980
019 POST DELIVERY	-	123,277	-	(8,300)	-	114,977
020 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,324	-	-	-	1,324
TOTAL AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM		632,022		(267,400)		264,622
021 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(23,911)		(23,911)
TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		6,252,872		(260,311)		5,992,361

Items of Special Interest

Landing craft air cushion (LCAC) service life extension program (SLEP)

The budget request contained no funds for LCAC SLEP.

The LCAC is the only surface platform that can provide high-speed, heavy lift for Marine Corps amphibious operations from over-the-horizon. Despite the Department's failure to provide funding for an LCAC SLEP in fiscal years 1997 and 1998, Congress added \$2.9 million in fiscal year 1997 and \$19.5 million in fiscal year 1998 to begin to correct serious corrosion problems on the LCACs that, if not addressed, would force them out of service long before they reach their planned twenty-year operational life. The Department plans to begin the LCAC SLEP in fiscal year 2000.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded requirements list for fiscal year 1999 identified acceleration of the LCAC SLEP as his number one shipbuilding and conversion priority. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$16.0 million for the service life extension of two LCACs.

LPD-17

The budget request contained \$638.8 million for LPD-18, the second ship of 12 in the LPD-17 class of new amphibious ships.

The committee has recently learned that the AN/SPY-1 radar and its associated combat system has been proposed to the Navy as an alternative to the currently planned combat system of the LPD-17 class of amphibious ships. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide to the congressional defense committees an analysis of alternatives that compares the AN/SPY-1 radar and its associated combat system with the currently-planned combat system or any other combat systems under consideration for the LPD-17 class by March 30, 1999. This analysis should consider current and future requirements for combat systems capability, as well as schedule and life-cycle cost impacts of the various alternatives.

National defense features

The committee continues its strong support for the National Defense Features (NDF) program and believes that a robust NDF program will provide superior ships to support mobilization requirements, preserve domestic shipbuilding and supplier base jobs, and assist U.S. shipyards in gaining commercial market share. The incorporation of defense features into newly built commercial vehicle carriers would be a cost effective method to both expand surge sea-lift capability and recapitalize the Ready Reserve Fleet.

The committee believes that entry into the commercial vehicle carrier market is a key element for the success of the NDF program. The committee reaffirms that the NDF program and, specifically, the entry of new U.S. built commercial vehicle carriers equipped with NDF into the U.S.-Japan shipping market are in the national interest. The committee expects the Navy to follow the committee's guidance and to more aggressively execute the NDF program. Furthermore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to enlist the cooperation of the Government of Japan to over-

come restrictions which inhibit U.S. flag carrier participation in the Japan trade market. Such cooperation will advance the mutual security interests of both nations.

New attack submarine (NSSN)

The budget request contained \$1,498.2 million for the second NSSN and \$504.7 million for advance procurement of the third NSSN in fiscal year 2001.

The committee has learned that the budget request underfunds the integration of the non-propulsion electronic systems (NPES). The NPES is composed of 24 subsystems, including sonar, combat control, and electronic support measures. The committee understands that underfunding NPES integration would add future cost risk to this program and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to address the integration shortfall.

Strategic sealift

The budget request contained \$251.4 million for procurement of the final Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) vessel.

Prior to the fiscal year 1999 budget request, procurement of strategic sealift vessels was budgeted, authorized and appropriated in the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF). The NDSF is a revolving fund that was specifically established by the Congress to give autonomy and visibility to the critical mission area of strategic sealift, in recognition of the low priority sealift had been previously accorded by the Navy. Consolidating the acquisition of sealift assets and their operations into a single account was intended to protect it from competing with other Navy priorities in the budget formulation and program execution processes. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of \$251.4 million to the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy request and an increase of \$251.4 million to the NDSF request in order to reflect the procurement of the final LMSR in the NDSF.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained \$3,937.7 million for Other Procurement, Navy in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$3,969.5 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	-	8,700	-	-	-	8,700
ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	-	6,737	-	-	-	6,737
STEAM PROPULSION IMPROVEMENT	-	617	-	-	-	617
OTHER PROPULSION EQUIPMENT	-	10,336	-	-	-	10,336
GENERATORS	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER GENERATORS	-	9,637	-	-	-	9,637
PUMPS	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER PUMPS	-	1,017	-	-	-	1,017
PROPELLERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	-	7,937	-	-	-	7,937
OTHER PROPELLERS AND SHAFTS	-	2,460	-	-	-	2,460
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	-	45,259	-	20,500	-	65,759
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	-	7,658	-	-	-	7,658
PERISCOPES	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	-	31,864	-	(3,000)	-	28,864
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	10,067	-	-	-	10,067
COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	-	9,787	-	-	-	9,787
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	149,669	-	(19,400)	-	130,269
SUBMARINE SILENCING EQUIPMENT	-	3,456	-	-	-	3,456
SUBMARINE BATTERIES	-	8,651	-	-	-	8,651
SSN21 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	15,475	-	-	-	15,475
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	10,345	-	-	-	10,345
USSP EQUIPMENT	-	10,470	-	-	-	10,470
MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	-	384	-	-	-	384
HM&E ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION	-	59,121	-	(3,100)	-	55,021
SURFACE IMA	-	661	-	-	-	661
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROLS	-	-	-	-	-	-
MINIMICROMINI ELECTRONIC REPAIR	-	518	-	-	-	518
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
REACTOR POWER UNITS	-	227,338	-	(27,300)	-	200,038

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
026 REACTOR COMPONENTS	-	211,382	-	(10,500)	-	200,882
027 OCEAN ENGINEERING	-	5,688	-	-	-	5,688
028 DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	-	8,174	-	-	-	8,174
028 EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	-	1,389	-	-	-	1,389
028 SMALL BOATS	-	1,842	-	-	-	1,842
028 STANDARD BOATS	-	673	-	-	-	673
030 TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	96,752	-	(6,000)	-	90,752
030 OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
031 PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
031 PRODUCTION SUPPORT FACILITIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
032 OPERATING FORCES IPE	-	-	-	-	-	-
032 OTHER SHIP SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
033 NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		963,074		(48,800)		914,274
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
034 SHIP RADARS	-	23	-	-	-	23
034 ANSPS-40	-	-	-	-	-	-
035 ANSPS-48	-	1,036	-	-	-	1,036
036 ANSPS-49	-	-	-	-	-	-
037 ANSYS-I	-	1	-	-	-	1
038 MK-23 TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM	-	1,260	-	9,000	-	10,260
039 RADAR SUPPORT	-	11,756	-	-	-	11,756
040 TISS	-	-	-	-	-	-
041 SHIP SONARS	-	15	-	-	-	15
041 SURFACE SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	27,432	-	(8,700)	-	18,732
042 ANSQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	-	133,535	-	(1,200)	-	132,335
043 SSN ACOUSTICS	-	1	-	-	-	1
044 SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME	-	8,915	-	-	-	8,915
045 SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	12,785	-	(1,000)	-	11,785
046 SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
046 ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
047 SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	-	7,326	-	-	-	7,326
048 SSTD	-	836	-	-	-	836
049 ACOUSTIC COMMUNICATIONS	-	401	-	-	-	401

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
050 FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	9,553	-	-	-	9,553
051 SURTASS	-	12,712	-	-	-	12,712
052 ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	-	2,658	-	-	-	2,658
053 CARRIER ASW MODULE	-	443	-	-	-	443
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
054 AN/SQ-32	-	1,469	-	-	-	1,469
055 AN/MLR-1	-	1,809	-	-	-	1,809
056 INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	-	4,312	-	-	-	4,312
057 EW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
058 C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	6,080	-	-	-	6,080
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
059 SHIPBOARD CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	-	40,238	-	-	-	40,238
060 COMBAT DF	-	-	-	-	-	-
061 OUTBOARD	-	-	-	-	-	-
062 BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTEN	-	73,542	-	-	-	73,542
SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
063 AN/MLQ-4	-	2,858	-	-	-	2,858
064 SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	-	3,936	-	-	-	3,936
OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
065 NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	-	34	-	-	-	34
066 COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	-	47,332	-	35,000	-	82,332
067 JMCIS AFLOAT	-	38,324	-	-	-	38,324
067A CIGSS	-	-	-	65,627	-	65,627
068 NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	-	73,333	-	-	-	73,333
069 ATDL	-	33,021	-	-	-	33,021
070 MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	-	32,834	-	-	-	32,834
071 SHALLOW WATER MCM	-	8,913	-	-	-	8,913
072 NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	-	9,542	-	-	-	9,542
073 HF LINK-11 DATA TERMINALS	-	-	-	-	-	-
074 ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	-	16,069	-	-	-	16,069
075 STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	12,687	-	(1,000)	-	11,687
TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
076 OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	1,040	-	-	-	1,040
077 OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	29,424	-	-	-	29,424
078 AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT	-	10,123	-	-	-	10,123
MATCALS	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
079 SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	-	8,588	-	-	-	8,588
080 AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	-	10,095	-	-	-	10,095
081 NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	-	28,201	-	-	-	28,201
082 TACAN	-	-	-	-	-	-
083 AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	6,776	-	-	-	6,776
084 MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	-	5,249	-	-	-	5,249
085 FACS/FAC	-	4,633	-	-	-	4,633
086 ID SYSTEMS	-	15,330	-	-	-	15,330
087 SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	-	5,321	-	-	-	5,321
088 TAC AC MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS) OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT	-	23,666	-	-	-	23,666
089 JMCIS ASHORE	-	4,517	-	-	-	4,517
090 JMCIS OED	-	343	-	-	-	343
091 TADIX-B	-	12,377	-	-	-	12,377
092 JMCIS TACTICAL/MOBILE	-	3,982	-	-	-	3,982
093 RAD/AC	-	4,035	-	-	-	4,035
094 GPE/TE	-	9,659	-	-	-	9,659
095 INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	-	4,482	-	-	-	4,482
096 CALIBRATION STANDARDS	-	1,871	-	-	-	1,871
097 EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	-	7,536	-	-	-	7,536
098 SHORE ELEC ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS	-	2,559	-	-	-	2,559
099 SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	-	34,397	-	-	-	34,397
100 PORTABLE RADIOS	-	10,913	-	-	-	10,913
101 SINGGARS	-	27,888	-	-	-	27,888
102 SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	-	90,638	-	-	-	90,638
103 SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER \$2 MILLION SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS	-	24,220	-	(1,900)	-	22,320
104 SHORE LFM/LF COMMUNICATIONS	-	13,028	-	-	-	13,028
105 SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	-	94,583	-	-	-	94,583
106 ADVANCED VLF RECEIVER SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS	-	17,171	-	-	-	17,171
107 SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	-	145,193	-	10,000	-	155,193
108 SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE) SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	-	71,077	-	-	-	71,077
109 JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	-	3,363	-	-	-	3,363

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
109A INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE				10,271		10,271
110 NSIPS						7,707
111 JEDMICS		7,707				
112 GCCS EQUIPMENT		2,944				2,944
113 NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		113,546		(3,000)		110,546
114 SECURE VOICE SYSTEM		-				-
115 SECURE DATA SYSTEM		-				-
116 INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		45,990				45,990
117 KEY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT		21,216				21,216
118 CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-				-
119 OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-				-
TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENTS		1,630,802		113,298		1,644,100
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SONOBUOYS						
120 ANSSQ-38 (BT)		1,360				1,360
121 ANSSQ-53 (DIFAR)		37,257				37,257
122 ANSSQ-57 (SPECIAL PURPOSE)		2,435				2,435
123 ANSSQ-62 (DICASS)		20,688				20,688
124 ANSSQ-101 (ADAR)		16,560				16,560
125 ANSSQ-110		-				-
126 SIGNAL UNDERWATER SOUND (SUS) AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,302				1,302
127 WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,064		15,000		23,064
128 EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		5,019				5,019
129 AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		12,912				12,912
130 AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		39,749				39,749
131 PIONEER UAV (DARP)		-				-
132 PIONEER UAV (DARP)		-				-
133 METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		32,892				32,892
134 OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT		623				623
135 AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		22,277				22,277

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
135 AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	-	39,406	-	-	-	39,406
137 LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
138 REWSON PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	855	-	-	-	855
139 STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
140 OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,264	-	-	-	4,264
TOTAL AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		245,663		15,000		260,663
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
141 GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	20,203	-	-	-	20,203
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
142 MK-92 FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	-	961	-	-	-	961
143 HARPOON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
144 TARTAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	1	-	-	-	1
145 POINT DEFENSE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	38	-	-	-	38
146 AIRBORNE ECM/ECCM	-	-	-	-	-	-
147 ENGAGEMENT SYSTEMS SUPPORT	-	307	-	(307)	-	-
148 NATO SEASPARROW	-	5,156	-	-	-	5,156
149 RAM GMLS	-	59,760	-	-	-	59,760
150 SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	-	22,944	-	-	-	22,944
151 AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	83,169	-	-	-	83,169
152 SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	90,209	-	(200)	-	90,009
153 SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	-	3,961	-	-	-	3,961
154 VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	-	7,791	-	-	-	7,791
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
155 STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	-	2,972	-	-	-	2,972
156 STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	-	283,612	-	(5,000)	-	278,612
157 ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	-	21,504	-	-	-	21,504
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
158 SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	17,460	-	-	-	17,460
159 SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	3,740	-	-	-	3,740
160 SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,967	-	-	-	4,967
161 ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,562	-	-	-	4,562
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
162 EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	-	7,274	-	-	-	7,274

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1969 AUTHORIZATION -- REQUEST --		FY 1969 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1969 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
163 UNMANNED SEABORNE TARGET	-	1,954	-	-	-	1,954
164 INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES CALIBRATION EQUIPMENT	-	1,034	-	-	-	1,034
165 STOCK SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	-	1,421	-	-	-	1,421
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE	-	-	-	-	-	-
166 FLEET MINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	11	-	-	-	11
167 SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	5,891	-	-	-	5,891
168 SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	-	23,801	-	-	-	23,801
169 INDUSTRIAL DEPOT MAINTENANCE	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		674,703		(5,507)		669,196
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	255	-	-	-	255
170 ARMORED SEDANS	-	3,224	-	-	246	3,224
171 PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	246	4,120	-	-	-	4,120
172 SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	-	2,322	-	-	-	2,322
173 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	-	1,034	-	-	-	1,034
174 FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	-	1,251	-	-	-	1,251
175 TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	27,688	-	-	-	27,688
176 AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	-	1,125	-	-	-	1,125
177 COMBAT CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT EQUIP	-	425	-	-	-	425
178 MOBILE UTILITIES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	419	-	-	-	419
179 COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
180 OCEAN CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	-	28,039	-	(5,500)	-	22,539
181 POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
182 OTHER CIVIL ENG SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		69,902		(5,500)		64,402
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
183 FORKLIFT TRUCKS	-	6,824	-	-	-	6,824
184 MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
185 OTHER MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	-	1,951	-	-	-	1,951
186 OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,419	-	-	-	4,419
187 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
188 SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	-	95,711	(27,080)	(27,080)	-	68,631
TOTAL SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		108,905		(27,080)		81,825
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
TRAINING DEVICES						
189 TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,174	-	5,000	-	7,174
190 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	17,916	-	-	-	17,916
191 MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	2,536	-	-	-	2,536
192 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	21,684	-	-	-	21,684
193 OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,684	-	-	-	4,684
194 NAVAL RESERVE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
195 ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	16,666	-	-	-	16,666
196 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
197 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
198 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (87)	-	-	-	-	-	-
199 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (88)	-	-	-	-	-	-
200 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJ (89)	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		65,660		5,000		70,660
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
201 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	279,028	(4,200)	(4,200)	-	274,828
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		279,028		(4,200)		274,828
202 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES	-	-	(10,441)	(10,441)	-	(10,441)
TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		3,937,737		31,770		3,969,507

Items of Special Interest

AN/BPS-15(H) submarine navigation radar upgrade

The budget request contained no funds for upgrading the AN/BPS-15(H) submarine navigation radar to make it compliant with the Navy's new electronic chart display information systems (ECDIS-N) requirement.

ECDIS-N compliance mandates the elimination of paper navigation charts on submarines by upgrading their radar navigation systems with computer-based charts designed to international commercial-off-the-shelf standards. The committee supports the ECDIS-N requirement and recommends an increase of \$9.0 million to provide for software and hardware upgrades to the AN/BPS-15(H) in order to meet it. The committee believes that this increase will further enhance the safety and improve the operational capability of the Navy's submarine fleet.

AN/SQQ-89 surface anti-submarine warfare (ASW) combat system

The budget request contained \$27.4 million for the AN/SQQ-89 ASW combat system, including \$8.7 million for upgrade of existing systems on DDG-51 destroyers.

The AN/SQQ-89 detects, classifies, and localizes threat attack submarines, and the planned upgrade is intended to improve its shallow water capabilities. However, subsequent to the submission of the Department's budget request, the committee was informed that the upgrade cannot be integrated into the existing systems. The committee has also learned that a fleet evaluation demonstrated that portions of the upgrade may not be effective or suitable to field. Moreover, limited developmental testing of a related classification system showed that it, too, may not meet performance requirements. As a result of these deficiencies, the committee understands that the Navy is reviewing and revising its AN/SQQ-89 upgrade program to develop and procure a fully integrated system in fiscal year 2003. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$8.7 million for this upgrade.

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

The budget request contained \$145.2 million for SATCOM ship terminals, but included no funds for AN/USC-42 mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals.

The AN/USC-42 Mini-DAMA is a commercial-off-the-shelf miniaturized submarine transceiver version of the DAMA terminal. DAMA terminals quadruple the UHF satellite channel capacity through multiplexing, thus providing adequate satellite access to meet user requirements without requiring an increase in the number of satellites on orbit. The committee has learned that at less than one-tenth the size or weight of previous UHF systems, the AN/USC-42 mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminal digitizes, encrypts, transmits and receives data and voice transmissions at more than ten times the efficiency of terminals without DAMA capability. The committee understands fiscal year 1999 is the final production year for the AN/USC-42 terminal and that the Depart-

ment has an operational requirement for 115 AN/USC-42 terminals but has only budgeted for 72, leaving a shortfall of 43 terminals. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to procure additional mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals and associated spare parts.

Beamhit laser marksmanship training system (LMTS)

The budget request contained \$2.2 million for training support equipment, but included no funds for the Beamhit LMTS.

The committee is aware of the improved marksmanship qualification scores achieved by Army, Army National Guard, Army Reserve and Navy personnel with the Beamhit LMTS. By using this system, the committee understands that military personnel may train with their own weapons and do so under home station conditions thereby conserving ammunition and other resources. The committee has also learned that the Army Dismounted Battlespace Lab at Fort Benning, Georgia, determined that the Beamhit LMTS was so precise that it could be used to correct the aim of both weapons and aiming devices. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for this system and encourages the Secretary of Defense to examine its utility for use throughout the Department.

Cooperative engagement capability (CEC)

The budget request contained \$47.3 million for four CEC systems.

CEC allows theater air and missile defense weapons to operate as a single system by distributing sensor data from any ship or aircraft in the battle group to other platforms through a real-time, line-of-sight, high-data-rate network. For fiscal year 1998, the Chief of Naval Operations identified nine CEC systems as one of his top three unfunded procurement priorities, and the Congress provided \$75.0 million to procure the seven needed for a carrier battle group. The committee understands that the Navy still requires five additional CEC systems for training and operational requirements. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$35.0 million to meet this requirement.

Weapons range support

The budget request contained \$8.1 million for weapons range support, but included no funds to procure a deployable rangeless air combat training system (DRACTS) or to procure mobile remote emitter simulator (MRES) systems for the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF).

The DRACTS is an air combat training system used by a deployed aircraft carrier battle group as a primary means of fleet readiness training. The committee has been advised that DRACTS capability can be achieved by leveraging the Navy's existing Large Area Tracking Range (LATR) capability through the addition of an off-the-shelf processor and by the reconfiguration of existing software. In its present configuration, the LATR tracks aircraft and vessels during large-scale battle group, mine warfare, and air combat training exercises. The committee notes that a future such system, the Joint Tactical Combat Training System (JTCTS), is under

development and, elsewhere in this report, recommends an increase to accelerate this process. However, to improve the near-term readiness of deployed carrier battle groups, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million to procure additional DRACTS components.

The MRES, which is employed with the LATR system, is a high-power electronic warfare simulator system capable of illuminating aircraft, ships and various other signal collection platforms. The system will also be capable of receiving active electronic countermeasures (ECM) transmissions for spectrum viewing and evaluation of ECM techniques. Existing threat simulators at the PMRF are low-fidelity emitters designed to track only ships and submarines and do not have the capability to track fast-moving fighter and attack aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to procure two MRES systems for the PMRF to improve electronic warfare training for the Pacific fleet.

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

The budget request contained \$45.3 million for other navigation equipment, including \$22.0 million for the procurement of 26 WSN-7 RLGs, but included no funds for the WQN-2 DVSL. The WSN-7 RLG is the common RLG for both surface and subsurface platforms. The WQN-2 has been designated by the Navy as the fleet standard speed log to replace the existing logs which were designed in the 1950s.

The committee understands that RLGs are less expensive, more reliable, more accurate, and have lower cost of ownership than the existing WSN-1, -3, and -5 navigators that they replace. The committee also understands that savings in maintenance costs alone will pay for replacement RLGs in three to four years. For these reasons, fleet commanders have emphasized the need to accelerate WSN-7 RLG installation. Consequently, the committee recommended an increase of \$18.0 million to accelerate the procurement of RLGs for fiscal year 1998. Consistent with its previous action, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million to continue to accelerate the procurement and installation of the WSN-7 RLG.

The committee notes that the Navy has not budgeted funding to modify the input/output boards of the WSN-7 RLG to make it compatible with the antiquated speed logs throughout the fleet. Since the WQN-2 is already compatible with these I/O boards, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million to initiate replacement of the existing speed logs and eliminate the need for unnecessary, expensive modification of existing speed logs. However, the committee understands that there are at least two versions of the WQN-2 that could be competed for production. Accordingly, the committee also recommends an increase of \$2.5 million to test and evaluate a second version for a possible future production competition.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request contained \$745.9 million for Procurement, Marine Corps in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$691.9 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
001 AAV7A1 PIP	-	89,934	-	-	-	89,934
002 LAV PIP	-	1,384	-	-	-	1,384
003 LIGHT ARMORED VEHICLE	-	-	-	-	-	-
004 MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	-	5,726	-	-	-	5,726
005 ITEMS UNDER \$2M (TRKD VEH)	-	97	-	-	-	97
006 ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
007 MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	-	1,809	-	-	-	1,809
007 ITEMS UNDER \$2M (ALL OTHER)	-	105	-	-	-	105
008 MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	-	2,075	-	-	-	2,075
009 WEAPONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
009 155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	-	10,002	-	-	-	10,002
TOTAL WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		111,132		-		111,132
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
010 HAWK MOD	-	981	-	-	-	981
011 JAVELIN	741	82,842	-	-	741	82,842
012 PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	-	218	-	-	-	218
013 OTHER SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
013 MODIFICATION KITS	-	-	-	-	-	-
014 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		84,041		-		84,041
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
015 REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	-	19,312	-	(7,000)	-	12,312
016 AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	-	9,240	-	-	-	9,240
016 GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP.	-	-	-	-	-	-
017 INTELLCOMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)	-	155	-	-	-	155
018 AN/TPQ-36 FIRE FINDER RADAR UPGRADE	-	10,363	-	-	-	10,363
019 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	4,791	-	-	-	4,791
019 MOD KITS (INTEL)	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTMIE CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
020 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (INTELL)	-	-	-	1,000	-	1,000
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
021 GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	-	4,416	-	-	-	4,416
OTHER COMMELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
022 NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	-	11,563	-	-	-	11,563
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)	-	-	-	-	-	-
023 COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	-	7,134	-	-	-	7,134
024 MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	-	19,307	-	(3,000)	-	16,307
RADIO SYSTEMS	-	52,902	-	(4,000)	-	48,902
025 COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	-	75,781	-	(23,000)	-	52,781
027 COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	-	57,862	-	-	-	57,862
028 MOD KITS MAGTF C41	-	27,427	-	-	-	27,427
029 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M MAGTF C41	-	2,436	-	-	-	2,436
030 MODIFICATION KITS (OTHER)	-	-	-	-	-	-
031 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M (OTHER)	-	4,332	-	-	-	4,332
032 AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	-	11,505	-	-	-	11,505
TOTAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		318,526		(36,000)		282,526
SUPPORT VEHICLES						
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES	-	1,248	-	-	37	1,248
033 COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	37	1,248	-	-	-	1,248
034 COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	-	8,621	-	-	-	8,621
TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	1,745	-	-	-	1,745
035 54AT TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	-	83,717	-	(9,800)	-	73,917
036 MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	240	83,717	-	-	240	83,917
037 LT TACTICAL VEHICLE REMANUFACTURE (LTRV)	-	39,263	-	-	-	39,263
038 LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	-	3,106	-	-	-	3,106
039 TRAILERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
040 MODIFICATION KITS	-	3,594	-	-	-	3,594
041 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL SUPPORT VEHICLES		141,494		(9,800)		131,694
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
042 ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	-	3,013	-	(800)	-	2,213
043 BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
044 ADVANCED DEMOLITION KITS	-	2,949	-	-	-	2,949
045 POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	-	5,097	-	(1,400)	-	3,697
046 SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	-	5,972	-	(3,000)	-	2,972
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
047 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	514	-	-	-	514
048 AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	-	3,723	-	-	-	3,723
049 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	-	1,856	-	-	-	1,856
050 GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	-	5,509	-	(400)	-	5,109
051 WAREHOUSE MODERNIZATION	-	1,495	-	-	-	1,495
052 MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	6,453	-	-	-	6,453
053 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	1,864	-	-	-	1,864
GENERAL PROPERTY						
054 FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	-	2,184	-	-	-	2,184
055 TRAINING DEVICES	-	3,305	-	-	-	3,305
056 CONTAINER FAMILY	-	7,074	-	-	-	7,074
OTHER SUPPORT						
057 MODIFICATION KITS	-	1,228	-	-	-	1,228
058 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MIL	-	1,853	-	-	-	1,853
059 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENT (M)	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		54,089		(5,600)		48,489
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
060 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	36,576	-	-	-	36,576
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		36,576		-		36,576
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES						
061 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES	-	-	-	(2,590)	-	(2,590)
TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		745,858		(53,950)		691,868

Items of Special Interest

Marine corps electronic warfare support system

The budget request contained \$16.4 million for acquiring two Marine Corps Electronic Warfare Support Systems (MEWSS).

Because of developmental problems and delays in the testing and fielding of the MEWSS, the committee directs that none of the funds authorized may be obligated until completion of a successful initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E).

Although the development of the MEWSS is common with that of the Army's Ground-Based Common Sensor (GBCS) system and that the IOT&E of the MEWSS is directly dependent to the testing of the GBCS, the committee does not see a specific need to make a successful IOT&E of MEWSS contingent on a successful IOT&E of GBCS.

Marine corps tactical intelligence equipment

The budget requested contained no funds for purchasing and evaluating commercial imagery display tools or modern printer technologies.

The committee is aware of the Marine Corps' highly successful evaluation of the Remote Replication System (RRS). The RRS allows the Marine Expeditionary Force (MEF) to deploy with automated equipment that provides the capability to "reach back" to National Imagery and Mapping Agency data bases and "pull forward" data in order to construct mapping and imagery products. The committee believes this concept has the potential to reduce drastically the paper products with which the MEF currently deploys. However, despite the success of the RRS concept, the committee understands that there has been little attention paid to providing modern display and printing technologies. Therefore the committee recommends \$1.0 million for purchasing and evaluating commercial imagery manipulation tools, state-of-the-art display devices and high quality large format printers for field use.

Medium tactical vehicle replacement (MTVR)

The budget request contained \$83.7 million for procurement of replacement vehicles for five-ton trucks, of which \$19.8 million was for training devices in support of the replacement vehicles. The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy has requested authorization to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the MTVR program.

The MTVR is the upgraded vehicle replacement for the current M809/M939 five-ton truck. Major improvements include an expanded 7½-ton off-road and up to 12-ton on-road cargo capacity, a new electronically controlled engine and transmission, independent suspension, central tire inflation system, antilock brakes, traction control, corrosion control, and safety and ergonomic features. While the committee supports the use of training and simulation devices to reduce costs of vehicle operations and maintenance, it questions the procurement of such a large number of these devices prior to a contract being awarded for low rate initial production of the vehicle they support. Therefore, the committee recommends \$73.9 million, a decrease of \$9.8 million for training devices. The

committee also approves the Secretary's request to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the MTRV program.

Unit cost growth

The budget request contained \$745.9 million for Procurement, Marine Corps in fiscal year 1999.

The committee is encouraged that the budget request is 50 percent higher than the fiscal year 1998 budget request. However, the committee notes that a number of programs have experienced unjustified unit cost growth even though for several programs twice as many units are planned to be procured in fiscal year 1999 than were procured in fiscal year 1998. The committee is concerned by these increases, and, therefore, recommends a decrease for the programs reflected in the table below.

[In millions of dollars]

Automatic Test Equipment System:	
Third Echelon Test Set-	\$7.0
Communications Switching and Control Systems:	
Tactical Data Network (TDN) Gateway/Shelter-	6.0
TDN Server	17.0
Environmental Control Equipment Assorted:	
Enhanced Refrigeration Unit-	0.5
Recycling Unit-	0.3
Power Equipment Assorted:	
Generator, 30 Kw/60 Hz-	0.9
Generator, 30 Kw/60 Hz-	0.5
Garrison Mobile Engineer Equipment-	0.4

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained \$7,756.5 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$8,219.1 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE						
001 B-1B (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
002 B-2A (MYP)	-	-	-	-	-	-
TACTICAL FORCES						
003 ADVANCED TACTICAL FIGHTER	2	688,058	-	-	2	688,058
003 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(72,964)	-	-	-	(72,964)
004 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	190,210	-	-	-	190,210
005 F-15A	-	11,000	-	-	-	11,000
005 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(11,000)	-	-	-	(11,000)
006 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
007 F-16 C/D (MYP)	-	-	2	60,000	2	60,000
TOTAL COMBAT AIRCRAFT		785,304		60,000		845,304
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
008 C-17 (MYP)	13	2,924,192	-	-	13	2,924,192
008 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(327,200)	-	-	-	(327,200)
009 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	303,500	-	-	-	303,500
010 EC-130J	-	-	1	51,500	1	51,500
OTHER AIRLIFT						
011 C-130H	-	11,176	-	(11,176)	-	-
012 C-130J	1	63,762	3	174,000	4	237,762
013 WC-130J	-	-	1	59,700	1	59,700
TOTAL AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		2,975,450		274,024		3,249,474
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
014 JPATS	19	107,086	3	(27,100)	22	79,986
015 TANKER, TRANSPORT, TRAINER SYSTEM	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL TRAINER AIRCRAFT		107,086		(27,100)		79,986

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
HELICOPTERS						
016 HH-60G	-	-	-	-	-	-
017 V-22 OSPREY	-	22,276	-	(22,276)	-	-
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
018 CIVIL AIR PATROL AC	27	2,619	-	-	27	2,619
019 SMALL VCX	-	-	-	-	-	-
020 C-32A	2	180,901	-	-	2	180,901
021 DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
022 E-8C	2	578,209	-	(13,000)	2	565,209
LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(115,158)	-	-	-	(115,158)
023 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	72,000	-	72,000
024 PREDATOR UAV	15	114,492	-	-	15	114,492
024A GLOBAL HAWK	-	-	-	32,500	-	32,500
TOTAL OTHER AIRCRAFT		763,339		69,224		832,563
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
025 B-2A	-	15,681	-	-	-	15,681
026 B-1B	-	91,614	-	-	-	91,614
027 B-52	-	38,308	-	-	-	38,308
028 F-117	-	25,654	-	-	-	25,654
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
029 A-10	-	31,088	-	-	-	31,088
030 F/RF-4	-	-	-	-	-	-
031 F-15	-	196,579	-	34,800	-	231,379
032 F-16	-	229,319	-	5,100	1	234,419
033 EF-111	-	-	-	-	-	-
034 T1A1-37	-	90	-	-	-	90
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
035 C-5	-	63,635	-	(400)	-	63,235
036 C-9	-	9,462	-	2,300	-	11,762
037 C-17A	-	45,704	-	(2,200)	-	43,504
038 C-21	-	59,938	-	22,200	-	82,138

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
039 C-22	-	180	-	-	-	180
040 C-STOL	-	-	-	-	-	-
041 C-137	-	-	-	-	-	-
042 C-141	-	33,412	-	4,200	-	37,612
043 T-1	-	7,739	-	-	-	7,739
044 T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	-	95	-	-	-	95
045 T-38	-	53,570	-	-	-	53,570
046 T-41 AIRCRAFT	-	95	-	-	-	95
047 T-43	-	2,233	-	-	-	2,233
048 OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	43,710	-	10,900	-	54,610
049 KC-10A (ATCA)	-	3,820	-	(2,300)	-	1,520
050 C-12	-	354	-	-	-	354
051 C-20 MODS	-	6,610	-	-	-	6,610
052 VC-25A MOD	-	7,424	-	5,800	-	13,224
053 C-130	-	119,592	-	(900)	-	118,692
054 C-135	-	261,070	-	(5,500)	-	255,570
055 DARP	-	139,242	-	-	-	139,242
056 E-3	-	114,181	-	-	-	114,181
057 E-4	-	13,987	-	(3,200)	-	10,787
058 E-6	-	44,179	-	(11,800)	-	32,379
059 H-1	-	1,911	-	-	-	1,911
060 H-60	-	17,224	-	-	-	17,224
061 OTHER AIRCRAFT	-	17,702	-	-	-	17,702
062 PREDATOR MODS	-	3,469	-	-	-	3,469
063 OTHER MODIFICATIONS CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	-	7,517	-	-	-	7,517
TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		1,736,388		89,000		1,796,388
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS	-	524,829	-	(2,431)	-	522,398
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		524,829		(2,431)		522,398

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITE						
065 COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	152,109	-	(4,200)	-	147,909
066 A-10 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	11,414	-	(1,900)	-	9,514
067 B-2A	-	189,869	-	86,000	-	275,869
068 C-5	-	28,502	-	(3,500)	-	25,002
069 F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	7,851	-	-	-	7,851
070 F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	-	27,289	-	-	-	27,289
071 H-1	-	-	-	-	-	-
072 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	19,109	-	-	-	19,109
073 WAR CONSUMABLES	-	49,396	-	-	-	49,396
074 MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	-	221,464	-	(10,100)	-	211,364
075 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	-	4,963	-	-	-	4,963
076 OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES - SOF	-	-	-	-	-	-
077 CANCELLED ACCOUNT PY ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
DARP	-	152,113	-	(10,300)	-	141,813
DARP	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		864,079		56,000		920,079
078 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES		(26,115)		(26,115)		(26,115)
TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		7,756,475		462,602		8,219,077

Items of Special Interest

Bomber modernization

The budget request contained \$189.9 million in post production support for the B-2 bomber and \$15.7 million, \$91.6 million and \$38.3 million for aircraft modifications for the B-2, B-1, and B-52 bombers, respectively.

The Long Range Airpower Review panel was mandated by section 8131 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105-56) to "evaluate the adequacy of current planning for United States long range airpower and the requirement for continued low rate production of B-2 stealth bombers." The panel concluded that in order to reach the full potential of the current bomber fleet, consisting of B-52s, B-1s, and B-2s, additional investments in upgrades should be fully supported. The committee endorses this conclusion and believes that upgrades to each of these aircraft, but especially the very small fleet of B-2 bombers, must be a priority. The committee received testimony from the panel that upgrades to the B-2 identified by the Air Force will solve a number of the problems concerning low observable maintainability, further enhance the B-2's stealthiness, as well as significantly improve situational awareness for B-2 crews. The panel strongly recommended that these upgrades be funded, and the committee understands that funding added to the B-2 program by Congress in fiscal year 1998 will meet the costs of many, but not all, of these improvements. Consequently, the committee recommends \$275.9 million for B-2 post production support, an increase of \$86.0 million to continue to enhance the B-2's operational effectiveness.

The panel also stated that a long-term bomber force structure plan, which includes consideration of additional bomber aircraft procurement, needs to be developed to ensure sustainment of the bomber force. The committee agrees with this assessment and, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare such a plan and submit it to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 1999. The plan should identify upgrades required for the current bomber fleet, a funding profile for these upgrades, and a timeline for consideration of the acquisition of a follow-on bomber.

C-130J

The budget request contained \$63.8 million for one C-130J aircraft. No funds were requested for any C-130J variant—the EC-130J, the WC-130J, and the KC-130J.

The committee recommends an increase of \$397.6 million for seven additional aircraft. Two of these are to be configured as KC-130J tankers for the Marine Corps, one is to be configured as a special operations variant for the Air National Guard, and one is to be configured as a weather reconnaissance variant for the Air Force Reserve.

CV-22

The budget request contained \$22.3 million for advance procurement of a CV-22 weapons system trainer.

The CV-22 is a Special Operations Forces variant of the V-22 tiltrotor aircraft. The Air Force plans to procure and field 50 CV-

22 aircraft and associate support equipment for the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). The Air Force also plans to fund 85 percent of the procurement costs for CV-22 training systems with USSOCOM funding the remaining 15 percent.

According to the budget justification material for the CV-22 weapons system trainer, it requires a three-year lead time for delivery, requiring procurement funding to begin in fiscal year 1999 in order to support a ready-for-training date of September 2002. The committee is unaware of any previous weapons system trainer of such complexity as to necessitate advance procurement funds two years prior to the request for full funding of the weapons system it supports. Consequently, the committee believes these funds can be deferred until fiscal year 2000 and recommends no authorization for this purpose. Likewise, the committee recommends no funds for CV-22 modifications in the Defense-wide Procurement account, a decrease of \$4.0 million.

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

The budget request contained \$463.1 million to procure two E-8C Joint STARS aircraft, but included no advance procurement funding to continue production of this aircraft.

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) recommended reducing the procurement objective of the Joint STARS from 19 to 13 aircraft, based on the assumption that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) would select Joint STARS as its Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) aircraft and purchase 6 of them. Despite NATO's having rejected the Joint STARS as its AGS choice before the budget request was finalized, the Department failed to change the QDR recommendation. The committee is disturbed that the Department chose not to continue Joint STARS production, despite the Air Combat Command's requirement for 19 of these "low-density, high-demand" aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$72.0 million for advance procurement of two additional E-8Cs in fiscal year 2000.

F-15 modifications

The budget request contained \$196.6 million for F-15 modifications, including \$17.8 million for upgrading 12 F100 engines to the 220E configuration. The request contained no funds for procurement of the ALQ-135 internal countermeasures set Band 1.5 upgrade.

The committee understands that the so-called "E-Kit" upgrade will provide increased safety, reliability, and performance at a fraction of the cost of a new production 220 engine. Since the F-15C will remain the Air Force's primary air superiority fighter until the F-22 enters the inventory in the mid-2000s, the committee believes that the "E-Kit" modification is critical to ensuring that this aircraft continues to perform safely and at peak efficiency. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to accelerate this upgrade.

The committee also understands that the ALQ-135 Band 1.5 program, which is currently in the Engineering and Manufacturing Development phase, is scheduled to complete initial operational test and evaluation in May 1999. The committee notes the Band

1.5 shares a high degree of commonality with the currently fielded Band 3, which completes production in late 1998. Because the Air Force did not request procurement funds to begin production of Band 1.5, the committee is concerned about the impact of a production break and with the delay in getting this important upgrade fielded. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$25.0 million to upgrade approximately one squadron of F-15Es with the modified ALQ-135 Band 1.5 in order to ensure this aircraft will have full frequency protection.

In total, the committee recommends \$231.4 million for F-15 modifications, an increase of \$34.8 million. In addition to the increases described above, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.2 million for various modifications which either show excessive cost growth or were poorly justified.

F-16

The budget request contained no funds for procurement of the F-16C multirole aircraft.

The committee notes that the Congress has funded 15 additional F-16Cs in the last three fiscal years—six each in fiscal years 1996 and 1997 and three in fiscal year 1998—to reduce the attrition reserve shortfall of 40 aircraft the Air Force has projected through 2010. The committee believes that it is prudent to continue to reduce this shortfall, especially in the most capable Block 40 and Block 50 versions, and, therefore, recommends \$60.0 million to acquire two additional F-16C aircraft for this purpose.

F-16 modifications

The budget request contained \$229.3 million for F-16 modifications but included no funding for the Digital Terrain System (DTS) upgrade.

The DTS, which provides both a precise navigation and a ground collision avoidance capability, is designed to reduce controlled flight into terrain mishaps. The committee strongly supports the DTS upgrade as indicated by its addition of \$20.0 million (of which \$12.0 million was appropriated) to the fiscal year 1998 budget request for this purpose. Although the Air Force states that DTS is a firm requirement for the F-16 and it is in the process of modifying the F-16's operational flight program to accommodate DTS integration, it has not budgeted funds to continue this upgrade until fiscal year 2001. The committee finds this situation unacceptable and recommends \$12.0 million to continue to accelerate the incorporation of DTS technology into the F-16 fleet. The committee also recommends a decrease of \$6.9 million for various poorly justified modifications.

Global hawk

The budget request contained \$90.1 million in research and development funds to complete fabrication and integration of the final three demonstration aerial vehicles, which will be used for military utility and user demonstration testing. However, the budget request contained no procurement funds to begin production of the vehicle. Global Hawk is a conventional, high altitude, endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), which will provide all-weather,

day/night, reconnaissance and surveillance in direct support of Joint Forces Commanders.

The committee understands that the Air Force will assume management of the Global Hawk from the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office on October 1, 1998 and that planning is underway to transition this UAV from an Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration platform to a production program. However, the committee notes that even if production funds are requested in fiscal year 2000, there will be a gap of two years between delivery of the last demonstration vehicle and the first production vehicle. In order to efficiently transition this program to production, the committee recommends an increase of \$32.5 million for advance procurement of three Global Hawk UAVs.

Joint primary aircraft training system (JPATS)

The budget request contained \$107.1 million for JPATS, including \$36.2 million for the Ground Based Training System (GBTS).

The committee notes that more research and development funding for the GBTS is included in the budget request—\$34.2 million—than was appropriated in fiscal years 1997 and 1998 combined. The committee further notes that this amount is only slightly less than the procurement request—indicating the GBTS program is highly concurrent. Although the committee strongly supports the JPATS program, it believes that GBTS procurement funding is premature in view of the pre-production research and development activities remaining. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$36.2 million and defers initial GBTS procurement. However, the committee also recommends an increase of \$9.1 million for three additional T6-A aircraft in order to allow the Air Force to obtain the upper limit in its JPATS variations-in-quantity contract. In total, the committee recommends a decrease of \$27.1 million for JPATS.

Miscellaneous production charges

The budget request contained \$221.5 million for miscellaneous production charges, including \$10.1 million for High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile targeting pod modifications.

The committee notes that \$6.1 million was requested for the same purpose in the “Other aircraft modifications” funding line. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.1 million.

Navigational safety upgrades

The budget request contained \$49.5 million for Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System (TCAS) equipment and \$51.1 million for Enhanced Ground Proximity Warning System (EGPWS) equipment. The committee is aware there is also funding for both TCAS and EGPWS in other larger modification projects where itemized cost breakouts are not exact.

TCAS provides a flight crew predictive collision avoidance information regarding its aircraft’s position relative to another aircraft. It operates without air traffic control from ground-based systems. EGPWS provides an aircrew with knowledge of impending collision with the ground.

The committee is very supportive of providing these navigational safety upgrades to the Air Force's fleet of passenger- and cargo-carrying aircraft as expeditiously as possible. The committee understands that the majority of these upgrades for passenger-carrying aircraft have been funded in prior years and believes that appropriate attention should now be given to cargo-carrying aircraft. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million for TCAS equipment and \$25.0 million for EGPWS equipment.

Pacer coin

The budget request contained \$2.4 million in aircraft spares and repair parts for the transfer of mission equipment from retiring Pacer Coin aircraft to the non-dedicated, follow-on C-130 reconnaissance aircraft. The committee notes that a fiscal year 1998 reprogramming action stated that all funds for the C-130 follow-on program were included in that request. Furthermore, the committee does not agree that \$2.4 million of procurement funding is required to transfer equipment from one aircraft to another. Therefore, the committee recommends no funding for this purpose.

AMMUNITION PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained \$384.2 million for Ammunition Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$383.6 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
ROCKETS						
001 2.75 INCH ROCKET MOTOR	6,139	3,399	-	-	6,139	3,399
002 2.75" ROCKET HEAD SIGNATURE	-	-	-	-	-	-
003 2.75 IN ROCKET FLARE IR	2,530	2,693	-	-	2,530	2,693
004 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	2,042	-	-	-	2,042
CARTRIDGES						
005 5.56 MM	20,026	5,394	-	-	20,026	5,394
006 20MM TRAINING	-	-	-	-	-	-
007 30 MM TRAINING	769	5,495	-	-	769	5,495
008 CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-180	795	11,661	-	-	795	11,661
009 CARTRIDGE CHAFF RR-188	876	2,548	-	-	876	2,548
010 SIGNAL MK-4 MOD 3	260	760	-	-	260	760
011 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	5,447	-	-	-	5,447
BOMBS						
012 MK-82 INERT/BDU-50	29,368	22,490	-	-	29,368	22,490
013 GBU-28 HARD TARGET PENETRATOR	163	24,256	-	-	163	24,256
014 GBU - 37	10	977	-	-	10	977
015 BOMB PRACTICE 25 POUND	266,801	3,842	-	-	266,801	3,842
016 2000 LB HE BOMB MK-64	1,928	9,391	-	-	1,928	9,391
017 MK-84 BOMB-EMPTY	2,894	7,138	-	-	2,894	7,138
018 SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	295	125,992	-	-	295	125,992
019 TTU-373A DIGITAL TEST SET	-	-	-	-	-	-
020 JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,187	53,157	-	-	2,187	53,157
021 WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	676	13,862	-	-	676	13,862
022 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	2,149	-	-	-	2,149
ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000						
023 FLARE, IR MJU-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-
024 ASTE (INFRARED EXPENDABLE)	34,154	4,886	-	-	34,154	4,886
025 FLARE, IR MJU-7B	355,826	8,862	-	-	355,826	8,862
026 MJU-10B	198,602	10,373	-	-	198,602	10,373
027 M-206 CARTRIDGE FLARE	881,944	11,430	-	-	881,944	11,430
028 CADYPAD	-	14,275	-	-	-	14,275
029 LUU-19 FLARE	3,926	4,338	-	-	3,926	4,338

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
030 REPLENISHMENT SPARES	-	1,896	-	-	-	1,896
031 MODIFICATIONS	-	49	-	-	-	49
032 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 FUZES	-	4,447	-	-	-	4,447
033 JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	3,861	15,326	-	-	3,861	15,326
TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		378,586				378,586
WEAPONS						
SMALL ARMS						
034 M-16 A2 RIFLE	-	4,450	-	-	-	4,450
035 9MM COMPACT PISTOL	345	232	-	-	345	232
036 M-9 PISTOL	1,576	767	-	-	1,576	767
037 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2M	-	117	-	-	-	117
TOTAL WEAPONS		5,566				5,566
038 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(534)		(534)
TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		384,161		(834)		383,627

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained \$2,359.8 million for Missile Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$2,234.7 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
BALLISTIC MISSILES						
001 MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC	-	5,654	-	-	-	5,654
001 MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES		5,654				5,654
OTHER MISSILES						
002 STRATEGIC HAVE NAP	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
003 ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE TACTICAL	-	1,395	-	-	-	1,395
004 JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	100	52,142	-	-	100	52,142
005 AMRAAM	180	114,627	-	(4,600)	180	110,027
006 AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15 TARGET DRONES	-	341	-	-	-	341
007 TARGET DRONES INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	36,263	-	-	-	36,263
008 INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	-	3,152	-	-	-	3,152
009 MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER	-	-	-	-	-	-
009 MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OTHER MISSILES		207,920		5,400		213,320
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
CLASS IV						
010 CONVENTIONAL ALCM	-	10,034	-	-	-	10,034
011 PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	-	9,615	-	-	-	9,615
012 AIM-9 SIDEWINDER	-	-	-	-	-	-
013 MM III MODIFICATIONS	-	90,618	-	23,000	-	113,618
014 AGM-65H MAVERICK	-	-	-	3,000	-	3,000
015 AGM-88C HARM	-	-	-	-	-	-
016 MODIFICATIONS UNDER \$2.0M	-	219	-	-	-	219
TOTAL MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		110,486		26,000		136,486

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
017 MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS	-	38,047	-	-	-	38,047
017 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	38,047	-	-	-	38,047
TOTAL SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
		38,047				38,047
OTHER SUPPORT						
SPACE PROGRAMS						
018 CANCELLED ACCOUNT	-	-	-	-	-	-
019 SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	-	9,485	-	-	-	9,485
020 GLOBAL POSITIONING (MYP) SPACE	-	97,395	-	-	-	97,395
020 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
021 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	(49,000)	-	28,400
022 NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	-	77,400	-	-	-	2,949
023 INERTIAL UPPER STAGES SPACE	-	2,949	-	-	-	46,012
024 TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS SPACE	-	48,012	-	(2,000)	-	550,540
025 MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE SPACE	-	578,540	-	(28,000)	-	230,121
025 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	5	241,121	-	(11,000)	5	(52,715)
026 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	(52,715)	-	-	-	-
027 DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPACE	-	36,066	-	-	-	36,066
028 DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM SPACE	-	89,904	-	-	-	89,904
029 DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM SPACE	-	28,969	-	-	-	28,969
029 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
030 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
031 SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	-	224,299	-	-	-	224,299
032 SPECIAL PROGRAMS	-	616,271	-	(40,000)	-	576,271
TOTAL OTHER SUPPORT						
		1,997,696		(130,000)		1,867,696
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES						
033 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES	-	-	-	(26,535)	-	(26,535)
TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
		2,359,803		(125,135)		2,234,668

Items of Special Interest

AGM-165 Maverick Modifications

The budget request contained no funds for Maverick modifications.

The committee recommended \$11.0 million in fiscal year 1998 to initiate a much-needed, low-cost, service life extension program to the Maverick missile. Unfortunately, only \$8.0 million was appropriated for this purpose. Consequently, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to provide the necessary funds to ensure a smooth transition from development to production. The committee expects the Air Force to include continued funding for this upgrade in the future years defense program.

Global positioning system

The budget request contained \$77.4 million for advance procurement of Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites.

The committee understands that \$28.4 million of the advance procurement funds would be used to acquire the first three Block IIF satellites and the remaining \$49.0 million would support a multiyear procurement of an additional 12 satellites. While the committee continues to support the GPS program, it believes that a commitment to a multiyear procurement for these satellites is premature. GPS satellites continue to remain on orbit much longer than their expected design lives. Although the uncertainty inherent in satellite life span requires that a certain number be constructed for contingencies, the committee believes that the planned multiyear procurement would result in an inventory well in excess of future requirements. Moreover, the Department's fiscal year 1999 legislative proposal included several requests for multiyear procurement approval, but it did not include such a request for GPS. Therefore, the committee recommends deferral of a GPS multiyear procurement and a decrease of \$49.0 million.

Inertial upper stage

The budget request contained \$48.0 million for the inertial upper stage (IUS) program.

The committee notes that the Department has withheld approximately \$2.0 million that was authorized and appropriated for the IUS in fiscal year 1998 and understands these funds are excess to program needs. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$46.0 million for the IUS and directs the Department to apply the funds being withheld to fiscal year 1999 requirements.

Medium launch vehicle

The budget request contained \$188.4 million for the medium launch vehicle program. The committee recommends \$177.4 million, a reduction of \$11.0 million, based on changes in the launch schedule of Global Positioning System satellites that will reduce medium launch vehicle operations costs.

Minuteman gyro stabilized platform

The budget request contained no funding for advanced inertial measurement units (IMU) or gyro stabilized platforms (GSP).

The committee notes that, although the Air Force has two validated mission need statements for improved missile guidance systems, Air Force Space Command has not completed a GSP operational requirements document (ORD). The committee understands that maintenance problems with the current IMU on the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) are increasing and believes that its replacement with an advanced IMU would result in increased alert force reliability and flexibility, as well as lower life cycle costs and improved accuracy.

The committee therefore urges Air Force Space Command to complete the GSP ORD in time to support the fiscal year 2000 budget request and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the congressional defense committees a report on IMU options for the Minuteman III by January 15, 1999. The report should include an analysis of options currently under consideration, estimated cost of these options, and potential benefits of any option involving a new GSP.

Minuteman III modifications

The budget request contained \$90.6 million for Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) modifications, of which \$83.7 million was for the guidance replacement program (GRP).

The committee notes that the Department reduced the fiscal year 1999 GRP request from the level anticipated when the fiscal year 1998 budget was submitted to Congress. The committee understands that this reduction would delay the program by up to two years and require continued use of increasingly unreliable guidance packages. The committee also believes that this delay could potentially undermine the ICBM industrial base. As a consequence, the committee is concerned that the proposed GRP funding level would increase risk to the sustainability of the ICBM force and increase overall program costs. Therefore, in order to mitigate such problems, the committee recommends \$113.6 million, an increase of \$23.0 million, for GRP procurement.

Titan space boosters

The budget request contained \$578.5 million for Titan space boosters. The committee understands that excess program funds have been identified in fiscal year 1998 and believes that the fiscal year 1999 request also contains excess funds. Therefore, the committee recommends \$550.5 million, a reduction of \$28.0 million. Of this reduction, \$12.0 million is from excess funds in fiscal year 1998, which the committee directs be applied to fiscal year 1999 program requirements.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained \$6,974.4 million for Other Procurement, Air Force in fiscal year 1998. The committee recommends authorization of \$7,046.4 million for fiscal year 1998.

The committee recommends approval of the request except for those programs adjusted in the following table. Unless otherwise

specified, adjustments are without prejudice and based on affordability considerations.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION -- REQUEST --	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001 SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	54	760			54	760
002 STATION WAGON, 4X2	22	413			22	413
003 BUSES	92	5,174			92	5,174
004 AMBULANCES	4	306			4	306
005 LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	95	1,817			95	1,817
006 ARMORED SEDAN	1	239			1	239
CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
007 TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	225	6,160			225	6,160
008 TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 1/2T, 4X2	104	2,612			104	2,612
009 TRUCK, PICKUP, 1/2T, 4X2	222	3,379			222	3,379
010 TRUCK, PICKUP, COMPACT	196	2,445			196	2,445
011 TRUCK, MULTI-STOP, 1 TON 4X2	315	8,708			315	8,708
012 TRUCK, CARRYALL	160	3,888			160	3,888
013 COMMERCIAL UTILITY, CARGO VEHICLE	-	-			-	-
014 FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-			-	-
015 HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	75	4,172			75	4,172
016 TRUCK, TRACTOR, OVER ST	55	3,611			55	3,611
017 TRUCK, UTILITY	124	3,347			124	3,347
018 CAP VEHICLES	-	744			-	744
019 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	3,843			-	3,843
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
020 HMM/WV, ARMORED	-	-			-	-
021 TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	279	8,001			279	8,001
022 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	12,680			-	12,680
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
023 TRUCK, CRASH P-19	13	6,023			13	6,023
024 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	2,287			-	2,287
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
025 TRUCK, FL, 6000 LB	84	2,328			84	2,328
026 TRUCK, FL, 10,000 LB	56	4,295			56	4,295
027 60K AC LOADER	60	86,179			60	86,279
028 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	(2,900)			-	3,200
BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
029 TRUCK, DUMP	-	-	-	-	-	-
030 RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQUIP	41	3,928	-	-	41	3,928
031 MODIFICATIONS	-	900	-	-	-	900
032 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTM	-	7,663	-	-	-	7,663
033 CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		192,132		(2,900)		189,232
ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
034 COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)	-	30,311	-	-	-	30,311
035 MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	-	487	-	-	-	487
036 INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
037 INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	-	17,574	-	-	-	17,574
038 INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	-	5,735	-	-	-	5,735
038 INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	-	5,697	-	3,000	-	8,697
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
039 AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/AND SYS (ATCALS)	-	-	-	-	-	-
040 NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	-	45,308	-	-	-	45,308
041 THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	-	30,002	-	-	-	30,002
042 WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST	-	18,581	-	-	-	18,581
043 STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	10,848	-	-	-	10,848
044 CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	-	896	-	-	-	896
045 TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	-	1,883	-	(1,883)	-	-
046 DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
047 AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	-	33,190	-	-	-	33,190
048 AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	-	5,819	-	-	-	5,819
049 MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	-	7,844	-	-	-	7,844
050 AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	-	26,965	-	-	-	26,965
051 COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	-	13,194	-	5,000	-	18,194
052 MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	-	1,545	-	-	-	1,545
053 FORCE PROTECTION/ANTI-TERRORISM	-	-	-	-	-	-
054 C3 COUNTERMEASURES	-	10,228	-	-	-	10,228
055 JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	-	11,137	-	-	-	11,137

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
056 BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	-	28,876	-	-	-	28,876
057 THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	-	44,654	-	-	-	44,654
058 AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS	-	10,792	-	-	-	10,792
059 INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	-	159,383	-	(30,000)	-	129,383
060 BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	-	4,458	-	-	-	4,458
061 USCENTCOM	-	14,884	-	(4,000)	-	10,884
062 AUTOMATED TELECOMMUNICATIONS PRG	-	1,447	-	-	-	1,447
DISA PROGRAMS	-	10,735	-	-	-	10,735
063 NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	-	1,278	-	-	-	1,278
064 DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPAC	-	26,007	-	-	-	26,007
065 NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	-	93,848	-	-	-	93,848
066 AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	-	28,233	-	-	-	28,233
067 EASTERNWESTERN RANGE I&M SPACE	-	7,917	-	-	-	7,917
068 MILSATCOM SPACE	-	31,064	-	20,000	-	51,064
069 SPACE MODS SPACE	-	13,757	-	-	-	13,757
ORGANIZATION AND BASE	-	12,203	-	-	-	12,203
070 TACTICAL C.E. EQUIPMENT	-	1,984	-	-	-	1,984
071 COMBAT SURVIVOR/REVADEER LOCATER RADIO	-	3,195	-	-	-	3,195
072 RADIO EQUIPMENT	-	27,829	-	-	-	27,829
073 TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	-	378	-	-	-	378
074 CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	-	7,106	-	-	-	7,106
075 BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	-	57,701	-	(5,800)	-	51,901
076 CAP COM & ELECT	-	-	-	-	-	-
077 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000 MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
COMM ELECT MODS	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		864,973		(13,663)		851,290
OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
TEST EQUIPMENT	-	11,021	-	-	-	11,021
078 BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	-	1,064	-	-	-	1,064
079 PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	-	6,706	-	-	-	6,706
080 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP	-	-	-	-	-	-
081 NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	-	8,118	-	-	-	8,118

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
082 BREATHING APPARATUS TWO HOUR	-	-	-	-	-	-
083 UNIVERSAL WATER ACTIVATED REL SYS	-	-	-	-	-	-
084 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	3,528	-	-	-	3,528
DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ	-	-	-	-	-	-
085 MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	-	14,516	-	-	-	14,516
086 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	4,124	-	-	-	4,124
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
087 GENERATORS-MOBILE ELECTRIC	-	1,411	-	-	-	1,411
088 FLOODLIGHTS	-	10,714	-	-	-	10,714
089 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	2,356	-	-	-	2,356
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
090 BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	-	5,644	-	-	-	5,644
091 MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	-	8,703	-	-	-	8,703
092 ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	-	973	-	-	-	973
093 AIR BASE OPERABILITY	-	5,363	-	-	-	5,363
094 PALLET AIR CARGO	-	2,001	-	-	-	2,001
095 NET ASSEMBLY, 108"X88"	-	1,916	-	-	-	1,916
096 BLADDERS FUEL	-	1,329	-	-	-	1,329
097 AERIAL BULK FUEL DELIVERY SYSTEM	-	4,320	-	-	-	4,320
098 PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	-	5,576	-	-	-	5,576
099 PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	-	12,304	-	-	-	12,304
100 MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	-	35,973	-	-	-	35,973
101 DEPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT CONTAINERS	-	2,258	-	-	-	2,258
102 AIR CONDITIONERS	-	10,668	-	-	-	10,668
103 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2,000,000	-	16,844	-	-	-	16,844
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
104 INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	-	72,605	-	(1,000)	-	71,605
105 TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	-	2,035	-	-	-	2,035
106 DARP	-	-	-	-	-	-
107 DARP RC135	-	-	-	5,681	-	5,681
108 DARP MRIGS	-	12,656	-	3,800	-	16,456
109 SELECTED ACTIVITIES	-	79,613	-	-	-	79,613
110 SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	-	5,322,644	-	91,000	-	5,413,644
111 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	-	179,813	-	-	-	179,813
112 MODIFICATIONS	-	1,162	-	-	-	1,162
113 FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	-	170	-	-	-	170
	-	16,442	-	-	-	16,442

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
TOTAL OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,864,570		99,481		5,964,051
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
114 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		52,712				52,712
TOTAL SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		52,712				52,712
115 ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES				(10,913)		(10,913)
TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		6,974,387		71,985		7,046,372

Items of Special Interest

Base information infrastructure

The budget request contained \$159.4 million for base information infrastructure, of which \$72.7 million is for the voice switching system (VSS) product area.

The committee notes that the request for the VSS product area exceeds the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1998 by almost \$67.0 million. This increase is attributed to the "Year 2000" problem, yet no justification has been provided to the committee that explains how these funds will be used. Although the committee is acutely aware of the "Year 2000" problem, it believes that an increase of this magnitude is unwarranted absent a detailed explanation for its intended use. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$30.0 million.

Rangeless air combat training system (RACTS)

The budget request contained \$13.2 million for combat training ranges, but included no funds for the RACTS.

The RACTS, which can be used at either home station or in a deployed location, provides realistic air combat training over land or sea without dependence upon ground-installed instrumentation. The committee notes that a RACTS was delivered to Kadena Air Base, Japan, in August 1997, and the committee understands that since its delivery, Air Force and Navy pilots have successfully used this system on more than 3,000 sorties. The committee also notes that a similar system is scheduled for installation at Alpena Air National Guard Base, Michigan, during fiscal year 1998. Since the committee has been informed that the United States Air Forces Europe (USAFE) has a requirement for a RACTS but has not budgeted funds to meet this requirement, it recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for this purpose.

Tactical communications-electronics (CE) equipment

The budget request contained \$31.1 million for tactical CE equipment, of which \$27.3 million is for theater deployable communications (TDC) sets. TDC is a compact, high bandwidth, commercially available communications system used by forward-deployed forces. It is much more capable than the aging equipment it replaces and requires significantly reduced airlift support.

In April 1997, the Air Force created a command and control (C2) task force and directed it to establish an air and space C2 policy for the 21st century. One key finding of that task force was the determination that the Air Force should accelerate procurement of TDC sets and complete the buyout of this equipment by fiscal year 2001. The committee endorsed this finding and added \$25.0 million (\$18.0 million of which was appropriated) for this purpose to the fiscal year 1998 budget request. To continue acceleration of TDC equipment and consistent with its fiscal year 1998 action, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million for TDC equipment.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request contained \$2,041.7 million for Procurement, Defense-Wide in fiscal year 1998. The committee recommends authorization of \$1,962.9 million for fiscal year 1998.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1989 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
001 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS		302				302
002 MAJOR VEHICLES		100,245		(17,790)		82,455
003 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		28,123				28,123
004 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		5,456				5,456
005 ARMED FORCE INFORMATION SERVICE		1,990				1,990
006 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY		-				-
007 DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION		77,435		(77,435)		-
008 DARPA		-				-
009 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA		11,988		3,419		15,407
DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSWA						
010 VEHICLES		-				-
011 OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		-				-
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
012 MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECHNOLOGIES		7,932				7,932
013 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		18,364				18,364
014 CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS		4,060				4,060
015 JOINT CAISR		-				-
016 DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM		43,372				43,372
017 GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		4,379				4,379
018 GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		6,711				6,711
019 STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT		11,956				11,956
020 PLANS & PROGRAM ANALYSIS SUPPORT CENTER		-				-
021 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION		14,383				14,383
022 DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		-				-
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA						
024 DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES		68,682		(8,300)		60,382
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						
024A AUTOMATED DOCUMENT CONVERSION SYSTEM				32,000		32,000
025 VEHICLES	267	3,200			267	3,200
026 OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		1,582				1,582
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
027 ITEMS LESS THAN \$2 MILLION		3,667				3,667

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
028 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	16,214	-	(16,214)	-	-
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSPO	-	-	-	-	-	-
029 MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	33,536	-	-	-	33,536
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	-	-	-	-	-	-
ON-SITE INSPECTION AGENCY	-	-	-	-	-	-
030 VEHICLES	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
031 BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	60	343,235	-	(40,000)	40	303,235
PATRIOT PAC-3	-	22,827	-	-	-	22,827
033 C4I	-	-	-	-	-	-
034 HAWK BNK3 MODS	21	43,318	-	-	21	43,318
NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	-	-	-	-	-	-
035 NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY	-	-	-	-	-	-
DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY	-	-	-	-	-	-
EQUIPMENT	-	-	-	-	-	-
037 DEF THREAT RED & TREATY COMP AGCY	-	-	-	-	-	-
VEHICLES	-	134	-	-	-	134
038 OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	28,029	-	-	-	28,029
039 DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	-	73	-	-	-	73
TOTAL MAJOR EQUIPMENT		961,793		(124,320)		777,473
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
AVIATION PROGRAMS						
041 RADIO FREQUENCY MOBILE ELECTRONIC TEST SET	-	46,980	-	6,500	-	53,480
042 SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	-	6,053	-	-	-	6,053
043 SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	-	3,983	-	(3,983)	-	-
044 CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	-	18,985	-	-	-	18,985
045 MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	-	28,600	-	-	-	28,600
046 AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	-	58,359	-	-	-	58,359
047 C-130 MODIFICATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
048 OH-6 PROCUREMENT & MODIFICATIONS	-	878	-	-	-	878
049 AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHIPBUILDING	-	-	-	-	-	-
050 PC CYCLONE CLASS	-	-	-	-	-	-

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
051 ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS)	-	10,603	-	-	-	10,603
051 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	(352)	-	-	-	(352)
052 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	293	-	-	-	293
053 MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE	-	589	-	-	-	589
054 SUBMARINE CONVERSION	-	5,990	-	-	-	5,990
054 LESS: ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (PY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
055 ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)	-	-	-	-	-	-
056 MK V SPECIAL OPERATIONS CRAFT (MK V SOC)	-	-	-	-	-	-
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
057 SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	-	15,707	-	-	-	15,707
058 SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	-	28,784	-	-	-	28,784
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS	-	-	-	-	-	-
059 MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS	-	26,012	-	(4,000)	-	22,012
060 NAVAL SPECIAL WARFARE RIGID INFLATABLE BOAT	-	13,606	-	-	-	13,606
061 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	-	40,237	-	-	-	40,237
062 COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	-	68,064	-	-	-	68,064
063 SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	-	19,148	-	-	-	19,148
064 SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	-	15,421	-	-	-	15,421
065 SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	-	2,060	-	-	-	2,060
066 DRUG INTERDICTION	-	-	-	-	-	-
067 ANTI-TERRORISM/COUNTER-TERRORISM	-	-	-	-	-	-
068 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	-	9,714	-	-	-	9,714
069 SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	-	1,027	-	-	-	1,027
070 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	-	73,991	-	-	-	73,991
071 PSYOP/EQUIPMENT	-	9,518	-	-	-	9,518
TOTAL SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		606,260		(1,483)		604,777
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
CBDP						
072 INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	-	128,423	-	-	-	128,423
073 DECONTAMINATION	-	10,982	-	-	-	10,982
074 JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	-	27,847	-	-	-	27,847
075 COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	-	20,452	-	-	-	20,452
076 CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	-	96,199	-	(6,900)	-	89,299

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
TOTAL CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		283,903		(6,900)		277,003
DEFENSE-WIDE						
DEFENSE-WIDE						
077 DEFENSE-WIDE PROGRAM						
TOTAL DEFENSE-WIDE						
989 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		349,694		53,919		403,613
TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		2,041,660		(78,784)		1,962,866

Items of Special Interest

Automated document conversion system (ADCS)

The budget request contained no funds for ADCS.

The committee understands that the ADCS program is performing a critical role in the attainment of the Department's goal to digitize all engineering drawings and technical data by fiscal year 2002. The committee continues to strongly support this program and recommends \$32.0 million for the purchase of ADCS hardware and software.

Chemical-biological defense equipment for rapid assessment and initial detection teams

The budget request contained a total of \$620.3 million for the chemical-biological defense program, including \$283.9 million for procurement of chemical and biological defense equipment for the military services and \$336.4 million for research, development, test and evaluation.

The committee is aware that the budget request includes \$6.9 million for initial procurement of contamination avoidance equipment for the National Guard Rapid Assessment and Initial Detection (RAID) teams that the DOD has proposed be established to provide immediate response and assistance to state and local authorities in response to a domestic emergency involving the use of weapons of mass destruction, or other chemical or biological accident or incident. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned that the Department's efforts and initiatives have not been closely coordinated with other agencies within the government who share responsibility for responding to such incidents, and by the apparent lack of an effectively coordinated effort on the part of these agencies. Accordingly, the committee has deferred action on the Department's recommendations for legislation which would provide authority to establish the RAID teams in the National Guard and on related matters, pending a report from the Secretary of Defense on the Department's overall plan for addressing these issues. Furthermore, the committee recommends no authorization for procurement of equipment for the RAID teams and recommends a decrease of \$6.9 million for procurement of chemical and biological defense contamination avoidance equipment for the military services.

Defense support program office training and exercise

The budget request contained \$7.8 million for Defense Support Program Office (DSPO) training and exercise support.

The Secretary of Defense has informed the committee that the DSPO is being abolished and its functions consolidated within the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO). The committee understands that the National Military and Operations Support Office within the NRO is also charged with, and funded for, training and exercise support. Therefore, the committee believes the DSPO training and exercise support funding is no longer required and recommends no funds for this purpose.

Flat panel night vision heads-up display system

The budget request contained \$47.0 million for rotary wing upgrades and sustainment, but included no funds for upgrading the HH-60G, MC-130P, C-141B, and MC-130E with a flat panel night vision heads-up display (HUD) system.

A night vision HUD system allows pilots to fly at night by using outside visual references instead of using only aircraft instruments. Since the early 1980s, Air Force special operations aircrews have had such a system, but it was recently removed from their aircraft because of safety issues related to high cockpit voltages. As a result, these aircrews face increased danger and mission degradation due to the lack of night vision capability. The committee understands that the newer-technology flat panel night vision HUD system is safer, more effective, and more reliable than its predecessor. The committee also understands that the flat panel night vision HUD is a non-developmental item and can therefore meet the near-term needs of Air Force special operations crews. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.5 million to procure and install the flat panel night vision HUD system into HH-60G, MC-130P, C-141B, and MC-130E aircraft in order to improve the safety and survivability of special operations aircrews.

Mentor protégé

The budget request contained \$17.8 million for the Mentor Protégé program. This program provides funds to major Department of Defense prime contractors for the purpose of developing the technical capabilities of Small Disadvantaged Businesses to perform as subcontractors.

The committee notes that the legal authority for this pilot program expires at the end of fiscal year 1998. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds for the Mentor Protégé program.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

Overview

The budget request contained no funds for National Guard and Reserve Equipment for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$300.0 million for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989		FY 1989		FY 1989	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
ARMY RESERVE						
HEMTT BRIDGE TRANS KITS		6,000				6,000
M915 ESP (UPGRADE) KITS		8,000				8,000
AVLB 60-70 TON UPGRADE		3,000				3,000
ROCK CRUSH, SCREEN, WASH		2,000				2,000
HMMWV CONTACT MNT TRK		7,000				7,000
5 TON ESP		15,000				15,000
GENERATOR, 5KW, TQ		3,000				3,000
M915A3, LONG HAUL TRACTOR		6,000				6,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		-				-
NAVY RESERVE						
CH60 AIRCRAFT		38,000				38,000
MIUW VAN UPGRADES		12,000				12,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		-				-
MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
F/A-18A+ ECP		35,000				35,000
D-7 PIP		5,000				5,000
CH-53e HNS 'B KITS'		7,000				7,000
ELECTRONIC CALIBRATION FACILITY (AN/TSM-198)		2,000				2,000
ELECTRONIC TEST MEASUREMENT & DIAGNOSTIC EQUIPMENT FACILITY		1,000				1,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		-				-
AIR FORCE RESERVE						
KC-135 REENGINE KITS		50,000				50,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT		-				-
TOTAL RESERVE EQUIPMENT		200,000		200,000		200,000
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
D-7 BULLDOZER		5,000				5,000
MOBILE BACKSCATTER TRUCK INSPECTION SYSTEM		9,000				9,000
CRASHWORTHY INTERNAL FUEL CELLS		5,000				5,000
AH-64 VMEP		3,000				3,000
SINGCARS		8,000				8,000

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	RECOMMENDATION QUANTITY	COST
RECONFIGURABLE MISSION SIMULATOR				7,000		7,000
ENGAGEMENT SKILLS TRAINERS				5,000		5,000
R-2000 ENGINE FLUSH SYSTEM				5,000		5,000
METEOROLOGICAL MEASURING SETS, ANUTMQ41				3,000		3,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT				-		-
005 AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
PATS (F-16)				15,000		15,000
F-16 IAIS				15,000		15,000
F-16 ALR-56M RWR				10,000		10,000
F-16 SADL ADP/COLOR				5,000		5,000
A-10 SADL GRP A				5,000		5,000
006 MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT				-		-
TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT				100,000		100,000
TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				300,000		300,000

Items of Special Interest

Air reserve forces

The United States has dramatically decreased its defense force structure over the last several years. To compensate for this smaller force structure will require the active Air Force to continue to rely on Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units to project and sustain power around the globe. The committee notes that Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard units have been seamlessly integrated into the total Air Force for many years and have performed their missions superbly. In order to adequately maintain a strong total Air Force, the committee believes it is important that weapons systems assigned to the air reserve forces and the active components be comparably equipped. Therefore, the committee expects the Air Force, and the other services as well, to ensure their operational plans and budget submissions reflect this guidance.

Senior scout-----

The budget request contained \$14.3 million in operations and maintenance, Air National Guard, partially for the continued operation of the Senior Scout tactical reconnaissance system.

Senior Scout is a C-130-employed, roll-on/roll-off, reconnaissance system operated by the Air National Guard. It provides an airborne reconnaissance collection system that is complementary to other airborne collection systems operated by the active component.

The committee perceives a lack of direction and support for Senior Scout, noting that on several occasions the Air Force has nearly terminated the program, that the system has not been well supported in terms of upgrades or sensor improvements, and that it has certainly not maintained technological pace with the RC-135 Rivet Joint aircraft or other similar reconnaissance platforms. Consequently, the committee does not believe continuing Senior Scout to be either cost or mission effective.

However, the committee believes the Air National Guard linguists currently operating the Senior Scout are vital to the overall national reconnaissance effort and sees a critical need both to retain and train them on more modern equipment.

In fiscal year 1997, the Congress authorized and appropriated funding for two additional RC-135 Rivet Joint aircraft. The committee has learned that the Air Force is having difficulty fully manning these aircraft. Since the Guard personnel are currently called on to supplement active component RC-135 operations, the committee believes providing at least one of these aircraft on a rotational basis to the Air National Guard would both resolve the manpower problem and take greater advantage of an available resource.

Therefore, the committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the congressional defense and intelligence committees no later than October 1, 1999, a plan for phasing out the Senior Scout reconnaissance system and replacing it with an RC-135 alternative or a plan for upgrading and maintaining the Senior Scout system commensurate with Rivet Joint capabilities.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained no funds for Chemical Agents and Munitions, Defense, for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$834.0 million for fiscal year 1999.

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

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT

(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1998 AUTHORIZATION - REQUEST -		FY 1999 CTIME CHANGE FROM REQUEST		FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST	QUANTITY	COST
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-RDT&E RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT						
001 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE				170,880		170,880
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF-RDT&E				170,880		170,880
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-PROC PROCUREMENT						
002 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC				134,670		134,670
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT, DEF-PROC				134,670		134,670
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT-O&M OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
003 CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M				528,450		528,450
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCT, DEF-O&M				528,450		528,450
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEF				834,000		834,000

DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEES

Overview

The budget request contained \$1.3 million for Defense Export Loan Guarantees, Defense for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$1.3 million for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE I - PROCUREMENT
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1966		FY 1966		FY 1966	
	AUTHORIZATION -- REQUEST --	COST	CTME CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COST	RECOMMENDATION	COST
	QUANTITY		QUANTITY		QUANTITY	
DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEES, PROGRAM ACCOUNT						
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES						
DEF LOAN GUARANTEES, PROGRAM ACCOUNT						
001 MISC PROJECTS	-	1,250	-	-	-	1,250
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES		1,250		-		1,250
TOTAL DEFENSE EXPORT LOAN GUARANTEES, PROGRAM ACCOUNT		1,250		-		1,250

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sections 101–109—Authorization of Appropriations

These sections would authorize the recommended fiscal year 1999 funding levels for all procurement accounts.

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Longbow Hellfire Missile Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the Longbow Hellfire missile.

Section 112—M1A2 System Enhancement Program Step 1 Program

This section would require the Army to use the \$20.3 requested in the budget for M1A1–D upgrade kits to instead procure M1A2 System Enhancement Program Step 1 communications upgrades.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Multiyear Procurement Authority for the Department of the Navy

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear procurement contract for the Navy AV–8B, T–45TS, and E–2C aircraft programs and for the Marine Corps Medium Tactical Vehicle Replacement.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 141—Funding, Transfer and Management of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Program

This section would authorize funding for identification and demonstration of technologies alternative to the baseline incineration process for destruction of assembled chemical munitions that are a part of the U.S. chemical munitions stockpile. The provision would also direct the transfer of management oversight responsibility for the program from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)) to the Secretary of the Army.

The Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment program was established under section 8065, Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 104–208) as the Department of Defense (DOD) program for assessment of the feasibility of alternative technologies for the demilitarization of assembled chemical munitions. Such technologies could provide an alternative to the baseline program, which uses incineration of chemical agents and munitions as the means for demilitarization of the chemical munitions stockpile. The assessment is to be completed with a final report to the Congress in December 1998.

Responsibility for the chemical agents and munitions destruction program will be transferred from the Office of the Secretary of De-

fense to the Secretary of the Army as a part of the Defense Reform Initiative (DRI). The committee believes that transfer of the responsibility for the assembled chemical weapons assessment (ACWA) program to the Army is also appropriate and consistent with the DRI recommendations. In making the transfer, the USD(A&T) and the Secretary of the Army must insure the independence of the ACWA program from the baseline incineration program, in order to maintain public acceptance of, interaction with, and confidence in the ACWA program management. The committee notes that the consultation among ACWA program management and interested individuals from the chemical weapons stockpile communities; federal, tribal, and state environmental regulators; and national activist organization representatives that regularly work on chemical weapons issues has been a key factor in winning public acceptance of the program. The committee strongly encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue that consultation as an integral part of the ACWA program.

Dialogue on assembled chemical weapons assessment

The DOD has committed to meaningful public involvement in the assessment program, and has stated that such involvement is critical to its success. In response to this commitment, a public interest group, known as the Dialogue on Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment ("the Dialogue") has sought to consult with the DOD to discuss issues relating to the assessment program. The Dialogue consists of a diverse group of interested individuals from the chemical weapons stockpile communities; federal, tribal, and state environmental regulators; and national activist organization representatives that regularly work on chemical weapons issues.

During the committee's consideration of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1999 (H.R. 3616), a concern was raised that the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-462; 5 U.S.C. App.) (FACA) might apply to the Dialogue in its consultative relationship with the DOD on the assessment program. The program's near-term deadline would make it unlikely that a formal charter process for the Dialogue, which would be required under FACA, could be completed in sufficient time to meet the deadline for the assessment program's final report to Congress and, concurrently, incorporate public involvement. In response to this concern, the committee consulted with the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the committee of jurisdiction on issues related to FACA. In the opinion of that committee, FACA does not apply to the Dialogue in its relationship with the DOD on the assessment program.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$36,078.5 million for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E), representing a \$144.1 million increase from the amount authorized for fiscal year 1998.

The committee recommends authorization of \$36,228.0 million, an increase of \$149.5 million from the budget request.

The committee notes that the budget request proposes to implement portions of the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) recommendations including increases in new procurement and major upgrades to current military equipment programs. However, the committee is concerned that while procurement accounts are projected to continue increasing by as much as 29 percent over the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP), the Department projects a decline in research and development accounts of at least 14 percent during that same time period. The Department has publicly placed great emphasis on QDR recommendations that stress preparing for future conflicts, maximizing capabilities of smaller force structures, and implementing leap-ahead technologies, with only minimal investment in legacy modernization programs. However, the committee notes that the Department's plan to continue decreasing already underfunded research and development accounts, the cornerstone investment needed to support each service's future requirements, appears in direct contradiction with QDR recommendations.

The committee is also concerned with the continuing trend of placing higher priority on a number of Department level initiatives such as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) and Advanced Concepts Technology Demonstrations (ACTDs) at the expense of already seriously constrained service research and development budgets. The committee notes, in particular, that while the Army, Air Force, and defense-wide research and development requests all decreased from fiscal year 1998 levels, the service requests also include shifts over \$300.0 million from defense-wide programs to the services. This shift results in actual increases to remaining defense-wide programs while masking an even greater decline in service programs.

For these reasons and others stated elsewhere in this report, the committee is seriously concerned that Department statements asserting the health and growing improvement of the defense budget are not evident in the research and development budget request. While the Secretary of Defense has described the fiscal year 1999 request as one that is carefully balanced to address both present and future requirements, the committee notes a very visible sacrifice on the part of high priority service requirements to achieve that balance, and yet, no similar level of sacrifice within the de-

fense-wide programs. The committee believes that the Department should provide a more succinct explanation of how DARPA, ACTDs, and other large defense-wide research and development programs are more appropriate investments for addressing future requirements than the focused service research and development accounts.

Department of Defense Basic Research/Science and Technology Program

The committee strongly supports the request for the Department of Defense basic research and science and technology programs, and recommends a total of \$1,130.7 million for basic research and a total of \$7,280.4 million for the Defense science and technology program (including basic research). However, to address the committee's concerns with respect to critical shortcomings in the service requests and perceived imbalances between defense-wide and service research and development programs, the committee recommends shifts of funding, outlined elsewhere in this report, from the defense agencies' science and technology accounts to those of the services.

The committee believes that the Department's basic research program has long played a crucial role in the development of technology and in the education and training of scientific personnel required to support the continuing technical advances critical to maintaining superior military capabilities. The ability of today's U.S. military forces to deploy anywhere in the world, sustain a forward presence, and win decisively on the battlefield results from past investments in research and technology. For more than 50 years, these investments have enabled the Department of Defense to advance the frontiers of knowledge and develop the technologies necessary to gain and maintain operational and technical superiority. The committee believes that the Department must continue to provide the necessary investments in research and technologies that ensure a strong, stable, and robust science and technology program for our armed forces.

The committee notes with concern that the research budget request is at a 19 year low and that funding for Defense science and technology is at an equally disturbing 13 year low. While the committee is pleased that this year's request brings an end to the disturbing decline in overall research funding levels and proposes a period of projected growth of approximately 5 percent over the period through fiscal year 2003, the committee expresses concern over the apparent conflict between the Department's projection for growth in the research budget in light of the current forecast for a 14 percent decline in overall research and development during the same period.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The committee is concerned by the Department's continued commitment to a very large budget for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in comparison to the science and technology budgets of the military departments, and by the trend this represents in the overall Department of Defense science and technology program. The committee commends the agency and its out-

standing contribution over its 40 year history to the development of advanced technology and military systems for our armed forces, and believes that DARPA will continue to play a key role in the development of advanced capabilities for our future armed forces.

The committee notes, however, that the budget request for DARPA, although reduced from the peak level attained in 1994, remains at a higher level (when measured in constant fiscal year 1997 dollars) than at any time since 1960, two years after the agency was formed. The committee also notes that, despite the elimination of over \$200.0 million in fiscal year 1998 programs from the DARPA budget by transfer to the military departments or by cancellation, there is no commensurate reduction in fiscal year 1999 budget request. The committee notes that a number of DARPA programs have grown significantly from the fiscal year 1999 projection that was included with the fiscal year 1998 budget request. The committee believes that in this time of great financial constraint, all expenditures must be considered carefully and continued only where they make a clear contribution to critical service requirements.

Information Systems Technology, Superiority and Security

The budget request contained a total of \$705.7 million for information technology research, development, test, and evaluation. The budget request also included a total of \$191.8 million for the Department of Defense (DOD) information systems security program.

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) and the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-340) directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congressional defense committees an assessment of the DOD information systems security program that addresses the current status of the program, specific actions being taken on the recommendations of the 1996 Defense Science Board Task Force on Information Warfare-Defense, and additional actions that should be taken to assure the increased security and integrity of the defense information infrastructure. The report is to also address measures necessary to assure the integrity of those elements of the national information infrastructure and critical national infrastructure on which the defense information infrastructure depends, and identify any additional resources and legislative authority which may be required.

The Secretary's report has not yet been received by the committee. However, assuming that the report will have been received by the Congressional defense committees prior to the House-Senate Conference on H.R. 3616 and that there will have been sufficient time for congressional review of the issues and recommendations contained in the report, the committee intends to address appropriate issues and recommendations from its review of Secretary's report during the conference.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 1999 RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major issues are discussed following the table.

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

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 1999	COMMITTEE	FY 1999
	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,780,645	12,452	4,792,997
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,545,021	(62,948)	3,482,073
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	1,235,524	95,400	1,330,924
	-	(20,000)	(20,000)
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,108,923	294,636	8,403,559
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	6,074,737	363,929	6,438,666
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	2,034,186	(19,293)	2,014,893
	-	(50,000)	(50,000)
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AIR FORCE			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	13,699,093	(20,884)	13,677,209
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	9,879,917	19,116	9,899,033
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	3,718,176	-	3,718,176
	-	(40,000)	(40,000)
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEFENSE WIDE			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,314,965	(140,733)	9,173,932
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	8,482,350	(146,733)	8,335,617
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	832,315	56,000	888,315
	-	(50,000)	(50,000)
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF TEST & EVAL DEFENSE			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	251,106	-	251,106
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	251,106	-	251,106
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-
TOTAL, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	25,245	4,000	29,245
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	25,245	4,000	29,245
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL			
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	36,076,577	149,471	36,228,048
ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	28,256,376	177,364	28,435,740
ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	7,820,201	132,107	7,952,308
	-	(160,000)	(160,000)

ARMY RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained \$4,780.5 million for Army RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of \$4,793.0 million, an increase of \$12.5 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 1999 Army RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Army request are discussed following the table.

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY	14,902.00	-	14,902.00
0801101A	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	137,399.00	-	137,399.00
0801102A	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	48,459.00	-	48,459.00
0801104A	3	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	200,760.00	-	200,760.00
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	200,760.00	-	200,760.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0802104A	4	TRACTOR ROSE	6,000.00	-	6,000.00
0802105A	5	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	10,137.00	5,000.00	15,137.00
0802120A	6	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	18,738.00	-	18,738.00
0802122A	7	TRACTOR HIP	11,685.00	-	11,685.00
0802211A	8	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	29,746.00	-	29,746.00
0802270A	9	EW TECHNOLOGY	18,249.00	-	18,249.00
0802303A	10	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	25,180.00	-	25,180.00
0802309A	11	MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	27,981.00	-	27,981.00
0802601A	12	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	40,107.00	10,000.00	50,107.00
0802618A	13	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	31,115.00	-	31,115.00
0802622A	14	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	5,116.00	-	5,116.00
0802623A	15	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,229.00	-	5,229.00
0802624A	16	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	29,489.00	-	29,489.00
0802705A	17	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	22,329.00	-	22,329.00
0802709A	18	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	19,157.00	-	19,157.00
0802712A	19	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	10,715.00	-	10,715.00
0802718A	20	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	13,369.00	4,800.00	18,169.00
0802720A	21	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	13,842.00	16,000.00	29,842.00
0802782A	22	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,746.00	2,800.00	22,546.00
0802783A	23	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	2,185.00	-	2,185.00
0802784A	24	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	37,488.00	-	37,488.00
0802785A	25	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	8,602.00	-	8,602.00
0802787A	26	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	18,661.00	-	18,661.00
0802787A	27	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	67,255.00	2,000.00	69,255.00
0802789A	28	ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,164.00	-	1,164.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989		FY 1989	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0602805A	29	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	20,000.00	-	20,000.00	20,000.00
			511,285.00	40,600.00	551,885.00	551,885.00
			511,285.00	40,600.00	551,885.00	551,885.00
0603001A	30	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	32,968.00	-	32,968.00	32,968.00
0603002A	31	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	11,012.00	-	11,012.00	11,012.00
0603003A	32	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	30,048.00	13,000.00	43,048.00	43,048.00
0603004A	33	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,555.00	17,000.00	41,555.00	41,555.00
0603005A	34	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	54,435.00	17,000.00	71,435.00	71,435.00
0603006A	35	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,109.00	-	20,109.00	20,109.00
0603007A	36	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,021.00	-	3,021.00	3,021.00
0603008A	37	TRACTOR HIKE	9,873.00	-	9,873.00	9,873.00
0603013A	38	TRACTOR DIRT	57.00	-	57.00	57.00
0603017A	39	TRACTOR RED	4,590.00	-	4,590.00	4,590.00
0603020A	40	TRACTOR ROSE	2,016.00	-	2,016.00	2,016.00
0603105A	41	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,710.00	-	5,710.00	5,710.00
0603238A	42	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHNOLOGY DE	9,973.00	-	9,973.00	9,973.00
0603270A	43	EW TECHNOLOGY	11,508.00	-	11,508.00	11,508.00
0603313A	44	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	86,096.00	(29,700.00)	56,396.00	56,396.00
0603322A	45	TRACTOR CAGE	4,408.00	-	4,408.00	4,408.00
0603606A	46	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,944.00	-	21,944.00	21,944.00
0603607A	47	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,173.00	3,500.00	8,673.00	8,673.00
0603654A	48	LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	20,099.00	-	20,099.00	20,099.00
0603710A	49	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,960.00	-	23,960.00	23,960.00
0603734A	50	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,564.00	-	13,564.00	13,564.00
0603772A	51	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	18,456.00	-	18,456.00	18,456.00
0603780A	52	TACTICAL TOWED ARRAY SONAR (H)	54,419.00	(54,419.00)	-	-
0604280A	53	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO TOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	15,600.00	-	15,600.00	15,600.00
			483,595.00	(33,619.00)	449,976.00	449,976.00
			483,595.00	(33,619.00)	449,976.00	449,976.00
0603018A	54	TRACTOR TREAD	-	-	-	-

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603308A	55	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEMVAL)	12,240.00	20,000.00	32,240.00	
0603619A	56	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	6,778.00	-	6,778.00	
0603627A	57	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	26,526.00	10,000.00	36,526.00	
0603639A	58	ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE	-	-	-	
0603640A	59	ARTILLERY PROPELLANT DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	
0603645A	60	ARMORED SYSTEM MODERNIZATION - ADV DEV	-	-	-	
0603649A	61	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,928.00	-	8,928.00	
0603653A	62	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	17,281.00	-	17,281.00	
0603713A	63	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	-	-	-	
0603745A	64	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SUPPORT SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	7,581.00	-	7,581.00	
0603747A	65	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	-	-	-	
0603768A	66	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	2,681.00	-	2,681.00	
0603774A	67	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	11,161.00	-	11,161.00	
0603780A	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,487.00	5,000.00	12,487.00	
0603801A	69	AVIATION - ADV DEV	17,478.00	-	17,478.00	
0603804A	70	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	14,353.00	-	14,353.00	
0603805A	71	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	11,414.00	-	11,414.00	
0603807A	72	MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	966.00	-	966.00	
0603851A	73	TRACTOR CAGE (DEMVAL)	313,166.00	(59,800.00)	253,366.00	
0603854A	74	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEMVAL	7,969.00	-	7,969.00	
0603856A	75	SCAMP BLOCK II DEMVAL	466,009.00	(24,600.00)	441,409.00	
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	466,009.00	(24,600.00)	441,409.00	
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0604201A	76	AIRCRAFT AVONICS	7,878.00	-	7,878.00	
0604220A	77	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	-	-	-	
0604223A	78	COMANCHE	367,823.00	62,000.00	429,823.00	
0604270A	79	EW DEVELOPMENT	85,989.00	5,000.00	90,989.00	
0604321A	80	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	28,081.00	2,000.00	30,081.00	
0604325A	81	FOLLOW-ON TO TOW	48,106.00	-	48,106.00	
0604328A	82	TRACTOR CAGE	1,788.00	-	1,788.00	
0604604A	83	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-	-	
0604609A	84	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	706.00	-	706.00	

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604611A	85	JAVELIN	5,277.00	-	5,277.00
0604619A	86	LANDMINE WARFARE	23,189.00	-	23,189.00
0604622A	87	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	-	-	-
0604633A	88	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	1,737.00	-	1,737.00
0604640A	89	ADVANCED COMMAND AND CONTROL VEHICLE (AC2V)	-	-	-
0604641A	90	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	2,468.00	-	2,468.00
0604642A	91	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	-	-	-
0604645A	92	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV.	4,500.00	-	4,500.00
0604649A	93	ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	63,069.00	-	63,069.00
0604710A	94	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	21,311.00	-	21,311.00
0604713A	95	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	62,218.00	-	62,218.00
0604715A	96	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	64,035.00	-	64,035.00
0604716A	97	TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	2,998.00	-	2,998.00
0604726A	98	INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,790.00	-	1,790.00
0604739A	99	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	4,447.00	-	4,447.00
0604741A	100	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV	6,476.00	-	6,476.00
0604746A	101	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	7,030.00	-	7,030.00
0604760A	102	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEERING DEVELOPME	2,766.00	-	2,766.00
0604766A	103	TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD (TIARA)	44,674.00	(4,600.00)	40,074.00
0604768A	104	BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	134,858.00	-	134,858.00
0604770A	105	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	5,503.00	16,000.00	21,503.00
0604778A	106	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	379.00	-	379.00
0604801A	107	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	7,533.00	-	7,533.00
0604801A	108	AVIATION - ENG DEV	6,599.00	-	6,599.00
0604802A	109	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	37,725.00	-	37,725.00
0604804A	110	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	28,002.00	2,000.00	30,002.00
0604805A	111	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	16,404.00	-	16,404.00
0604807A	112	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	5,338.00	-	5,338.00
0604808A	113	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	46,905.00	-	46,905.00
0604814A	114	SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	20,813.00	-	20,813.00
0604816A	115	LONGBOW - ENG DEV	-	-	-
0604817A	116	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	13,471.00	-	13,471.00
0604818A	117	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	32,929.00	-	32,929.00
0604820A	118	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	2,786.00	-	2,786.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604823A	119	FIREFINDER	19,822.00	-	19,822.00
0604824A	120	DUAP COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS	33,600.00	-	33,600.00
0604854A	121	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	100.00	13,000.00	13,100.00
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,288,124.00	95,400.00	1,384,524.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,235,524.00	95,400.00	1,330,924.00
0604256A	122	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	11,935.00	-	11,935.00
0604258A	123	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,127.00	-	13,127.00
0604759A	124	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,284.00	-	40,284.00
0605103A	125	RAND ARROYO CENTER	16,718.00	-	16,718.00
0605301A	126	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	142,710.00	-	142,710.00
0605328A	127	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	17,441.00	-	17,441.00
0605502A	128	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605601A	129	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	119,553.00	-	119,553.00
0605602A	130	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	33,439.00	-	33,439.00
0605604A	131	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	30,488.00	-	30,488.00
0605605A	132	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	15,022.00	-	15,022.00
0605609A	133	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	2,924.00	-	2,924.00
0605702A	134	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,691.00	-	6,691.00
0605706A	135	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	9,711.00	-	9,711.00
0605709A	136	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	4,031.00	-	4,031.00
0605712A	137	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	66,320.00	-	66,320.00
0605716A	138	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	25,526.00	-	25,526.00
0605801A	139	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,588.00	-	64,588.00
0605802A	140	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0605803A	141	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	16,251.00	-	16,251.00
0605805A	142	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	8,497.00	-	8,497.00
0605853A	143	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	3,195.00	-	3,195.00
0605854A	144	POLLUTION PREVENTION	44,116.00	-	44,116.00
0605856A	145	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	4,205.00	-	4,205.00
0605876A	146	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	49,233.00	-	49,233.00
0605878A	147	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	87,172.00	-	87,172.00
0605879A	148	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E	-	-	-

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605896A	149	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E	230,029.00	-	230,029.00
0605898A	150	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	4,683.00	-	4,683.00
0909999A	151	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	1,076,593.00	-	1,076,593.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,076,593.00	-	1,076,593.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603778A	152	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	20,244.00	6,000.00	26,244.00
0102419A	153	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	103,937.00	(73,900.00)	30,037.00
0203726A	154	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	35,111.00	-	35,111.00
0203735A	155	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	94,756.00	-	94,756.00
0203740A	156	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	28,923.00	-	28,923.00
0203744A	157	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	26,681.00	-	26,681.00
0203752A	158	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,948.00	9,000.00	11,948.00
0203758A	159	DIGITIZATION	45,007.00	-	45,007.00
0203759A	160	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	52,469.00	-	52,469.00
0203761A	161	FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRA	99,528.00	-	99,528.00
0203801A	162	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	11,252.00	12,000.00	23,252.00
0203802A	163	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	1,248.00	-	1,248.00
0203806A	164	TRACTOR RUT	-	-	-
0203808A	165	TRACTOR CARD	3,993.00	-	3,993.00
0208010A	166	JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	35,941.00	-	35,941.00
0208053A	167	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	12,229.00	(12,229.00)	-
0301359A	168	SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	6,537.00	-	7,537.00
03023751A	168A	DEFENSE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TEST BED	-	6,600.00	6,600.00
0303140A	169	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,433.00	-	12,433.00
0303142A	170	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	53,897.00	5,000.00	53,897.00
0303150A	171	WMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	17,543.00	-	17,543.00
0305114A	172	TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM-FY 1987 AND PRIOR (H)	-	-	-
0305128A	173	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	950.00	-	950.00
0305204A	174	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	75,636.00	(25,000.00)	49,636.00
0708045A	175	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	30,511.00	27,200.00	57,711.00
1001018A	176	NATO JOINT STARS	6,405.00	-	6,405.00
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	773,179.00	(45,329.00)	727,850.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	773,179.00	(45,329.00)	727,850.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	(20,000.00)	(20,000.00)
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	4,780,545.00	12,452.00	4,792,997.00
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL ARMY	3,545,021.00	(62,948.00)	3,482,073.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,235,524.00	95,400.00	1,330,924.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	(20,000.00)	(20,000.00)
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-

Items of Special Interest

Aerostat

The budget request contained for \$103.9 million for the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (JLENS), formerly referred to as Aerostat, in PE 12419A.

The committee is aware that JLENS is duplicative of more promising missile defense efforts and believes funding should be reduced to support strengthening other more essential Army programs. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$73.9 million in PE 12419A.

All source analysis system

The budget request contained \$28.1 million in PE 64321A for the All Source Analysis System (ASAS).

The committee recommends \$30.1 million, an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 64321A to continue the development of situation display fusion algorithms, for migrating these algorithms to the other service intelligence support systems, and to achieve ASAS Block II interoperability with the Defense Intelligence Agency's Modernized Integrated Data Base.

Army after next combat vehicle initiative

The committee is aware of the Army's commitment to ensure that priority modernization efforts are fully compatible with the Army's vision of required capabilities for the Army After Next (AAN). While a significant number of important Army modernization programs are being refocused or restructured to incorporate new technologies needed for the AAN, the committee notes with interest numerous criticisms, including recent Army statements and the recommendations of the National Defense Panel, that question the viability of the current combat vehicle technology for the lighter, faster, more mobile AAN. The committee also notes, however, that the Army is already addressing these criticisms by conducting promising new research on lighter, more capable vehicle systems, lighter-weight and more fuel-efficient hybrid power systems and other innovations to meet the emerging combat vehicle requirements of the AAN.

The committee is encouraged by these developments and finds the associated longer range planning/development horizon especially noteworthy for guiding investment of increasingly scarce research and development funds. The committee believes that longer planning horizons are required to develop the reaching systems necessary to ensure technical viability and longer useful service lives for AAN combat systems.

Accordingly, the committee recommends:

Advanced combat vehicle and automotive technology

The budget request contained \$4.8 million in PE 63005A for advanced materials and components for advanced combat vehicle technology.

The committee notes that new composite materials have the potential of reducing future combat vehicle weight and operating costs, as well as for improving vehicle mobility and transport-

ability. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63005A for advanced composite materials.

Digital fire control system

The budget request contained \$0.1 million for artillery system engineering and development. No funds were included for the Army and Marine Corps joint Light Weight 155mm Towed Howitzer program and its digital fire control system.

The committee notes the Army's continued efforts to develop digital fire control technology that will yield significant increases in howitzer system capability while reducing weight and size of current 155mm howitzer fire control systems. The committee believes that, given sufficient funding, this area of technology offers the potential for significant contributions to all 155mm howitzer systems, including Crusader.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 64854A for further development of digital fire control technology.

Hardened materials

The budget request contained \$10.1 million for materials technology in PE 62105A. The request did not include funds for continuation of the hardened materials project.

The committee notes that this project is directed toward developing materials technology that will make heavy forces lighter and more deployable while improving their survivability. The committee recommends \$15.1 million in PE 62105A, an increase of \$5.0 million for advanced hardened materials.

Industry and academia alternative vehicle propulsion initiative

The budget request contained \$40.1 million in PE 62601A for combat vehicle and automotive technology, but did not include funds for the ongoing industry and academia alternative vehicle propulsion initiative.

The committee notes that one of the Army's most significant challenges for future vehicles is lighter, more efficient power systems that comply with future environmental regulations. The committee is aware that the Fuel-Efficient AAN Task Group concluded that the AAN is conceived to be a highly mobile, high-speed insertion force and stated that decrease in the fuel logistics burden is a prerequisite to achieving this goal. The task group determined that a significant fuel decrease is a practical possibility that can be realized by two primary approaches: (1) by doubling propulsion efficiency, and (2) by decrease in vehicle weight.

The committee believes that combining the efforts of the private sector, academic research, and Army technical experts offers a means of infusing both new ideas and technologies into future Army vehicles. The committee recommends \$50.1 million, an increase of \$10.0 million for the innovative industry and academia alternative vehicle propulsion initiative.

Innovative engine technology

The budget request contained \$54.4 million in PE 63005A for advanced combat vehicle and automotive technology. No funding was included for completion of the combined diesel/turbine engine program.

The committee is aware that the combined diesel/turbine engine offers the potential for an improved power plant for next generation vehicles. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 63005A for completion and testing of the combined diesel/turbine engine and other hybrid engine developments.

Crusader self-propelled howitzer

The budget request contained \$313.2 million in PE 63854A for the Crusader self-propelled howitzer.

The Crusader is an evolutionary development of a self-propelled howitzer (SPH) intended to replace the current Paladin 155mm SPH. It promises improved mobility, higher rate-of-fire, and greater survivability than the Paladin. The committee notes that the Crusader no longer incorporates some of the key technologies, specifically liquid propellant gun technology and common heavy vehicle chassis, that were original cornerstones of the program when first introduced. Nevertheless, the committee is aware of the Army's stated need to modernize its tactical ground fire support forces and remains very concerned that technology currently incorporated in Crusader is not sufficiently advanced to ensure Crusader's viability in the AAN. At a minimum, Crusader's weight, speed, agility and fuel efficiency would be so dissimilar, to other combat vehicles planned for the AAN, as to be operationally limiting. Given the current and projected fiscal environment, the committee does not believe that the Army should continue making such large investments in new weapon systems such as Crusader in order to maintain a proposed fielding schedule, unless that system is fully compatible with AAN requirements. Rather, the committee believes the Army should be developing the first of the next generation combat systems instead of developing and fielding the last of the current generation that the Crusader program now represents.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to evaluate the restructuring of the Crusader program to ensure incorporation of applicable state-of-the-art technologies such as weight saving composite technology for armor and structural uses, advanced lighter, more efficient propulsion technologies to meet AAN fuel economy goals, and innovative weapons technologies to increase lethality and reduce the logistics tail. The committee believes that such restructuring of Crusader development will provide for maturation and integration of these promising technologies to support a lighter, more mobile, more lethal SPH that would be more compatible with AAN combat vehicle requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$59.6 million in PE 63854A.

Aviation advanced technology development

The budget request contained \$30.0 million in PE 63003A for aviation advanced technology.

The committee notes that the Army is seeking new propulsion technologies to reduce the size and cost of future missiles while increasing lethality and further notes the potential benefits of scramjet propulsion technology for future missiles and interceptors. The committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 63003A for scramjet technology.

Comanche

The budget request contained \$367.8 million for Comanche in PE 64223A.

Comanche is a vital system for the 21st century Army, as well as the Army After Next (AAN), and is planned to replace several aging helicopters that cannot be upgraded to meet AAN requirements. The Comanche schedule has steadily slipped beyond its first envisioned operational capability in 1996 as a result of numerous funding decreases which have collectively slowed initial operational capability until late 2006. The Army's decision to reduce prototype aircraft from eight to two has delayed development still further and increased program risk. Comanche development is presently proceeding with a single prototype after funding was again reduced, reinforcing the perception that the Army's Comanche program appears fated to proceed at only a minimal level for the foreseeable future.

The committee is aware that increased funding is required to enable Comanche to fully participate in upcoming Army warfighting experiments such as Division 00 and Digitized Corps 04. Additional funding will also reduce the unwarranted program risk inherent in undertaking a major aviation development effort with a single flying prototype. Specifically, additional funding would support the Army Advanced Warfighting Experiments (AWE), accelerate mission electronics package development and weapons system integration, and integrate and test the proven Apache Longbow radar, as well as lower outyear procurement costs.

The committee recommends \$429.8 million, an increase of \$62.0 million in PE 64223A to accelerate fielding and equipping the second Comanche prototype and provide a more robust testing program in fiscal year 1999. The committee is aware that this increase, coupled with additional funding throughout the future year defense program, would enable the Comanche schedule to be accelerated to coincide with establishment of the first digitized Army division in 2004.

Command, control, communications technology

The budget request contained \$19.7 million in PE 62782A for command, control and communications technology, including \$12.9 million for communications.

The committee notes that rapid dissemination of multimedia information is critical to total integration of forces on the future battlefield. The committee is aware of successful demonstrations of the Army Multimedia Communications Device which addresses warfighter requirements to conduct two-way communication wherever they may be deployed.

The committee supports efforts to improve communications and provide better man-machine interfaces and recommends \$22.5 mil-

lion, an increase of \$2.8 million in PE 62782A for further development of the Army multimedia communications device.

Defense healthcare information assurance program

The budget request contained \$7.4 million in PE 33140A for the Army information systems security program.

Congress provided \$2.5 million for fiscal year 1998 to initiate a demonstration program for military healthcare information protection that would be consistent with national healthcare and information protection initiatives. The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 103-132) directed the Secretary of the Army to report to the Congressional defense committees on the program's development, demonstration, evaluation plan and funding requirements.

The committee recommends \$12.4 million, an increase of \$5.0 million to continue the demonstration program for military healthcare information protection. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the Congressional defense committees an update to the program plan and funding required to complete the demonstration program with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 Defense budget request.

Defense information technology test bed

The budget request contained no funding in PE 323751A for the defense information technology test bed (DITT).

The committee is aware that information dominance is vital to success on the future battlefield and supports the Army's ongoing joint DITT effort at the Center for Army Lessons Learned at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas to establish a fully electronic virtual intelligence archive for use by battlefield commanders. The committee recommends \$6.6 million in PE 323751A, an increase of \$6.6 million to make DITT operational.

Environmental development and management programs

The budget request contained \$13.8 million in PE 62720A for environmental quality technology. The committee notes that no funding is specifically provided to continue the facility environmental management and monitoring system and the computer based land management efforts. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for facility environmental management and monitoring system and \$4.0 million for computer based land management, noting that these increases will complete these developments.

Environmental quality technology

The budget request contained \$13.8 million for environmental quality technology within PE 62720A.

The committee supports continuation of the joint effort of the U.S. Army Environmental Center and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to demonstrate the efficacy and cost effectiveness of agriculturally based bioremediation to restore contaminated military and civilian sites in geographically isolated Pacific island ecosystems. The committee supports demonstration of phytoremediation, composting, wetlands, and other agriculturally based technologies to restore lands and related resources and rec-

ommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 62720A to continue agriculturally based bioremediation efforts.

Future direct support weapon system

The budget request contained \$24.6 million in PE 63004A for weapons and munitions advanced technology.

The committee is aware that the Army After Next (AAN) will require lighter, more transportable, and more mobile weapons systems, and supports the Army's efforts to develop enabling technologies such as soft recoil, advanced propellant technology, and improved digital fire control that can provide such systems. The committee supports development of lighter, more agile AAN weapons and recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the future direct support weapon system.

Future missile technology integration program

The budget request contained \$86.1 million in PE 63313A for missile and rocket advanced technology, which included \$1.5 million for future missile technology integration.

The committee notes the importance of lighter more affordable missiles and supports composite technology development for that purpose. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million for composite missile technology.

Helmet-mounted retinal display technology

The budget request contained \$7.5 million in PE 63801A for aviation advanced development, including \$2.5 million for aircrew integrated systems.

The committee notes the aircrew integrated common helmet (AICH) incorporates reaching technology including miniature retinal display technology that greatly improves aircrew performance. The committee recommends \$12.5 million, an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63801A for retinal display technology.

High mobility artillery rocket system

The budget request contained \$20.2 million in PE 63778A for the multiple launch rocket system (MLRS) improvement program.

The committee notes the high mobility artillery rocket system (HIMARS) is being developed as an early entry capability for light forces and is scheduled to participate in the Army's rapid force projection initiative. The committee strongly supports development of this mobile, high lethality weapons system for early entry and light forces and notes that this effort represents an excellent example of leveraging the proven capabilities of the MLRS system to address a specifically defined force projection requirement. The committee recommends \$26.2 million, an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63778A for HIMARS.

Improved fuel pumps and fuel controls

The budget request contained \$2.9 million in PE 23752A for the aircraft engine component improvement program.

Improved fuel pumps and engine controls are necessary elements of all fielded helicopters, as well as new helicopter development programs such as Longbow Apache and Comanche. The committee

supports these critical improvements and recommends \$11.9 million in PE 23752A, an increase of \$4.0 million for improved fuel pumps and \$5.0 million for the full authority digital engine control.

Joint service small arms program

The budget request contained \$5.2 million for the joint service small arms program in PE 63607A.

The objective of this program is to demonstrate key technologies leading to more effective small arms and munitions for all services, including such technology as the objective individual combat weapon.

The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million for the joint service small arms program.

Joint surveillance and target attack radar system (Joint STARS)

The budget request contained \$5.5 million for engineering, manufacturing and development system improvements to the Joint STARS in PE 64770A. The committee notes the proven success of the Joint STARS system in both Operation Desert Storm and Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia. A key feature of Joint STARS is the secure, encrypted, anti-jam Surveillance Control Data Link (SCDL). The SCDL links the Air Force's E-8 Joint STARS aircraft to the Army's ground support modules and common ground stations, enabling real-time data transfer of command and control information between the aircraft and ground stations. The committee is aware that the ongoing SCDL System Improvement Program (SIP), which eliminates obsolete parts and updates older digital circuit boards with state-of-the-art, software-based array boards, will increase the data transfer rate while reducing component cost, size, weight, and power requirements by as much as 50 percent. Based on the increased reliability and improved performance benefits of this SIP, the committee recommends \$21.5 million, an increase of \$16.0 million in PE 64770A for its completion.

Lighter more lethal weapons

The budget request contained \$26.5 million in PE 63639A for the armament enhancement initiative.

No funds were included for the ongoing tank extended range munitions-kinetic energy (TERM-KE) program. The committee notes that the TERM-KE is a 120mm tank munition that uses a rocket boosted standard kinetic energy penetrator and fire-and-forget guidance to provide greater lethality at extended ranges. The committee is aware that lighter, more lethal, fire and forget weapons are needed for the Army After Next and supports such efforts. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63639A for continued development of TERM-KE technology as an integral part of efforts to meet the broad range of future requirements for lighter, longer range, more lethal weapons.

The committee is also aware of continued Army/Marine Corps joint development of the lightweight 155mm howitzer and that additional funding is needed for testing, evaluation of a breech mounted laser ignition system, and modifications to accommodate the Army's new propelling charge system. A significant part of this effort is the Army's digital fire control system. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of \$5.0 million for the lightweight 155mm howitzer and fire control system in PE 64854A.

MedTeams

The budget request contained \$13.4 million in PE 62716A for human factors engineering technology, including, \$0.5 million for the Emergency Team Coordination program (MedTeams) in PE 62716A.

The committee notes that the Army MedTeams research under the extended team performance efforts has improved shock trauma care to reduce medical and casualty risks. The committee recommends \$18.2 million, an increase of \$4.8 million in PE 62716A for MedTeams, with the clear understanding that this increase will complete this program.

Missile and rocket advanced technology

The budget request contained \$86.1 million in PE 63313A to support development of advanced missile technologies.

The committee notes recent statements by the Army Chief of Staff expressing concern over the inability of future budgets to sustain the current number of Army modernization programs. While the Army is currently pursuing a significant number of anti-armor missile programs, the committee remains concerned over continuing poor performance of the Enhanced Fiber Optic Guided Missile (E-FOGM) missile system, and questions whether this program is an appropriate use of the Army's extremely limited modernization funds.

Last year, the committee expressed great concern over the Army's plan to procure over 300 of these missiles during the Advanced Concepts Technology Demonstration (ACTD) based on only two actual missile flights, both of which were failures. However, \$31.4 million was authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998 to complete the planned 14 missile ACTD testing with the direction that no additional missiles be procured for other than test purposes. A full year later, still with no successful missile flights during the ACTD, the fiscal year 1999 request includes funds to continue ACTD testing and procure an additional 192 missiles, including 96 production missiles. The committee remains concerned over the lack of successful missile flight tests and recent problems with rising missile costs projections. Furthermore, the committee has seen no indication that the Army intends to pursue fielding this system beyond those capabilities obtained during the planned scope of the ACTD.

Based on the disappointing results of this program to date and the assessment that fiscal year 1998 funds should be more than sufficient to complete the remaining 12 missile flight tests, the committee believes that the time has come to terminate this effort and redirect limited resources to more viable programs. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$35.7 million in PE 63313A allocated for evaluation of the E-FOGM missile system.

Missile defense battle integration center/battle lab

The budget request contained \$12.2 million in PE 63308A for Army missile defense system integration.

The Army is developing the missile defense battle integration center (MDBIC), a flexible distributed interactive simulation-based architecture for training, exercises, and military operations. The committee notes that while missile defense is a stated high priority for the Army, the MDBIC program is inadequately funded. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63308A to continue development of the integrated battle lab.

Plasma energy pyrolysis system

The budget request contained no funds in PE 62720A for completion of the plasma energy pyrolysis system (PEPS) development.

The committee notes that PEPS technology has been validated through testing to safely destroy hazardous waste streams into inert gasses. The committee supports efforts to keep the environment clean and recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62720A, to complete development, construction and delivery of a transportable and a mobile PEPS system to the Army for testing. The committee notes that this funding will complete PEPS development, and any future PEPS procurement must be based on military requirements and priorities.

Precision guided mortar munitions

The budget request contained \$24.6 million in PE 63004A, including \$1.9 million for precision guided mortar munitions (PGMM).

The committee notes that PGMM doubles the weapon range and provides a precision kill capability against tanks and bunkers. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63004A for PGMM.

Starstreak

The budget request contained \$30.0 million for aviation advanced technology in PE 63003A. No funds were included for Starstreak (ATASK)-Stinger missile side-by-side testing for the Apache helicopter.

The committee is aware that the Apache helicopter does not have a defensive air-to-air missile capability, even though other helicopters are being so equipped, and that Starstreak and Stinger are being evaluated and compared using simulation. The committee supports comparative test of Starstreak and Stinger, as appropriate, in live side-by-side firings, and recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63003A for this purpose.

Stinger missile block two upgrades

The budget request contained \$11.3 million in PE 23801A for missile/air defense product improvement, which included \$2.0 million for Stinger product improvement.

The committee notes efforts to develop block II modifications to the Stinger missile to provide enhanced performance. The committee supports continuation of this initiative and recommends an increase of \$12.0 million in PE 23801A to support these efforts.

Stinger universal launcher

The budget request contained \$30.0 million for aviation advanced technology in PE 63003A.

The budget request contained no funds for the Stinger universal launcher, which is under development, and required to support side-by-side testing. The committee notes that this launcher has broad applicability to a number of platforms, including Apache aircraft. The committee supports this development including necessary weapons system interfaces and recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63003A for this purpose.

Strategic environmental research and development program

The budget request contained \$54.4 million for the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP)/Environmental Security Technology in a new Army program element (PE 63780A).

SERDP was established in 1990 to address Department of Defense and Department of Energy environmental concerns. SERDP's stated objective is to improve DOD's mission readiness. This program was transferred from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to the Army with the fiscal year 1999 request. The Army's budget request already contains ongoing environmental programs including: Environmental Quality Technology (PE 62720A), Environmental Conservation (PE 65853A), Pollution prevention (PE 65854A), and Environmental Compliance (PE 65856A) totaling \$75.8 million. The committee believes that the mission essential Army environmental protection needs can be met within existing Army programs and, therefore, recommends no funding for SERDP.

Tactical high energy laser

The budget request contained \$12.2 million in PE 63308A, but included no funding for the tactical high energy laser (THEL) program.

The committee understands that the Army now has an identified mission need for a directed energy air defense system. The committee believes that the Army's continued technical involvement in the THEL program represents an effectively leveraged path to meeting its requirements.

While the early prototypes of THEL will not have sufficient mobility to meet Army needs, the committee understands that the planned evolution of the THEL program will lead to a mobile, sustainable battlefield system. Key elements of this effort include development of materials for crystals and manufacturing technology in support of solid state laser technology and integration of a lightweight acquisition and tracking system with a lightweight beam director. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63308A for THEL.

Tactical exploitation of national capabilities

The budget request contained \$44.7 million in PE 64766A for Army tactical exploitation of national capabilities (TENCAP).

The committee notes that the amount requested represents nearly a \$26.0 million increase from the level approved for fiscal year 1998. The committee is concerned that the Army may be using the

TENCAP program as a means for bypassing the “normal” acquisition process allowing it to procure and operate combat systems associated with space sensors. The committee is supportive of TENCAP efforts for short-term, high-pay off concepts and initiatives that improve the use of national space sensors and systems. However, the committee will not support TENCAP funded development and production of entire weapons systems. Therefore, the committee directs that future TENCAP requests be limited to space exploitation initiatives and projects that are of short-duration and high payoff.

The committee recommends \$40.1 million for the Army’s TENCAP program in fiscal year 1999, a reduction of 4.6 million in PE 64766A.

Trajectory correctable munitions development

The budget request contained \$24.6 million weapons and munitions advanced technology in PE 63004A. No funds were provided for the Trajectory Correctable Munitions (TCM) program.

The committee is aware that the TCM will provide the Army with a versatile projectile with unprecedented range and accuracy and will significantly extend the range and accuracy of both current and developmental 155mm artillery platforms. The committee supports TCM development and recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63004A for TCM development.

Ultra lightweight camouflage net system

The budget request contained \$26.0 million for Logistics and Engineer Equipment in PE 64804A, including \$0.8 million for camouflage systems (ULCANS).

The committee notes that the ultra lightweight camouflage net system is intended to increase force survivability in arctic, desert and urban environments. The committee recommends \$28.0 million, and increase of \$2.0 million for expedited production qualification and testing of ULCANS.

NAVY RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained \$8,108.9 million for Navy RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of \$8,403.6 million, an increase of \$294.6 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 1999 Navy RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Navy request are discussed following the table.

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0601152N	000	RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NAVY	14,734.00	-	-	14,734.00
0601153N	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	347,945.00	4,500.00	-	352,445.00
	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	362,679.00	4,500.00	-	367,179.00
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	362,679.00	4,500.00	-	367,179.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT				
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0602111N	3	AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,140.00	-	-	37,140.00
0602121N	4	SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	43,177.00	-	-	43,177.00
0602122N	5	AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	23,229.00	-	-	23,229.00
0602131M	6	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	12,132.00	-	-	12,132.00
0602228N	7	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE	4,699.00	-	-	4,699.00
0602232N	8	COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLA	65,033.00	1,000.00	-	66,033.00
0602233N	9	HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	29,722.00	-	-	29,722.00
0602234N	10	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	77,617.00	12,000.00	-	89,617.00
0602270N	11	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	23,849.00	-	-	23,849.00
0602314N	12	UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	50,619.00	-	-	50,619.00
0602315N	13	MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	45,928.00	-	-	45,928.00
0602435N	14	OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	56,722.00	10,000.00	-	66,722.00
0602633N	15	UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	34,856.00	2,000.00	-	36,856.00
0602805N	16	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	20,000.00	-	-	20,000.00
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	524,723.00	25,000.00	-	549,723.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	524,723.00	25,000.00	-	549,723.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0603217N	17	AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,143.00	(2,000.00)	-	46,143.00
0603238N	18	PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	58,306.00	-	-	58,306.00
0603270N	19	ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,169.00	-	-	17,169.00
0603508N	20	SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,264.00	8,000.00	-	47,264.00
0603640M	21	MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	41,931.00	-	-	41,931.00
0603706N	22	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	18,728.00	-	-	18,728.00
0603707N	23	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	21,042.00	-	-	21,042.00
0603712N	24	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,919.00	-	-	20,919.00
0603747N	25	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,827.00	8,000.00	-	64,827.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603782N	26	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	41,710.00	-	41,710.00	
0603792N	27	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	74,392.00	-	74,392.00	
0603794N	28	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	22,294.00	-	22,294.00	
06036XXN	28A	NAVY THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE		50,000.00	50,000.00	
		TOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	460,725.00	64,000.00	524,725.00	
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	460,725.00	64,000.00	524,725.00	
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0603207N	29	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	28,824.00	-	28,824.00	
0603208N	30	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT				
0603216N	31	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	8,164.00	6,000.00	14,164.00	
0603254N	32	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	20,184.00	3,000.00	23,184.00	
0603261N	33	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,479.00	-	1,479.00	
0603382N	34	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	8,653.00	-	8,653.00	
0603502N	35	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	73,491.00	7,000.00	80,491.00	
0603504N	36	ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	68,402.00	-	68,402.00	
0603506N	37	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE				
0603512N	38	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	154,307.00	-	154,307.00	
0603513N	39	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	27,725.00	1,000.00	28,725.00	
0603514N	40	SHIP COMBAT SURVIVABILITY	7,595.00	-	7,595.00	
0603525N	41	PILOT FISH	117,094.00	-	117,094.00	
0603536N	42	RETRACT JUNIPER	11,055.00	-	11,055.00	
0603542N	43	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	3,600.00	-	3,600.00	
0603553N	44	SURFACE ASW	11,871.00	-	11,871.00	
0603561N	45	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	60,520.00	-	60,520.00	
0603562N	46	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,676.00	-	4,676.00	
0603563N	47	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	14,900.00	-	14,900.00	
0603564N	48	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	42,668.00	-	42,668.00	
0603570N	49	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	118,342.00	5,900.00	124,242.00	
0603573N	50	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	58,419.00	-	58,419.00	
0603576N	51	CHALK EAGLE	122,031.00	-	122,031.00	
0603582N	52	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,654.00	-	9,654.00	
0603609N	53	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS		8,000.00	8,000.00	
0603610N	54	ADVANCED WARHEAD DEVELOPMENT (MK-50)	39,775.00	-	39,775.00	

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603611M	55	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	104,822.00	4,000.00	108,822.00
0603612M	56	MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	1,958.00	-	1,958.00
0603635M	57	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	37,133.00	2,500.00	39,633.00
0603654N	58	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,756.00	-	10,756.00
0603658N	59	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	131,623.00	26,000.00	157,623.00
0603711N	60	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603713N	61	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,257.00	-	15,257.00
0603721N	62	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	59,438.00	2,700.00	62,138.00
0603724N	63	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,592.00	-	4,592.00
0603725N	64	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,861.00	-	1,861.00
0603734N	65	CHALK CORAL	97,552.00	-	97,552.00
0603746N	66	RETRACT MAPLE	117,186.00	-	117,186.00
0603748N	67	LINK PLUMERIA	22,123.00	-	22,123.00
0603751N	68	RETRACT ELM	11,665.00	10,529.00	22,194.00
0603755N	69	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEMVAL	12,337.00	-	12,337.00
0603785N	70	SHIP SYSTEMS OCEANOGRAPHIC PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT(H)	-	-	-
0603787N	71	SPECIAL PROCESSES	81,743.00	-	81,743.00
0603790N	72	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	11,004.00	(5,000.00)	6,004.00
0603795N	73	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	110,104.00	(20,000.00)	90,104.00
0603800N	74	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEMVAL	463,402.00	-	463,402.00
0603851M	75	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEMVAL	22,592.00	-	22,592.00
0603852N	76	ARSENAL SHIP	-	-	-
0603860N	77	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEMVAL	-	-	-
0603889N	78	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS	-	-	-
0604327N	79	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	9,827.00	-	9,827.00
0604707N	80	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING S	17,955.00	-	17,955.00
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	2,358,359.00	51,629.00	2,409,988.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,358,359.00	51,629.00	2,409,988.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603208N	81	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	595.00	-	595.00
0603266N	82	AH-1T COMPOSITE ROTOR BLADE (H)	-	-	-
0604212N	83	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	231,120.00	-	231,120.00
0604214N	84	AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	13,787.00	-	13,787.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604215N	85	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	51,987.00	-	-	51,987.00
0604217N	86	S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	31,469.00	(27,093.00)	-	4,376.00
0604218N	87	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,162.00	-	-	6,162.00
0604221N	88	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,046.00	-	-	3,046.00
0604231N	89	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	50,713.00	-	-	50,713.00
0604245N	90	H-1 UPGRADES	98,542.00	-	-	98,542.00
0604261N	91	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	29,637.00	-	-	29,637.00
0604262N	92	V-22A	355,142.00	-	-	355,142.00
0604284N	93	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,454.00	-	-	9,454.00
0604270N	94	EW DEVELOPMENT	128,586.00	-	-	128,586.00
0604307N	95	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	132,561.00	-	-	132,561.00
0604310N	96	ARSENAL SHIP	-	-	-	-
0604311N	97	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	1,343.00	-	-	1,343.00
0604312N	98	TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,064.00	-	-	2,064.00
0604355N	99	VERTICAL LAUNCH ASROC	-	-	-	-
0604366N	100	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,320.00	-	-	1,320.00
0604373N	101	AIRBORNE MCM	24,967.00	-	-	24,967.00
0604503N	102	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	50,300.00	15,000.00	-	65,300.00
0604504N	103	AIR CONTROL	4,196.00	-	-	4,196.00
0604507N	104	ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	1,599.00	-	-	1,599.00
0604512N	105	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	8,531.00	-	-	8,531.00
0604516N	106	SHIP SURVIVABILITY	6,196.00	-	-	6,196.00
0604524N	107	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	4,704.00	-	-	4,704.00
0604528N	108	SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	11,710.00	-	-	11,710.00
0604558N	109	SWATH (SMALL WATERPLANE AREA TWIN HULL) OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIP	-	-	-	-
0604561N	110	NEW DESIGN SSN	218,816.00	17,000.00	-	235,816.00
0604562N	111	SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	27,456.00	-	-	27,456.00
0604567N	112	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	28,573.00	-	-	28,573.00
0604574N	113	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E	133,645.00	(30,900.00)	-	102,745.00
0604601N	114	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	8,249.00	-	-	8,249.00
0604603N	115	MINE DEVELOPMENT	15.00	-	-	15.00
0604610N	116	UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	5,183.00	-	-	5,183.00
0604612M	117	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	8,106.00	-	-	8,106.00
	118	MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	3,855.00	-	-	3,855.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604618N	119	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	11,738.00	-	11,738.00
0604651M	120	NONLETHAL WEAPONS - EMD	-	-	-
0604654N	121	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,037.00	-	7,037.00
0604703N	122	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,235.00	-	1,235.00
0604710N	123	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,544.00	-	5,544.00
0604721N	124	BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	5,770.00	-	5,770.00
0604727N	125	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	73,022.00	-	73,022.00
0604755N	126	SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	148,165.00	-	148,165.00
0604771N	127	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	4,321.00	-	4,321.00
0604777N	128	NAVIGATION/D SYSTEM	42,301.00	-	42,301.00
0604784N	129	DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	42,017.00	6,700.00	48,717.00
0604805N	130	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	28,500.00	-	28,500.00
		TOTAL ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,063,281.00	(19,293.00)	2,043,988.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	29,095.00	-	29,095.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,034,186.00	(19,293.00)	2,014,893.00
0604256N	131	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,400.00	-	24,400.00
0604258N	132	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	54,800.00	-	54,800.00
0604759N	133	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	17,281.00	-	17,281.00
0605152N	134	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	10,132.00	(1,000.00)	9,132.00
0605154N	135	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	44,201.00	-	44,201.00
0605155N	136	FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,748.00	-	2,748.00
0605502N	137	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605804N	138	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	8,513.00	-	8,513.00
0605853N	139	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	28,690.00	(1,000.00)	27,690.00
0605856N	140	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,213.00	-	2,213.00
0605861N	141	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	64,455.00	-	64,455.00
0605862N	142	RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	8,530.00	-	8,530.00
0605863N	143	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	57,421.00	(2,000.00)	55,421.00
0605864N	144	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	260,601.00	(5,800.00)	254,801.00
0605865N	145	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	9,194.00	-	9,194.00
0605866N	146	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,477.00	(300.00)	3,177.00
0605867N	147	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	13,185.00	-	13,185.00
0605873M	148	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	7,132.00	-	7,132.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0609999N	149	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	616,973.00	(10,100.00)	606,873.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	616,973.00	(10,100.00)	606,873.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0604227N	150	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	1,965.00	-	1,965.00
0101221N	151	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	56,604.00	-	56,604.00
0101224N	152	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,588.00	-	33,588.00
0101226N	153	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,328.00	-	8,328.00
0204139N	154	F/A-18 SQUADRONS	357,214.00	-	357,214.00
0204152N	155	E-2 SQUADRONS	47,797.00	-	47,797.00
0204229N	156	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	16,297.00	-	16,297.00
0204311N	157	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	66,727.00	98,600.00	165,327.00
0204413N	158	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	19,772.00	-	19,772.00
0204571N	159	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	1,945.00	-	1,945.00
0204575N	160	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,390.00	5,000.00	33,390.00
0205601N	161	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	3,716.00	-	3,716.00
0205604N	162	HARM IMPROVEMENT	18,921.00	15,000.00	33,921.00
0205620N	163	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	49,757.00	-	49,757.00
0205632N	164	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,390.00	-	9,390.00
0205633N	165	MK-48 ADCAP	17,550.00	-	17,550.00
0205658N	166	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	64,956.00	-	64,956.00
0205667N	167	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	-	-	-
0205675N	168	F-14 UPGRADE	12,947.00	-	12,947.00
0206313M	169	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	54,183.00	-	54,183.00
0206623M	170	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	50,594.00	-	50,594.00
0206624M	171	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	14,698.00	8,000.00	22,698.00
0207161N	172	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	4,634.00	-	4,634.00
0207163N	173	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	65,855.00	-	65,855.00
0301303N	174	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	4,862.00	-	4,862.00
0301327N	175	MARITIME INTELLIGENCE	-	-	-
0303109N	176	TECHNICAL RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEILLANCE	18,188.00	-	18,188.00
0303140N	177	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	-	-	-
	178	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	22,201.00	-	22,201.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0303150N	179	WMMCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	469.00	-	469.00
0304111N	180	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	[-]	[-]	[-]
0305154N	181	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	11,671.00	-	11,671.00
0305160N	182	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	5,352.00	-	5,352.00
0305189N	183	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	2,302.00	-	2,302.00
0305192N	184	JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	-	-	-
0305204N	184A	NAVY TACTICAL UAV - TRANSFER FROM 35204A	-	59,200.00	59,200.00
0305204M	184B	MARINE CORPS CLOSE RANGE TACTICAL UAV - TRANSFER FROM 35204A	342.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
0305207N	185	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	399.00	-	342.00
0305227N	186	NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	69,967.00	-	399.00
0702207N	187	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	59,060.00	-	69,967.00
0708011N	188	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	521,541.00	8,600.00	67,860.00
XXXXXXXX	998	Classified Programs	1,722,183.00	26,500.00	548,041.00
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,722,183.00	228,900.00	1,951,083.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-
		TOTAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL NEW	8,108,923.00	(50,000.00)	(50,000.00)
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,074,737.00	294,636.00	8,403,559.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,034,186.00	363,929.00	6,438,686.00
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	(19,283.00)	2,014,883.00
		TOTAL	-	(50,000.00)	(50,000.00)

Items of Special Interest

ADC(X) auxiliary cargo ship development

The budget request contained \$133.6 million in PE 64567N for the Navy's program for ship contract design and live fire test and evaluation design, including \$5.9 million for the ADC(X) Dry Auxiliary Cargo Ship program.

The committee is aware that research and development funding for the ADC(X) should be shifted from PE 64567N, Ship Contract Design, to PE 63564N, Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies, to support the Build and Charter and program for auxiliary ships that is recommended elsewhere in this report. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$5.9 million in PE 64567N and an increase of \$5.9 million in PE 63564N.

Advanced amphibious assault vehicle

The budget request contained \$104.8 million in PE 63611M for the advanced amphibious assault vehicle (AAAV).

The AAAV is a self-deploying, high water speed, fully tracked, nuclear biological and chemical warfare protected armored amphibious personnel carrier. The committee is aware that additional funding will permit accelerated development of alternative propulsion system and suspension components which are critical to the AAAV system. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63611M to support these efforts.

Advanced anti-radiation guided missile

The budget request contained \$18.9 million in PE 25601N for the Homing Anti-Radiation Missile (HARM) improvement program, including \$10.5 million for continued development of the advanced anti-radiation guided missile (AARGM). AARGM is a Phase III Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program for demonstration of an integrated anti-radiation homing seeker, active millimeter wave terminal seeker, and precision mid-course navigation suite within the size constraints of an existing HARM missile. The program is designed to demonstrate that a dual-mode seeker of this type can effectively engage and destroy advanced air defenses even in the presence of system shutdown or other anti-radiation missile countermeasures.

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) directed the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an independent assessment of the AARGM program, including the program plan and schedule, program execution, technical performance, and program risk. The Secretary's report, dated April 3, 1998, stated that the Navy had initiated and completed a revised program baseline which significantly reduces program risk, and concluded that the AARGM program is fundamentally sound, is executable with the currently budget resources, and will provide a technology demonstration which will determine technical feasibility and military utility of the AARGM technology. The AARGM demonstration program, if successful, will demonstrate system level capabilities which exceed current Navy tactical missile capabilities. The program schedule includes completion of guided flight tests and the demonstration program by fiscal year 2001. The report states that funding budgeted

for the rebaselined program is sufficient to accomplish the technology demonstration, however, the report also states that the current program does not address a number of issues that would be required for a Milestone II development decision.

The committee recommends a total of \$25.5 million in PE 25601N for the AARGM program, an increase of \$15.0 million to address risk reduction and other issues necessary to support a development decision following completion of the demonstration program.

Arctic oceanographic observation program

The budget request contained \$56.7 million in PE 62435N for applied research in oceanographic and atmospheric technologies. No funds were requested for continuation of the program for Arctic Climate Observations Using Underwater Sound (ACOUS).

ACOUS is a cooperative program for the utilization of underwater acoustic techniques to determine ocean climate and acoustic characteristics in a large ocean basin. The program provides the capability for understanding the large temperature changes occurring in the Arctic Ocean, the potential impact of these changes on the Arctic, and their implications for global climate. As a bilateral program with Russia, ACOUS furthers U.S. national security interests through improved scientific relations and the transfer of Russian defense technology and scientific experience to peaceful uses. The committee encourages the Navy to reprogram funds to continue the ACOUS program in fiscal year 1999 and to include funds for completion of the program in the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Automatic target tracker

The budget request contained \$14.7 million in PE 26623M for Marine Corps ground combat/support systems but included no funding for an automatic target tracker for the M1A1 tank.

The committee notes that an automatic target tracker has been successfully tested on National Guard M1A1 tanks. The committee is aware that automatic target tracking could increase the Marine Corps warfighting capability and recommends \$3.0 million to evaluate this available capability for Marine Corps use.

Autonomous underwater robotics technology

The budget request contained \$347.9 million in PE 61153N for the Navy's defense research sciences program.

Recent research, including software simulations and hardware tests in the water, indicate that the application of autonomous underwater robotic systems has the potential for significant improvements in surveillance, tactical oceanography, and shallow water mine countermeasures. The committee believes that partnerships established among academia, industry, and the Navy's research and development and operational communities would be beneficial in the development and evaluation of the technology and operational concepts for these systems. Such partnerships could develop and evaluate tactics and capabilities, as well as demonstrate the operational utility of these systems in at-sea tests. Of the funds provided in PE 61153N, the committee recommends \$4.0 million for continued basic research and development in autonomous under-

water robotic systems for surveillance, tactical oceanography, and shallow water mine countermeasures.

Autonomous underwater vehicle and sonar development

The budget request contained \$56.7 million in PE 62435N for oceanographic and atmospheric technology, including \$20.3 million for applied research in environmental influences on mine countermeasures systems and littoral oceanography.

The committee recommends \$66.7 million, an increase of \$10.0 million to continue applied research and exploratory development in technologies for advanced sensors and unmanned underwater vehicles applicable to mine countermeasures and other littoral operations.

Aviation depot maintenance technology

The budget request contained \$59.4 million in PE 63721N for environmental protection demonstration and validation, including \$3.5 million for Naval aviation pollution prevention.

The committee recommends \$62.1 million, an increase of \$2.7 million for the development and demonstration of aviation depot maintenance technologies that will significantly reduce maintenance and repair costs, and reduce or eliminate hazardous waste and pollution products.

Carbon-carbon materials for reentry bodies

The budget request contained \$77.6 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

The committee encourages the Navy to continue a robust program for the development of carbon-carbon heatshield and insulation materials to address future Navy reentry body requirements to survive long atmospheric flight trajectories while maintaining a precision strike capability. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 62234N for the development of carbon-carbon materials.

Common support aircraft

The budget request contained \$27.1 million in PE 64217N for the Common Support Aircraft (CSA), a fiscal year 1999 major new start program to develop the replacement for the Navy's S-3B, ES-3A, E-2C, and C-2 aircraft. The common support airframe would also be a primary candidate for the Navy's organic tanker aircraft mission. The CSA program plan calls for a Milestone 0 decision in fiscal year 1999 to initiate the concept formulation phase and achievement of CSA initial operating capability in 2013.

The committee supports the need for a replacement for the Navy's E-2/C-2 and S-3/ES-3 aircraft which represent 1960s and 1970s aviation technology, respectively, and will begin reaching the end of their service lives in the 2010 time-frame. However, based on the projected in-service date for the CSA, the committee believes that the start of the CSA program should be delayed until fiscal year 2000. Accordingly, the committee recommends no funding for the CSA program for fiscal year 1999. The committee expects that the program will be included in the fiscal year 2000 defense budget request, and directs the establishment of a separate concept explo-

ration/product definition and risk reduction program element for the program.

Cooperative engagement capability

The budget request contained \$131.6 million in PE 63658N for cooperative engagement capability (CEC) demonstration and validation.

The committee is aware of additional funding requirements for the CEC program that developed too late to be included in the fiscal year 1999 defense budget request. These requirements include correction of deficiencies discovered during the initial operational test and evaluation of the system, and support of follow-on testing in preparation for the interoperability test that will involve two carrier battle groups. The committee is also aware of the increasing role that the Navy's CEC system will play in air defense and tactical ballistic missile defense for the fleet and for joint forces. Development and evaluation of these capabilities will require an integrated test and evaluation system that links together major military test and training ranges. Such a system should capitalize on a number of existing government-sponsored high performance computing and high-speed network programs. The committee recommends \$157.6 million for the CEC program, an increase of \$20.0 million to address funding shortfalls in the program as outlined above, and \$6.0 million for continued development of the CEC test and evaluation system and linking that system to the military test and training ranges infrastructure.

Cooperative engagement capability frequency spectrum requirements

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) required the Secretary of Defense to review the impact of the loss of portions of the frequency spectrum, previously assigned to the CEC program, due to frequency spectrum sales under title VI of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1993, and to report on the measures being taken to compensate for any operational degradation that might result from such loss. The DOD report to Congress on spectrum requirements, dated March 1998, states that in addition to the loss of capability resulting from the transfer of 50 megahertz (MHz) from the radio frequency operating band of the CEC, the reallocated spectrum also has the potential for making a substantial portion of the remaining CEC spectrum unusable. The report also states that there is an existing radio frequency interference problem between the CEC and the Light Airborne Multi-purpose System (LAMPS) that impacts the use of the CEC. This interference problem could be accommodated by movement of the LAMPS Mark III data link from C-band to Ku-band at a potential cost of \$115.0 million.

Of the funds provided in PE 63658N for the CEC program, the committee recommends \$5.0 million to continue development activities necessary for the transfer of the LAMPS Mark III data link from C-band to Ku band. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a detailed assessment of the measures required to compensate for the loss of the CEC frequency spectrum and for the CEC/LAMPS Mark III data link interference problem. The Secretary shall report the plan and program required to main-

tain the CEC operational capability to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Cryogenic electronics technology

The budget request contained \$77.6 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

The committee is aware that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Office of Naval Research are demonstrating notable performance gains through the use of cryogenic electronics and high temperature superconductivity technology in analog and digital electronic components, and that such applications may offer the potential for achieving significant improvements in the ability of future radar systems to detect and track low-flying targets in clutter. The committee also understands that these technologies may permit the development of advanced RF receiver/exciter subsystems that could be common to a wide range of radar applications and could result in significant reductions in the cost of future radar systems. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million to continue the development of superconducting waveform generator and analog-to-digital converter technology, leading to the demonstration of an advanced "cryo-radar" with increased performance and clutter rejection and reduced size, power, and weight.

Distributed surveillance system

The budget request contained \$42.0 million in PE 64784N for advanced deployable system (ADS) engineering and manufacturing development.

The committee recommends \$48.7 million, including an increase of \$6.7 million to continue the planned introduction of automation and data fusion capability for the ADS demonstration system.

DD-21 land attack destroyer

The budget request contained \$133.6 million in PE 64567N for ship contract design and live fire test and evaluation design, including a total of \$84.9 million for the Navy's DD-21 land attack destroyer program.

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) directed the Secretary of the Navy to review the acquisition strategy for the Navy's next-generation surface combatant (SC-21), determine if a prototyping strategy is appropriate for the program, and report the results of the review to the Congress. The Secretary's report, dated April 1998, describes a phased acquisition process that would culminate in the selection of a single contractor to complete system design, construction, test, delivery, and support of the lead ship for the DD-21 class land attack destroyer. The three-phased program would emphasize active competition among competing contractors during the concept design and initial systems design phases, and identification of a "second ship builder" prior to completing the system design in the detailed design and construction phase. The report also identified the following: early contractor involvement, the use of state of the art engineering tools to enable "virtual prototyping" and analysis of alternatives prior to beginning construction,

and the use of "cost as an independent variable" criteria in meeting the affordability goals for the program. Additionally, a risk management process that includes the use of process teams, extensive modeling and simulation, networked land-based engineering sites, lessons-learned from the Maritime Fire Support Demonstrator program, and at-sea testing of DD-21 components and sub-systems would be established.

The committee supports the need for a competitive acquisition strategy for the DD-21 and believes that such a strategy is critical to achieve the advanced surface combatant that will meet or exceed the aggressive cost and performance goals established for the DD-21. The committee believes that it is imperative that the Navy and industry make every effort to ensure a competitive environment, even if a brief delay in initiation of the concept phase of the program is necessary. The committee notes that such a delay would affect the Navy's ability to obligate fiscal year 1998 funds, which have been provided for the concept phase, and reduce the requirement for fiscal year 1999 funding for the DD-21 program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$25.0 million in PE 64567N for the DD-21 land attack destroyer. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committee within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, the measures that will be taken to maintain competitiveness in the DD-21 program.

DP-2 thrust vectoring system proof of concept demonstration

The budget request contained \$48.1 million in PE 63217N for advanced development of air systems and weapons advanced technology. No funds were requested for continuation of the DP-2 thrust vectoring system (DP-2) proof of concept demonstration.

DP-2 is a proof of concept program to demonstrate in a one-quarter scale flight test vehicle the technology for a short take off/vertical landing (STOVL) aircraft of advanced composite construction using thrust vector control. Following the ground test demonstration of an all-composite, divert thruster system that was supported by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the program and \$10.0 million in fiscal year 1997 funds were transferred from DARPA to the Department of the Navy for an 18-month, proof of concept demonstration phase. Roll-out of the one-quarter scale flight test vehicle is scheduled in February 1999 and the first flight test in June 1999. Should the proof of concept demonstration prove successful, the contractor has proposed the construction and test of a full scale aircraft, which would demonstrate an affordable, high performance, vertical take off transport aircraft for ship to shore operation and for ship and shore based reconnaissance.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63217N for completion of the DP-2 proof of concept demonstration. Completion of a successful proof of concept demonstration could provide the basis for the Department of the Navy to proceed with a full-scale aircraft development program.

Environmentally safe energetic materials

The budget request contained \$39.8 million in PE 63609N for conventional munitions demonstration and validation.

The committee has supported the elimination of toxic materials and solvents from explosives and other energetic material and the development of new insensitive explosives and other materials that are able to meet increasingly stringent environmental compliance regulations. Such developments could lead to propellants and explosives that could result in higher weapon systems performance and significant savings in overall life cycle costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63609N to accelerate the program for the development of propellants and explosives that utilize environmentally compliant energetic materials for undersea, surface, and other weapons systems.

Escape system dynamic flow test facility

The budget request contained \$8.2 million in PE 63216N for the aviation survivability demonstration/validation program.

The committee believes that there is a need for improvements in the ability to test the performance of aircraft ejection seats in a realistic environment and to evaluate the interaction between the ejection seat, aircrew equipment, and aircraft cockpit as the seat leaves the aircraft. In recent years, added aircrew equipment and the smaller stature of female crewmembers have raised concerns about the safety of the crew during ejection from an aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63216N for improvements in ejection seat test capabilities.

Hybrid electronically scanned antenna

The budget request contained \$65.0 million in PE 62232N for the Navy's command, control, communications, intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance technology program, including \$20.8 million for applied research in radar technology.

The committee is aware of work at the Naval Research Laboratory leading to a hybrid electronically scanned antenna for potential use with the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM). If successful, this antenna development could replace the existing ESSM mechanically scanned illuminator radar dish antenna with a two-dimensional X-band array, and provide a multiple target engagement capability for the ESSM and significant reduction in ship radar cross section at an affordable cost. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to consider reprogramming of fiscal year 1999 funds to accelerate the development and an advanced technology demonstration of the new antenna technology.

Hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications system technology

The budget request contained \$65.0 million in PE 62232N for applied research in command, control, and communications technology.

The committee is aware that command and control functions require a high degree of mobility and security and that current shipboard communication systems cannot simultaneously provide both maximum security and mobility. Wireless systems offer a high degree of mobility, but are susceptible to intercept, and fiberoptic systems offer increased security, but are limited to fixed point-to-point communications. The committee is aware of efforts to develop a shipboard communications system which would combine distrib-

uted wireless base stations and fiberoptic networks to achieve increased mobility and security, while reducing the effects of frequency interference. The committee believes that this technology may have the potential for enhanced, secure shipboard command and control systems. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$66.0 million, an increase of \$1.0 million for development and demonstration of the technology for hybrid fiberoptic/wireless communications systems.

Inter-cooled recuperated gas turbine engine

The budget request contained \$58.4 million in PE 63573N for the Navy's advanced service machinery program (ASMP), including \$23.5 million for continued development of the inter-cooled recuperated (ICR) gas turbine engine.

The ICR engine program is a cooperative development program between the United States, the United Kingdom and France to develop and demonstrate an advanced fuel efficient gas turbine engine that could be the prime power plant for future ship applications.

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1110 (H. Rept. 105-304) required the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an assessment of the progress in the ICR engine program, future plans for engine testing and qualifications, and the status of agreements on program conduct and funding with the United Kingdom and other participating countries, and budget estimates of the cost to complete the program. The Secretary's report, dated February 1998, and an earlier report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, responds to these issues and states that testing requirements were under discussion with the United Kingdom and France and that an estimated \$95.5 million in U.S. funding would be required to complete the program. The committee is also aware that engine testing to date has demonstrated the ability to achieve 21 percent fuel savings and that 27 percent savings are believed achievable.

The committee supports continued development of the ICR engine because of the potential the engine holds for increased performance and improvements in fuel economy for future Navy ships. The committee recognizes that the technical, programmatic, and funding issues must be resolved in order to insure a stable development program which will meet U.S. and allied requirements for an advanced naval prime power plant.

The committee recommends the budget request. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide an updated report, which addresses the issues cited above, to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 defense budget request. The committee also directs consideration of the ICR gas turbine engine among the alternatives for the prime power plant for the future DD-21 land attack destroyer.

Link 16 improvement program

The budget request contained \$49.8 million in PE 25604N for the Navy's tactical data link program, including \$4.4 million for Link 16 improvements.

The committee strongly supports the program that was initiated in fiscal year 1998 for integration of Link 16 into the Joint Maritime Command and Control System (JMCIS) and the Global Command and Control System (GCCS). The committee is aware that Link 16 integration into GCCS will satisfy many DOD data dissemination requirements, including those from the Joint Surveillance Tactical Reconnaissance System (JSTARS). Within the funds provided in PE 25604N, the committee recommends a total of \$7.4 million for Link 16 improvements, an increase of \$3.0 million for that program.

LPD-17 amphibious assault ship self-defense

The committee is aware that the Navy is evaluating combat system alternatives for the LPD-17 Class Amphibious Assault Ships. The committee reiterates the need for the LPD-17 to meet the Navy's own "Capstone" requirement for ship self-defense and previous congressional direction that the LPD-17 should have no less self-defense capability than other Navy ships. The committee also believes that to do otherwise could unnecessarily place at risk the combat elements which may be deployed on this class ship. In view of the fact that these ships are projected to be in the fleet for 40 years, the committee believes that the Navy should consider combat system commonality and compatibility with other elements of the fleet, life cycle support costs, and growth in combat system capability required to keep pace with future threats. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report the results of the evaluation to the Congressional defense committees before proceeding with procurement of a combat system for the LPD-17.

Man overboard indicator technology

The budget request contained \$6.2 million in PE 64516N for Navy ship survivability program engineering and manufacturing development.

The committee has followed closely the Navy's efforts to develop and introduce into the fleet a computer-based, total ship damage control information management system that would enable rapid/coordinated response to wartime and peacetime casualties, reduce crew manpower requirements, and improve manpower utilization. The committee is aware that the Navy currently has no method other than visual detection for detecting man overboard incidents. The committee is also aware of a commercially available, water-activated man overboard indicator, and believes that integration into such an indicator of a human factors monitor and location-monitoring device could significantly enhance crew safety and survivability and also provide the personnel monitoring capabilities sought in the damage control information management system. The committee urges the Navy to investigate the utility of such a man overboard indicator for fleet use and the feasibility of integrating a human factors monitor and location-monitoring capability into the indicator as outlined above. The committee requests that the Secretary of the Navy report the results of these investigations to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget request. The committee recommends the budget request for fiscal year 1999.

Marine Corps ground combat/support system

The budget request contained \$37.1 million in PE 63635M, including funds for continued development of the joint Army/Marine Corps lightweight 155mm howitzer.

The lightweight 155mm towed howitzer will be the Marine Corps sole artillery weapon for all forces and missions, replacing the aging and operationally deficient M198 Howitzer. The program is a third of the way through a three year engineering and manufacturing development (EMD). The committee is aware that additional funding is needed for EMD testing and program support, evaluation of a breech mounted laser ignition system, modification to accommodate the Army's new propelling charge system, and perform live fire testing of weapons crew ballistic protection. The committee recommends \$39.6 million, an increase \$2.5 million for the lightweight 155mm howitzer in PE 63635M.

Marine mammal research

The budget request contained \$347.9 million in PE 61153N for the Navy's defense research sciences program.

Of the funds provided in PE 61153N, the committee recommends \$500,000 for continuation of the Navy's cooperative marine mammal research program.

Molecular design materials science

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) required the Secretary of the Navy to submit an assessment of the Department of the Navy's materials science program, which was initiated in May 1995 at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and at the Georgia Institute of Technology. The Secretary's report, dated February 1998, indicates that first phase of the program, in little more than two years and with an initial investment of less than \$10.0 million, has clearly impacted materials science at the national and international levels. The program has also contributed to faculty, graduate student, and curriculum development and, through patents, licensing, and technology transfer, has catalyzed industrial activity and state partnerships. The committee notes that the report stated that the funding provided by the Congress for fiscal year 1998 is sufficient to support the next three years of the program, consolidate discoveries made in the first phase, and support other discoveries now in their early stages. At the end of this second phase, a significant part of the science and technology developed in the program will have transitioned to private industry, and the remaining program will be sufficiently well established to be funded by the regular Navy budget process.

Multi-function self aligned gate technology

The budget request contained \$32.1 million in PE 35204D8Z for continued development of the unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) tactical control system (TCS).

The committee notes that the TCS will provide interoperability and commonality for mission planning, command and control, communications, and data dissemination for the current and future family of tactical and medium altitude endurance UAVS. The multi-function self aligned gate (MSAG) technology developed as

part of the TCS development has been successfully demonstrated and is now ready for larger scale testing. The committee acknowledges the Departments' plan to transfer funding for this program to the Navy, as lead service for this effort, and recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 35204N for fabrication and testing of prototype MSAG active array antennae for TCS UAVS.

Multipurpose processor

The budget request contained \$50.3 million in PE 64503N for submarine system equipment development, including \$37.2 million for engineering and manufacturing development of submarine sonar improvements.

The committee notes the Navy's selection of the multipurpose processor (MPP) as the cornerstone of sonar upgrades for existing SSN-688, 688I, and TRIDENT submarines and the improvement in sonar systems capability that has resulted from the application of MPP acoustic signal processing technology. The committee also believes that similar improvements in the capability of airborne and surface sonar systems and of undersea surveillance systems would be realized through the use of MPP technology. Therefore, the committee recommends \$65.3 million in PE 64503N, an increase of \$15.0 million, to continue the research and development necessary for the introduction of MPP technology in submarine and other naval sonar systems.

Navy land attack missile program

The budget request contained \$110.1 million in PE 63795N for land attack technology, including \$11.3 million for continued evaluation of the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) for adaptation for naval surface ship and submarine use. No funds are included in budget request for the Land Attack Standard Missile (LASM).

During fiscal year 1999 budget review briefings, the committee was informed that the Navy's surface warfare community and the Navy's submarine warfare community were considering different approaches to fulfilling the requirement for a land attack missile system for naval surface fire support. The former favored selection of the LASM, while the latter favored selection of the Navy Tactical Missile System (NTACMS), a naval variant of ATACMS. The committee was also informed that the Navy surface warfare community intends to move to a Milestone II decision in mid-1999 for the selection of LASM as the land attack missile.

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-340) expressed the view that a number of mature systems, sub-systems and components appear to be capable of fulfilling surface fire support requirements and that the Navy needs to conduct the basic analysis required to narrow the field of candidates analytically and to take maximum advantage of developed systems. The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) cautioned that a thorough, objective, and independent cost and operational effectiveness analysis of competing system alternatives would be required before the Navy proceeds with any development milestone decision for a land attack missile. The committee is unaware that any such analysis has been completed.

The committee strongly believes that the selection of a land attack missile system must reflect the operational requirements of the entire Navy, should capitalize on mature systems, and should also capitalize on future system capabilities. The committee believes that selection of a land attack missile system will be a major defense acquisition decision that will set the direction for future Navy fire support systems capabilities and, as such, should be subject to the rigorous analysis and review associated with such decisions. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that an appropriate analysis of alternatives (AOA) be conducted to support acquisition of a Navy land attack missile program, and that the Navy may not proceed to a Milestone I decision until this AOA and other requirements appropriate to a major acquisition milestone decision have been satisfied. The committee recommends \$11.3 million for the Navy Tactical Missile System as contained in the budget request.

Navy theater missile defense

The budget request contained \$190.4 million in PE 63868C for the Navy Theater Wide (NTW) defense system.

The committee recognizes the value of leveraging the large investment in the Aegis fleet as the cornerstone of NTW development and continues to support this important effort. The committee notes that in a number of instances, ballistic missile defense development costs are shared between the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) and the executing service. Examples include the Air Force Space Based Laser, Navy Area Defense, and the Army Patriot Advanced Capability-Configuration 3 (PAC-3) programs. The committee believes cost sharing is justified if the resulting system serves multiple missions, or if major elements of the resulting system meet other service-unique requirements.

The committee understands that while the projected NTW Block I will continue to rely on the existing Aegis SPY-1 radar, the operating frequency of this radar is not adequate to acquire ballistic missile targets without cueing from other sources or to discriminate the threat warhead from other clutter. Further evolution of the Aegis radar will be needed to achieve the capabilities required by the objective NTW Block II system. At the same time, the committee notes that these radar improvements required for missile defense will help meet wider Navy requirements for fleet defense against cruise missile and air attack and that the Navy is pursuing other initiatives to improve current Aegis radar capabilities.

The committee believes that the Navy has unique expertise in developing radar capabilities to meet fleet defense requirements, that these requirements overlap with those derived from the ballistic missile defense mission, and the resulting radar system will be inherently multi-mission in nature. Consequently, the committee recommends \$50.0 million for a new Navy program element, PE 636XXN, to develop SPY-1 radar upgrades critical to development of the NTW Block II system and to integrate that development with continuing Navy efforts to improve radar capabilities required for fleet defense. In doing so, the committee believes that overall control of the ballistic missile defense architecture must remain

with BMDO, and that Navy radar development must remain closely coordinated with BMDO.

NSSN advanced technology insertion

The budget request contained \$218.8 million in PE 64558N for the New Attack Submarine (NSSN) program, including \$146.4 million for NSSN hull, mechanical, and electrical systems development, and \$72.5 million for NSSN combat systems development.

The committee continues to strongly support the development of advanced submarine technologies for the NSSN and the insertion of these technologies into its design at the earliest possible opportunity. The committee has reviewed the Navy's plan for technology insertion in the first four submarines of the NSSN class and notes that the plan falls short in funding for several technologies. Inclusion of these technologies in the NSSN design would result in significant improvements in the capabilities of the NSSN class. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million for the development of high priority submarine technologies that are currently unfunded and the insertion of these technologies into the NSSN program. The committee is aware that insertion of the technologies will also require a limited amount of procurement funding across the first four submarines (less than \$5.0 million) and encourages the Navy to reprogram from within available funds the procurement funding necessary to complete the technology insertion in the appropriate NSSN hulls.

Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamformer

The budget request contained \$347.9 million in PE 61153N for the Navy's defense research sciences program.

In shipboard radar surveillance systems, high instantaneous bandwidth is need to achieve the necessary resolution for theater ballistic missile defense, ship self-defense, and non-cooperative target identification. The committee is aware that the use of optical wavelength-division multiplexing (WDM) technology, now being developed in the commercial sector, may provide the capability for wideband beamforming that could result in the demonstration of a wideband electronically-steered active radar antenna with high instantaneous bandwidth and the resolution necessary for theater ballistic missile defense requirements. Use of optical WDM technology to reduce hardware complexity would permit reductions in system cost and achieve system performance levels that are needed for ship-self defense in a littoral environment. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 61153N to initiate a cooperative program for research, development, and demonstration of a prototype optically multiplexed, wideband, radar beamforming array using optical WDM technology.

Parametric airborne dipping sonar

The budget request contained \$231.1 million in PE 64212N for anti-submarine warfare (ASW) and other helicopter development, including \$215.5 million for the Light Airborne Multi-purpose System (LAMPS) ASW helicopter. No funds were requested for the parametric airborne dipping sonar (PADS).

The PADS project was initiated as a small business innovative research program (SBIR) proposal in 1990 for an advanced acoustic source for helicopter dipping sonar. Following successful demonstration of a parametric projector (acoustic source) beam-forming capability approximating theoretical estimates, funding was added in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201) to initiate a limited PADS onboard helicopter demonstration and at-sea helicopter PADS system test. The test will be conducted in 1999 using funds added in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). Following completion of the at-sea test in 1999, the Navy plans to review the test results, assess the viability of integrating PADS technology into current or future weapons systems for enhanced shallow water ASW and mine detection capabilities, and report the results of its review and assessment to the Congress.

The committee is aware of recommendations for insertion of the PADS technology into the LAMPS ASW helicopter and establishment of an engineering and manufacturing development program for PADS during fiscal year 1999. In view of the time required to complete the PADS testing and follow-on assessment during 1999, the committee believes that this recommendation should be addressed as a part of the fiscal year 2000 defense budget request. Accordingly, the committee recommends no increase in funding for PADS.

Power electronic building blocks and power node control centers

The budget request contained \$39.3 million in PE 63508N for surface ship and submarine hull, mechanical, and electrical advanced technology. The request included funding to continue the development and demonstration of power electronic building blocks and power node control centers for shipboard electrical power systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$6.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the program to accelerate the development of power electronic building block technology and the use of virtual prototyping and a virtual test bed to demonstrate and evaluate advanced shipboard electrical power system concepts. The committee also recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 63508N to continue the development of power node control centers for advanced electrical distribution system fault detection, switching, reconfiguration, and control of shipboard electrical systems.

Project M

The committee has followed the progress of Project M—an active approach for noise and vibration cancellation. The results to date have shown that the active machinery raft may provide unprecedented quieting for submarines.

Congress appropriated \$5.0 million in fiscal year 1998 to be used for only active control of machinery rafts, and the committee notes that Project M is to be tested on a submarine large scale vehicle. However, the committee understands that no funds have been budgeted to develop a prototype system for surface ships. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to program funds to develop a prototype system for surface ships in fiscal year 2000.

Reduction to fiscal year 1999 budget request programs

The committee has reviewed the Navy's budget request for fiscal year 1999 and, in a number of program elements, identified program growth over fiscal year 1998 projected funding for fiscal year 1999 funding for those programs to the actual requested levels in fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that these increases are not sufficiently justified in comparison to higher priority Navy programs and recommends reductions totaling \$9.8 million and listed by program element in the following table.

65152N—Studies And Analysis Support—Navy	\$ - 1.0
65853N—Management, Technical & International Support	- 1.0
65863N—RDT&E Ship And Aircraft Support	- 2.0
65864N—Test And Evaluation Support	- 5.8
Total Reduction	\$ - 9.8

Remote minehunting system

The budget request contained \$73.5 million in PE 63502N for surface and shallow water mine countermeasures demonstration and validation including \$11.0 million for the Remote Minehunting System (RMS). The RMS is a remotely operated system that is being developed to detect and classify mines. This system is the primary element of the Navy's program to provide an organic mine countermeasures means for surface combatants.

The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 63502N to continue the program for accelerated development and fielding of the RMS. This increase, and an increase recommended for the shallow water influence minesweep system (SWIMS) elsewhere in this report, reflect the high priority that the committee places on the mine countermeasures program and on the introduction of an organic mine countermeasures capability into the Navy's battle groups and amphibious ready groups.

Shallow water influence minesweeping system

The budget request contained \$56.8 million in PE 63747N for the Navy's undersea warfare advanced technology program.

The committee strongly endorses the need for development and deployment of improved mine countermeasures and believes that systems are needed that have high speed minesweeping capabilities, provide significantly improved area coverage, are effective in all environments, and meet the requirements of the Navy's mine warfare plan for littoral operations. The committee recommends \$64.8 million in PE 63747N, an increase of \$8.0 million to continue the development and demonstration of advanced magnetic and acoustical minesweeping system technology.

Shipboard system component development

The budget request contained \$27.7 million in PE 63513N for shipboard system component development demonstration and validation.

The committee is aware that the U.S. manufacturer of the 110-kilowatt static frequency converter for Navy combatant ships has been selected by two foreign navies to develop a new 150-kilowatt static frequency converter. The 110-kilowatt unit, which uses 25-year old technology, is both difficult and expensive to maintain.

The committee believes that replacement of the older 110-kilowatt unit with the new 150-kilowatt unit in new construction of U.S. Navy ships, such as the LPD-17, could result in significant cost savings. The committee recommends that the Secretary of the Navy assess the feasibility of using the new 150-kilowatt unit in new naval ship construction programs, and, if such use is judged feasible and cost-effective, conduct the necessary U.S. qualification and environmental tests for the new converter. The committee recommends \$28.7 million in PE 63513N, an increase of \$1.0 million for the qualification and testing program.

Shortstop electronic protection system

The budget request contained \$14.7 million for Marine Corps ground combat/supporting arms but included no funding for additional development of the shortstop electronic protection system (SEPS). The committee notes recent completion of successful testing of SEPS, which provides detection and early detonation of incoming artillery, mortar and rocket rounds to protect ground forces. However, SEPS requires upgrading to protect forces from newer weapons. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 26623M, and an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 64270A, a total increase of \$10.0 million for this purpose.

Silicon carbide semiconductor substrates

The budget request contained \$77.6 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

Silicon carbide (SiC) is a wide band-gap semiconductor material with unique physical and electrical properties that will make possible the fabrication of the next-generation of microelectronic devices. These devices will be capable of operation in radiation environments and at high temperatures, high voltages, high power levels, and high frequencies in the microwave regime. These capabilities will enable a wide range of applications in military and commercial systems, such as high voltage/high power systems, advanced radar, nuclear, instruments, satellite communications, and advanced sensors. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.5 million in PE 62234N to accelerate the development of SiC semiconductor materials and to advance high electrical power control and other applications for next generation military platforms.

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

The budget request contained \$5.2 million in PE 64603N for the Navy's SLAM-ER program.

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) required the Secretary of the Navy to provide an assessment of the SLAM-ER program. The report, dated January 23, 1998, states that SLAM-ER is the missile system that will meet the Navy's requirement for an advanced air-launched, standoff land attack system, that the Navy acquisition objective for SLAM-ER is approximately 700 missiles, and that no further capability is currently anticipated. Accordingly, the committee agrees with the Navy's decision and recommends \$5.2 million for SLAM-ER as contained in the budget request.

Submarine sonar domes

The budget request contained \$218.8 million in PE 64558N for the New Design SSN (NSSN) program.

The committee is aware of a Navy risk reduction program in which a new structural acoustic sandwich material system composed of glass-reinforced plastic and rubber has been used to fabricate a quarter-scale sonar dome. Although this advanced material system was initially developed for surface ship sonar domes and windows, at-sea testing of the quarter-scale sonar dome indicated potentially significant advantages for the NSSN, including major improvements in sonar performance, enhanced sonar dome durability, and reduced manufacturing and life-cycle costs. The committee recommends an increase of \$7.0 million in PE 64558N to complete fabrication of a full-scale sonar dome using this acoustic sandwich material system for further evaluation and testing.

Tactical combat training systems development

The budget request contained \$28.4 million in PE 24571N for the consolidated training system development program, including \$6.9 million for continued development of the Joint Tactical Combat Training System (JTCTS).

The committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) directed the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, to conduct an assessment of the requirement for the JTCTS and execution of the JTCTS program. The Secretary's report, dated February 19, 1998, stated that the joint instrumented range requirement remains valid, that JTCTS meets the requirements of both the Navy and the Air Force, and that the program had been restructured to allow the Services to field a prototype JTCTS mobile, rangeless air combat training capability in 1999, one year sooner than originally scheduled. The report also stated that service priorities have driven the first procurement of JTCTS with an emphasis on replacing existing, less capable and aging air combat range instrumentation systems. However, the report also noted that JTCTS capabilities for joint simulation system integration, ground interoperability, and shipboard weapons system integration had been deferred to later in the program with the full system capability becoming available in fiscal year 2003.

The committee notes the existing Navy large area tracking ranges (LATR) and the Air Force's AN/ASQ-34 air combat training system. In view of the projected delay in fielding of the full JTCTS capability, the committee believes that the Navy and the Air Force need to develop an overall strategy for transition from these legacy systems to the full JTCTS capability. The committee believes that such a transition strategy should include potential improvements in the legacy systems, requirements for interoperability with JTCTS as it is fielded, and ultimate replacement of the legacy systems by JTCTS. The committee directs that the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, conduct a further assessment of the feasibility and desirability of such a transition strategy and report the results of that assessment to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget request. To accelerate the development of the full capability of JTCTS and to address the recommendations that may

result from the assessment, the committee recommends \$33.4 million in PE 24571N, an increase of \$ 5.0 million and a total of \$11.9 million for the JTCTS program.

Tactical Tomahawk

The budget request contained \$66.7 million in PE 24229N for Tomahawk operational system development; \$132.9 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy for the Tomahawk Block Improvement Program (TBIP); \$94.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy for TBIP; and \$117.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy for TBIP.

In September 1997, during the House-Senate conference on H.R. 1119, the Department of the Navy and the Department of Defense (DOD) advised the conferees of a proposal to upgrade the capability and reduce the production unit cost of the Tomahawk cruise missile. The upgraded missile, "Tactical Tomahawk," would include several enhancements to improve the tactical responsiveness of the Tomahawk missile.

In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 103-340), the conferees supported the concept of the Tactical Tomahawk missile system, but raised several issues regarding the acquisition strategy and funding for the system that would need to be addressed before initiation of the Tactical Tomahawk program.

In February 1998, following submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 1999, the committee received a reprogramming proposal from the DOD which would transfer fiscal year 1998 funds provided for TBIP missile procurement to research and development for the Tactical Tomahawk. Following review of the supporting rationale for the reprogramming, the committee approved the proposal in April, 1998.

The committee is generally satisfied with the rationale that the Navy and the DOD have provided to support the reprogramming request. The committee is concerned, however, about the Navy's ability to establish a competitive environment for future Tactical Tomahawk procurement. The committee is particularly interested in the measures that will be taken by the Navy to insure a Tactical Tomahawk program that includes the potential for a second source for missile system production and also provides for a qualified second source engine for the production phase of the program. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Congressional defense committees by September 30, 1998, the Navy's plan for ensuring competitiveness in the production phase of the Tactical Tomahawk program.

To provide the fiscal year 1999 funding required to complete the reprogramming for Tactical Tomahawk, the committee recommends \$165.3 million in PE 24229N for Tomahawk operational systems development, an increase of \$98.6 million; an increase of \$2.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy for TBIP; and reductions of \$96.5 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy, and \$4.9 million in Operations and Maintenance, Navy, for TBIP.

Ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers

The budget request contained \$77.6 million in PE 62234N for applied research in materials, electronics, and computer technology.

The committee is aware that over the last three years the Navy has engaged in a program to significantly advance the use of ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers in high-performance, high-density electronic modules. Through this research, the Navy has concluded that ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers could allow for the expanded use of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) electronic components in military applications, such as avionics, in which the high thermal output of such components has constrained their use. The committee believes that the potential exists for substantial savings if greater use could be made of COTS components in aircraft and avionics systems. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million to determine the feasibility of application of the Navy's recently completed research in ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers.

Undersea warfare advanced technology

The budget request contained \$34.9 million in PE 62633N for applied research in undersea warfare weaponry technology.

The committee recommends \$36.9 million, an increase of \$2.0 million to continue the development and application of micro electromechanical systems (MEMS) technology to Navy undersea weapons systems.

Vacuum electronics

The budget request contained \$77.6 million in PE 62234N for the Navy's materials, electronics and computer technology program, including \$10.0 million for applied research in vacuum electronics.

The January 1997 Report to the Congress on the Tri-Service Microwave Power Module Project by the Director, Defense, Research, and Engineering, and the April 1997 Industrial Assessment of the Microwave Power Tube Industry by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Industrial Affairs and Installations) underscore the importance of vacuum electronics to the Department of Defense (DOD). The assessment cites the requirement for a focused DOD research and development investment strategy to advance the technology and improve manufacturability of vacuum electronics to meet future DOD system performance improvement and cost reduction requirements. The assessment also notes that additional development funding may be necessary to adapt emerging product technologies to meet service-specific requirements. The committee supports continuation of a robust vacuum electronics research and development program, and expects the Navy as DOD executive agent for the program to insure a coordinated vacuum electronics research and development program among the military services and defense agencies, and among the DOD and other U.S. Government agencies, which will meet DOD requirements for advanced vacuum electronics technology. The committee recommends the budget request of \$10.0 million for the vacuum electronics program.

Vectored thrust ducted propeller compound helicopter technology demonstration

The budget request contained \$23.2 million in PE 62122N for aircraft technology applied research. No funds were requested for the Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller (VTDP) compound helicopter technology demonstration program.

The VTDP program is intended to demonstrate the technology for a vectored thrust, ducted propeller in a compound helicopter, which could meet requirements for improvements in future rotor craft performance, survivability and affordability. The funded program includes design, fabrication and ground testing of full-scale VTDP components, control system simulation, and system design focused on the H-60 helicopter as a demonstration platform. If successful, the ground test program would provide a basis for a potential follow-on flight demonstration program. The committee is aware that the Navy expects to address the VTDP technology potential for naval rotary wing aircraft before final preparation of the fiscal year 2000 budget.

The committee recommends the budget request. Should the Navy make a decision to begin a flight demonstration phase for the VTDP program in fiscal year 2000, the committee also recommends that the Secretary of the Navy consider reprogramming the fiscal year 1999 funds necessary to transition the program from the ground test phase to the flight test phase.

Vectoring ESTOL control tailless operation research

The budget request contained \$48.3 million in PE 63217N for advanced development in air systems and advanced technology, including \$7.0 million for the Vectoring Extremely Short Take-off and Landing Control Tailless Operation Research (VECTOR) project, and \$11.0 million in PE 63790N, NATO Research and Development, including \$5.0 million for the VECTOR project.

The committee notes that VECTOR is a new start, international flight demonstration effort that would utilize the X-31 experiment aircraft to demonstrate the feasibility of tailless fighter designs to perform carrier and amphibious ship/land-based strike fighter mission, and also demonstrate extremely short take-off and landing (ESTOL) using thrust vectoring directional control.

The committee strongly supports the development of advanced aviation technology, but notes that the VECTOR project represents a new start program that was not included in the fiscal year 1998 defense budget request and that was initiated with a below threshold reprogramming of \$3.0 million. Notwithstanding the technical merit of the VECTOR project, the committee believes that many of the operational capabilities sought in the project duplicate those being pursued in the Joint Strike Fighter program. The committee believes that priority should be given to the development of advanced aviation technology in the JSF program and that funding for the VECTOR program should be deferred to fiscal year 2000, following completion of JSF technology maturation demonstrations and assessments. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$7.0 million in PE 63217N for VECTOR; and a decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 63790N for VECTOR.

Vertical gun for advanced ships

The budget request contained \$110.1 million in PE 63795N for project definition and risk reduction in land attack technology, including \$25.2 million for the Vertical Guns for Advanced Ships (VGAS) program.

The committee strongly supports the accelerated development and fielding of advanced fire support system capabilities for naval surface fire support and believes that an advanced gun system for the next generation of Naval Surface Combatants (SC-21) surface combatants will be an integral part of the future system. However, the committee does not believe that the Navy has given sufficient consideration to, nor completed the rigorous analysis of alternative gun system concepts that would justify selection of the VGAS concept as the preferred alternative for the advanced naval gun system for SC-21. Nor, in the committee's opinion, has the Navy given sufficient consideration to the relative technical requirements and operational roles of gun and missile systems. Until such an analysis of alternatives is completed, the committee believes that the Navy is not prepared to proceed to a Milestone I decision for an advanced gun system as described in the fiscal year 1999 budget request. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$20.0 million for the VGAS project.

AIR FORCE RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained \$13,598.1 million for Air Force RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of \$13,577.2 million, a decrease of \$20.9 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 1999 Air Force RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Air Force request are discussed following the table and in the classified annex to this report.

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	REQUEST		
ACCOUNT 0601102F	000	RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AF DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	209,395.00	-	-	209,395.00
	1	TOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	209,395.00	-	-	209,395.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	209,395.00	-	-	209,395.00
0602102F	2	MATERIALS	62,578.00	-	-	62,578.00
0602201F	3	AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	64,932.00	-	-	64,932.00
0602202F	4	ARMSTRONG LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	60,805.00	-	-	60,805.00
0602203F	5	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	69,081.00	-	-	69,081.00
0602204F	6	AEROSPACE AVIONICS	65,549.00	-	-	65,549.00
0602299F	7	HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	16,649.00	-	-	16,649.00
0602601F	8	PHILLIPS LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	116,139.00	-	-	116,139.00
0602602F	9	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	41,529.00	-	-	41,529.00
0602702F	10	COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	65,175.00	3,000.00	-	68,175.00
0602805F	11	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	19,606.00	-	-	19,606.00
		TOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	582,023.00	3,000.00	-	585,023.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	582,023.00	3,000.00	-	585,023.00
0603106F	12	LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	8,677.00	-	-	8,677.00
0603108F	13	INTEGRATED DATA SYSTEMS	-	-	-	-
0603112F	14	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,006.00	9,000.00	-	30,006.00
0603202F	15	AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	30,814.00	-	-	30,814.00
0603203F	16	ADVANCED AVIONICS FOR AEROSPACE VEHICLES	26,442.00	-	-	26,442.00
0603205F	17	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	7,035.00	-	-	7,035.00
0603211F	18	AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	12,494.00	-	-	12,494.00
0603216F	19	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	38,984.00	-	-	38,984.00
0603227F	20	PERSONNEL TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	6,636.00	-	-	6,636.00
0603231F	21	CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	16,603.00	13,000.00	-	29,603.00
0603238F	22	GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY	-	-	-	-
0603245F	23	FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	7,674.00	-	-	7,674.00
0603253F	24	ADVANCED AVIONICS INTEGRATION	10,536.00	-	-	10,536.00
0603270F	25	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	25,553.00	9,000.00	-	34,553.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603302F	26	SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	21,121.00	4,000.00	25,121.00
0603311F	27	BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY		17,300.00	17,300.00
0603401F	28	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	42,571.00	17,700.00	60,271.00
0603410F	29	SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,457.00	-	3,457.00
0603601F	30	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	23,244.00	-	23,244.00
0603605F	31	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	40,153.00	-	40,153.00
0603707F	32	WEATHER SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,568.00	-	1,568.00
0603723F	33	ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	2,663.00	-	2,663.00
0603726F	34	C3I SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	11,025.00	-	11,025.00
0603728F	35	ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	7,827.00	-	7,827.00
0603789F	36	C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	13,235.00	-	13,235.00
0305176F	37	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR		-	
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	379,318.00	70,000.00	449,318.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	379,318.00	70,000.00	449,318.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603280F	38	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,615.00	-	4,615.00
0603319F	39	AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	292,219.00	-	292,219.00
0603430F	40	ADVANCED MILSATCOM (SPACE)	54,413.00	(24,400.00)	30,013.00
0603432F	41	POLAR ADJUNCT (SPACE)	41,508.00	-	41,508.00
0603434F	42	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYS	64,732.00	-	64,732.00
0603441F	43	SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEMVAL	160,262.00	-	160,262.00
0603617F	44	COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	7,770.00	-	7,770.00
0603742F	45	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	6,177.00	-	6,177.00
0603790F	46	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H)	11,117.00	-	11,117.00
0603800F	47	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	456,137.00	-	456,137.00
0603851F	48	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEMVAL	29,360.00	-	29,360.00
0603852F	49	C-130J - DEMVAL		-	
0603853F	50	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)- DEMVAL	70,147.00	-	70,147.00
0603854F	51	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE		-	
0603855F	52	SPACE ARCHITECT OFFICE		-	
0603856F	53	AIR FORCE/NRO PARTNERSHIP (AFNP)	17,645.00	-	17,645.00
0603860F	54	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEMVAL	22,057.00	-	22,057.00
0603876F	55	SPACE-BASED LASER	35,000.00	(10,000.00)	25,000.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0604237F	56	VARIABLE STABILITY IN-FLIGHT SIMULATOR TEST AIRCRAFT	9,803.00	-	9,803.00
0604327F	57	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	1,282,962.00	(34,400.00)	1,248,562.00
			1,282,962.00	(34,400.00)	1,248,562.00
0604201F	58	INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	10,762.00	-	10,762.00
0604218F	59	ENGINE MODEL DERIVATIVE PROGRAM (EMDP)	4,977.00	-	4,977.00
0604222F	60	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	195,385.00	-	195,385.00
0604226F	61	B-1B	1,961.00	-	1,961.00
0604227F	62	TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	55,563.00	-	55,563.00
0604233F	63	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	1,582,217.00	-	1,582,217.00
0604238F	64	F-22 EMD	131,247.00	-	131,247.00
0604240F	65	B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	-	-	-
0604243F	66	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0604270F	67	EW DEVELOPMENT	90,126.00	-	90,126.00
0604321F	68	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM - EMD	-	-	-
0604441F	69	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	538,438.00	-	538,438.00
0604442F	70	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD	33,328.00	-	33,328.00
0604479F	71	MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	550,940.00	-	550,940.00
0604800F	72	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM BLOCK IIF (SPACE)	62,591.00	-	62,591.00
0604600F	73	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	7,559.00	-	7,559.00
0604602F	74	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	12,037.00	-	12,037.00
0604604F	75	SUBMUNITIONS	4,805.00	-	4,805.00
0604611F	76	JOINT STANDOFF LAND ATTACK MISSILE (JSLAM)	-	-	-
0604617F	77	AIR BASE OPERABILITY	2,503.00	-	2,503.00
0604618F	78	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	12,204.00	-	12,204.00
0604703F	79	AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	3,336.00	-	3,336.00
0604706F	80	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	3,744.00	-	3,744.00
0604708F	81	CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,715.00	-	2,715.00
0604711F	82	SYSTEMS SURVIVABILITY (NUCLEAR EFFECTS)	-	-	-
0604727F	83	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	15,134.00	-	15,134.00
0604735F	84	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	14,581.00	-	14,581.00
0604740F	85	COMPUTER RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (CRTT)	200.00	-	200.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION		
0604750F	86	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,300.00	-	-	1,300.00
0604754F	87	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	7,956.00	-	-	7,956.00
0604762F	88	COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	4,901.00	-	-	4,901.00
0604770F	89	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	-	-	-	-
0604779F	90	JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYSTEMS (JI)	5,823.00	-	-	5,823.00
0604805F	91	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	27,937.00	-	-	27,937.00
0604851F	92	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	81,546.00	-	-	81,546.00
0604853F	93	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE) - EMD	280,297.00	-	-	280,297.00
0605011F	94	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE) - EMD	4,901.00	-	-	4,901.00
0207325F	95	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	-	-	-	-
0207414F	96	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM	-	-	-	-
0305178F	97	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	-	-	-	-
		TOTAL ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,751,014.00	-	-	3,751,014.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	32,858.00	-	-	32,858.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,718,176.00	-	-	3,718,176.00
0603402F	98	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (SPACE)	-	-	-	-
0604258F	99	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	32,582.00	-	-	32,582.00
0604259F	100	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,666.00	-	-	1,666.00
0604759F	101	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	34,518.00	-	-	34,518.00
0605101F	102	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	21,168.00	-	-	21,168.00
0605306F	103	RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,408.00	-	-	4,408.00
0605502F	104	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH	-	-	-	-
0605704F	105	THEATER AIR DEFENSE BMC4I	-	-	-	-
0605712F	106	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	24,541.00	-	-	24,541.00
0605807F	107	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	370,168.00	6,000.00	-	376,168.00
0605808F	108	DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	6,075.00	-	-	6,075.00
0605853F	109	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION	-	-	-	-
0605854F	110	POLLUTION PREVENTION	1,673.00	-	-	1,673.00
0605859F	111	ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	-	-	-	-
0605860F	112	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,865.00	11,000.00	-	18,865.00
0605864F	113	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	45,933.00	-	-	45,933.00
0605876F	114	MINOR CONSTRUCTION (RPM) - RDT&E	-	-	-	-
0605878F	115	MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR (RPM) - RDT&E	-	-	-	-

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605879F	116	REAL PROPERTY SERVICES (RPS) - RDT&E			
0605896F	117	BASE OPERATIONS - RDT&E			
0609900F	118	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
1001004F	119	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	3,752.00		3,752.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	554,349.00	17,000.00	571,349.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT			
0101113F	120	B-52 SQUADRONS	6,436.00		6,436.00
0101120F	121	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE			
0102325F	122	JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	2,175.00		2,175.00
0102328F	123	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRA	13,592.00		13,592.00
0102411F	124	NORTH ATLANTIC DEFENSE SYSTEM	615.00		615.00
0207131F	125	A-10 SQUADRONS	2,312.00		2,312.00
0207133F	126	F-16 SQUADRONS	125,076.00		100,476.00
0207134F	127	F-15E SQUADRONS	104,207.00	(24,800.00)	104,207.00
0207141F	128	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	2,443.00		2,443.00
0207161F	129	F-117A SQUADRONS	5,147.00		5,147.00
0207163F	130	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	52,968.00		52,968.00
0207217F	131	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	45,078.00		45,078.00
0207247F	132	PODDED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM			
0207248F	133	AF TENCAP			
0207268F	134	SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	6,447.00		6,447.00
0207320F	135	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	92,551.00		92,551.00
0207323F	136	SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS	92,069.00		92,069.00
0207325F	137	AGM-86C CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE SYSTEM	3,551.00		3,551.00
0207412F	138	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)			
0207414F	139	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	132,870.00		132,870.00
0207417F	140	COMBAT INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM	431.00		431.00
0207419F	141	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	9,802.00		9,802.00
0207423F	142	TACTICAL AIRBORNE COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS	28,189.00		28,189.00
0207424F	143	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS			
0207424F	144	EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	2,348.00		2,348.00
0207431F	145	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	84,950.00		84,950.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0207433F	146	ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	74,707.00	-	74,707.00
0207438F	147	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	27,292.00	-	27,292.00
0207440F	148	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL SYSTEM FOR COUNTERNARCOTICS			
0207581F	149	JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JOINT STARS)	123,793.00	(5,600.00)	118,193.00
0207590F	150	SEEK EAGLE	17,590.00	2,000.00	19,590.00
0207591F	151	ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	272,914.00	-	272,914.00
0207601F	152	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	14,899.00	-	14,899.00
0207605F	153	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,287.00	-	5,287.00
0208006F	154	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	17,090.00	-	17,090.00
0208019F	155	TACTICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM (TIP)	10,685.00	-	10,685.00
0208021F	156	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	1,375.00	-	1,375.00
0208030F	157	WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - AMMUNITION			
0208031F	158	WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,470.00	-	1,470.00
0208060F	159	THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	31,057.00	-	31,057.00
0208160F	160	TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	113,040.00	-	113,040.00
0208161F	161	SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	61,119.00	-	61,119.00
0301310F	162	FOREIGN TECHNOLOGY DIVISION	1,234.00	-	1,234.00
0301315F	163	MISSILE AND SPACE TECHNICAL COLLECTION	18,595.00	8,000.00	26,595.00
0301324F	164	FOREST GREEN	(-)	(-)	(-)
0301398F	165	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS GDIP	1,241.00	-	1,241.00
0302015F	166	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	4,233.00	-	4,233.00
0303110F	167	DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	15,641.00	-	15,641.00
0303131F	168	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	39,230.00	-	39,230.00
0303140F	169	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,420.00	2,000.00	10,420.00
0303141F	170	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	17,973.00	-	17,973.00
0303144F	171	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER (JSC)			
0303150F	172	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	13,675.00	-	13,675.00
0303152F	173	WORLD-WIDE MILITARY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS, INFORMATION SYSTEM			
0303601F	174	MILSTAR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	2,352.00	-	2,352.00
0304111F	175	SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	(-)	(-)	(-)
0304311F	176	SELECTED ACTIVITIES	3,000.00	-	3,000.00
0305099F	177	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	27,056.00	-	27,056.00
0305110F	178	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	56,622.00	-	56,622.00
0305111F	179	WEATHER SERVICE	10,649.00	-	10,649.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0305114F	180	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCAL)	4,729.00	-	4,729.00	4,729.00
0305119F	181	MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	7,375.00	-	7,375.00	7,375.00
0305128F	182	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	458.00	-	458.00	458.00
0305137F	183	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	1,881.00	-	1,881.00	1,881.00
0305138F	184	INERTIAL UPPER STAGE (IUS)	558.00	-	558.00	558.00
0305142F	185	APPLIED TECHNOLOGY AND INTEGRATION	-	-	-	-
0305144F	186	TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	-	-	-	-
0305145F	187	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	-	-	-	-
0305154F	188	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	87,443.00	-	87,443.00	87,443.00
0305158F	189	TACTICAL TERMINAL	-	-	-	-
0305160F	190	DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	237.00	-	237.00	237.00
0305164F	191	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	20,432.00	-	20,432.00	20,432.00
0305165F	192	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	67,238.00	-	67,238.00	67,238.00
0305172F	193	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	21,155.00	-	21,155.00	21,155.00
0305182F	194	EASTERN SPACE LAUNCH FACILITY (ESLF) (SPACE)	-	-	-	-
0305205F	195	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	24,578.00	-	24,578.00	24,578.00
0305207F	196	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,307.00	-	4,307.00	4,307.00
0305208F	196A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM INTEROPERABILITY, NI	-	-	-	-
0305906F	197	NCMC - TWAA SYSTEM	-	-	-	-
0305910F	198	SPACETRACK (SPACE)	7,878.00	-	7,878.00	7,878.00
0305911F	199	DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	39,532.00	-	39,532.00	39,532.00
0305913F	200	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	12,037.00	-	12,037.00	12,037.00
0305917F	201	SPACE ARCHITECT	13,314.00	-	13,314.00	13,314.00
0305953F	202	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE (EELV) (SPACE)	13,714.00	-	13,714.00	13,714.00
0308601F	203	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	3,316.00	-	3,316.00	3,316.00
0401119F	204	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	1,093.00	-	1,093.00	1,093.00
0401130F	205	C-17 AIRCRAFT	123,069.00	-	123,069.00	123,069.00
0401214F	206	AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)	512.00	-	512.00	512.00
0401218F	207	KC-135S	11,093.00	-	11,093.00	11,093.00
0404102F	208	AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY	-	-	-	-
0702207F	209	DEPT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,500.00	-	1,500.00	1,500.00
0708011F	210	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	50,997.00	7,400.00	58,397.00	58,397.00
0708026F	211	PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN, PROG OFC (PRAMPO)	970.00	-	970.00	970.00
0708071F	212	JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	16,086.00	-	16,086.00	16,086.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0708811F	213	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,010.00	-	23,010.00
0804734F	214	CRYPTOLOGIC/SIGINT-RELATED SKILL TRAINING		-	
0801218F	215	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	6,756.00	-	6,756.00
1001004F	216	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES		-	
1001018F	217	NATO JOINT STARS		-	
XXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs		-	
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,420,330.00	(216,182.00)	4,204,138.00
		ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT	6,839,032.00	(36,484.00)	6,802,548.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	6,839,032.00	(36,484.00)	6,802,548.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT		-	
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION		-	
		TOTAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL AIR FORCE	13,598,083.00	(40,000.00)	13,577,209.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,879,917.00	19,116.00	9,899,033.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	3,718,176.00	-	3,718,176.00
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	(40,000.00)	(40,000.00)

Items of Special Interest

Advanced low observable coatings

The budget request contained \$21.0 million in PE 63112F for advanced materials for weapon systems.

The committee is aware of the constantly evolving threats to U.S. aircraft and notes numerous Department of Defense initiatives pursuing survivability enhancements to address these evolving threats. One technology approach which has proven both adaptable and cost effective is that of low observable coatings applied to aircraft and other high value platforms which mask them from evolving battlefield sensors.

The committee supports these efforts and recommends \$30.0 million, an increase of \$9.0 million for continued exploration of advanced low observable coatings.

Advanced military satellite communications

The budget request contained \$54.4 million for the advanced military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) program in PE 63430F.

Advanced MILSATCOM is the planned Air Force replacement for the MILSTAR extra high frequency (EHF) communications satellite. The committee notes that the commercial satellite communications industry is taking a strong interest in EHF communications and in greatly increasing the on-board processing capacity of communications satellites. The committee believes that the overlap between these trends and advanced MILSATCOM requirements offers an opportunity for the Air Force to leverage commercially developed technology.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$30.0 million, a decrease of \$24.4 million. The authorized funding would support research and development for Air Force-unique requirements in EHF communications, including radiation hardened electronics, compatibility of a new system with the existing EHF communications infrastructure, and interoperability with ground terminals.

Aircrew laser eye protection

The budget request contained \$16.6 million in PE 63231F for crew systems and personnel protection technology. No funds were requested to support development of the aircrew laser eye protection program.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's continued efforts to enhance aircraft crew member protection systems and yet notes, with concern, recent incidences of injuries sustained by crew members due to exposure to lasers. The committee is aware of ongoing efforts to develop dye based aircrew visors and urges the Air Force to continue funding these efforts.

The committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million for aircrew laser eye protection.

ALR-69 radar warning receiver

The budget request contained \$25.6 million in PE 63270F for electronic combat technology. No funds were requested to support development of the ALR-69 radar warning receiver.

The committee is aware of continuing efforts by the services to improve situational awareness of the radar threat environment. While modernization of radar warning equipment has progressed for the active forces, the committee remains concerned that modernization of National Guard, Reserve, and Special Forces aviation assets has not kept pace with available technology to address this critical area of vulnerability. The committee is aware of the potential of the ALR-69 radar warning receiver to offer protection to these forces and recommends \$34.6 million, an increase of \$9.0 million for integration of the ALR-69 radar warning receiver into priority National Guard, Reserve, and Special Forces aviation assets.

Ballistic missile technology

The budget request contained \$1.3 million for the ballistic missile technology (BMT) program in PE 63401F and no funding for a conventional ballistic missile demonstration in PE 63851F.

Prior year ballistic missile technology funding has supported several demonstrations of guidance technology, deep earth penetrating warheads, and Global Positioning System (GPS) range safety. This technology has in turn supported a demonstration of a conventional ICBM that could be used for long range precision strike of deeply buried or very hardened targets. Many such targets, which include facilities for command and control and weapons of mass destruction, are currently immune from attack by anything but nuclear weapons. The committee believes that this demonstration should be pursued as part of the wider effort to develop effective non-nuclear means to attack this target set.

Last year, the BMT program was funded separately in PE 63311F. The committee believes that funding BMT in PE 63401F, a program element for advanced spacecraft development is inappropriate. The committee recommends \$17.3 million, an increase of \$16.0 million, for advanced ballistic missile technology and the conventional ballistic missile demonstration. The committee recommends this funding for PE 63311F and believes that combining these efforts in one PE will result in better program coordination.

Distributed agent information warfare

The budget request contained \$8.4 million in PE 33140F for the information systems security program.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is engaged in several development initiatives to mature information security technologies for military purposes. One such effort, the Distributed Agent Information Warfare Framework (DAIWF) has been successfully demonstrated in a small business innovative research program under Air Force supervision.

The committee supports this development effort and recommends \$10.4 million for continued DAIWF development, an increase of \$2.0 million.

Ejection seats

The budget request contained \$16.6 million in PE 63231F for crew systems and personnel protection and \$8.2 million in PE 63216N for aviation survivability.

Last year, the committee supported an increase in funding to continue improvements in aircrew ejection seats and to explore alternative technologies leading to injury-free ejection seat designs that can accommodate both male and female pilots.

The committee remains supportive of these efforts and recommends an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63231F, and an increase of \$3.0 million in PE 63216N.

The committee is also aware that the Navy has completed the second phase of a small business innovative research program (SBIR) for stabilizers for Navy fighter ejection seats, which may produce an extraordinary reduction in injuries as well as a dramatic increase in aircrew ability to survive ejection from the aircraft. Based on the results of the feasibility demonstration, the committee encourages the Navy and the Air Force to consider establishing a phase III SBIR or a demonstration/validation program to continue development of this promising stabilization technology.

F-16 squadrons

The budget request contained \$125.1 million in PE 27133F for continued operational system development support for the F-16 fleet.

The committee notes that the budget request reflects an increase of \$24.6 million over the level forecast as necessary to support fiscal year 1999 requirements in the fiscal year 1998 budget request. Further, the committee believes that some of the proposed fleet support modifications are not expected to be carried out until the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1999 and should be considered for incorporation into the fiscal year 2000 program.

The committee recommends \$100.5 million to continue F-16 fleet support at the level previously forecast for fiscal year 1999, a decrease of \$24.6 million in PE 27133F.

Flight test safely enhancements

The budget request contained \$370.2 million in PE 65807F for test and evaluation support.

The committee is aware of Air Force efforts to improve the safety of high performance aircraft flight test operations at the Air Force Flight Test Center. The committee notes that upgrades to air traffic control systems and on-board aircraft equipment offer significant improvements in safety of flight test operations and recommends \$376.2 million, an increase of \$6.0 million to continue these efforts.

Integrated high payoff rocket propulsion technology

The budget request contained \$19.0 million in PE 63302F for the integrated high payoff rocket propulsion technology (IHRPT).

The IHRPT program is developing technologies and components for insertion into existing launch vehicles, with the goal of improving launch vehicle performance in a variety of areas and lowering costs of space launch substantially. The committee understands the importance of testing these new technologies to demonstrate their performance. The committee recommends \$23.0 million for IHRPT in PE 63302F, an increase of \$4.0 million, to support a Phase I Solid Boost and Orbit Transfer demonstration.

Integrated powerhead demonstration

The budget request contained \$21.1 million in PE 63302F for space and missile rocket propulsion.

The committee notes that the Air Force is maximizing efforts to integrate advanced propulsion technologies into its highest priority space related programs. Of particular interest, the committee believes that the Integrated Powerhead Demonstration included in this year's request offers potential for significant advances in capability and cost reduction for the Air Force and other service space programs.

The committee strongly urges the Air Force to continue this effort and supports the request for space and missile rocket propulsion.

Longshot

The budget request contained \$17.6 million in PE 27590F for the SEEK EAGLE weapons integration flight test program. No funds were requested to support continued testing of the Longshot guided munition adaption kit.

The committee notes that the Longshot kit offers the potential for a highly cost effective, precision stand-off adaption kit that could provide a long range glide capability combined with an inexpensive guidance system for increased accuracy, and could be strapped on existing inventory bombs and submunition delivery systems without modification.

The committee notes that the system has only received limited testing to date and recommends \$19.6 million, an increase of \$2.0 million to continue testing of Longshot.

Low cost launch technology

The budget request contained no funding for low cost launch technology development. Fiscal year 1998 funding was appropriated in PE 63173C and PE 63401F.

Congress added funding for low cost launch technology development in both fiscal year 1997 and 1998. The committee continues to believe that these technologies, as embodied in programs such as Scorpius and Excalibur, show considerable promise and deserve additional support. The committee encourages the Department to identify and program funds for these efforts in the future years defense plan.

Microsatellite technology

The budget request contained no funding for microsatellite technology. Fiscal year 1998 funding for microsatellite technology was appropriated in PE 63401F in the Clementine II program.

In congressional testimony, the commander-in-chief of U.S. Space Command, identified the development of microsatellite technology as a high priority. The committee notes that the nation relies heavily on space-based assets for both commercial and military purposes, and that reducing the size and weight and increasing the agility of satellites and space vehicles has the potential to lower costs and improve sustainability. The committee understands that \$4.0 million would allow the microsatellite technology development program to fly a satellite inspection mission. The committee rec-

ommends an increase of \$4.0 million to PE 63401F for this purpose.

Military spaceplane

The budget request contained no funding for the military spaceplane in PE 63401F and \$3.0 million for the space maneuvering vehicle in the space test program, PE 65864F.

The committee notes that U.S. military forces are increasingly reliant on space-based capabilities and the Air Force has identified requirements that are best met by a military spaceplane and an associated family of vehicles. The committee understands that any military spaceplane effort should focus on militarily unique requirements and leverage NASA investment in the reusable launch vehicle program. These unique requirements are reflected in development efforts for a space maneuvering vehicle (SMV) that would provide all-orbit access and extended on-orbit dwell time, a low cost expendable upper stage to deploy payloads to all orbits, and a common aero vehicle (CAV) that would serve as a maneuvering reentry vehicle capable of delivering various payloads anywhere on earth within an hour of launch.

The committee believes that a military spaceplane and its related elements have the potential to contribute significantly to U.S. military capability. The committee recommends an addition of \$15.0 million to PE 63401F to support further SMV and CAV development.

More electric aircraft program

The budget request contained \$69.1 million in PE 62203F for aerospace propulsion, including \$17.9 million for More Electric Aircraft (MEA).

The committee is encouraged with Air Force efforts to develop advanced electric power technology through the MEA program and urges the Air Force to accelerate this program in future budget requests. The committee recommends the \$69.1 million requested.

Panoramic night vision goggle

The budget request contained \$16.6 million in PE 63231F for crew systems and personnel protection technology.

The committee notes the Air Force progress in development of night vision technology for application to existing fighter and tactical aircraft. Of particular note is the panoramic night vision goggle (PNVG) program which significantly broadens the field of view for pilots.

The committee supports this effort and recommends an increase of \$4.5 million in PE 63231F to continue development of PNVG.

Protein-based memory development

The budget request contained \$65.2 million in PE 62702F for command, control and communications research.

The committee notes the encouraging results of Air Force research in protein-based ultra-high density memory storage. Of particular interest is the progress made in the past year confirming the potential for significant increases in memory storage capacity.

The committee urges the Air Force to continue this research and recommends \$68.2 million, an increase of \$3.0 million.

Rocket system launch program

The budget request contained \$7.9 million for the rocket system launch program (RSLP) in PE 65860F.

The committee notes that the Air Force has a requirement for improved high performance missile technology. The committee understands that Advanced Solid Axial Stage (ASAS) technology is potentially valuable for ballistic missile defense interceptors and other future missiles, and that RSLP plays an important role in ASAS development. The committee recommends \$18.9 million, an increase of \$11.0 million in PE 65860F, for ASAS development and activities related to current and future RSLP flights.

DEFENSE AGENCIES RDT&E

Overview

The budget request contained \$9,591.0 million for Defense Agencies RDT&E. The committee recommends authorization of \$9,454.3 million, a decrease of \$136.7 million.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 1999 Defense Agencies RDT&E program are identified in the table below. Major changes to the Defense Agencies request are discussed following the table.

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
ACCOUNT	000	RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEFENSE				
0601101DBZ	1	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,173.00	-	-	2,173.00
0601101E	2	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	65,102.00	-	-	65,102.00
0601103DBZ	3	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	216,320.00	15,000.00	-	231,320.00
0601105DBZ	4	GULF WAR ILLNESS	19,846.00	-	-	19,846.00
0601111DBZ	5	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	9,870.00	-	-	9,870.00
0601384BP	6	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	25,282.00	-	-	25,282.00
		TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	338,393.00	15,000.00	-	353,393.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	338,393.00	15,000.00	-	353,393.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0602110E	7	NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	40,000.00	13,000.00	-	53,000.00
0602173C	8	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	86,866.00	2,800.00	-	89,666.00
0602227DBZ	9	MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,706.00	5,000.00	-	14,706.00
0602234DBZ	10	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE				
0602301E	11	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	19,641.00	-	-	19,641.00
0602393E	12	COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	417,723.00	-	-	417,723.00
0602384BP	13	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	88,000.00	-	-	88,000.00
0602702E	14	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	57,883.00	-	-	57,883.00
0602708E	15	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	188,985.00	(37,000.00)	-	151,985.00
0602712E	16	INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	34,000.00	6,000.00	-	40,000.00
0602715BR	17	MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	244,408.00	-	-	244,408.00
0602715H	18	WMD RELATED TECHNOLOGIES	203,598.00	-	-	203,598.00
0602787DBZ	19	DEFENSE SPECIAL WEAPONS AGENCY	9,239.00	-	-	9,239.00
0305108K	20	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	1,961.00	-	-	1,961.00
	21	COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,401,820.00	(10,200.00)	-	1,391,620.00
		TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,401,820.00	(10,200.00)	-	1,391,620.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,401,820.00	(10,200.00)	-	1,391,620.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
0603002DBZ	22	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,136.00	-	-	2,136.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603104D8Z	23	EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	11,650.00	2,000.00	13,650.00
0603120D8Z	24	DEMINEING			
0603121D8Z	25	ALTERNATIVE TO LANDMINES	4,753.00	-	4,753.00
0603122D8Z	26	COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	35,813.00	4,000.00	39,813.00
0603160B8Z	27	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	70,611.00	(13,000.00)	57,611.00
0603160D8Z	28	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV			
0603173C	29	SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	166,676.00	10,000.00	176,676.00
0603225D8Z	30	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,447.00	-	13,447.00
0603232D8Z	31	AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	5,081.00	3,000.00	8,081.00
0603384B8Z	32	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPME	42,762.00	-	42,762.00
0603704D8Z	33	SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	11,337.00	-	11,337.00
0603711B8Z	34	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	63,052.00	(25,000.00)	38,052.00
0603711H	35	VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION			
0603712S	36	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	17,788.00	-	17,788.00
0603727D8Z	37	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM			
0603728D8Z	38	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM			
0603729D8Z	39	AGILE PORT DEMONSTRATION	23,700.00	-	23,700.00
0603730D8Z	40	ROCKET LAUNCH FACILITY UPGRADES			
0603738D8Z	41	AIRFIELD SURFACE TRAFFIC MONITORING			
0603739E	42	COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH			
0603746E	43	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	244,737.00	-	244,737.00
0603747E	44	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY	15,000.00	-	15,000.00
0603750D8Z	45	ELECTRIC VEHICLES			
0603752D8Z	46	ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,330.00	(12,000.00)	104,330.00
0603753S	47	COMMERCIAL TECHNOLOGY INSERTION PROGRAM			
0603755D8Z	48	ELECTRONIC COMMERCE RESOURCE CENTERS			
0603760E	49	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	140,927.00	-	140,927.00
0603761E	50	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	200,100.00	(27,500.00)	172,600.00
0603762E	51	COMMUNICATION AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	56,114.00	-	56,114.00
0603763E	52	SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	213,154.00	(3,100.00)	210,054.00
0603764E	53	MARINE TECHNOLOGY	24,788.00	-	24,788.00
0603764E	54	LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	108,490.00	(11,600.00)	96,890.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603765E	55	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	55,500.00	-	55,500.00
0603800E	56	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEMVAL	-	-	-
0603805E	57	DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAMS	-	-	-
0603805S	58	DUAL USE APPLICATION PROGRAMS	6,000.00	-	6,000.00
0603832D8Z	59	JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	70,696.00	-	70,696.00
0303132G	60	GLOBAL GRID COMMUNICATIONS	-	-	-
0304211G	61	NATIONAL ACTIVITIES	-	-	-
0305166G	62	SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,720,642.00	(73,200.00)	1,647,442.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,720,642.00	(73,200.00)	1,647,442.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603228D8Z	63	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	31,792.00	-	31,792.00
0603709D8Z	64	INTEGRATED DIAGNOSTICS	3,436.00	-	3,436.00
0603709D8Z	65	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	16,217.00	-	16,217.00
0603714D8Z	66	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,147.00	-	15,147.00
0603736D8Z	67	CALS INITIATIVE	1,863.00	-	1,863.00
0603790D8Z	68	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603790T	69	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	10,762.00	-	10,762.00
0603851D8Z	70	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	17,051.00	-	17,051.00
0603857J	71	ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM (ASCJET)	13,014.00	-	13,014.00
0603861C	72	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - DEMVAL	487,752.00	-	487,752.00
0603867C	73	NAVY AREA	-	-	-
0603868C	74	NAVY THEATER WIDE	190,446.00	70,000.00	260,446.00
0603869C	75	MEADS CONCEPTS - DEMVAL	43,027.00	-	43,027.00
0603870C	76	BOOST PHASE INTERCEPT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - DEMVAL	-	-	-
0603871C	77	NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEMVAL	950,473.00	-	950,473.00
0603872C	78	JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEMVAL	178,846.00	-	178,846.00
0603873C	79	FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I)	96,915.00	(2,000.00)	94,915.00
0603874C	80	BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	190,147.00	(4,000.00)	186,147.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0603875C	81	INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	50,676.00	-	50,676.00
0603876C	82	THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	22,113.00	-	22,113.00
0603884BP	83	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	60,404.00	-	60,404.00
0603892D8Z	84	ASAT	-	-	-
0603920D8Z	85	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	17,234.00	(5,000.00)	12,234.00
0605104T	86	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	980.00	-	980.00
0605110T	87	CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	2,618.00	-	2,618.00
0208043J	88	ISLAND SUN	-	-	-
0904901U	89	UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
		TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION	2,408,913.00	59,000.00	2,467,913.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,408,913.00	59,000.00	2,467,913.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0604160D8Z	90	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - EMD	125,312.00	-	125,312.00
0604384BP	91	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	11,307.00	-	11,307.00
0604709D8Z	92	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - ENG DEV	15,588.00	-	15,588.00
0604764K	93	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	30,512.00	-	30,512.00
0604771D8Z	94	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	13,410.00	-	13,410.00
0604805D8Z	95	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	323,942.00	-	323,942.00
0604861C	96	THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	137,265.00	-	193,265.00
0604865C	97	PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EMD	245,796.00	56,000.00	245,796.00
0604867C	98	NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	603,132.00	56,000.00	959,132.00
		TOTAL, ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	70,817.00	-	70,817.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	832,315.00	56,000.00	888,315.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0603858D8Z	99	UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,273.00	-	1,273.00
0604942D8Z	100	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	3,916.00	-	3,916.00
0605104D8Z	101	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,021.00	-	30,021.00
0605110D8Z	102	USD(A&T)-CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	-	-	-
0605114E	103	BLACK LIGHT	5,000.00	-	5,000.00
0605117D8Z	104	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	35,035.00	-	35,035.00
0605122D8Z	105	INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENTS	2,937.00	-	2,937.00
0605126J	106	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	17,423.00	-	17,423.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0605128BR	107	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,755.00	-	13,755.00
0605128DRZ	108	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	-	-	-
0605160BR	109	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	9,874.00	-	9,874.00
0605160DRZ	110	COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	-	-	-
0605384BP	111	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	24,922.00	-	24,922.00
0605502DRZ	112	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605502E	113	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	-	-	-
0605710DRZ	114	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	439.00	-	439.00
0605790DRZ	115	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,820.00	-	1,820.00
0605798S	116	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,010.00	-	5,010.00
0605801K	117	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	46,469.00	-	46,469.00
0605801S	118	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER	-	-	-
0605803S	119	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	8,248.00	-	8,248.00
0605898E	120	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	38,611.00	-	38,611.00
0305190DRZ	121	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	1,657.00	-	1,657.00
0606900E	122	FINANCING FOR EXPIRED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	-	-	-
		TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	246,410.00	-	246,410.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	246,410.00	-	246,410.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
0208045K	123	C3 INTEROPERABILITY	26,296.00	-	26,296.00
0208052J	124	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,847.00	-	1,847.00
0301011G	125	CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	-	-	-
0301301L	126	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	-	-	-
0302016K	127	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	1,189.00	-	1,189.00
0302019K	128	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	4,975.00	-	4,975.00
0303126K	129	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	11,561.00	-	11,561.00
0303127K	130	SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	4,428.00	-	4,428.00
0303129K	131	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	-	-	-
0303131K	132	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	3,061.00	-	3,061.00
0303140G	133	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	239,081.00	-	239,081.00
0303149J	134	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	2,819.00	-	2,819.00
0303149K	135	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,675.00	-	3,675.00
0303153K	136	JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,839.00	-	8,839.00

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
			AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
0304349BQ	137	NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	-	-	-	-
0305102BQ	138	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	114,417.00	-	-	114,417.00
0305127V	139	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	418.00	-	-	418.00
0305154D8Z	140	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	-	-	-
0305154G	141	DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	-	-	-	-
0305159I	142	DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	40,504.00	(6,000.00)	-	34,504.00
0305188J	143	JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	-	-	-	-
0305190D8Z	144	C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	8,015.00	-	-	8,015.00
0305204D8Z	145	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	37,192.00	(37,192.00)	-	-
0305205D8Z	146	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	178,666.00	(178,666.00)	-	-
0305206D8Z	147	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	162,666.00	(80,400.00)	-	82,266.00
0305206D8Z	147	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	10,840.00	16,000.00	-	26,840.00
0305207D8Z	148	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,085.00	-	-	4,085.00
0305207G	149	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	34,985.00	-	-	34,985.00
0305208D8Z	150	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	-	(5,578.00)	-	(5,578.00)
0305208BQ	150A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM INTEROPERABILITY, NI	-	2,540.00	-	2,540.00
0305208G	150B	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM INTEROPERABILITY, NS	-	2,540.00	-	2,540.00
0305208I	50C	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM INTEROPERABILITY, DIA	-	1,958.00	-	1,958.00
0305209D8Z	151	DARP INTEGRATION AND SUPPORT	15,701.00	(15,701.00)	-	-
0305884L	152	INTELLIGENCE PLANNING AND REVIEW ACTIVITIES	-	-	-	-
0305885G	153	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	104,510.00	-	-	104,510.00
0305886G	154	COUNTERDRUG INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT	-	-	-	-
0305898L	155	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (AUXILIARY FORCES)	26,231.00	-	-	26,231.00
0708011S	156	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	9,617.00	-	-	9,617.00
0902298J	157	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	24,775.00	-	-	24,775.00
0902740J	158	JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	-	-	-	-
0909989D8Z	159	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	1,957.00	4,000.00	-	5,957.00
1001017D8Z	160	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES	-	-	-	-
1160279BB	161	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG	4,026.00	-	-	4,026.00
1160401BB	162	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	8,020.00	-	-	8,020.00
1160402BB	163	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	106,238.00	3,000.00	-	109,238.00
1160404BB	164	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,805.00	5,000.00	-	6,805.00
1160405BB	165	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-	-

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

PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	R-1 LINE	PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
116040788	166	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,015.00	-	2,015.00
116040888	167	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	33,799.00	-	33,799.00
XXXXXXXXXX	999	Classified Programs	1,057,100.00	70,768.00	1,127,868.00
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,295,355.00	(137,333.00)	2,158,022.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,295,355.00	(137,333.00)	2,158,022.00
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-
		TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL DEF WIDE	9,314,665.00	(50,000.00)	(50,000.00)
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,482,350.00	(140,733.00)	9,173,932.00
		ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT	832,315.00	(146,733.00)	8,335,617.00
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	56,000.00	888,315.00
			-	(50,000.00)	(50,000.00)
ACCOUNT 000		DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	122,169.00	-	122,169.00
0604940D8Z	1	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	32,684.00	-	32,684.00
0605130D8Z	2	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	96,253.00	-	96,253.00
0605804D8Z	3	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	251,106.00	-	251,106.00
		TOTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	251,106.00	-	251,106.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-
ACCOUNT 000		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	15,311.00	-	15,311.00
0605118D8Z	1	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	9,934.00	4,000.00	13,934.00
0605131D8Z	2	LIVE FIRE TESTING	25,245.00	4,000.00	29,245.00
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE	25,245.00	4,000.00	29,245.00
		RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	-	-	-
		ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES REDUCTION	-	-	-

Items of Special Interest

Advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD)

The budget request contained \$116.3 million for advanced concept technology demonstrations in PE 63750D8Z, an increase of \$38.8 million over fiscal year 1998.

Although the management of the ACTD initiatives appears to have improved, the committee remains concerned that the Department's selection criteria for ACTD candidates lacks specificity and believes such a large increase is not warranted. The committee recommends a decrease of \$12.0 million in PE 63750D8Z.

Advanced synthetic aperture radar system improvement program

The budget request contained \$5.0 million in PE 35207D8Z for the Advanced Synthetic Aperture Radar System (ASARS) Improvement Program (AIP) for the U-2 aircraft.

As a result of the termination of the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office, the Deputy Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology sent a letter to the Congress recommending specific redistribution of Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program funding in fiscal year 1999. Included in this recommendation was an additional \$2.5 million for AIP research and development.

The AIP program will dramatically increase the U-2's radar system with significantly improved synthetic aperture radar imagery, a highly capable moving target indicator tracking capability, and integral onboard processing functions. Unfortunately, the AIP has suffered cost growth and has a fiscal year 1999 shortfall of over \$18.0 million. Some of this growth is due to contractor overruns and schedule slips caused by late deliveries of commercial processors. Some of this growth is due to a decision to postpone certain Global Hawk High Altitude Unmanned Aerial Vehicle radar developments that were cost sharing with AIP. This growth has forced the Air Force to make decisions to slip the AIP, thereby further increasing costs. In order to deliver the AIP when required, the Air Force has stated a need to reprogram funding from procurement to research and development in fiscal year 1999. However, such a step would have a significant procurement funding impact in fiscal year 2000.

The committee recommends an authorization of \$13.0 million, an increase of \$8.0 million for AIP development.

Ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained \$3.6 billion for ballistic missile defense (BMD). The committee recommends \$3.8 billion, an increase of \$132.8 million.

The committee believes that the budget request represents a reasonable effort to fund BMD priorities more adequately than the budget requests of the past several years. The committee notes specifically that the National Missile Defense (NMD) program request is consistent with the revised estimate of program requirements put forward by the Department last year. The committee also believes that the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program request reflects an effort to restore funding reduced last year as a result of program delays.

While the committee is gratified with this commitment of funds, it is concerned that the Administration's commitment to robust research and development and timely deployment in the longer term is still lacking. According to Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) budget documents, BMD funding would decline rapidly in the future years defense plan (FYDP), from \$3.6 billion requested in fiscal year 1999 to \$2.6 billion in both fiscal years 2002 and 2003. This decline would leave the BMDO with an annual budget shortfall of over \$1.0 billion and unable to meet clearly identified and understood BMD requirements. These documents acknowledge that the shortfall is even greater than appears, because several high priority programs are unfunded or underfunded throughout the FYDP, including innovative research and development to support next generation BMD systems, the medium extended air defense system (MEADS), the Navy theater wide defense system, and NMD, should a decision be made to deploy within the FYDP. This projected shortfall would inevitably result in delayed development and deployment schedules for virtually all BMD programs.

The committee notes that missile defense remains a very high priority with commanders in the field and that missile threats to the U.S. homeland, deployed troops, and allies continue to grow. The committee believes that the planned reduction of the BMDO budget baseline is completely unjustified and urges in the strongest terms that the Department identify funds in the future year defense plans to meet legitimate missile defense needs.

Advanced technology development

The budget request contained \$166.7 million for Advanced Technology Development in PE 63173C, of which \$30.2 million is for Operational Support (project 4000).

The committee notes that the \$30.2 million request for Operational Support (project 4000) represents an eleven percent increase over the fiscal year 1997 request. The committee recommends a decrease of \$2.0 million for Operational Support.

Atmospheric interceptor technology

The budget request contained \$24.5 million for the atmospheric interceptor technology (AIT) program in PE 63173C.

The AIT program has been restructured to develop advanced components for a variety of hit-to-kill vehicles, including advanced high performance divert and attitude control systems, seekers, energy sources, and avionics. The committee notes that BMDO is now pursuing five hit-to-kill missile defense systems which will remain in U.S. inventories for many years. The committee believes that the AIT effort can provide beneficial technology to all of these programs. The committee recommends \$46.5 million, an increase of \$22.0 million.

BMD research and development

The committee notes with considerable concern that, according to budget documents provided by the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), by fiscal year 2002, BMDO research and development accounts will fall to their lowest levels since fiscal year 1985. This situation would result from the precipitous decline in funding

projected by the BMDO budget and from the fact that several programs are transitioning from development to acquisition.

The committee believes that this projected level of investment in next generation missile defense technologies is inadequate. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Congressional defense committees by March 1, 1999, on the appropriate level of research and development investment in next generation ballistic missile defense technologies, the BMD budget level required to sustain both acquisition of critical BMD systems and robust R&D, and how the Department of Defense intends to manage the BMDO transition from an R&D organization to one that must manage both R&D and acquisition programs.

Ballistic missile defense testing

The committee has long expressed frustration with the lack of a robust test program in a number of BMD programs, including the theater high altitude area defense (THAAD), national missile defense (NMD), and navy area defense systems. In its recent report, the Panel on Reducing Risk in Ballistic Missile Defense Flight Test Programs criticized BMD flight test programs for accepting excessive risk, in part because of the perceived urgency of speeding BMD capabilities into the field. The panel also argued that BMD flight test programs have incorrectly viewed flight tests as significant advances in technology rather than validations of technical advances and carefully planned efforts to prove technology that cannot be tested on the ground. The report recommended that BMD program schedules be slowed, and that ground testing, modeling and simulation be substantially increased.

The committee finds considerable merit in the report, and notes that many of its recommendations had already been incorporated into the THAAD and NMD test programs prior to the report's release. Due in part to funding added to by Congress, the number of integrated ground tests planned in the NMD program has doubled. Nevertheless, the committee believes that the report's implication that the urgency of the need to deploy TMD systems is merely "perceived" is seriously mistaken. Both the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Central Command, and the commander of U.S. and United Nations forces in Korea testified this year that theater missile defense is their top priority. This priority is reflected in House passage of H.R. 2786, the Theater Missile Defense Improvement Act of 1998, that would provide additional test and development funds for a number of systems to more effectively and more rapidly address emerging theater missile threats. The committee continues to believe that the earliest possible deployment of theater missile defense capabilities remains a very high priority.

The committee believes the report of the panel would have been more valuable had it focused more directly on testing practices that would allow BMDO to minimize development risks while sustaining aggressive schedules, and believes that such a focus would have benefited not only BMD programs and the warfighters, but the test and evaluation community as well. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Congressional defense committees by March 1, 1999, on innovative testing concepts,

processes, and procedures that have the potential to advance BMD technologies rapidly with minimum risk.

Cooperative ballistic missile defense

The budget request contained \$37.9 million for the Israeli-American Arrow theater missile defense program and \$12.8 million for the Russian-American Observation Satellites (RAMOS) program in PE 63875C.

The committee continues to endorse cooperative BMD efforts as a means of leveraging U.S. BMD investments, and recommends the requested amount for the Arrow program. The committee understands that the rapid emergence of an Iranian ballistic missile threat capable of threatening Israel requires an effective and timely response. The committee notes that the Israeli government has expressed strong interest in deploying a third Arrow battery to mitigate this emerging threat and that the Administration has recently endorsed U.S. assistance toward that end. The committee urges the Administration to proceed rapidly in determining appropriate funding sources and finalizing appropriate agreements with the government of Israel that would allow such aid to be provided expeditiously.

The committee recognizes that the Iranian ballistic missile program has advanced so rapidly in large part due to substantial assistance from Russian sources. The committee recommends \$12.8 million for RAMOS, and recommends a legislative provision (sec. 233) that would prohibit obligation or expenditure of \$5.0 million until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the Department has acquired detailed information concerning the nature, extent, and military implications of ballistic missile technology transfer from Russian sources to Iran.

Joint theater missile defense

The budget request contained \$176.8 million for Joint TMD in PE 63872C.

The committee notes unjustified increases in the cost of various TMD exercises, and recommends \$174.8 million, a decrease of \$2.0 million in User Interface, project 3265.

National missile defense

The budget request contained \$950.5 million in PE 63871C for the national missile defense (NMD) program.

The committee recommends the budget request. The committee is encouraged by the Administration decision to fully fund the NMD program and by the selection of the lead system integrator (LSI). The committee believes that the LSI concept is sound and will provide the necessary management expertise to move the program forward expeditiously.

The committee continues to support efforts to develop an NMD system capable of defending all 50 states. The committee believes that the threat of ballistic missile attack on the U.S. homeland continues to grow, and understands that nations hostile to U.S. interests are developing or seeking to acquire long range ballistic missile technologies. Therefore, the committee recommends a legislative provision (sec. 231) that expresses the sense of Congress that

any deployed national missile defense should defend all fifty states and that U.S. territories should be protected from ballistic missile attack.

The committee is aware that defense of all 50 states by an NMD system could require changes to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The committee believes that the United States and Russia should pursue approaches to the ABM Treaty responsive to new strategic requirements that would permit an effective limited defense of U.S. national territory and enhance the security of both Russia and the United States. U.S.-Russian discussions to explore these issues were pursued in the early 1990s but were discontinued in 1993. The committee does not believe that such exchanges should or would restrict the right to deploy an effective limited national missile defense when U.S. interests require such a deployment. The committee recognizes that the Treaty expressly provides for the right of withdrawal, a right that could be exercised if a demarche with Russia fails to produce the necessary agreement concerning the intent or content of the Treaty.

Navy theater wide

The budget request contained \$190.4 million in PE 63868C for the navy theater wide (NTW) defense system.

The committee continues to support this important theater missile defense program. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition recently testified that the NTW system could achieve Block I capabilities by fiscal year 2002 if provided with sufficient additional funding above the Administration's request. The committee notes recent analysis performed by BMDO and the Navy indicating that this date would entail very high program risk, very high near term costs, and does not appear reasonably executable. The committee further notes that BMDO and the Navy now support deployment of a Block I capability by fiscal year 2005 as a fiscally plausible and technically achievable goal. However, additional funding in fiscal year 1999 and throughout the future year defense plan will be necessary to achieve this objective. To this end, the committee recommends \$260.4 million, an increase of \$70.0 million for continued risk reduction, additional testing of the Lightweight Exoatmospheric Interceptor (LEAP) program and Aegis-LEAP integration. The committee urges the Department to identify and support adequate funding in the future years defense plan to sustain Block I NTW deployment.

The committee is concerned that the technical evolution of NTW Block I to Block II has not been adequately considered. As a consequence, BMDO has not yet been able to provide assurance to the committee that Block I development efforts are on a path to support the evolution to Block II. The committee believes that the long term success of NTW requires that Block II technology requirements and architecture be well defined to ensure that accelerated Block I development can proceed along that critical path.

Patriot advanced capability

The budget request contained \$343.2 million in procurement and \$137.3 million in PE 64865C for the Patriot Advanced Capability-Configuration 3 (PAC-3) program.

The committee understands that the PAC-3 development program has experienced cost increases. The committee supports the Department's request to use \$40.0 million requested for PAC-3 procurement in fiscal year 1999 to meet this development shortfall and to ensure that the PAC-3 test program is completed.

The committee understands that this reduction to procurement will reduce the number of low rate initial production missiles that will be acquired in fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that increasing the initial production rate is an important goal as a means of addressing the threat posed by potential deployment of Iranian theater ballistic missiles to U.S forces, friends and allies in the Persian Gulf and Middle East. The committee understands that an additional \$16.0 million would support increasing low rate initial production to six a month. Consequently, the committee recommends \$303.2 million for PAC-3 procurement, a reduction of \$40.0 million, and \$193.3 million for engineering and manufacturing development, an increase of \$56.0 million which includes the \$40.0 million transfer from procurement and an increase of \$16.0 million in PE 64865C.

Space based laser

The budget request contained a total of \$93.8 million for the Space Based Laser (SBL) program, of which \$58.8 million is in PE 63173C and \$35.0 million is in 63876F.

The committee understands that SBL technology has matured to the point where a readiness demonstrator (SBLRD) is a logical next step. However, the committee is concerned that a program leading to an SBLRD launch in 2005 may be too costly and would unnecessarily restrict the technical options open to the program. The committee believes that innovative technical ideas can reduce the cost of the SBLRD, advance the technologies that might be used if a decision were taken to develop and deploy an operational system, and provide valuable proof of concept demonstrations. The committee believes that these goals can be accomplished without an inordinate delay in the launch date.

However, the committee does not believe that the best path to achieve these goals has been adequately laid out in the currently proposed SBLRD program. Until the Department proposes a technically achievable program plan and funding in the future years defense plan has been identified, the committee believes that a commitment to higher funding levels is premature. Consequently, the committee recommends a reduction of \$10.0 million in PE 63173C and a reduction of \$10.0 million in PE 63876F. The committee further recommends that BMDO establish a separate SBL program element in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission.

Support technology—applied research

The budget request contained \$86.9 million in PE 62173C for ballistic missile defense support technologies.

The committee is concerned with the deep reduction in innovative science and technology for BMD in project 1651, from \$60.5 million in fiscal year 1998 to a request of \$24.0 million. The committee understands that BMDO seeks to support only those areas of applied research relevant to BMD without duplicating other ef-

forts, but is also aware that a number of such technology efforts are not sufficiently funded. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million in project 1651, including \$5.0 million for wide bandgap semiconductor research.

Furthermore, while the committee is aware and appreciative of the value of involving small business in BMD research, the committee is not convinced that a 35 percent increase in Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer in project 1660 is justified. Therefore, the committee recommends \$50.0 million, a reduction of \$12.2 million in project 1660.

The committee recommends \$89.7 million for PE 62173C, an increase of \$2.8 million.

Technical operations

The budget request contained \$190.1 million for BMD technical operations in PE 63874C. The committee notes a significant increase in fiscal year 1999 funding in project 3153, System Architecture and Engineering compared to projections made in fiscal year 1998, and, therefore, recommends \$186.1 million, a reduction of \$4.0 million.

Theater high altitude area defense (THAAD)

The budget request contained \$497.8 million in PE 63861C for THAAD demonstration and validation, and \$323.9 million in PE 64861C for THAAD engineering and manufacturing development.

The committee continues its strong support for the THAAD program and recommends authorization of the request. The hiatus in THAAD flight testing has been used for extensive quality control and risk reduction efforts, and has put the program on a firmer technical footing. While THAAD missile development remains an area of risk, the THAAD battle management/command, control, and communications (BMIC3) system and ground based radar have achieved significant progress. The committee strongly encourages the Director of BMDO to proceed with EMD on the elements of the program mature enough to do so, while the THAAD missile continues to evolve. The committee believes that starting EMD for the THAAD radar and BM/C3 will result in more a capable system earlier than if those systems are held back.

The committee notes that early deployment of a contingency capability remains a high priority of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization to address longer range threat missiles, such as those currently deployed in North Korea and under development in Iran. The committee is aware of concern that a decision to proceed to production of 40 User Operational Evaluation System (UOES) missiles after one successful intercept may be premature. The committee notes that the decision to proceed is based not only on one intercept but three subsequent "in progress reviews." Further funding for THAAD UOES acquisition can be suspended after any of these reviews if problems or difficulties that warrant such an action are discovered. The committee also understands that delaying the commitment to UOES correspondingly delays delivery of a contingency capability to the warfighters, and believes that such a delay would unnecessarily deny them a valuable defensive and deterrent capability.

Chemical-biological defense program

The budget request contained a total of \$620.3 million for the Department of Defense chemical-biological defense program, including \$283.9 million for procurement of chemical and biological defense equipment for the military services and \$336.4 million for research, development, test and evaluation (RDTE). The budget request also included \$88.0 million in PE 62383E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's component of the biological warfare defense program.

The committee has repeatedly expressed its concerns about the need for a strong chemical-biological defense program to meet the potential threat posed by the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons in the post-Cold War world. The committee has strongly supported and insisted upon a coordinated and integrated chemical-biological defense program and the need for joint coordination and oversight of the program. The committee notes ongoing research and development activities by the Department of Energy (DOE) national laboratories that are addressed elsewhere in this report, including \$17.0 million for the DOE Deterrence and Detection Technologies Program and \$56.5 million for the DOE Proliferation Detection Program.

The committee believes that increased and continuing emphasis should be given to the development of advanced stand-off detectors that employ a range of potential sensing technologies capable of detecting nuclear, chemical, and biological weapon proliferation effluents and agents. The committee also believes that the chemical-biological defense program must incorporate the best efforts of the military services' research and development establishment, defense agencies, national laboratories, federally funded research and development centers, and industry. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense address this issue, including plans for developing a more fully integrated program with the DOE, as a specific item of interest in the next annual report to Congress on the Department of Defense Nuclear/Biological/Chemical (NBC) Defense Program.

Counterproliferation support

The budget request contained \$70.6 million for counterproliferation support in PE 63160BR. The committee notes that the requested funding is significantly above last year's projection for fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that maintaining level funding is appropriate and recommends \$57.6 million, a decrease of \$13.0 million.

The committee also recommends a provision (sec. 234) that would prohibit obligation or expenditure of the funds authorized and appropriated in PE 63160BR until the report on the threat posed to the United States by weapons of mass destruction and cruise and ballistic missiles is submitted to Congress as required in section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85).

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

The budget request contained \$2,040 million for Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs.

The committee is concerned, as detailed elsewhere in this report, by the increased emphasis given to defense-wide research, science, and technology programs at the apparent expense of those programs within the military departments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following adjustments in selected DARPA programs and transfer of the funds to the accounts of the military departments: a reduction of \$37.0 million in PE 62702E for applied research in tactical technology; a reduction of \$27.5 million in PE 63760E for command, control, and communications systems advanced development; a reduction of \$13.1 million in PE 63762E for advanced development of sensor and guidance technology; and a reduction of \$11.6 million in PE 63764E for land warfare technology advanced development.

DARPA marine technology program

The committee is also concerned by the overall reduction in funding for the DARPA marine technology program, for which \$24.8 million in PE 63763E was requested. The objective of the program is to identify and mature critical enabling technologies for maritime systems, and to develop and demonstrate advanced systems concepts to counter the threat created by the worldwide proliferation of increasingly sophisticated naval technology. The growing threat of quiet diesel/electric submarines, the continuing worldwide proliferation of advanced submarine and weapons capabilities, and the easy availability of modern underwater mines all necessitate the development of solutions for enhancing the operating capabilities and the survivability of U.S. naval forces in the littoral. With the cancellation of the Arsenal Ship program at the beginning of fiscal year 1998 and other adjustments in the marine technology program, the DARPA fiscal year 1999 budget request for marine technology was reduced by \$64.0 million and estimated funding for the remainder of the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) reduced by \$135.2 million. The committee believes that such reductions result in an advanced marine technology program which is not adequate to address the future requirements of U.S. naval forces. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology and the Secretary of the Navy to conduct an assessment of the DARPA marine technology program from the standpoint of these requirements and report to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 defense budget request the results of the assessment and recommendations for adjustments to budget projections for the FYDP period.

Defense airborne reconnaissance program management

The budget request contained \$15.7 million for defense airborne reconnaissance program (DARP) integration and support in PE 35209D8Z, and \$35.0 million in PE 35208D8Z for distributed common ground systems.

The committee notes that, subsequent to development of this year's budget request, the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO) has been eliminated and its functions absorbed within the reorganized office of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence

(OASD (C3I)) and within the military services. The committee supports actions which adhere to the Department's stated objective of maintaining very small cadre oversight organizations within OSD, focused on policy level guidance to ensure reconnaissance system interoperability and architectural compliance. The Department provided a report to the Congressional defense committees which included plans to request reprogramming authority to shift DARO funding for DARP integration and support from PE 35209D8Z to program elements within the Air Force and other DOD agencies, as well as to defense-wide operations and maintenance accounts.

The committee supports this transfer of funding and, therefore, recommends \$7.0 million in Operations and Maintenance, defense-wide for OASD (C3I), \$2.5 million in PE 35208F, \$2.5 million in PE 35208BQ, \$2.5 million in PE 35208G, and \$2.0 million in PE 35208L, for a total transfer of \$11.0 million, a decrease of \$4.7 million in PE 35209D8Z and \$5.6 million in PE 35208D8Z.

Defense manufacturing, technology program (MANTECH)

The budget request contained \$14.5 million in PE 78045A, \$59.1 million in PE 78011N, \$51.0 million in PE 78011F, and \$26.2 million in PE 78011S, for the Department of Defense manufacturing technology (ManTech) program.

Section 211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) requires the Secretary of Defense to prepare a five-year plan for the manufacturing technology program and to submit the plan annually to the Congress with the President's budget request. The committee has received the first such plan which establishes the goals, milestones, priorities, and investment strategy for the manufacturing technology program through fiscal year 2003. The committee commends the Secretary for preparing a comprehensive plan and is encouraged by the positive trends in the five-year budget projection for the ManTech program.

However, the committee believes that the budget projections are still inadequate to accomplish the stated goals for the program. In the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-340), the conferees recommended an annual manufacturing technology funding target for each of the military departments and defense agencies of at least 0.25 percent of the total amount budgeted in each service for demonstration and validation, engineering and manufacturing development, operational system development, and procurement programs. The fiscal year 1999 budget request falls short of this recommended minimum funding level.

The committee is aware of a number of promising candidate ManTech programs, including electronic circuit board manufacturing development, battery technology, rotary wing sustainment, the Instrumented Factory for Gears, fiber optics, advanced composites, synchronized drive trains, smart production product model, and simulation based design and operational evaluation. The committee believes that each program should compete for funding within the overall priorities of the service ManTech programs.

The Army is the single service manager for the defense ammunition program. The committee believes that insufficient attention

has been paid to the development of manufacturing technology for this critical commodity and recommends increased funding for munitions manufacturing technology in the Army ManTech program. The committee recommends that munitions manufacturing technology be reflected as an integral part of the ManTech program in the future and directs that this aspect of the program be addressed as a specific item of interest in the annual plan update.

Accordingly, to bring the total ManTech program to the level that has been recommended by the Congress, the committee recommends a total of \$41.7 million in PE 78045A for the Army ManTech program (including \$15.0 million for munitions manufacturing technology), an increase of \$27.2 million; \$67.7 million in PE 78011N, an increase of \$8.6 million; \$58.4 million in PE 78011F, an increase of \$7.4 million; and \$26.2 million in PE 78011S.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a legislative provision that addresses ManTech program cost sharing.

Demilitarization of non-nuclear military explosives

The budget request contained \$11.6 million in PE 63104D8Z for the development of explosives demilitarization technology, including \$7.4 million for continuation of the tunnel demonstration program.

The committee notes that funding for the conventional munitions demilitarization program has decreased from the original goals that were set when the program was established. The committee also notes the need for increased emphasis on the development of environmentally safe procedures and processes for the disposal of non-nuclear military explosives. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$13.6 million in PE 63104D8Z, an increase of \$2.0 million to allow continued aggressive development of environmentally safe procedures to safely dispose of military explosives.

Electro-optic framing technologies

The budget request contained \$5.4 million in PE 35207D8Z for electro-optic (EO) framing technology.

The committee continues to strongly support the state-of-the-art EO framing with on chip forward motion compensation (FMC). This technology is proving itself in operationally deployed systems.

The committee recommends \$13.4 million, an increase of \$8.0 million in PE 35207D8Z for the purposes of furthering the EO with on-chip FMC technologies. Specifically, these additional funds are to be used for continued development of the ultra-high resolution focal plane array and conformance with JPEG 2000 compression standards. These developments should produce form/fit operational insertions into currently deployed CA-260 framing cameras. Further, these funds are to be used to develop infra-red EO framing technologies and image intensified EO framing sensors with FMC for operational insertion into existing Air National Guard tactical reconnaissance aircraft and other aircraft as appropriate.

Endurance unmanned aerial vehicle

The budget request contained \$178.7 million in PE 35205D8Z for endurance unmanned aerial vehicles, and included \$40.6 million for the DarkStar stealth high altitude endurance (HAE) unmanned

aerial vehicle (UAV), \$90.1 million for Global Hawk HAE UAV, and \$48.0 million for the common ground segment.

The committee is aware that there has been a tendency to describe existing advanced concept technology demonstration (ACTD) aircraft, such as DarkStar and Global Hawk, as systems that may, in part, replace manned reconnaissance aircraft. The committee notes that Global Hawk has recently completed its first test flight. The committee is also aware that continuing problems with the DarkStar development have prevented any flight test since the previous crash during the attempted second flight test of air vehicle #1. The committee is concerned by continuing delays in the DarkStar flight test schedule and is aware that the DarkStar, as well as other similar ACTD aircraft, require significant redesign and modification before user evaluation can be performed. Such demonstration aircraft are not, nor were they designed to be, operational aircraft. Predator, the first ACTD UAV to transition to production has demonstrated the difficulties inherent to this process. The committee reaffirms its direction that the ACTD program is not to be used to circumvent established acquisition procedures.

The committee strongly supports continued development of HAE UAVs as potential replacements for manned reconnaissance aircraft, and recommends \$178.7 million in PE 35205F only for HAE UAV and common ground segment development.

Facial recognition technology

The budget request contained \$35.8 million for the DOD counter-terror technical support (CTTS) program in PE 63122D8Z.

The CTTS is an interagency program for development and demonstration of surveillance, physical security, and infrastructure protection technology. The committee continues to support use of advanced technology to control access to critical facilities and recommends an increase of \$4.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for the development and demonstration of biometric access control technology, including the use of authentication software and the principal component method of facial recognition.

Flat panel displays

The budget request contained \$34.0 million in PE 62708E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's integrated command and control technology applied research program.

In 1994, the President and the Department of Defense announced a five-year, National Flat Panel Display Initiative (NFPDI) to establish a viable domestic industrial capability for the manufacture of high definition displays that could develop and produce advanced technology flat panel displays for use by the military services. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)) recently provided a report, dated March 1988, to the Congressional defense committees that states that the objective of the NFPDI remains valid, that considerable progress has been made in the development of a domestic industrial capability for commercial and military applications of flat panel displays, but the objective of the initiative has not yet been fully achieved. According to the report, the issue facing DOD today is how to allocate its resources most effectively to obtain assured, affordable ac-

cess to advanced flat panel display technology. The report also cites the need for improved coordination of issues that cut across programs, such as assured sources of supply, commonality, and upgrade and replacement of flat panel display systems over the life cycle of weapon systems.

The committee recommends \$40.0 million in PE 62708E, an increase of \$6.0 million to continue the development of advanced technology for flat panel displays. The committee directs the USD(A&T) to report to the Congressional defense committees with submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget request the actions taken on the recommendations contained in the USD(A&T) report.

Global positioning system guidance package

The budget request contained \$213.2 million in PE 63762E for advanced development of sensor and guidance technology, including \$4.5 million for continued development, integration and test of the global positioning system (GPS) guidance package.

The GPS guidance package (GPP) is a fiber-optic-gyro-based inertial navigation system which has the potential to lower substantially the cost, size, and weight of military inertial navigation systems. If the objectives of the program are met, the reduced cost of the system would make precise inertial navigation and positioning available for use in a significantly larger number of Army, Navy, and Air Force airborne and ground vehicle systems. Of the funds authorized in PE 63762E, the committee recommends \$6.5 million for completion of the GPP program, an increase of \$2.0 million to the budget request for that program.

Humanitarian demining

The budget request contained \$17.2 million for humanitarian demining in PE 63920D8Z.

The committee does not believe that humanitarian demining is the sole responsibility of the Department of Defense, but rather an initiative that should be conducted in close coordination and shared funding with other agencies and organizations. The committee notes that many of the tasks with the humanitarian demining effort are assessed by the Department as having low to medium utility to the military. Therefore, the committee recommends \$12.2 million in PE 63920D8Z, a decrease of \$5.0 million.

International medical programs global satellite system

The budget request contained \$2.0 million in PE 11017D8Z for Partnership For Peace activities.

The committee notes that the Peace Information Management System (PIMS) is a NATO program to enable efficient, reliable information exchange between partnership countries and NATO members. The committee recognizes that the International Medical Programs Global Satellite System (IMPGSS) is an important part of the PIMS effort and recommends \$6.0 million, an increase of \$4.0 million to initiate the IMPGSS in PE 11017D8Z.

While supportive of this effort, the committee is concerned about continuing loss of radio frequency spectrum allocated to the Department of Defense (DOD) and believes that precautions must be taken to ensure that the radio frequency authorization for IMPGSS

does not interfere with or result in the loss of radio frequency spectrum to DOD users. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense shall not obligate any funds provided for the IMPGSS program prior to submitting a report to the Congressional defense committees detailing the impact of the IMPGSS on the DOD radio frequency spectrum.

Joint signals intelligence avionics family

The budget request contained \$80.4 million in PE 35206D8Z for the joint signals intelligence avionics family (JSAF).

The committee continues to be concerned by problems with JSAF development. While the committee is encouraged by progress in design of the low band subsystem (LBSS), it is concerned by schedule delays and cost increases that have forced reduction of system performance to remain within budget. Further, the committee remains doubtful that the high band subsystem (HBSS) development can successfully meet its cost and performance goals.

The committee's concerns are heightened by the fact that the JSAF development is the only planned upgrade for future airborne signals intelligence (SIGINT) reconnaissance. If JSAF fails to provide the needed capabilities, users ranging from theater tactical forces to national policy makers will be severely impacted.

Executive Order 12333 charges the Director of the National Security Agency (NSA) to conduct "research and development to meet the needs of the United States for signals intelligence. . . ." To ensure proper joint oversight of JSAF development, the committee recommends the budget request be authorized in PE 35885G, the Defense Cryptologic Program. The committee believes this action will allow the Air Force, as the executive agent for JSAF, to continue to execute the program, while providing joint oversight by NSA.

Live fire testing of vulnerability to asymmetric threats

The budget request contained \$9.9 million in PE 65131D8Z for the live fire testing program under the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.

The Department of Defense live fire testing program is focused primarily upon assessing the vulnerability of U.S. military systems to the effects of conventional threats, such as projectiles and explosives. The committee is concerned by the potential threat posed to U.S. weapons and supporting defense systems by emerging threats such as those posed by low, medium, and high energy lasers, high power microwave radio frequency weapons, or by weapons capable of generating a high-power electromagnetic pulse. Such weapons might be used by an adversary to exploit a specific area of vulnerability, such as communications, information warfare, or other selected areas, to attack U.S. forces more effectively and efficiently, and thereby achieve an asymmetric advantage. The committee believes that increased attention should be given to the potential threat posed by such weapons and to assessing their potential threat to U.S. military systems.

The committee recommends \$13.9 million for the live fire testing program, an increase of \$4.0 million to expand threat vulnerability testing and evaluation to include the threat of radio frequency

weapons. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the requirements for testing of the vulnerability of U.S. military systems to asymmetric threats and to submit the results of the assessment to the Congressional defense committees with the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

Medical free electron laser

The budget request contained \$9.7 million for the medical free electron laser program (MFEL) in PE 62227D8Z.

The committee is aware that the MFEL has undergone rigorous peer review and is now enabling new methods for treating burns and other minimally invasive techniques. The committee supports MFEL and recommends \$14.7 million in PE 62227D8Z, an increase of \$5.0 million for MFEL.

National technology alliance

The committee is aware that the National Technology Alliance (NTA) program has demonstrated its worth in over a decade of productive, cooperative efforts with government, industry and academia which have measurably benefited users of information technology. Originated by the intelligence community, the NTA program has focused on advanced technology solutions to address the expanding needs for information of operational users.

The committee notes that the program's unique user support activities conducted by the National Media Laboratory, the National Information Display Laboratory, and the new National Center for Applied Technology have saved hundreds of millions of dollars, and have been successful in providing dual-use solutions for the Intelligence Community, Department of Defense and civil agencies, due largely to the organization's ability to work across agency and departmental boundaries on common technological problems and technical standards.

The committee believes that the NTA program should expand its efforts to address intelligence and information needs within the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense investigate means to expand the NTA program to focus on cross-agency needs in technology areas such as visualization, video technologies, compression, digital libraries, displays, data storage and operational user support, leveraging on the existing NTA effort.

Next Generation Internet revolutionary applications

The budget request contained \$40.0 million in PE 62110E for applied research in the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency (DARPA) component of the Next Generation Internet (NGI) program.

NGI is a major national initiative involving DARPA, the National Science Foundation (NSF), Department of Energy (DOE), National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in a three-year, \$100.0 million per year program to development and demonstrate the technologies, protocols, and standards for a very high speed, broad bandwidth NGI that will offer reliable, affordable, secure information delivery. The program has three primary goals: (1) de-

velop the next generation network and connect universities and Federal research institutions with high speed networks that are 100 to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet; (2) promote experimentation with the next generation of networking technologies; and (3) demonstrate new applications that meet important national goals and missions.

The committee fully supports the NGI initiative and the concept of working with the applications communities—Federal agencies, the public sector, academia, and private companies—to incorporate new and existing networking technologies and capabilities developed under the NGI into applications of importance to each community. The committee further supports the formation of cooperative ventures with regional consortia established for this purpose among federal agencies, local governmental authorities, industry, and academic institutions. The committee expects that such initiatives would leverage the application specific funding, knowledge, skills, and methods brought to the venture by the members of the regional consortium. The committee recommends \$53.0 million, an increase of \$13.0 million for the NGI program. The committee directs that competitive procedures shall be used for awarding all partnership grants and entering into all partnership contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions under the program, and encourages the establishment of cost-shared relationships where feasible.

Polymer-cased ammunition

The budget request contained no funding for polymer-cased ammunition in PE 116404BB.

The committee notes that polymer-cased ammunition offers potential cost and weight savings compared to existing munitions. The committee recommends \$109.2 million in PE 116404BB, an increase of \$3.0 million for polymer-cased ammunition.

Operational field assessment program

The budget request contained \$15.3 million in PE 65118D8Z for the Defense Operational Test and Evaluation program. No funding was requested for the operational field assessment (OFA) program.

Section 212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) directed the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congressional defense committees a report on the conduct and management of the OFA program. In the statement of managers which accompanied the conference report on H.R. 2266, The National Defense Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1998, (H. Rept. 105-265), the conferees agreed to provide \$4.0 million for the operational field assessments program, but expressed concern about the widely differing views within the Department of Defense on this issue and directed the Joint Staff Director for Force Structure, Resources and Assessment (J-8) to conduct a thorough review of all aspects of operational field assessments.

The committee has reviewed the Secretary of Defense report on the OFA program, dated April 3, 1998, which was prepared by the DOT&E, and the letter from the Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated March 30, 1998, which transmits the J-8's findings and recommendations.

Based upon the committee's review of these reports, it is clear there is continuing disagreement within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and between OSD, the Joint Staff, and the military departments, regarding the conduct and management of, and funding for, the OFA program. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense needs to codify the role of the DOT&E and the OFA process in the conduct of operational field experiments, if that role and the OFA process are warranted. Until the OFA process has been codified in DOD instructions, the committee recommends no authorization of funds for the OFA program.

Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition

The budget request contained \$5.1 million in PE 63232D8Z for the development and demonstration of automatic target recognition technology, \$67.2 million in PE 62787A for the Army's medical technology program, and \$39.8 million in PE 63609N for the Navy's conventional munitions program.

The committee continues to be encouraged by the progress being made in the use of automatic target recognition (ATR) technologies to support missiles, precision-guided weapons and target cueing for surveillance systems. The committee encourages the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (DDR&E) to provide assistance to the Navy and other services initiatives pursuing ATR technologies in their development of optical correlators for potential use on the Navy's Standard Missile and for other applications, such as medical diagnosis. The committee expects the military services to capitalize on current programs for the development of optical correlator technology in the DDR&E's ATR program and to coordinate their activities with the ATR program. The committee recommends \$8.1 million in PE 63232D8Z, an increase of \$3.0 million for the DDR&E ATR program. The committee also recommends an increase of \$5.0 million in PE 63609N for development and demonstration of a miniature, rugged optical correlator for automatic target recognition and improved aimpoint selection for the Standard Missile. The committee also recommends an increase of \$2.0 million in PE 62787A for applied research in the use of low cost optical correlator technology in medical diagnosis. The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology) to report to the Congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2000 Defense budget request, the Department's overall plan and program for the development and demonstration of optical correlator technology for automatic target recognition.

Seismic sensor technology

The budget request contained \$213.2 million in PE 63762E for sensor and guidance technology.

The committee notes that seismic technology is critical to detection, verification and evaluation of both natural and weapon related phenomena important to national security. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63762E for seismic sensor technology.

Specialty aerospace metals initiative

The budget request contained \$244.4 million in PE 62712E for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) materials and electronics technology program, including \$145.4 million for applied research in materials processing technology.

The committee notes the progress made by DARPA in the development of low-cost manufacturing of specialty aerospace metals such as beryllium-aluminum, nickel-based, and titanium alloys through the use of government-industrial partnerships. The committee also notes actions that have been taken by the military services to capitalize on the development of these advanced technologies. Several have already successfully transitioned into military systems such as aircraft engines, guidance systems, and electronic components. The committee understands that the Air Force Research Laboratory has created a government-industrial consortium to further address affordability and availability issues with regard to such metals.

Of the funds provided in PE 62712E for materials and electronics technology, the committee recommends \$10.0 million to continue the DARPA program for development of manufacturing technologies for specialty aerospace metals and the transition of these technologies to the military departments. These funds should be used in conjunction with other service funds to establish cooperative government-industry programs for the development of manufacturing technology and industrial applications for these specialty metals.

Special operations intelligence systems

The budget request contained \$1.8 million in PE 1160405BB for the special operations systems development.

The committee notes that the special operations forces intelligence vehicle (SOF IV) is an evolutionary ongoing effort that requires additional funding to complete development. The committee recommends \$6.8 million, an increase of \$5.0 million for SOF IV in PE 1160405BB.

Tactical unmanned aerial vehicles funding

The budget request contained \$75.6 million in PE 35204A and \$37.2 million in PE 35204D8Z for tactical unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV).

The committee notes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology recently provided the Congressional defense committees with the Department's plan to implement legislative direction included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) for reorganization of the Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office (DARO) and commends the Department for its prompt response.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) contained further direction that the Department of Defense review commercial solutions for the various UAV requirements. The committee notes that the Navy is now conducting a three-phase competitive demonstration of vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL) UAVs to meet the Navy and Marine Corps VTOL UAV requirement. The committee continues to support this ap-

proach and urges the Navy to continue this multiple-participant competitive demonstration through the shipboard phase prior to final selection using the funds provided.

The committee notes the proposed plan for transfer of DARO funding in the budget request to the appropriate service accounts and recommends the following transfers of funds: a decrease of \$26.0 million in PE 35204A for the Tactical UAV program, an increase of \$18.0 million in PE 35204N for VTOL UAV, and \$8.0 million in PE 35204M for the Marine Corps close range tactical UAV. In addition, the committee recommends transfer of \$37.2 million from PE 35204D8Z to PE 35204N for ongoing common tactical control system development previously managed by the Joint Program Office.

Thermionics

The budget request contained \$203.6 million in PE 62715BR for weapons of mass destruction related technologies, but no funding for thermionics.

The committee recognizes the increasing importance of space to commercial and military users and believes that high performance, high reliability power and propulsion sources will be critical to the effective exploitation of space assets. The committee believes that advanced thermionic converters could provide compact electrical generations systems. The committee directs that of the funds provided in PE 62715BR, \$5.0 million shall be available to continue thermionics technology development.

University research initiatives

The budget request contained \$216.3 million in PE 61103D8Z for the university research initiatives (URI), including \$10.0 million for the defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research (DEPSCoR). The committee supports continuation of the DEPSCoR program to strengthen the infrastructure, enhance research, and develop human resources to assist the DEPSCoR states to become more competitive for regular research and training grants. Therefore, the committee recommends \$231.3 million, an increase of \$15.0 million for DEPSCoR.

Unmanned aerial vehicle systems integration laboratory

The budget request contained \$5.0 million in PE 35204D8Z for the U.S. Army's Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Systems Integration Laboratory (SIL), and included \$3.0 million for continued development of the Multiple UAV Simulation Environment (MUSE).

The committee supports the SIL's joint UAV developmental work and it is concerned that the reorganization of Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Program will leave the SIL without a sponsor, thereby possibly losing a valuable joint UAV integration organization and jeopardizing continued evolution and improvement of the MUSE tool. While SIL is clearly a service organization, it provides joint support that may well be overseen directly by the new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence

to provide the Congressional defense and intelligence committees a plan, which includes a funding profile, for the continued operation of the SIL, by no later than March 31, 1999.

Verification technology demonstration

The budget request contained \$63.0 million in PE 63711BR.

This request has increased by \$12.8 million over the funding level for fiscal year 1999 projected last year and includes approximately \$25.0 million for efforts other than research and development, such as sustained systems operations, equipment procurement and seismic detection. Of these areas, seismic detection within the continental United States is the specific responsibility of the U.S. Geological Survey. The committee recommends a decrease of \$25.0 million in PE 63711BR.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation (RDT&E) funding for fiscal year 1999.

Section 202—Amount for Basic and Applied Research

This section would specify the amount authorized for fiscal year 1998 for technology base programs.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Management Responsibility for Navy Mine Countermeasures Programs

This section would amend section 216(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-190, as amended), and would extend the implementation of the provision through fiscal year 2003.

Since the completion of the Gulf War, the Congress has repeatedly emphasized the need for improvements in the Navy's mine countermeasures capabilities (MCM). In response to this emphasis, the Navy has developed three successive mine warfare plans, increased funding for MCM research and development, focused on improving the readiness and sustainability of its dedicated MCM ships, and accelerated the development of a Remote Mine hunting System. A limited contingency shallow water mine hunting capability using laser mine detection has been established in one Navy Reserve helicopter squadron. Since 1992, the Navy has spent about \$1.2 billion and plans to spend an additional \$1.3 billion for MCM research and development over the next six years.

In 1996, a General Accounting Office (GAO) report (NSIAD-96-104, Navy Mine Warfare—Budget Realignment Can Help Improve Countermine Capabilities, March 1996) recommended that a long range plan be developed to identify gaps and limitations in the Navy's MCM capabilities, establish priorities, and fund the most

critical programs. The Office of the Secretary of Defense responded that such a process was ongoing and would provide an architecture within which the needs and shortfalls in MCM capabilities could be identified and prioritized. The Navy has changed its MCM strategy from a focus on dedicated MCM forces to deploying organic MCM capabilities within the fleet and developing rapid in-stride mine avoidance and clearing capabilities. However, in a follow-up report (NSIAD-98-135, Navy Mine Countermeasures—Plans to Improve Countermeasures Capabilities Unclear, March 1998), the GAO observed that the investment in MCM research and development had not produced any systems that are ready to transition to production. Delaying factors cited by the GAO included funding instability, changing requirements, cost growth, unanticipated technical problems, and inadequate contractor performance.

The committee believes that the annual certification process has served to increase the visibility of MCM requirements within the DOD and the Navy and has had positive results. However, as currently conducted, the annual certification process has not been able to address the adequacy of resources for the MCM mission because it addresses only the adequacy of funding for the budget year and does not include the out years. Nor does the certification contain any objective measures against which the Navy's progress in enhancing its MCM capabilities can be evaluated. In recommending an extension of the requirement for certification through fiscal year 2003, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff to include such criteria in their annual certification.

Section 212—Future Aircraft Carrier Transition Technologies

This section would make \$50.0 million of the funds authorized for development of technologies for the CV(X) next-generation aircraft carrier available for research, development, test, evaluation, and insertion of technologies into the CVN-77 nuclear aircraft carrier program. The committee understands that the U.S. Navy's plan to transition to the next generation aircraft carrier—the CV(X)—is to use the CVN-77 as a transition ship by incorporating new technology and process design changes. This could have the double benefit of dramatically enhancing the operating efficiency and capability of the CVN-77, while also delivering proven aircraft carrier enhancements to the CV(X) design and minimizing both risk and cost for the new platform. This transition plan could also provide technologies that would contribute to reduction of life cycle costs when inserted into other aircraft carriers that are already in the fleet.

Section 213—Manufacturing Technology Program

This section would amend section 2525 of title 10, United States Code, to establish goals for cost sharing in the manufacturing technology program and procedures by which the requirement for cost sharing, that is now contained in current law, could be waived. Section 211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) requires the Secretary of Defense to prepare a five-year plan for the manufacturing technology program

and to submit the plan annually to the Congress with the Presidents budget request. Both the Secretary's plan, submitted to the Congress in February 1999, and the Department of Defense Inspector General's Audit Report "Defense Manufacturing Technology Program", dated February 25, 1998, cite problems created by the cost-sharing requirement in executing the manufacturing technology problem, and the need for revisions in the cost-sharing requirement and waiver procedures.

SUBTITLE C—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

Section 231—National Missile Defense Policy

This section would establish congressional findings pertaining to the threat posed to U.S. national territory by weapons of mass destruction and long range ballistic missiles. It would also establish the sense of Congress that any deployed national missile defense should defend all fifty states and that the territories of the United States should be protected from ballistic missile defense.

Section 232—Limitation on Funding for the Medium Extended Air Defense System

The budget request contained \$43.0 million in PE 63869C for Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS). The committee understands the requirement for the MEADS, strongly supports the program, and recommends authorization of the requested amount. The budget request again fails to include funding for MEADS in the future years defense plan. Last year, the committee expressed reluctance to continue its support of MEADS in the absence of a clear commitment to the program from DOD.

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from obligating or expending funds authorized and appropriated for MEADS until the Secretary certifies to Congress that funding has been designated for MEADS in the future years defense plan.

The funds so identified must be sufficient to meet the MEADS program goal of proceeding to low rate initial production by fiscal year 2003 and first unit equipped by fiscal year 2007. The provision would require that if such certification is not received by January 1, 1999, the funds authorized for MEADS would thereafter be authorized only for the purpose of research and development to adapt the Patriot Advanced Capability 3-Configuration 3 (PAC-3) to meet the Army requirement for a mobile theater missile defense system.

Section 233—Limitation on Funding for Cooperative Ballistic Missile Defense Programs

This section would prohibit obligation or expenditure of \$5.0 million authorized to be appropriated for the Russian-American Observational Satellite (RAMOS) program until the Secretary of Defense certifies to Congress that the Department of Defense has received detailed information concerning the nature, extent, and military implications of ballistic missile technology transfer from Russian sources to Iran.

Section 234—Limitation on Funding for Counterproliferation Support

This section would prohibit obligation or expenditure of the requested funds for counterproliferation support in PE 63160BR, until the report on the threat posed to the United States by weapons of mass destruction and cruise and ballistic missiles is submitted to Congress as required in section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–85).

Section 235—Ballistic Missile Defense Program Elements

This section would realign program elements for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and require each program element to include funding for management and support necessary for the activities within that program element.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

Funding Realities

The fiscal year 1999 budget request for operation and maintenance represents an \$828.0 million increase from the level authorized and appropriated by Congress for fiscal year 1998. The senior leadership of the Department of Defense has stated on numerous occasions that the budget request contains an increase of over one billion dollars. To date, the committee has been unable to identify these increases, other than the proposed transfer of \$982.0 million from the Defense Working Capital Fund account into the military services operation and maintenance accounts for commissary store operations. Prior to this year, the funding of the commissaries was not included in the operation and maintenance accounts. This proposed accounting transfer will do nothing to improve readiness. In addition, the committee notes that many of the accounts having little to do with readiness that are contained within the operation and maintenance accounts contain budget increases. These include accounts such as Cooperative Threat Reduction, Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid, among others. Neither the movement into the operation and maintenance accounts of commissary funding, or budget growth in non-readiness operation and maintenance accounts should be misconstrued as increased readiness spending.

The committee remains deeply concerned with the continued under-funding of critical readiness accounts and the impact this practice is having on military forces in the field. In fact, the problems seem to be getting worse. Despite the addition by Congress of approximately \$350.0 million in fiscal year 1998 to arrest the backlog of depot maintenance and repair, the backlog will grow by \$120.4 million in fiscal year 1999. After the addition by Congress of \$600.0 million in the real property maintenance and repair accounts in fiscal year 1998, the backlog will grow by \$1.6 billion. And after Congress added \$562.0 million to the Navy and Air Force flying hour/spare parts accounts in fiscal year 1998, there is a projected shortfall, in fiscal year 1999, of approximately \$250.0 million in these accounts. The five year shortfall in the readiness related accounts, according to the military Service Chiefs, is \$18.1 billion. The effect of growing shortfalls in key readiness accounts is readily evident in mounting readiness problems in the field.

Readiness Realities

Contradictions between reports on military unit readiness provided by the senior leadership of the Department of Defense (DOD) and observations made by military personnel in the field continue

to grow. Where official reports and testimony before the committee portray the overall readiness of U.S. armed forces as high, soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines increasingly admit that their units continue to slip below past readiness standards.

In its continuing effort to assess force readiness, the committee once again conducted a series of field hearings at various military installations throughout the United States to hear the views of operational unit commanders and senior non-commissioned officers from all of the military services. The overwhelming impression left with the committee was of a force working harder, longer, and with fewer personnel than ever before. Funding and forces continue to shrink while the demands of the job increase. For example, the Army, which conducted 10 "operational events" outside of normal training and alliance commitments during the 31 year period of 1960-1991, has conducted 26 "operational events" just in the seven years since 1991. The Marine Corps, which undertook 15 "contingency operations" from 1982 to 1989, has conducted 62 since the fall of the Berlin Wall. These increases in operational tempo are occurring at the same time that the Army has been reduced from 18 to 10 Divisions, the Navy has reduced its ships almost by one-half, and the Air Force has reduced from 24 to 12 fighter wings.

Among the disturbing problems raised in the committee's hearings and investigations were indications of a growing shortage of spare parts and the related increase in the cannibalization of equipment; combat aircraft and vehicles are being operated at a pace that requires longer and more extensive repairs at the maintenance depot; and the deterioration of base facilities where personnel live and work are below acceptable standards. These are indicators of broader trends throughout the force that are raising doubts about present, and future readiness.

None of this is new. Indeed, these readiness problems are consistent with those enumerated in past committee hearings and reports. The persistence of these problems leaves the committee concerned by the lack of progress the Department of Defense has made in developing a more comprehensive readiness measurement system that better reflects today's operational realities. As defense resources and force size have declined, and the number, frequency and duration of contingency operations has increased, the ability of U.S. armed forces to train for their primary warfighting missions is being compromised.

In addition to improving its readiness reporting systems, discussed elsewhere in this report, the committee believes that DOD should also take further steps to aggressively reduce costs in areas that do not directly contribute to readiness. After a review of the fiscal year 1999 budget request, the committee notes repeated examples where funding for support activities, such as headquarters and other support activities has inexplicably increased over current spending. Accordingly, the committee has identified administrative and support accounts that do not directly contribute to readiness and re-prioritized much of these spending increases to areas that will immediately improve readiness, such as depot maintenance, real property maintenance and aircraft spare parts.

As the reprioritization of operation and maintenance funding clearly demonstrates, and consistent with the testimony of the

Service Chiefs, the committee remains committed to address the service readiness shortfalls even within a declining defense budget.

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 1999	COMMITTEE	FY 1999
	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	17,273,063	(933,363)	16,339,700
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	21,927,202	(87,874)	21,839,328
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,523,703	16,000	2,539,703
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	19,177,004	(360,896)	18,816,108
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	10,750,701	(396,485)	10,354,216
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,202,622	(5,000)	1,197,622
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	928,639	20,000	948,639
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	114,593	2,400	116,993
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,744,696	3,000	1,747,696
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	2,436,815	28,000	2,464,815
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,093,933	3,000	3,096,933
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	-	-	-
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	377,640	-	377,640
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	281,600	-	281,600
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	379,100	-	379,100
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	26,091	-	26,091
ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SIT	195,000	-	195,000
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES	727,582	-	727,582
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	746,900	-	746,900
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	130,764	-	130,764
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	7,324	-	7,324
OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	63,311	(16,000)	47,311
PAYMENT TO KAHOLAWE ISLAND	15,000	-	15,000
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	9,653,435	9,600	9,663,035
FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	442,400	(25,000)	417,400
TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	94,219,118	(1,742,618)	92,476,500

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGSAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 98 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
	<u>LAND FORCES</u>			
	<u>DIVISIONS</u>			
10	NTC Funding	2,966,468	80,200	3,046,668
		1,091,232		1,151,432
20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	299,739	60,200	299,739
30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	316,361		316,361
40	ECHOLON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	434,579		434,579
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	824,557		824,557
	JRTC IMPROVEMENTS		20,000	20,000
	<u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u>	1,919,575	50,000	1,969,575
60	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	973,814		973,814
70	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	375,038		375,038
80	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	570,723	50,000	620,723
	<u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u>	3,219,888	0	3,219,888
90	BASE SUPPORT	2,332,231		2,332,231
100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	641,651		641,651
110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	110,538		110,538
120	UNIFIED COMMANDS	71,960		71,960
130	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	63,478		63,478
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	8,105,931	130,200	8,236,131
BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
	<u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u>			
150	STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	624,635	0	624,635
160	ARMY POSITIONED STOCKS	314,541		314,541
		165,349		165,349

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAJ/AG/SAG	FY 1998 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
170	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	78,645		78,645
180	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	66,100		66,100
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	624,635	0	624,635
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
	ACCESSION TRAINING	339,001	0	339,001
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	63,580		63,580
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	14,264		14,264
210	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	14,908		14,908
220	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	130,270		130,270
230	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	72,889		72,889
240	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMY ONLY)	42,979		42,979
	BASIC SKILL/ADVANCE TRAINING	2,185,176	0	2,185,176
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	215,964		215,964
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	226,501		226,501
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	192,720		192,720
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	488,799		488,799
290	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	782,265		782,265
300	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	258,927		258,927
	RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING	731,356	0	731,356
310	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	234,154		234,154
320	EXAMINING	71,593		71,593
330	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	100,203		100,203
340	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	73,517		73,517
350	JUNIOR ROTC	73,423		73,423
360	BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	178,496		178,496
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	3,235,563	0	3,235,563

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAJ/AG/SAG	FY 1999		FY 89	
		AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES					
370	SECURITY PROGRAMS	<u>404,340</u>	0	<u>404,340</u>	<u>404,340</u>
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	404,340		404,340	404,340
380	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	<u>1,505,999</u>	0	<u>1,505,999</u>	<u>1,505,999</u>
	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	398,473		398,473	398,473
390	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	370,824		370,824	370,824
400	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	336,403		336,403	336,403
410	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	400,299		400,299	400,299
420	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	<u>3,131,374</u>	<u>(365,900)</u>	<u>2,765,474</u>	<u>2,765,474</u>
	ADMINISTRATION	304,679	(27,500)	277,179	277,179
430	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	606,379		606,379	606,379
440	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	142,081		142,081	142,081
450	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	150,483		150,483	150,483
460	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	618,384		618,384	618,384
470	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	118,886		118,886	118,886
480	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	68,815		68,815	68,815
490	BASE SUPPORT	700,689		700,689	700,689
500	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS (transfer to DECA Working Capital Fund)	338,400	(338,400)	0	0
510	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	82,578		82,578	82,578
520	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	<u>285,221</u>	0	<u>285,221</u>	<u>285,221</u>
	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	227,377		227,377	227,377
540	MISC SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	37,844		37,844	37,844
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	5,306,934	(365,900)	4,941,034	4,941,034

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGSAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	<u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u>			
	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OVERSTATEMENT		(517,000)	(517,000)
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(40,000)	(40,000)
	FOREIGN CURRENCY		(78,232)	(78,232)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		7,000	7,000
	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS TRAINING EFFICIENCIES (SEC. 907)		(12,000)	(12,000)
	CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS COMPUTERS, TRAINING & LAB (SEC. 907)		(6,000)	(6,000)
	ADP LEGACY SYSTEMS EFFICIENCIES		(96,660)	(96,660)
	JCAL PROGRAM SLIPPAGE		(33,200)	(33,200)
	USAREUR LONG HAUL TRUCK REPAIR COST REDUCTION		(5,400)	(5,400)
	JRISB DUPLICATIVE PROGRAM		(3,770)	(3,770)
	E-MAIL CONSOLIDATION		(1)	(1)
	FUEL SAVINGS		(29,900)	(29,900)
	DISA TRANSFER		53,400	53,400
	WHS TRANSFER		6,100	6,100
	RPMA		50,000	50,000
	Basic training barracks modification		8,000	8,000
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED		(697,663)	(697,663)
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	17,273,063	(933,363)	16,339,700
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	AIR OPERATIONS	4,766,805	145,000	4,933,805
	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,088,630	50,000	2,138,630
	Aircraft Spares			

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AG/SAG	FY 1999		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		AUTHORIZATION REQUEST			
20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	751,533		20,000	771,533
	Naval Air Strike Air Warfare Center Improvements				
30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	46,925			46,925
40	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	88,459			88,459
50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	735,731		75,000	810,731
60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,249			20,249
70	BASE SUPPORT	772,678			772,678
80	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	283,600			283,600
SHIP OPERATIONS					
90	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	7,093,373		90,000	7,183,373
100	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	1,987,873			1,987,873
110	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	541,069			541,069
120	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	388,408			388,408
130	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,947,424		90,000	2,037,424
140	BASE SUPPORT	1,147,209			1,147,209
150	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	832,789			832,789
		248,601			248,601
COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT					
160	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,723,193		7,500	1,730,693
170	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	234,450			234,450
180	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	7,734			7,734
190	WARFARE TACTICS	138,271			138,271
200	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	134,014			134,014
	Naval Oceanography Partnership Program	228,159		7,500	235,659
210	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	444,072			444,072
220	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	170,937			170,937
230	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	694			694
240	BASE SUPPORT	312,259			312,259
250	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	52,603			52,603

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999		COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
		AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	FY 98		
	WEAPONS SUPPORT	<u>1,535,843</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>1,535,843</u>
260	CRUISE MISSILE	121,192			121,192
270	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	812,041			812,041
280	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	61,598			61,598
290	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	389,469			389,469
300	BASE SUPPORT	119,868			119,868
310	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	31,675			31,675
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT	<u>43,300</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>43,300</u>
320	NWCF SUPPORT	43,300			43,300
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	15,184,514		242,500	15,427,014
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
	READY RESERVE AND REPOSITIONING FORCES				
330	SHIP REPOSITIONING AND SURGE	<u>428,775</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>428,775</u>
	ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	<u>512,627</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>512,627</u>
340	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	651			651
350	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	511,976			511,976
	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	<u>56,891</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>56,891</u>
360	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,496			23,496
370	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	16,166			16,166
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	17,229			17,229
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	998,293		0	998,293
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
	ACCESSION TRAINING	<u>287,693</u>		<u>0</u>	<u>287,693</u>
390	OFFICER ACQUISITION	75,643			75,643

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGS/AG	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 89 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
400	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,556		4,556
410	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	69,087		69,087
420	BASE SUPPORT	57,036		57,036
430	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	81,371		81,371
440	<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>	<u>1,187,896</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,187,896</u>
450	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	237,916		237,916
460	FLIGHT TRAINING	315,874		315,874
470	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	71,780		71,780
480	TRAINING SUPPORT	138,319		138,319
490	BASE SUPPORT	331,607		331,607
	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	92,400		92,400
500	<u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u>	<u>265,851</u>	<u>38,600</u>	<u>304,451</u>
510	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	130,415		130,415
520	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	74,669		74,669
530	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	37,425		37,425
540	JUNIOR ROTC	22,830		22,830
550	BASE SUPPORT	451		4,051
	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	61	3,600	61
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,741,440	38,600	1,780,040
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
560	<u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u>	<u>1,825,874</u>	<u>(255,000)</u>	<u>1,570,874</u>
570	ADMINISTRATION	565,193		565,193
580	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	21,456		21,456
590	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	140,247		140,247
600	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	125,125		125,125
610	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	201,014		201,014
	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	244,766		244,766

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
620	BASE SUPPORT	228,046		228,046
640	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	44,827		44,827
650	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS (transfer to DECA Working Capital Fund)	255,000	(255,000)	0
	<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u>	1	0	<u>1,590,349</u>
660	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION			144,245
670	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN			262,615
680	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT			473,159
690	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	280,437		280,437
700	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	55,467		55,467
710	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	41,700		41,700
720	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,178		72,178
730	BASE SUPPORT	219,826		219,826
740	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	40,722		40,722
	<u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u>	<u>578,497</u>	0	<u>578,497</u>
750	SECURITY PROGRAMS	568,257		568,257
760	BASE SUPPORT	8,814		8,814
770	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	1,426		1,426
	<u>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</u>	<u>8,435</u>	0	<u>8,435</u>
780	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,435		8,435
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,002,955	(255,000)	3,747,955
	<u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u>			
	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OVERSTATEMENT		(15,000)	(15,000)
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(40,000)	(40,000)
	FOREIGN CURRENCY		(6,650)	(6,650)
	SECTION 911 ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT HQ REDUCTION 5%		(23,900)	(23,900)
	ADP LEGACY SYSTEMS EFFICIENCIES		(87,820)	(87,820)
	FUEL SAVINGS		(90,500)	(90,500)

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGSAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	RPMA			
	NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM		50,000	50,000
	DISA TRANSFER TO NAVY		4,000	4,000
	WHS TRANSFER TO NAVY		67,800	67,800
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		7,700	7,700
			20,396	20,396
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	(113,874)	(113,874)
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	21,927,202	(87,874)	21,839,328
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
	OPERATIONAL FORCES	1,660,869	50,400	1,711,269
	AGCC Twentynine Palms	375,531		380,531
	FIELD LOGISTICS	221,683	5,000	221,683
	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,713	20,700	99,413
	BASE SUPPORT	692,716		692,716
	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	292,216		292,216
	EQUIPMENT REPAIR, OKINAWA		10,000	10,000
	COLD WEATHER CLOTHING		12,600	12,600
	ACTIVE DUTY SPECIAL WORK		2,100	2,100
	USMC PREPOSITIONING	85,653	0	85,653
60	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	81,325		81,325
70	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	4,328		4,328
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,746,522	50,400	1,796,922

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
	ACCESSION TRAINING	81,309		81,309
80	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,202	0	10,202
90	OFFICER ACQUISITION	289		289
100	BASE SUPPORT	53,526		53,526
110	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	17,292		17,292
	BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING	196,025	0	196,025
120	SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	28,269		28,269
130	FLIGHT TRAINING	161		161
140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	6,478		6,478
150	TRAINING SUPPORT	81,338		81,338
160	BASE SUPPORT	55,771		55,771
170	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,009		24,009
	RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION	115,951	13,500	129,451
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	80,798	12,000	92,798
190	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	15,016		15,016
200	JUNIOR ROTC	9,201		9,201
210	BASE SUPPORT	8,496	1,500	9,996
220	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,440		2,440
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	393,286	13,500	406,786
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
	SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	383,895	(86,600)	297,295
230	SPECIAL SUPPORT	224,668		224,668
240	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	29,630		29,630
250	ADMINISTRATION	29,600		29,600

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGSAG	FY 1999		FY 99	
		AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
260	BASE SUPPORT	14,557		14,557	
270	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	1,931		1,931	
280	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS (transfer to DECA Working Capital Fund)	86,600	(86,600)	0	
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	383,895	(86,600)	297,295	
	UNDISTRIBUTED				
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE USMC		25,000	25,000	
	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURES, USMC		5,000	5,000	
	DISA TRANSFER TO MARINE CORPS		7,800	7,800	
	WHS TRANSFER TO MARINE CORPS		900	900	
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	38,700	38,700	
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,523,703	16,000	2,539,703	
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE					
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES					
AIR OPERATIONS					
10	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	7,400,896	170,000	7,570,896	
	Aircraft Spares	2,311,299	150,000	2,461,299	
20	PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	236,147		236,147	
30	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	196,036		196,036	
40	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	562,839		562,839	
45	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,022,087		1,022,087	
50	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	958,706		958,706	
60	BASE SUPPORT	1,538,126		1,538,126	
65	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	575,656		575,656	
	AIR WARFARE CENTER IMPROVEMENTS		20,000	20,000	

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS	<u>1,385,350</u>		<u>1,385,350</u>
70	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	668,379		668,379
80	NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	118,337		118,337
90	OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	221,593		221,593
100	JCS EXERCISES	30,521		30,521
110	MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	117,540		117,540
120	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	227,980		227,980
	SPACE OPERATIONS	<u>1,123,425</u>		<u>1,123,425</u>
130	LAUNCH FACILITIES	221,046		221,046
140	LAUNCH VEHICLES	102,064		102,064
150	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	246,940		246,940
160	SATELLITE SYSTEMS	36,152		36,152
170	OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	85,292		85,292
180	BASE SUPPORT	309,406		309,406
185	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	122,525		122,525
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	9,909,671	170,000	10,079,671
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
	MOBILITY OPERATIONS	<u>2,808,949</u>		<u>2,808,949</u>
190	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,326,774		1,326,774
200	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	21,676		21,676
210	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	134,807		134,807
215	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	316,485		316,485
220	PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	470,000		470,000
230	BASE SUPPORT	390,876		390,876
235	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	148,331		148,331
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	2,808,949	0	2,808,949

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
240	ACCESSION TRAINING	205,044	0	205,044
250	OFFICER ACQUISITION	57,679		57,679
260	RECRUIT TRAINING	4,360		4,360
270	RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	46,522		46,522
275	BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	58,828		58,828
	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMIES ONLY)	37,655		37,655
280	<u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u>	<u>1,264,253</u>	0	<u>1,264,253</u>
290	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	215,477		215,477
300	FLIGHT TRAINING	406,940		406,940
310	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	90,709		90,709
315	TRAINING SUPPORT	65,742		65,742
320	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	12,186		12,186
325	BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	370,961		370,961
	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	102,238		102,238
330	RECRUITING	229,246	0	229,246
340	EXAMINATIONS	54,775		54,775
350	OFF DUTY /VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	2,668		2,668
360	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	84,122		84,122
370	JUNIOR ROTC	61,124		61,124
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	26,557		26,557
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	1,698,543	0	1,698,543
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
380	<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u>	<u>2,535,950</u>	0	<u>2,535,950</u>
	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	706,893		706,893

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
390	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	389,685		389,685
400	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	196,178		196,178
405	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	69,344		69,344
410	BASE SUPPORT	916,165		916,165
415	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	257,685		257,685
	SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,653,027	(316,971)	1,336,056
420	ADMINISTRATION	140,879	(14,900)	125,979
430	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	234,065		234,065
440	PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	127,718		127,718
450	RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	48,466		48,466
470	ARMS CONTROL	30,005		30,005
480	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	517,780		517,780
490	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	31,828		31,828
500	CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,927		13,927
505	COMMISSARY OPERATIONS (transfer to DECA Working Capital Fund)	302,071	(302,071)	0
510	BASE SUPPORT	180,221		180,221
515	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	26,067		26,067
	SECURITY PROGRAMS	557,256	0	557,256
520	SECURITY PROGRAMS	557,256		557,256
	SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS	13,608	0	13,608
530	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	13,608		13,608
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	4,799,841	(316,971)	4,442,870
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(40,000)	(40,000)
	FOREIGN CURRENCY		(16,105)	(16,105)
	SECTION 911 MANAGEMENT HQ REDUCTION 5%		(60,300)	(60,300)
	ADP LEGACY SYSTEMS EFFICIENCIES		(95,620)	(95,620)

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	ELIMINATION OF FIRST PROGRAM		(7,000)	(7,000)
	E-MAIL CONSOLIDATION		(1,000)	(1,000)
	FUEL SAVINGS		(110,500)	(110,500)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		500	500
	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, USAF		50,000	50,000
	DISA TRANSFER TO AIR FORCE		59,400	59,400
	WHS TRANSFER TO AIR FORCE		6,700	6,700
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	(213,925)	(213,925)
	TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	19,177,004	(360,896)	18,816,108
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u>			
	OPERATING FORCES	1,559,393	25,000	1,584,393
10	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	410,065		435,065
	Mobility Enhancement Fund		25,000	
20	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,149,328		1,149,328
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,559,393	25,000	1,584,393
	<u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION</u>			
	MOBILIZATION	38,934	0	38,934
30	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	38,934		38,934
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2:	38,934	0	38,934

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
45	TRAINING AND RECRUITING	53,467	0	53,467
50	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	11,059		11,059
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	42,408		42,408
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:	53,467	0	53,467
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
55	ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	9,099,907	(427,975)	9,670,932
60	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	93,815		93,815
65	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	44,894		44,894
75	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	3,803,561		3,803,561
	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	330,087	(2,375)	326,112
80	Section 911 Management HQ Reduction 5%		(1,600)	
85	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	83,277	(34,600)	48,677
	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	198,923		192,923
	DCPDS Program slippage		(6,000)	
90	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	771,106	(30,000)	517,706
	Section 911 Management HQ Reduction 5%		(1,800)	
	Transfer to Service Accounts		(221,600)	
95	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	9,027		9,027
100	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,140,137		1,120,137
	Headquarters and Administration Management		(35,000)	
	Document Conversion Technology		15,000	
105	DEFENSE POW/MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,110		14,110
100	DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY	4,610		4,610
105	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	83,419		83,419
125	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AND TREATY COMPLIANCE AGENCY	304,745	(13,000)	291,745
130	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,347,718		1,347,718
140	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	139,616	(24,400)	112,816
	Section 911 Management HQ Reduction 5%		(2,400)	

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AG/SAG	FY 1998 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
145	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	31,233		31,233
150	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DRI Administration and Management Innovative Readiness Training National Guard Youth Challenge Program	369,836	(15,900) (16,000) 21,500	359,436
165	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND Section 911 Management HQ Reduction 5%	47,117	(3,400)	43,717
170	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE Travel Reengineering Program slippage Travel Reengineering Prog. Mgmt. to USTRANSCOM and transfer to serv.accts.	281,676	(35,000) (21,400)	225,276
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	9,088,907	(427,975)	8,670,932
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OVERSTATEMENT		(5,300)	(5,300)
	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES		(40,000)	(40,000)
	FOREIGN CURRENCY		(7,117)	(7,117)
	ADP LEGACY SYSTEMS EFFICIENCIES		(18,000)	(18,000)
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		17,707	17,707
	IMPACT AID		35,000	35,000
	DISA TRANSFER TO DEFENSE AGENCIES		33,200	33,200
	FUEL SAVINGS		(9,000)	(9,000)
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	6,490	6,490
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	10,750,701	(396,485)	10,354,216

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
	LAND FORCES			
10	DIVISION FORCES	509,126	0	509,126
20	CORPS COMBAT FORCES	10,918		10,918
30	CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	17,890		17,890
40	ECHOLON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	165,897		165,897
50	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	86,565		86,565
		227,856		227,856
	LAND FORCES READINESS			
60	FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	184,923	0	184,923
70	LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	123,824		123,824
80	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,757		13,757
		47,342		47,342
	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
90	BASE SUPPORT	368,427	0	368,427
100	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	305,760		305,760
110	UNIFIED COMMANDS	61,177		61,177
120	MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	107		107
		1,383		1,383
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,062,476	0	1,062,476
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130	STAFF MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	140,146	0	140,146
140	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	27,465		27,465
150	PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	23,601		23,601
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	47,327		47,327
		41,753		41,753
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	140,146	0	140,146

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
	WMID REDUCTIONS		(5,000)	(5,000)
	TOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		(5,000)	(5,000)
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,202,822	(5,000)	1,197,822
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS	569,877		569,877
10	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	300,682		300,682
20	FLEET AIR TRAINING	484		484
30	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,271		17,271
40	AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,044		3,044
50	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	121,740		121,740
60	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	323		323
70	BASE SUPPORT	101,963		101,963
75	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,370		24,370
	RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS	152,723	20,000	172,723
80	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	61,924		61,924
	MCM Operations		20,000	
90	SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	611		611
100	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	9,472		9,472
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	79,257		79,257
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,459		1,459

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
	<u>RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</u>	<u>72,372</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>72,372</u>
140	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	28,355		28,355
150	BASE SUPPORT	34,411		34,411
155	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	9,606		9,606
	<u>RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT</u>	<u>5,217</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,217</u>
160	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,217		5,217
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	800,189	20,000	820,189
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	<u>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>125,916</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>125,916</u>
170	ADMINISTRATION	6,209		6,209
180	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,015		1,015
190	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	25,420		25,420
210	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	50,534		50,534
220	BASE SUPPORT	29,571		29,571
225	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	7,182		7,182
230	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,398		5,398
240	GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	587		587
	<u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u>	<u>2,534</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2,534</u>
250	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	2,534		2,534
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	128,450	0	128,450
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	928,639	20,000	948,639

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
	MISSION FORCES			
10	TRAINING	74,327	1,200	75,527
20	OPERATING FORCES	14,435		14,435
30	BASE SUPPORT	33,823		33,823
35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	16,272		16,272
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,976		6,976
	USMCR INCREASED USE	2,821	1,200	2,821
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	74,327	1,200	75,527
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
50	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	40,266	1,200	41,466
60	SPECIAL SUPPORT	7,920	1,200	9,120
70	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,080		11,080
80	ADMINISTRATION	4,714		4,714
90	BASE SUPPORT	8,763		8,763
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	40,266	1,200	41,466
	TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	114,593	2,400	116,993
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
10	AIR OPERATIONS	1,663,150	0	1,663,150
	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,038,509		1,038,509

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BAI/AGSAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	40,926		40,926
30	BASE SUPPORT	223,606		223,606
35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	61,616		61,616
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	298,493		298,493
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	1,663,150	0	1,663,150
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	81,546	3,000	84,546
50	ADMINISTRATION	46,002		46,002
60	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,205		20,205
70	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,360	3,000	11,360
80	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,366		6,366
90	AUDIOVISUAL	613		613
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	81,546	3,000	84,546
	TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,744,696	3,000	1,747,696
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
	BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
	MISSION OPERATIONS	2,285,721	0	2,285,721
10	LAND FORCES	1,302,542		1,302,542
20	LAND FORCES READINESS	144,113		144,113
30	LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT	839,066		839,066
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	2,285,721	0	2,285,721

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
50	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	151,094	0	151,094
60	STAFF MANAGEMENT	59,249		59,249
70	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	33,490		33,490
90	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	21,793		21,793
		36,562		36,562
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	151,094	0	151,094
UNDISTRIBUTED				
	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE TRAINING		3,000	3,000
	MILITARY TECHNICIANS		27,000	27,000
	WMD REDUCTION		(2,000)	(2,000)
	TOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	0	28,000	28,000
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NAT. GUARD	2,436,815	28,000	2,464,815
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
AIR OPERATIONS				
10	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,083,268	0	3,083,268
20	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	1,935,880		1,935,880
30	BASE SUPPORT	340,884		340,884
35	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	295,163		295,163
40	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,633		82,633
		428,708		428,708
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:	3,083,268	0	3,083,268

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AG/SAG	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 99 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
<u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u>				
50	ADMINISTRATION	10,665	3,000	13,665
60	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	2,913		2,913
		7,752	3,000	10,752
	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:	10,665	3,000	13,665
	TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,093,933	3,000	3,096,933
<u>TRANSFER ACCOUNTS AND MISCELLANEOUS</u>				
<u>TRANSFER ACCOUNTS</u>				
10	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	2,733,913	0	2,733,913
20	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	377,640		377,640
30	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	281,600		281,600
40	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	379,100		379,100
50	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY UTILIZED DEFENSE SITES	26,091		26,091
60	DRUG INTERDICTION	195,000		195,000
70	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCIES	727,582		727,582
		746,900		746,900
	TOTAL, O&M, TRANSFER ACCOUNTS:	2,733,913	0	2,733,913
<u>O&M, MISCELLANEOUS</u>				
80	INSPECTOR GENERAL	10,312,234	(31,400)	10,280,834
90	COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS	130,764		130,764
120	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AFFAIRS	7,324		7,324
130	PAYMENT TO KAHOOLAWE ISLAND	63,311	(16,000)	47,311
140	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	15,000		15,000
	Defense Health Program Environmental Risk Assessment	9,653,435		9,653,435
	Defense Health Program Medical Trauma Training		1,800	1,800
	Traditional CHAMPUS for Disabled Retirees		4,800	4,800
			3,000	3,000

TITLE III - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE	ACCOUNT/BA/AGSAG	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 89 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
150	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	442,400	(25,000)	417,400
	TOTAL, O&M, MISCELLANEOUS:	10,312,234	(31,400)	10,280,834
	TOTAL, O&M, MISCELLANEOUS AND TRANSFER ACCOUNTS:	13,046,147	(31,400)	13,014,747
	TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE TITLE:	94,219,118	(1,742,618)	92,476,500

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST INCREASES

Critical Readiness Accounts Increases

The committee remains committed to addressing critical readiness problems and has, therefore, recommended an increase of \$610.7 million in a number of underfunded readiness accounts. Although the committee has increased funding in key readiness accounts over the President's budget by more than \$4.6 billion over the past three years, force readiness continues to decline. The committee has carefully reprioritized the Administration's request in an effort to once again provide increases to key readiness accounts, many of which reflect the priorities expressed by the Service Chiefs in their testimony before the committee. Examples include:

[In millions of dollars]

Depot Maintenance—Army—	50.0
Depot Maintenance—Navy/Air—	75.0
Depot Maintenance—Navy Sea—	90.0
Depot Maintenance—Marine Corps—	20.7
Aircraft Spare Parts—Navy—	50.0
Aircraft Spare Parts—Air Force—	150.0
Real Property Maintenance—Army—	50.0
Real Property Maintenance—Navy—	50.0
Real Property Maintenance—Marine Corps—	25.0
Real Property Maintenance—Air Force—	50.0

Mobility Enhancement Funding

The committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million to improve deployment and mobility of military forces and supplies through investment in en-route infrastructure. These funds are provided for the United States Transportation Command Mobility Enhancement Fund (MEF). The committee is aware that the MEF was established to address strategic mobility shortcomings that revealed themselves during Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. The committee believes that this additional funding will improve the ability of the military services to respond to future contingencies.

Training Accounts

The budget request once again proposes to require funding for Army unit rotations at the National Training Center, (NTC) Fort Irwin, California to pay for the use of the pre-positioned equipment out of the funds provided for home station training. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 108-85), the committee added \$60.2 million to the Army's Operation and Maintenance account to continue central funding of the equipment necessary to maintain the equipment at the NTC, and urged the Army to continue funding the NTC centrally. Unfortunately, the budget request does not support central funding of equipment for the NTC.

The NTC is the only U.S.-based training facility where Army maneuver units can train against a dedicated opposing force in an environment which most closely approximates high intensity combat. The committee continues to believe that the Army policy of requir-

ing rotational units to fund training at the NTC diminishes home station training and will adversely impact training at the NTC.

The committee is also concerned by inadequate funding for the other military training centers. As an example, the committee is aware of funding shortfalls for aggressor training equipment at the Navy and Air Force air warfare centers, which has severely reduced the frequency and level of training for aircraft fighter crews. In addition, the training equipment at the Joint Readiness Training Center, Fort Polk, Louisiana and the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Training Center, Twenty Nine Palms, California is in urgent need of repair and upgrade. Due to increasing restrictions on the availability of local station training ranges and other environmental concerns, the committee reiterates that the military service training centers are national assets that require additional attention and funding.

Therefore, the committee recommends increases as follows:

[In millions of dollars]	
National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California-	60.3
Naval Strike Air Warfare Center, Fallon Naval Air Station, Nevada-	20.0
Air Warfare Center, Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada-	20.0
Joint Readiness Training Center, Fort Polk, Louisiana-	20.0
Marine Air Ground Combat Center, Twenty Nine Palms, California-	5.0
Total	125.3

United States Marine Corps Cold Weather Clothing

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps is in need of additional funding for the Extended Cold Weather Clothing System (ECWCS), which is designed to provide protection during cold and wet weather. The committee believes the ECWCS is a significant contributor to the combat readiness of the individual marine and would significantly improve quality of life. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.6 million for ECWCS.

BUDGET REQUEST REDUCTIONS

Administration and Support Accounts

The committee notes that at the same time the budget request contains underfunded readiness and operational accounts, many at levels even below current fiscal year 1998 spending, it proposes spending increases in a number of administrative and support accounts with no direct impact on service readiness. The committee disagrees with the budget's priorities in this regard and, therefore, recommends decreases in many of the military services' and defense agencies' non-readiness accounts. These decreases reflect reductions in spending growth over current fiscal year 1998 level:

[In millions of dollars]	
Army Administration	27.5
Air Force Administration-	14.9
Joint Chiefs of Staff-	24.4
Defense Logistics Agency-	35.0
Defense Finance and Accounting Service-	35.0
Defense Information Systems Agency	30.0

The committee fails to understand the justification for budget growth in support accounts at a time when the services face critical

readiness shortfalls. For example, the Defense Reform Initiative (DRI) proposed management reductions of 33 percent in the Office of the Secretary of Defense by the end of fiscal year 1998, yet the budget request reflects no such reduction. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$15.9 million in this account to bring the budget request in line with the recommendations of the DRI.

The committee also notes questionable funding requests in the support accounts. As an example, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, a working capital fund agency, request contains nearly \$35.0 million for executive and professional training. The committee believes that funding for the training of working capital funded employees should be charged against the appropriate working capital fund and managed accordingly.

As expressed in more detail elsewhere in this report, the committee is disappointed that the department of Defense has not fully complied with section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) which required a five percent reduction in all headquarters and headquarters support activities personnel by October 1, 1998. Except for the Department of the Army, the budget request fails to account for these reductions and in some cases, these accounts reflect budget growth. Therefore, the committee recommends the following reductions consistent with section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85):

[In millions of dollars]	
Navy-	23.9
Air Force-	60.3
Defense Information Systems Agency-	1.8
Defense Contract Audit Agency-	1.6
Joint Chiefs of Staff-	2.4
Special Operations Command-	3.4

Advisory and Assistance Services

The committee recommends the following reductions for Advisory and Assistance Services:

[In millions of dollars]	
Army	40.0
Navy	40.0
Air Force	40.0
Defense Agencies	40.0

A more detailed discussion on Advisory and Assistance Services can be found elsewhere in this report.

Bulk Fuel Reductions

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has estimated that fuel purchases by the services have been executed at levels below those assumed in the budget request since fiscal year 1996. The overestimates of fuel costs ranged from \$440.0 million in fiscal year 1996 to \$201.0 million in fiscal year 1998. The committee notes that the budget estimates used by the Department of Defense (DOD) for fuel purchases for fiscal year 1999 exceed the latest DOD estimates by approximately \$2 per barrel. Consistent with the revised pricing date, the committee recommends the following reductions:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	29.9
Navy	90.5
Air Force	110.5
Defense Agencies	9.0

Civilian Personnel Overstatement Reductions

To determine civilian personnel requirements for the budget request, the Department of Defense (DOD) applied the actual fiscal year 1997 personnel levels and the estimated personnel levels the Department would have on hand at the end of fiscal year 1998, to forecast civilian personnel levels in fiscal year 1999. Because the DOD was unable to accurately estimate the fiscal year 1998 end strengths prior to the submission of the budget request, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has determined that DOD will employ fewer civilian personnel at the beginning of fiscal year 1999 than it assumed and budgeted for in the request.

Therefore, to bring the request in line with GAO's estimated civilian end strength levels for fiscal year 1999, the committee recommends reductions in funding as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	518.0
Navy	15.0
Defense Agencies	5.3

Foreign Currency Reductions

Since the submission of the Department of Defense fiscal year 1999 budget request, the U.S. dollar has increased in value compared to various foreign currencies. As a result, the committee believes that the fiscal year 1999 budget request is overstated. In addition, the committee understands that the Defense Foreign Currency Fluctuation account already contains a balance of over \$300.0 million to be used in the event that unfavorable currency fluctuations develop. The committee believes the requested amount is, therefore, in excess of the needs of the Department and recommends the following reductions:

[In millions of dollars]

Army	78.2
Navy	6.7
Air Force	16.1
Defense Agencies	7.1

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Air Force Plant #3, Tulsa, Oklahoma

The committee commends the Department of the Air Force for the expeditious response to the committee's concerns regarding the cleanup of ground contamination at Air Force Plant #3 in Tulsa, Oklahoma. However, despite this attention the committee is aware that other environmental problems remain at the facility, particularly in the above-ground structures. The committee directs the Air Force to investigate these hazards and provide a report on these risks along with a revised obligation and cleanup schedule for the facility by December 31, 1998.

Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has established the Arctic Military Environmental Cooperation (AMEC) program to cooperatively address the military impact on the arctic environment. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, out of the \$5.5 million available for AMEC, to use \$1.0 million to support the establishment of a Joint United States-Russia Nuclear Materials Commission. The members of this commission may include legislators, agency and ministry leaders, and environmental experts, representing the international environmental community, to provide recommendations on establishing more effective tracking and verification systems for nuclear nonproliferation and contamination containment programs, consistent with the objectives of AMEC. This commission may also support an international summit on Russian nuclear waste to initiate this cooperative effort.

Navy Environmental Leadership Program

The committee continues to support the Chief of Naval Operation's Navy Environmental Leadership Program (NELP), with two designated sites—one on the east and the west coast of the United States. The primary mission of each site is to identify and demonstrate new technologies that improve the environmental compliance, cleanup, conservation and pollution prevention efforts within the Navy. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for the Navy Environmental Leadership Program. The committee believes these additional funds are needed to aid the east coast site in developing technologies to separate aqueous fire-fighting foam and other contaminants in oily water and wastewater, reduce waste generated by the de-painting/painting process, and reduce emissions from fire-fighting training facilities.

Pollution Prevention Program

The committee notes recent Department of Defense (DOD) testimony indicating a strategy of improving environmental compliance by increasing priority and funding for pollution prevention. According to this testimony, pollution prevention is designed to lower overall compliance costs. The committee is concerned that between fiscal years 1997 and 1999, DOD will spend \$776.0 million on pollution prevention, but compliance costs are estimated to drop only \$30.0 million during the same period—roughly a four percent return on the pollution prevention investment. In an effort to better understand why the rate of return is only four percent, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security, by December 31, 1998, a report on DOD's pollution prevention metrics, strategic plans, and how pollution prevention outcomes relate to environmental compliance and cleanup outcomes.

Scrapping of Naval Vessels

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense (DOD) has established a task force to review the scrapping of naval

vessels and has provided a report to Congress on this issue recently. However, the committee believes the DOD continues to have a lack of a credible domestic scrapping program, and that additional innovative options should be considered. One such option that should be considered is, through competition, providing surplus ships for the purpose of creating artificial reefs. The committee believes that such an arrangement would allow qualified companies to seek arrangements with states on cost sharing and appropriate environmental clearances.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide, by December 31, 1998, a report that reviews all options, both domestic and foreign, for the scrapping of naval vessels. The report shall also include a review of and recommendations for the option to competitively sell surplus ships to create artificial reefs.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

Overview

The committee is concerned by the current status of the Department of Defense (DOD) information technology programs. In the last several years, the committee has taken several steps, including requiring annual performance plans and the enactment of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-106), to improve DOD's information technology (IT) systems and programs. Despite these efforts, the committee remains unconvinced that the Department has made the necessary improvements in managing its \$26 billion Command, Control, Communications, and Computers (C4) program. This is particularly disturbing, given the increasing role of information technology in the battlefield of today and tomorrow. As a result, the committee's recommendation focuses on improving management of IT programs, supporting joint and interoperable systems, eliminating funding due to program redundancies, and shifting IT funding to higher priority areas.

Automatic Identification Technology

The committee is aware that the Joint Task Force for Automated Identification Technology (AIT) will pilot test AIT systems for air, sea, ammunition, and personnel movement this summer. Each AIT system under review is designed to support joint operations and be interoperable with the Global Combat Supply System (GCSS). Dependent on the outcome of these pilot studies, the committee directs that the implementation costs of each proven AIT systems shall be provided out of each of the individual military departments fiscal year 1999 funding for GCSS.

Computer Crimes and Information Technology Security

Section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) required that all of the military services criminal investigation agencies utilize the joint computer security training center and forensics laboratory. The committee understands that the Department of the Army has not complied with section 907. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to join the other Defense criminal investigation agencies

in using the joint computer security training center and forensics laboratory. The committee also directs that the joint computer security training center and forensics laboratory be budgeted in the Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account. Further, the Air Force Criminal Investigative Organization is directed to serve as the executive agent for this joint program.

Information Technology Management

The committee is concerned with the general management of the Department of Defense's (DOD) information technology (IT) systems. Recent analysis by the General Accounting Office (GAO) identified poor management controls and implementation in such areas as interoperability testing and certification, migration strategy of legacy systems, and compliance with Year 2000 requirements. In an effort to refocus the management of IT programs in DOD, the committee recommends two provisions (sections 311 and 333) that would clarify and expand the roles of the DOD and military department's Chief Information Officers and the Smartcard Technology Office. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, by December 1, 1998, to provide the committee with a review of the department's efforts to improve its management of information technology. This review shall include:

- (1) DOD's overall Information Technology Management strategic plan (ITM) (including any service and agency subsets);
- (2) Performance measures and plan for implementing the performance measures;
- (3) Barriers to achieving the goals in the ITM strategic plan and performance measures;
- (4) Directives and policies addressing the implementation of reforms required by the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996;
- (5) Actions taken to integrate the requirements of the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996 into DOD's Program, Planning, and Budget System (PPBS);
- (6) Actions taken on the GAO recommendations (AIMD-98-5) to improve the Department's management control over the technology investments in its national security systems and its combat support (administrative) systems; and
- (7) DOD's plans to perform vulnerability assessment and operational testing for Year 2000 compliance or contingency plans, particularly for mission critical systems.

The committee requests that GAO provide an analysis of this report to the committee by February 15, 1999.

Information Technology Priorities

The committee is concerned that the Department has not provided the appropriate level of attention to the information technology (IT) priorities of Year 2000 compliance and IT infrastructure developments. As a result, the committee recommends a provision (section 313) that would protect the development and implementation of IT infrastructure programs from internal transfers or reductions during execution of fiscal years 1999, 2000, and 2001. In addition, the committee recommends a provision (section 314) that

would increase the priority of Year 2000 compliance for mission critical systems within the fiscal year 1999 information technology program. The committee also recommends a provision (section 315) that the Department utilize its military exercises to simulate the year 2000 in operational scenarios and to provide the committee with a plan for incorporating such tests during fiscal year 1999 exercises.

Furthermore, the committee recommends reallocating funds in the budget request from lower priority IT systems and IT systems that will be executed after the year 2000, to provide for a \$1.0 billion increase in funding for Year 2000 compliance. For example, the committee recommends a \$33.2 million decrease to the Army's Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support (JCALS) system due to continued program slippage and fielding after fiscal year 2000. Similarly, since the Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS) milestones have slipped another six months, the committee recommends a reduction of \$6.0 million. The Army Recruiting System (previously known as the Joint Recruiting Information Support System) is a new system that duplicates existing systems in the other military department. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$3.8 million for this program and directs the Army to use an existing military department IT system.

Joint Information Technology Systems

The committee is concerned that the Department is labeling systems "joint" and "global" that are not single, standard, or interoperable systems for use throughout the department. As an example, the Global Combat Supply System (GCSS), which is intended to provide an integrated view of combat support functions, at a cost of approximately \$370.0 million, will not be a single system but at least four systems: GCSS-Army, GCSS-Air Force, GCSS-Navy, and GCSS-JCS. The committee does not believe that there is a justifiable requirement for developing unique systems for each military department, instead of a single, joint system integrating all logistics, medical, transportation, finance, and personnel systems. The committee is convinced that there should be joint, interoperable systems in all areas of DOD, from electronic malls (E-malls) to Automated Identification Technology and computer security training centers.

As a further example, the Department of the Navy and the Defense Logistics Agency are developing a joint E-mail system. However, the Departments of the Army and the Air Force are each developing separate, service-specific E-mail systems. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (section 312) that would create a Department-wide joint E-mail system and recommends a decrease of \$1.0 million from each of the operation and maintenance accounts of the Army and the Air Force. The committee believes this reduction is justified based on a reduction in the staff and overhead costs that will not be needed after incorporation into a joint E-mail system.

The committee also recommends a reduction of \$6.0 million in the Army's operation and maintenance account consistent with the requirement for the Army to eliminate their service-unique computer security and forensics center and laboratory in compliance

with section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85).

Redundant Information Technology Programs

The committee is concerned that the Department is not implementing plans to eliminate redundant information technology (IT) systems and old IT systems that have been replaced by newer systems. The result is duplicative funding of outdated and unused IT systems. For example, although the decision was made to move all the military departments and defense agencies onto a single system for program, budgeting, and accounting (PBAS), the Air Force has refused to move to the new system. In fact, the Air Force has begun development of the Financial Information Resources System (FIRST) that duplicates PBAS and will utilize the Global Combat Supply System-Air Force (GCCS-AF) contract to develop this program. The committee believes that this not only represents an unnecessary duplication of systems and funding, but is work outside of the scope of the GCCS-AF contract. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds for FIRST, and encourages the Department of the Defense to upgrade the interoperability of PBAS.

The Department has provided a report to Congress which identifies all of the current IT systems that will be replaced by newer IT systems. However, when this report is matched against the current budget request, many of the IT systems scheduled for elimination are still receiving funding even though they have been replaced by newer systems. Based on the information provided by DOD, the committee believes there is \$298.1 million in redundant IT systems that should be eliminated and recommends the appropriate reductions in these accounts.

Utilizing Commercial Information Technology

The committee is concerned with the trend by the DOD to develop information technology systems in-house instead of utilizing today's commercial-of-the-shelf (COTS) technology for joint, interoperable warfare systems reliant on an information technology infrastructure. For example, the Global Command and Control System (GCCS) is being developed as the single Command, Control, Communications, Computer and Intelligence system (C4I) supporting the warfighter from the foxhole to the command post. GCCS is scheduled for implementation around 2003, however, most of the technology under development for GCCS is available today in COTS packages, at a fraction of the current DOD estimate of \$1.7 billion. In fact, most national news networks employing existing commercial capabilities have significantly superior battlefield mapping and imagery capabilities than our warfighters take to the battlefield. The committee believes that in many instances, providing the warfighters with superior information technology need not wait until 2010, if DOD would better capitalize on existing commercial technologies.

INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Integrated Architecture Plan

The budget request contained \$6.1 million for the Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Integrated Architecture Plan (CIAP).

CIAP has been strongly endorsed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence as well as the commanders-in-chief of the nine unified commands. The CIAP developments have included the highly successful C4ISR Architecture Framework for the Department of Defense, the Command C4ISR Architectures for the regional Commanders-in-Chief, and the initiation of the C4ISR Architectures for the Warfighter (CAW) effort at selected unified commands. The committee believes this later effort should be extended to all nine unified commands.

The committee believes these architectural developments will provide a cohesive and more cost-effective strategy for developing and procuring the proper intelligence support systems for the users. Therefore, the committee recommends \$9.1 million for the continuation of these efforts and extension of the CAW to all unified commands.

Joint Reserve Intelligence Program

The budget request contained \$9.4 million in operations and maintenance, defense-wide, for continued reserve component man days for the conduct of the Joint Reserve Intelligence Program (JRIP).

The committee is favorably impressed by the intelligence production mission load the JRIP has been able to accommodate in support of the active forces. This has been particularly true of the JRIP support to the European Joint Analysis Center (JAC) from the Fort Sheridan, Illinois, Joint Reserve Intelligence Center. This world-wide support has included direct personnel support via temporary duty assignments as well as support from the continental United States via virtual connectivity whereby reservists can drill with their gaining units without having to leave their home area. Further, this support, in excess of 34,000 man days, has provided the active components with critical intelligence augmentation to conduct collection operations, process backlogs, and produce targeting materials, final reports and studies—all without having to use the presidential selected reserve call-up authority.

The committee believes this program should be expanded and its benefits maximized to the extent possible. The committee recommends \$12.6 million, an increase of \$3.0 million for these purposes.

Intelligence Congressional Justification Books

In the committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132), the committee directed that the Congressional Justification Books and the Congressional Budget Justification Books accompanying the intelligence budget request must contain all direct costs of a program, including the costs of operating and maintaining the systems or project. The committee notes that the materials received with

this year's budget request are incomplete in this respect. For example, the operations and maintenance costs of some intelligence aircraft systems show the direct operating costs, but do not provide the direct depot maintenance costs. Several service systems show procurement costs, but do not reflect the operations costs for fielded systems nor the personnel required to man them. At best, this practice makes understanding the total costs of a program difficult; at worst, this practice is suggestive of an attempt to hide these costs.

The committee directs that, beginning with the fiscal year 2000 budget request, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence must include all associated costs of an intelligence program or project within the justification materials. Further, the committee directs that the intelligence justification books contain a signed formal statement by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of Central Intelligence that, to the best of their knowledge, all such associated costs are included in each of the justification publications.

MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ISSUES

Defense Commissary Agency Information Technology Acquisition

The committee is aware that the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) has had substantial difficulty in fielding the Defense Commissary Information System (DCIS). The committee understands that the development of this system has cost significantly more than originally expected, and has taken considerably longer to develop than planned. The committee understands that costs have increased by over \$20 million, and that the time to field the system has increased from 18 to 40 months. Since the new system is funded through the commissary surcharge account, commissary patrons are bearing the cost of these overruns. The committee notes that DCIS was intended to be a quick modification of a commercial grocery chain's information technology system, and notes that DeCA's inability to quickly adapt the system has caused delay in meeting critical year 2000 software adjustments. The committee is concerned about DeCA management of this program and the effect of the cost overruns on the patron funded surcharge account, and directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to audit the award and execution of the DCIS contract, and report her findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security by January 31, 1999.

Libraries

The committee has learned that the Army and the Navy have closed libraries at active installations. The committee regards libraries as essential category A morale, welfare, and recreation activities that should be present on every military installation, as well as on vessels afloat. Libraries are important elements to any American community, and are especially important in our education oriented military. School children of military families living on base, as well as soldiers seeking wholesome diversion, lessons in military history, or Internet access for civilian job searches, de-

serve quality libraries. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to suspend further library closings, except at those installations being closed under BRAC, and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security by December 31, 1998, each library closed by a military service since January 1, 1996, list installations that have libraries open fewer than four days a week, and explain why library service was either terminated or established at fewer than four days a week for each installation reported. The Secretary will further report on plans to reestablish service at installations that have no library service.

Performance Based Agreements

The committee is aware that the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) has negotiated performance based agreements as authorized by section 374 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) as a way to improve category management. The committee is concerned about the adequacy and effectiveness of internal controls relating to these agreements and about the possible negative impact on customer selection and commissary sales. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security by January 31, 1999 on the policy and procedures used to negotiate and approve these agreements, the amount of annual revenue expected, how that revenue is accounted for, and the Department's plans for continuance of this program.

Public-Private Ventures

The committee notes that the report required by section 376 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) has not been received. Despite this failure, the Department continues to submit proposals for public-private ventures of various kinds to the committee's Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare, and Recreation for its approval. Further, these requests do not contain the information required by law. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense submit public-private venture requests annually, in the same manner that commissary surcharge and nonappropriated fund major construction requests are submitted. Exceptions may be submitted out of cycle for compelling reasons. All requests must describe the impact that the proposal will have on local businesses which provide the same goods and services, and include local business comments on the proposal.

Uniform Health Benefit for Nonappropriated Fund Employees

The committee notes that the Department still has not implemented section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337), which required the Department of Defense to take such steps as necessary to provide a uniform health benefits program for its nonappropriated fund employees. In addition, the committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) required that the contract for a uniform plan be subject to the competitive bidding process. The committee is concerned that the

competitive bid process has still not been initiated, and that there is still no uniform benefit. The committee understands that there is some disagreement among the affected nonappropriated fund entities about the cost of the proposed plan. While the committee expects that the plan would address a certain minimum level of benefit at reasonable cost and provide for portability of the benefit among nonappropriated fund entities, the committee reminds the Department that the implementing law did not require that the Department's plan be the most costly available. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security by December 31, 1998, on the features of the Department's final plan, and the ways in which the final plan incorporates the objectives of uniformity, competitive bidding, portability, and reasonable cost.

OTHER ISSUES

Advanced Self-Protection Jammer

The committee notes that the AN/ALQ-165, the Advanced Self-Protection Jammer (ASPJ), is one of the most advanced tactical aircraft electronic countermeasures systems in production. Over 530 F/A-18C/D and 50 F-14D aircraft in the Navy and the Marine Corps inventory have been equipped for ASPJ installation, and it is the only electronic countermeasures system installed on these aircraft that can effectively counter the more modern threats encountered worldwide today. However, the committee also notes that out of 131 ASPJ units that have been procured thus far, only 82 systems are currently available for use by the Navy and the Marine Corps. As there is no organic depot capability to maintain the ASPJ systems, all failed systems must be returned to the manufacturer for repairs resulting in the Navy being only able to support approximately four fleet squadrons, or around 48 to 50 aircraft. The committee is also concerned that the lack of a sufficient ASPJ inventory requires that squadrons deploying with the ASPJ must have them installed just prior to deployment or while en route to the deployment areas. This situation precludes sufficient time for either pilot or maintenance personnel to properly train on the ASPJ system to ensure maximum operational proficiency.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to fully review all options for improving the availability of the ASPJ system, including the consideration of establishing a logistics support system for ASPJ maintenance and repair. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million to address unfunded aviation depot maintenance requirements.

Appropriated Funds Used to Pay for Defense Information System Agency Costs

The committee notes that the Defense Information System Agency (DISA) is using direct appropriations to offset the cost of Working Capital Fund (WCF) services. According to the General Accounting Office, these costs could reach as high as \$285.0 million in fiscal year 1998. For example, approximately \$46.0 million in ap-

propriated funds were used to support the Defense Satellite Communication System, thereby artificially deflating average telecommunications prices by four cents a minute. These findings were also supported by a recent independent telecommunications study, commissioned by DISA. As a result, DISA charges to its customers may not represent the true cost of the services provided.

Therefore, the committee recommends reallocating \$221.6 million from the DISA budget request, that should be part of the WCF pricing structure, to the military department operation and maintenance accounts to offset increased DISA WCF rates in fiscal year 1999. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, beginning with the fiscal year 2000 budget request, to more appropriately reflect and justify the DISA non-WCF budget request.

Army Civilian Personnel Management

The Department of the Army has been making substantial progress in developing the Army Workload and Performance System (AWPS), which allows it to manage civilian personnel according to workload and prioritized requirements. The committee notes, however, that two recent General Accounting Office (GAO) studies point out several areas that need to be improved if AWPS is to accurately determine civilian personnel requirements. In a study that is nearing completion, GAO found that the Army cannot achieve the most cost-effective system without evaluating maintenance requirements for the total Army. GAO has also reported that a number of active and reserve component installations are developing depot-like facilities without the Army assessing the impact of these activities on its total maintenance program.

The committee believes that it is critical for the Army to assess its total maintenance program, including ad hoc programs that are being developed at the local installations level and any funding from procurement and foreign military sales. The Army must determine the appropriate mix of the various types of equipment maintenance that will ensure efficiency at public depots, arsenals, and ammunition depots so that staffing levels are adequate and costs are lowered not only in the public depots, but also in the private sector or at the installation level. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study and report to the committee not later than February 1, 1999, on the following issues:

- (1) The proliferation of depot maintenance type activities throughout the Army;
- (2) The total number of personnel involved in these activities;
- (3) Recommendations concerning the consolidation of any fragmented activities to the public depots;
- (4) A long-range master plan to implement AWPS;
- (5) Future applications for AWPS; and
- (6) The total funding for the implementation of AWPS.

The committee requests that the GAO review the above requested study and provide comments as to the adequacy and completeness of the study, including any other relevant information, to the committee not later than March 31, 1999.

The committee is also concerned that the AWPS corporate-level system requirements have not yet been defined and a decision has not been made on whether to develop and install the Decision Support System, which would provide roll-up data from all installations and allow commands to identify areas where performance could be improved through reengineering as well as allowing the setting of performance goals. Since these corporate-level systems are critical to enable the Army to measure performance and identify areas for improvement, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Army move forward with the development of these modules as quickly as possible.

Finally, the committee directs that none of the working capital funds of the Department of the Army may be used for the completion of the AWPS studies or any implementation of AWPS.

Automatic Document Conversion Technology

The committee believes that there is the potential for significant savings from automatic document conversion software for use in weapons systems engineering drawing digitization, and that the Department of Defense (DOD) should increase its efforts to digitize all weapons engineering drawings by the year 2000. Therefore, the committee recommends the addition of \$15.0 million for engineering drawings and document storage and retrieval to be directly managed by the Defense Logistics Agency. The committee strongly urges the DOD to include funding for document conversion technology in future budget requests.

Budget Justification Materials

The committee is frustrated by the Department of Defense's persistent tardiness in providing all of the budget justification materials needed by Congress to fulfill its oversight responsibilities and provide for effective decision-making in the budget review process. The justification materials, particularly for the operation and maintenance accounts, continue to be provided to Congress late in the committee's review process, often precluding the ability to conduct thorough and in-depth analysis of the President's budget request. Although an extensive amount of material is eventually provided, much of it remains in formats that contradict information from the individual services, making it difficult to assess trends in similar functions. The complexity of the multiple displays of budget information also makes locating information on a specific subject difficult and time consuming. In particular, details on efficiency savings generated by outsourcing and business reforms are either not provided or scattered throughout several tables.

Because of these persistent difficulties, in the committee report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132) the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to convene a working group, consisting of representatives of the military departments and the appropriate defense agencies, to develop a single DOD-wide standard formulation for the display of budget justification materials provided to Congress. The committee urged this working group to consider eliminating repetitive and redundant budget displays, and further directed that budget justification materials provided to support the

fiscal year 1999 budget request conform, to the maximum extent practicable, with a new department-wide standardized format. To the committee's knowledge, none of these actions have been taken.

The committee again directs the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously reform and standardize the format and presentation of the budget justification materials, with particular emphasis on the operations and maintenance and environmental materials. The committee notes that if DOD continues to ignore repeated requests to improve the timing and content of the budget justification materials required by Congress, a legislative remedy may be required.

Classified Materials Containers

The committee supports the Department of Defense plan to retrofit existing classified material containers with security locks that conform to the Federal Specification FF-L-2740A, and the Department's other efforts to provide secure protection of sensitive classified materials. In addition, the committee encourages the Department to include in these efforts a review of the protection of sensitive classified materials in the possession of defense contractors and provide appropriate recommendations to the committee, if any.

Corrosion Control Programs

The committee believes that the ability to establish an effective corrosion control program is an important component of maintaining military readiness. This critical maintenance activity increases the life of multi-million dollar weapons systems and ensures their availability during times of crisis. The capability to perform remote location corrosion control must also be considered where wash facilities do not exist. At the same time, environmental concerns mandate military equipment/system washing on approved wash racks and disposal of effluents in compliance with Environmental Protection Agency standards. However, the committee further believes that military readiness needs must be balanced with environmental concerns and that both objectives must be achieved for the security of the United States and the preservation of the environment.

Defense Automated Printing Service

The committee supports the Department's efforts to improve the management of the Defense Automated Printing Service (DAPS). However, the committee is concerned that DAPS has not incorporated best business practices of the private sector and is passing the costs of this inefficiency onto its customers. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete a review of DAPS, utilizing a private sector source, and provide a report by March 31, 1999. The Secretary shall ensure that the contractor providing the review has experience in content and network management, along with offset, gravure, digital printing and print related services. The report shall include:

- (1) A description of the management structure of DAPS, including the location of all DAPS sites;
- (2) The total number of personnel employed by DAPS and their location;

- (3) A description of the functions performed by DAPS and the number of DAPS employees performing each of the DAPS functions;
- (4) A list of each inherently governmental and non-inherently governmental function performed by DAPS;
- (5) A site assessment of the type of equipment at each DAPS site;
- (6) The type and explanation of the networking and technology integration linking all DAPS sites;
- (7) Identify current and future customer requirements;
- (8) Assess the effectiveness of DAPS current structure in supporting current and future customer needs and plans to address any shortcomings;
- (9) Identify and discuss best business practices that are utilized by DAPS, and such practices that could be utilized by DAPS; and
- (10) Provide options on maximizing the DAPS structure and services to provide the most cost effective service to its customers.

Depleted Uranium Penetrators

The committee is aware of the Department of the Army's efforts to reduce from two to one the number of producers of tank depleted uranium penetrators as part of an effort to downsize and make more cost-effective the ammunition production base. However, the committee is concerned that the Army has apparently not identified any requirement for the removal of government furnished equipment from the facility that will no longer produce the depleted uranium penetrators. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review this removal process and to report back to the congressional defense committees on the Army's plans to remove government furnished equipment from the facility in question and to identify any necessary funding in future budget requests for this purpose.

Infrastructure Reduction Initiatives

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense's (DOD) current reform and infrastructure reduction initiatives are not supported by executable programs. The Quadrennial Defense Review states that one of the primary sources of instability in future defense plans is the migration of funds to cover shortfalls in savings estimates when competitive outsourcing or business process reengineering initiatives fail to achieve expectations.

The committee remembers the Defense Management Review Directives, initiated in 1989 by DOD to generate significant savings and apply these savings against future years budgets. The committee also remembers that many of these initiatives failed to generate the anticipated savings and further remembers the budgeting difficulties resulting from this exercise. The committee generally supports the concept of outsourcing and encourages the department to continue pursuing improved business practices when they are cost effective and do not affect the readiness of the military services. However, savings estimates must be based on proven program re-

sults and not incorporated into future budgets until determined to be achievable.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to report, by March 1, 1999, on the fiscal year 1999 and Five Year Defense Plan (FYDP), supporting the fiscal year 1999 budget, savings and personnel reductions for each military department and the Defense Agencies due to outsourcing, for non-depot maintenance and repair functions, or other Defense Reform Initiative efforts. The report shall:

- (1) Determine whether or not the estimated savings and personnel reductions in the fiscal year 1999 budget or FYDP were based on the results of outsourcing studies completed during fiscal year 1999 or after fiscal year 1999, using either section 2462 of title 10, United States Code or the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76;

- (2) Identify those savings and personnel reductions in the fiscal year 1999 budget or FYDP that are linked to current outsourcing studies or planned outsourcing studies where the function to be outsourced has been identified;

- (3) Calculate the outsourcing savings identified as a percentage of the current cost of the function;

- (4) Identify those savings and personnel reductions in the fiscal year 1999 budget or the FYDP that are the result of DRI and other efforts unrelated to outsourcing; and

- (5) Determine the extent to which the military departments and Defense Agencies appear to be engaged in outsourcing activities that include inherently governmental functions, do not allowing civilian employees to compete, or do not providing the study and notification requirements of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code.

Military Affiliate Radio System

The committee is encouraged by the Department's expression of support for the Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS), an inexpensive DOD-sponsored program that relies on volunteer radio communications personnel to provide the Department and the armed forces with an auxiliary and emergency communications capability as an adjunct to normal communications. Specifically, the committee agrees with the conclusion of the Secretary of Defense, in a report submitted to the committee on December 31, 1997, that "the broadly stated mission of MARS continues to be valid." The committee also notes the Department's estimate that use of the MARS system, in lieu of commercial or DOD resources, results in annual savings to DOD of between \$11.1 million and \$27.5 million, and encourages the Department to proceed with plans to restructure the MARS program in order to realize manpower savings, eliminate duplicative efforts, improve coordination, and modernize the program through technology improvements.

The committee notes that although MARS is also used to relay morale communications traffic for the armed forces, the Department has relied on other means to fulfill this function, which often result in out-of-pocket costs to U.S. military personnel. For example, the Department has acknowledged that the cost of commercial telephone calls for troops deployed in Bosnia has been a morale

issue. Notwithstanding the recent agreement with AT&T to reduce commercial telephone rates for U.S. troops participating in the Bosnia peacekeeping operation, the committee believes that restoring a MARS capability within Bosnia will provide a useful alternative and encourages the Department to give serious consideration to this option.

Prime Vendor Contracts

The committee supports prime vendor delivery of materiel, since this program not only improves delivery response times and product availability but lowers inventory costs. In addition, the prime vendor program lowers the recovery rate charged by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). The prime vendor contracts rates are around 15 percent of the cost of the sales compared to DLA's current rate of 20 to 30 percent. The committee is concerned that the disparity between rates illustrates that DLA has made little effort to adjust its administrative structure to respond to a new business environment. Further, the committee encourages the Department to require the military departments to utilize an existing prime vendor contract for similar items, instead of generating another contract for the same materiel.

Ship Repair Industrial Base

The committee is concerned the Department of the Navy is not providing sufficient ship repair and overhaul funding to sustain a viable private sector industrial base. In recognition of continual under-funding in the overall ship depot maintenance account, Congress has added significant additional funding during the past three years to correct this deficiency. The committee notes that the majority, if not all, of this additional funding has been applied to the public shipyards. The committee further notes that if the distribution of ship overhaul and repair funds are not more equitably provided to private ship repair industry, the capabilities of this critical defense industry will severely impacted. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to apply no less than 50 percent of any additional funding above the budget request to the private sector.

Tagging System for Hydrocarbon Fuels

The committee has learned of commercial technologies for tagging and identifying hydrocarbon fuels. These commercial technologies would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to track and identify its fuels, provide a deterrence to fuel theft, aid in investigation of fuel theft and environmental pollution, and improve internal accounting. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report by February 1, 1999 to the House Committee on National Security on the feasibility of using commercial technologies to tag DOD fuels particularly for:

- (1) Quantitative analysis and identification of DOD fuels;
- (2) Deterrence of theft and misuse of DOD fuels; and
- (3) Determining the source of surface and underground pollution.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize \$92.5 billion in operations and maintenance funding for the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense.

Section 302—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize \$1.7 billion for Working Capital Funds of the Department of Defense.

Section 303—Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize \$70.745 million from the Armed Forces Retirement Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, including the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the Naval Home.

Section 304—Transfer From National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than \$150.0 million from the amounts received from sales in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund to the operation and maintenance accounts of the military services.

Section 305—Refurbishment of M1-A1 Tanks

This section would require that out of the total authorization of operation and maintenance appropriations for the Department of the Army, \$49.3 million may be used only for the refurbishment of up to 70 M1-A1 tanks under the AIM-XXI maintenance and repair program.

Section 306—Operation of Prepositioned Fleet, National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California

This section would authorize \$60.2 million in additional funding for the operation of the preposition vehicle fleet by units of the armed forces during training rotations at the Army's National Training Center (NTC).

The committee believes that the reduced proficiency levels of units arriving at the NTC is, in large part, due to the lack of home station training funds available to prepare for the rotation. This section, similar to section 307 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), would authorize the funds for the Army to pay for the operation of the preposition fleet for all units rotating through the NTC. In the future, the committee expects the Secretary of the Army to take the necessary steps to ensure sufficient funding is made available to pay NTC preposition fleet operational costs out of a central fund.

Section 307—Relocation of USS Wisconsin

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to utilize up to \$6.0 million for the relocation of the USS Wisconsin which is currently berthed in reserve status at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Virginia.

Section 308—Fisher House Trust Funds

This section would authorize appropriations from the Fisher House Trust Funds for use in the operation and maintenance of the Fisher Houses of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

SUBTITLE B—INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ISSUES

Section 311—Additional Information Technology Responsibilities of Chief Information Officers

This section would expand the responsibilities of the Chief Information Officers within the Department of Defense.

Section 312—Defense-Wide Electronic Mall System for Supply Purchases

This section would require the development of a single, joint, defense-wide electronic mall system.

Section 313—Protection of Funding Provided for Certain Information Technology and National Security Programs

This section would require the Department of Defense to notify Congress prior to changing authorized funding level for high priority information technology programs.

Section 314—Priority Funding to Ensure Year 2000 Compliance of Mission Critical Information Technology and National Security Systems

This section would shift the priorities within the Department of Defense's Command, Control, Communication, and Computer budget request to ensure that mission critical systems are Year 2000 compliant.

Section 315—Evaluation of Year 2000 Compliance as Part of Training Exercises Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a plan on utilizing training exercises in the military departments and Joint Chiefs of Staff to test Year 2000 compliance of information technology systems to transmit information from the point of origin to the point of termination simulating the year 2000.

SUBTITLE C—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

Section 321—Authorization to Pay Negotiated Settlement for Environmental Cleanup at Former Department of Defense Sites in Canada

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to pay the Government of Canada up to \$100.0 million in annual payments over a ten year period. These payments would be pursuant to a bilateral agreement between the United States and Canada in which the United States agreed to pay cleanup costs associated with the operations by the United States of various military installations in Canada. Any future arrangements relating to environmental damage by the Department of Defense at overseas locations would be subject to treaty negotiations and ratification by the United States Senate.

Section 322—Removal of Underground Storage Tanks

This section would enable the Department of Defense to use authorized funds for removal of ten Army Corps of Engineers' underground storage tanks.

SUBTITLE D—DEFENSE INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT

Section 331—Reporting and Study Requirements Before Change of Commercial and Industrial Type Functions to Contractor Performance

This section would clarify the mandated reporting requirements prior to the study and conversion of any defense activities for possible performance by the private sector. The Defense Reform Initiative (DRI) states that between fiscal years 1999 and 2003 the Department of Defense will conduct Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 competitions for 150,000 federal positions. The committee has learned, however, that at least two of these competitions have not used the A-76 guidance or complied with the current reporting requirements of section 2461 of title 10, United States Code. Specifically, DOD failed to notify Congress of its efforts to restructure over 1,700 positions at the Air Force's 38th Engineering and Installation Wing (USAF 38th EIW) in Oklahoma, and its intention to compete 664 positions at the Army's Logistics Systems Support Command (USA-LSSC), St. Louis, Missouri.

In addition to the legislative changes recommended by this section, the committee clarifies that the title 10 reporting requirements are not limited to competitions using the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76. Regardless of whether such activities are called outsourcing, privatization, divestiture, re-engineering or restructuring, section 2461 of title 10 clearly states that Congress must be notified of a decision to study any current defense activities for possible performance by a private contractor.

Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the committee, prior to any further activity regarding the USAF 38th EIW or USA-LSSC "competitions," all the information required by law including the documentation supporting each certification under sections 2461(a)(3) and (4) of title 10. The com-

mittee also directs the General Accounting Office to analyze and determine whether information provided by the Army and Air Force on this matter supports the proposed action.

Section 332—Clarification of Requirement to Maintain Government-Owned and Government-Operated Core Logistics Capability

This section would clarify section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, to provide a specific definition of work performed by defense contractors in government-owned and government-operated maintenance facilities as it would apply to the requirements to maintain a core logistics capability.

Section 333—Oversight of Development and Implementation of Automated Identification Technology

This section would extend the responsibilities of the Smartcard Technology Office within the Defense Human Resources Field Activity.

Section 334—Conditions on Expansion of Functions Performed Under Prime Vendor Contracts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, or the secretary of a military department, to provide a report to Congress 60 days prior to entering into a prime vendor contract that would give a defense contractor the responsibility to manage, store, and distribute inventory, manage and provide services, or manage and perform research on behalf of the Department of Defense or a military service. The section would also require that the report include a description of the competitive procedures to be used in the proposed prime vendor contract, and a cost benefit analysis that demonstrates that the use of the prime vendor contract will result in savings to the government over the life of the contract.

Section 335—Clarification of Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would clarify section 2460(a) of title 10, United States Code, to include the location at which depot-level maintenance is performed.

Section 336—Clarification of Commercial Item Exception to Requirements Regarding Core Logistics Capabilities

This section would clarify section 2464(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, to establish specific requirements for the determination of a commercial item exception for depot-level repair and maintenance of equipment.

Section 337—Development of Plan for Establishment of Core Logistics Capabilities for Maintenance and Repair of C-17 Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide to Congress, by March 1, 1999, a plan for the establishment of a core logistics capability for the C-17 aircraft that would be consistent with section 2464 of title 10, United States Code. The

section would also prohibit the extension of the interim contract support agreement for the C-17 aircraft until 60 days after the receipt of the plan by Congress.

Section 338—Contractor-Operated Civil Engineering Supply Stores Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide additional information on competitions that combine a Contractor-Operated Civil Engineering Supply Store with other functions.

Section 339—Report on Savings and Effect of Personnel Reductions in Army Materiel Command

This section would require the Comptroller General to submit a report to Congress concerning the effect that the proposed personnel reductions in the Army Materiel Command will have on workload and readiness, and a report on any anticipated cost savings from these proposed reductions. The section would also preclude some personnel reductions in the Army Materiel Command until receipt of the report or March 31, 1993.

Subtitle E—Commissaries and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

Section 341—Continuation of Management and Funding of Defense Commissary Agency through the Office of the Secretary of Defense

This section would require that the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) continue to be managed and funded by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The budget request proposed to return the funding and management of DeCA to the military services. The committee is concerned that the Department's plan would negate the benefits gained from consolidating the former service commissary agencies into DeCA, and put further strain upon the operating and maintenance accounts of the military services.

Section 342—Expansion of Current Eligibility of Reserves for Commissary Benefits

This section would increase the number of days that certain ready reserve members and reserve retirees under the age of 60 are eligible to use commissary stores from 12 days each calendar year to 24 days each calendar year. This section would also extend commissary eligibility to members of the national guard who are activated during federally declared disasters. This committee recognizes the increased reliance the nation has placed upon the reserve components in recent years. The committee notes that this change is not expected to result in any measurable increase in commissary sales, and expects that no requests for new commissary store construction would be requested or approved as a result of this increased benefit.

Section 343—Repeal of Requirement for Air Force to Sell Tobacco Products to Enlisted Personnel

This section would repeal a provision of law that is ambiguous and an apparent anachronism. The provision that would be repealed, section 9623 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Air Force to sell not more than 16 ounces of tobacco a month to an enlisted member who requests it. There are no similar provisions of law that apply to the other military services.

Section 344—Restrictions on Patron Access to, and Purchases in, Overseas Commissaries and Exchange Stores

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to continue to restrict the sale of certain items in overseas exchanges and commissaries, but would require that the secretary ensure that such restrictions are consistent with the primary purpose of providing U.S. made goods to authorized patrons. The committee firmly believes that access to these products is an important morale boost to those serving in remote locations, and that restrictions should only be imposed for the best of reasons. The committee is concerned that overseas commanders have exercised unfettered reign in this area, have taken the view that patron convenience is a secondary concern, and have been free from departmental oversight. The committee expects the Department to begin exercising effective supervision of these programs, and expects that necessary controls will be consistent with the goal of minimizing infringement on the right of authorized patrons to purchase U.S. made products.

Section 345—Extension of Demonstration Project for Uniform Funding of Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Activities

This section would amend section 335(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106) to extend for one year the authority of the Department of Defense to conduct a demonstration project for the uniform funding of morale, welfare, and recreation activities at certain military installations. The committee understands that the demonstration project appears to be working well. The committee will consider the Department's views on the merits of expanding the program throughout the Department after the Department submits the report required by the authorizing test legislation. The extension of authority provided by this section would permit the test installations to maintain the test funding procedures and avoid the disruption of reversion to the traditional method of funding while the report is being prepared and considered by the Congress.

Section 346—Prohibition on Consolidation or Other Organizational Changes of Department of Defense Retail Systems

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from consolidating military exchange and commissary operations and from conducting further study of consolidation, unless specifically authorized by law. The committee is aware of an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) directed study within the Department of Defense regarding the creation of a DOD Resale Agency. The com-

mittee is concerned that OMB's direction of the resale study may be indicative of a shift in policy on the part of the Administration away from one of ensuring that commissary and exchange services are properly supportive of the needs of military families and retirees and toward one of allowing economic efficiencies to be the principal driver that determines these essential benefits. The committee notes that the recent proliferation of suggestions to change the military resale system has caused concern among service members, their families, and retirees about the health of the resale benefit. The committee firmly asserts its support for the commissary and exchange benefit, and strongly believes that no further changes should be made to the resale system without specific Congressional approval. The committee notes that the Department recently contracted for a due diligence study regarding exchange integration issues. The committee intends for that study to continue, but expects that implementation of any study recommendations would await Congressional approval.

Section 347—Authorized Use of Appropriated Funds for Relocation of Navy Exchange Service Command

This section would provide that the Navy Exchange Service Command (NEXCOM) shall not be required to reimburse the United States for appropriated funds allotted to NEXCOM during fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996 for costs incurred in connection with the relocation of NEXCOM headquarters to Virginia Beach, Virginia, and for the lease of headquarters space.

Section 348—Evaluation of Merit of Selling Malt Beverages and Wine in Commissary Stores as Exchange System Merchandise

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to survey eligible commissary store patrons to determine their interest in commissary stores selling beer and wine. The provision would also authorize the secretary to conduct a demonstration project at seven military installations in the United States, after consideration of the survey results. The demonstration project, if conducted, would only be permitted in those states in which the sale of beer and wine in grocery stores is lawful, and would authorize the sale of beer and wine in commissary stores at exchange prices.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361—Eligibility Requirements for Attendance at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools

This section would permit dependents residing in a territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States to participate in an educational program where the parent is a service member assigned to a remote or unaccompanied location. This section would also clarify the Secretary of Defense's authority to provide exceptions for enrollment in dependent schools for dependents of civilian employees in Puerto Rico and Guam, where such employees reside off the installation, and would provide that the Department would be reimbursed for the cost of such education.

Section 362—Specific Emphasis of Program to Investigate Fraud, Waste, and Abuse within Department of Defense

This section would identify the specific Department of Defense (DOD) agency to manage the pilot program established in section 388 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). The committee understands that the General Accounting Office (GAO) has identified hundreds of millions of dollars in contract overpayments at DOD. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106), the Congress provided the authority for a DOD pilot study to test private sector methods in identifying contract overpayments. This pilot was expanded by section 388 of Public Law 105-85 to test whether such commercial techniques were applicable to a larger variety of DOD contracts. The committee has learned that, to date, DOD has failed to take the necessary steps to fully implement section 388. Specifically, DOD has not determined the functional contract areas for review, established a program management office, or established a date for the release of a request for proposal for this program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to select at least two commercial functions within the working capital funds accounts and release a Request For Proposal (RFP) for competitive bid by December 31, 1998 that would fully implement section 388 of Public Law 105-85. The committee also directs the GAO to provide an initial review of both pilot programs by April 1, 1999.

Section 363—Revision of Inspection Requirements Relating to Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would revise the current procedures for the periodic inspection of the Armed Forces Retirement Homes by the Inspector General of each of the military departments on an alternating basis, and would require that upon completion of these inspections, the report of the inspections shall be provided to Congress.

Section 364—Assistance to Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize \$35.0 million for educational assistance to local education agencies where the standard for the minimum level of education within the state could not be maintained because of the large number of military connected students or the effects of base realignments and closures. The Department of Education impact aid program provides supplementary funds to eligible school districts nationwide. The committee believes that the Department of Education bears the principal responsibility for providing support for the education needs of the nation's children, and, therefore, does not support additional assistance beyond what is authorized in the section.

Section 365—Strategic Plan for Expansion of Distance Learning Initiatives

This section would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop a plan to establish a framework for developing and applying distance learning technologies to training courses where it makes sense and is cost effective. The committee is concerned that DOD has not taken sufficient steps to avoid duplicative investment in distance learning technology, has not established appropriate standards for software design, and may not be fully exploring new technologies for distance learning such as the use of home study through the internet. Further, the committee believes there is insufficient funding in the five year defense plan to take best advantage of the economies of inter-operable information distribution platforms that are durable and can be accessed globally. The committee believes that DOD should refocus its efforts on distance learning and take steps to ensure the initiatives associated with distance learning are adequately funded and are clearly established as a DOD priority.

Section 366—Public Availability of Operating Agreements Between Military Installations and Financial Institutions

This section would subject operating agreements that provide financial services, including electronic banking, on military installations in the United States, to the same requirements of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) as all other federal contracts. The committee believes this section would not provide any new authorization, nor does it extend or limit any part of the financial agreements, services, or institutions governed by the Department of Defense Directive 1000.11, "Financial Institutions on DoD Facilities", dated July 26, 1989.

The committee is concerned that all solicitations for banking services on military installations may not currently be conducted in an open competition, which could impact potential services to military personnel. The committee believes that subjecting these solicitations and agreements to FOIA will provide a means for all interested parties to review the proposals. In addition, the committee directs the General Accounting Office to review and report its findings to the committee by March 1, 1999 on the solicitation process for selecting banking services on military installations and the potential for generating revenue from fees, charges, or other payments from depository institutions.

Section 367—Department of Defense Readiness Reporting System

Over the past four years, the committee has become increasingly frustrated by the contradictions between assessments of military unit readiness as reflected in official reports and the observations made by military personnel in the field. Where official reports portray the overall readiness of U.S. armed forces as high, soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines increasingly admit that their units are slipping below past standards. Indeed, they frequently state that the readiness reporting system is inaccurate, even corrupted.

In recent hearings before the committee, service officials at all levels expressed significant concern over many issues affecting

readiness, including operating tempo, increased deployments, morale, the impact of peacekeeping operations, and the increasing use of training funds for other purposes. Ironically, none of these factors are measured by the current reporting system. Their effects on readiness, and the effects of other such factors, are not apparent in formal readiness assessments and could go unnoticed by senior officials until readiness is severely degraded.

The themes of this testimony are not new and are consistent with those enumerated in past committee hearings and reports. The persistence of these problems leaves the committee concerned by the lack of progress the Department of Defense has made to develop a more comprehensive readiness measurement system reflective of today's operational realities. As defense resources have declined in real terms, and the number, frequency and duration of contingency operations has increased, the ability of U.S. armed forces to train for their primary warfighting missions has been compromised. Yet at the same time, unit readiness reports have remained unchanged, at high levels. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 367) that would direct the Secretary of Defense to create a more complete and accurate readiness reporting system by July 1, 1999.

Senior uniformed leaders frankly acknowledge this lack of accuracy in readiness reporting. The committee recognizes and praises the efforts now being made to enhance joint assessments through the Joint Monthly Readiness Reviews, the establishment of a Senior Readiness Oversight Council that elevates readiness issues to the senior officer level, and those efforts aimed at developing a Readiness Baseline. In addition, some of the services are attempting to adjust their readiness reporting systems. However, none of the actions undertaken by the Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor the services has yet to result in a readiness measurement system capable of timely and accurate reporting. The committee is concerned that the current plan for achieving such a system has been underfunded, suffered from lack of senior leadership attention, and suffered from entrenched bureaucratic resistance.

In light of its review of the current readiness reporting system, the committee believes that an improved and comprehensive readiness reporting system would consist of four basic elements: a unit status report, measuring the readiness of service units; a training establishment status report, measuring the condition of service training institutions; a defense infrastructure status report, measuring the ability of service and other defense facilities to deploy, sustain and reconstitute forces from the United States and abroad; and a joint forces status report, which would measure the ability of the Department of Defense to successfully conduct the two major theater wars as called for in the Defense Planning Guidance and on the timelines specified by the relevant theater commanders-in-chief.

Moreover, the committee believes that these status reports should accomplish three fundamental tasks: objectively capture current conditions as of the date of reporting, separately report commander's readiness estimates and risk assessments, and highlight deficiencies so that programmatic adjustments can be made. The committee firmly believes that the results of this readiness re-

porting system need to be widely available to senior civilian leaders in the Department of Defense and Congress; the complexity, incompleteness and inaccuracies of the current system create confusion where there should be common understanding. The committee also encourages the Department and the services to reassess their readiness reporting regulations to eliminate loopholes, exceptions, inconsistencies and inappropriate subjective assessments. In sum, it is the committee's view that the purpose of the readiness reporting system should be to capture what personnel and equipment are available and what training has been accomplished as of the date of the report, and that these quantitative measures should be considered in light of wartime requirements alone.

The heart of any readiness reporting system must be to capture the current status of operational units. In the committee's judgment, the unit status report should quantify personnel available for duty, the number of available "skill-qualified" personnel, the available officers and senior-grade enlisted personnel (pay grade E-5 and above, and the percentage of these personnel who are available for duty when calculated against the unit's wartime requirements—not against the budgeted level of unit fill. The committee's study of service regulations governing personnel reporting provides a cause for deep concern in that many of these measurements are devalued by the variety of waivers and loopholes that permit units to consider personnel as available even when they are temporarily deployed in a distant theater of operations. The committee urges the services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense to review these regulations with an intent to make them more realistic.

Equipment readiness also is recognized as an essential measure of unit readiness. The committee is concerned that current equipment measures are insufficient and riddled with waivers and loopholes. The committee firmly believes that the appropriate standard of unit readiness is the calculation of equipment that is both on hand and rated as mission capable. The committee has been dismayed to learn that the services continue to rate the percentage of on-hand equipment against the level of equipment authorized, and the level of serviceable equipment compared to that which is on-hand. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to enforce a department-wide standard establishing the percentage of equipment both on-hand and mission capable as the unexceptionable measure of equipment readiness.

However, the key element in improving the objectivity, consistency and credibility of the unit readiness reporting system is an improvement in training measures. The committee has concluded that it is of the highest importance that the Department of Defense establish a set of objective criteria for judging training readiness, and to develop an automated system for weighting warfighting training priorities. Projects now underway in the Army and other services have demonstrated the validity of this concept, and the committee applauds the Army's attempt to develop a set of algorithms that will make training readiness calculations as simple as a computer-assisted tax preparation program. Despite the complexity of the task, the committee is encouraged by the Army's example that an automated training reporting system is an achievable goal,

and urges the Secretary of Defense to make such efforts his highest priority in reforming the readiness reporting system.

This objective training reporting system must be keyed to the unit's wartime mission and the identified tasks associated with that mission. Yet because military units are so often called today to execute missions in peacekeeping operations and other similar operations other than war, the Secretary should consider including an element in the unit status report that allows for recognition of this reality. Thus, an Army unit deployed to Bosnia or an Air Force squadron conducting a no-fly zone may be performing their assigned missions at a high level of competence and readiness, but require additional training to properly execute their warfighting missions. The committee believes it is appropriate to measure both kinds of readiness, but that the core readiness rating should be that related to the wartime requirement.

As suggested above, the committee believes that, even as the level of objectivity in readiness reporting is raised, there is an important role to be played by unit commanders in assessing overall readiness. In particular, the committee has concluded that the commander can bring a unique perspective in regard to two salient factors: the overall ability of the unit to accomplish its assigned wartime mission and the level of risk associated with the conduct of that mission based upon the unit's current status. Such judgments are already an element in the Department's readiness assessments, yet the committee believes these judgments should be part of a regular and formal process, and conducted at all levels of command. Commanders should be encouraged to draw upon the full range of their professional experience and expertise in making such judgments, including such factors as equipment modernization, doctrinal development or other assessments as appropriate. While these judgments should generally reflect and be based upon the results of the objective readiness reporting system, their purpose should be to add nuance, context and fuller explanation of the unit's combat status.

The committee also believes that a comprehensive readiness reporting system must better capture the effects of factors outside the current unit reporting system. This, the second component of an improved overall readiness system must be an assessment of the institutional training establishments that are the seed-corn of sustained unit readiness over time. In hearings, interviews and in reports, the committee has become alarmed at the degree to which training establishments increasingly are being deprived of resources, equipment and personnel in order to provide for the needs of deploying operational units. The committee applauds the Army's efforts to measure the readiness of its training establishment and the fact that this report has served as an important tool in maintaining the health of its Training and Doctrine Command. Though the command continues to suffer resource shortfalls, the Army has found that at least it can measure and limit the effects of these shortfalls.

Likewise, in the committee's judgment, defense infrastructure is an increasing factor in the readiness of units that are constantly deployed. The committee has heard repeated testimony that such factors as the quantity and quality of child care, medical care and

housing have become major concerns as the pace of operations increases. These and a variety of other factors must be properly assessed and weighed to create a comprehensive picture of current military readiness.

The committee has been pleased to learn of the efforts of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and senior military leaders of all services that have led to the creation of the Joint Monthly Readiness Report. This will provide a very good basis for monitoring the readiness of joint U.S. armed forces to support the National Military Strategy, and the committee applauds the explicit requirement to assess the risk to that strategy resulting from the pace of current operations. Though the committee has been sobered to learn how senior military leaders currently assess that risk, it finds the effort to do so commendable and correct; indeed, overdue.

In conclusion, the committee underscores its belief that this reporting system must be as objective and as widely disseminated as possible. Past assessments and discussions of readiness have suffered from the Department's inability to create and implement objective and consistent readiness reporting criteria, especially with respect to training assessments, that are capable of providing a clear picture to senior uniformed leaders, senior defense civilians, and the Congress. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to establish the rapid creation of such a readiness reporting system as one of his top priorities.

Section 368—Travel by Reservists on Carriers under Contract with General Services Administration

This section would permit members of the reserve components to use General

Services Administration (GSA) federal supply contracts for commercial air transportation in order to perform inactive duty training. At present, travel arranged through the GSA contract is limited to service members and federal employees traveling at government expense. Although reserve personnel are not authorized reimbursement for travel to and from inactive duty training, the committee notes that reserve personnel are eligible for military medical care for any injuries incurred in connection with such travel. The committee believes that this provision would assist the reserve components in recruiting qualified personnel to perform reserve duties in overseas and other remote locations.

SUBTITLE G—DEMONSTRATION OF COMMERCIAL-TYPE PRACTICES TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF PERSONAL PROPERTY SHIPMENTS

Section 381—Demonstration Program Required

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense.

Section 382—Goals of Demonstration Program

This section would establish the goals of a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense.

Section 383—Program Participants

This section would establish the participants of a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense.

Section 384—Test Plan

This section would establish the components of a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense. The section would also provide for performance evaluations during the demonstration test program and would revise procedures for the settlement of claims for losses or damage during shipments of household goods.

Section 385—Other Methods of Personal Property Shipping

This section would specify that the demonstration program for the improvement of personal property shipments would not affect the existing Do-It-Yourself or the Direct Procurement Method Program for the shipment of household goods.

Section 386—Duration of Demonstration Program

This section would establish the beginning date and the duration of a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense.

Section 387—Evaluation of Demonstration Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide for the evaluation of a demonstration program to test commercial-style practices to improve the quality of personal property shipments within the Department of Defense. The evaluation would be provided to Congress within 180 days before the termination date of the demonstration program.

**TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL
AUTHORIZATIONS**

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

Based on repeated reports of manpower shortages in all services, and especially in the Army, the committee believes that the end strengths for active forces requested in fiscal year 1999 are too low to adequately support service requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends end strengths levels nearly 11,000 above those requested. Accordingly, this section would authorize the following end strengths for active duty personnel of the Armed Force as of September 30, 1999:

Service	FY 1998		FY 1999		Change from fiscal year	
	Authorized and floor	Program	Request	Recommendation	1999 Request	1998 Program
Army	495,000	488,000	480,000	484,800	4,800	(3,200)
Navy	390,802	386,894	372,696	376,423	3,727	(10,471)
USMC	174,000	172,987	172,200	173,922	1,722	935
USAF	371,577	371,409	370,882	371,577	695	168
DOD	1,431,379	1,419,290	1,395,778	1,406,722	10,944	(12,568)

In addition, based on a high priority requirement identified by the Army Chief of Staff, the committee recommends an increase of \$74.0 million in the Army's military personnel account over the amount requested to assist the Army in maintaining active force manning levels throughout fiscal year 1999.

Section 402—Revision in Permanent End Strength Levels

The budget request sought to repeal section 691 of title 10, United States Code, that established permanent end strength levels for members of the armed forces on active duty. The committee believes that it is necessary to retain end strength floors, not only because of a long-standing concern that the end strength levels of active forces remain inadequate to support the national military strategy, but also because of a growing concern that military personnel reductions are now and will continue to be an expedient means to finance the growing shortfalls across the defense budget. Retention of the end strength floors remains, therefore, a means for Congress to control the propensity by the services to accelerate personnel reductions in order to generate savings during a fiscal year as assumptions about presumed savings and efficiencies in other programs fail to materialize. Therefore, this section would amend section 691 of title 10, United States Code, by establishing new end

strength floors for the active forces at the levels recommended by the committee in section 401. This section would also permit active end strengths to vary up to one percent below the established floor.

In addition, the committee notes that fiscal year 1998 end strengths for some of the services will fall below the appropriated levels. Such underexecution works to the advantage of a service in two ways: (1) as people are eliminated faster than planned, savings are achieved and funds are made available for other purposes in fiscal year 1998, the current fiscal year, and (2) savings are achieved for the following year, fiscal year 1999, because the service starts the year with fewer people than anticipated. The committee estimates the fiscal year 1999 so-called "savings" associated with the Department's fiscal year 1998 military personnel under-execution to be \$125.0 million. The committee recommends reallocation of the fiscal year 1999 underexecution savings to support a range of military pay, end strength, and recruiting initiatives that were not included in the budget request.

Section 403—Date for Submission of Annual Manpower Requirements Report

Section 115a of title 10, United States Code, requires the submission of an Annual Manpower Requirements Report not later than February 15 of each fiscal year. This section would establish a new suspense date for the report, requiring it to be transmitted to Congress not later than 30 days after the budget for the next fiscal year is submitted to Congress.

Section 404—Extension of Authority for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Designate Up to 12 General and Flag Officer Positions to Be Excluded from General and Flag Officer Grade Limitations

This section would extend to October 1, 2001, from October 1, 1998, the authority for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to exclude up to 12 general and flag officer positions from existing grade limitations.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for the selected reserve personnel, including the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves, as of September 30, 1999:

Service	Fiscal year 1998		Fiscal year 1999		Change from fiscal year	
	Authorized	Program	Request	Recommendation	1999 request	1998 program
ARNG	361,516	361,516	357,000	357,000	0	(4,516)
USAR	208,000	208,000	208,000	209,000	1,000	1,000
USNR	94,294	94,294	90,843	90,843	0	(3,451)
USMCR	42,000	40,855	40,018	40,018	0	(837)
ANG	108,002	108,002	106,991	106,991	0	(1,011)
USAFR	73,447	73,447	74,242	74,242	0	795
CGR	8,000	7,800	8,000	8,000	0	200

Service	Fiscal year 1998		Fiscal year 1999		Change from fiscal year	
	Authorized	Program	Request	Recommendation	1999 request	1998 program
Total	895,259	893,914	885,094	886,094	1,000	(7,820)

The increases in selected reserve end strength shown above include the additions to the end strength for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves described in section 412.

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves as of September 30, 1999:

Service	Fiscal year 1998		Fiscal year 1999		Change from fiscal year	
	Authorized	Program	Request	Recommendation	1999 request	1998 program
ARNG	22,310	22,310	21,763	21,763	0	(547)
USAR	11,500	11,500	11,804	12,804	1,000	1,304
USNR	16,136	16,136	15,590	15,590	0	(546)
USMCR	2,559	2,494	2,362	2,362	0	(132)
ANG	10,616	10,671	10,930	10,930	0	259
USAFR	748	867	991	991	0	124
Total	63,869	63,978	63,440	64,440	1,000	462

The section would also increase by 1,000 the number of AGR's requested for the United States Army Reserve. The committee believes this increase is necessary to offset reductions in other components of the full-time force supporting the Army Reserve, and to improve the readiness of early deploying units. To support this additional end strength, the committee recommends an increase of \$25.0 million in the Army Reserve military personnel account.

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 1999:

Service	Fiscal year 1998		Fiscal year 1999		Change from fiscal year	
	Authorized	Program	Request	Recommendation	1999 request	1998 program
ARNG	23,125	22,849	22,179	23,125	946	276
USAR	5,503	5,503	5,205	5,395	190	(108)
ANG	22,853	22,853	22,408	22,408	0	(445)
USAFR	9,802	9,802	9,761	9,761	0	(41)
Total	61,283	61,007	59,553	60,689	1,136	(318)

Section 10216 of title 10, United States Code, provides that military technician end strength authorizations shall only be reduced in connection with military force structure reductions. The committee notes that the President's budget requested end strengths for military technicians (dual status) in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve that were well below the fiscal year 1998 authorizations, however, in violation of the statute, the Army National

Guard reductions were unsupported by force structure changes, and the Army Reserve reductions were supported only in part by force structure changes. The committee admonishes the Secretary of the Army to ensure that all future budget requests for reductions in military technician (dual status) end strength below the level authorized in fiscal year 1999 are made only as a result of force structure changes.

The committee is also aware that the Chief of Staff of the Army identified the restoration of national guard military technician (dual status) end strength as the second highest priority among the Army's unfunded requirements list submitted to the committee. The restoration was required because of a total Army decision to defer some national guard force structure reductions until fiscal year 2000 and beyond. The committee commends the senior Army leadership (both active and national guard) for the priority afforded to this Army National Guard requirement, and recommends that the Army National Guard operations and maintenance account for operating forces (land forces) be increased by \$27.0 million to facilitate the restoration of military technicians (dual status).

Section 414—Increase in Number of Members in Certain Grades Authorized to Serve on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize increases in the grades of reserve members authorized to serve on active duty or on full-time national guard duty for the administration of the reserves or the national guard. The provision would authorize 133 additional majors, 22 additional E-9s, and 89 additional E-8s in the Air Force. The provision would also authorize 26 additional colonels and 20 additional E-9s in the Army. The committee believes these increases are necessary to support the additional missions now being performed by the reserve components.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Authorization of Appropriations for Military Personnel

This section would authorize \$70,697.1 million to be appropriated for military personnel.

This authorization of appropriation reflects both reductions and additions to the President's budget request.

Recommended Increases	Military per- sonnel ac- counts	O&M accounts
Basic Pay Increase (3.6% vs 3.1%)	186.0
Recruiting Advertising:		
Navy Recruiting Advertising		35.0
USMC Recruiting Advertising		12.0
Air National Guard Recruiting Advertising		3.0
USAFR Recruiting Advertising	3.0
End Strength:		
Active Army	74.0
Reserve Components:		
USNR Contributory Support to CINCs (ADT) (RPN)	10.0
USNR Active Duty Special Work (MPN)	10.0
USMCR Increased Use	3.4	1.2
USMCR Active Duty Special Work	2.1

Recommended Increases	Military per- sonnel ac- counts	O&M accounts	
Increase USAR AGR's	25.0		
Retain Army National Guard Mil. Technicians		27.0	
Equitable Imminent Danger Pay for RC	3.0		
Other Recruiting Priorities:			
Navy:			
Enlistment Bonus	9.4		
College Fund	13.9		
Recruiter Support		3.6	
USMC:			
Enlistment Bonus	3.0		
College Fund	5.9		
Recruiter Support		1.5	
Army:			
Enlistment Bonus	10.0		
Defense Health Program:			
Environmental Risk Assessment		1.8	
Medical Trauma Training		4.8	
Transitional CHAMPUS for Disabled Retirees		3.0	
Other:			
Repayment of Health Professional Scholarship	5.0		
Authorize Rental Car when Shipped POV Delayed	2.0		
National Guard Youth Challenge Program		21.5	
Army Basic Training Barracks Modifications		8.0	
Total Increases	360.6	127.5	
Recommended reductions	Military per- sonnel ac- counts	O&M accounts	Revolving and management funds
Obligations for Advanced Pay:			
Army	161.0		
Navy	69.0		
Air Force	53.0		
USMC	18.0		
Innovative Readiness Training		16.0	
FY 98 End Strength Underexecution:			
Navy	94.0		
USMC	21.0		
USAF	4.0		
USMCR	6.0		
Weapons of Mass Destruction:			
Military Personnel, Army	0.1		
Reserve Personnel, Army	0.8		
National Guard Personnel, Army	13.4		
Military Personnel, Navy	0.1		
Military Personnel, Air Force	0.1		
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	0.1		
O&M, Army Reserve	5.0		
O&M, Army National Guard	2.0		
Mobilization Income Insurance			24.5
Total Reductions	440.6	23.0	24.5

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

National Guard Youth Challenge

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) provided the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, authority to conduct a program known as the National Guard Youth Challenge Program and authorized the expenditure of up to \$50.0 million in federal funds on the program. The budget request only contained \$28.5 million for the Challenge program. The program is a 22-week, quasi-military, residential program for drug-free 16- to 18-year old high school dropouts who are unemployed and have no criminal record. The program seeks to improve the life skills and potential for employment or military service of its participants through military-based training, supervised work experience, and post-graduation mentoring. The committee recommends an increase of \$21.5 million to maintain the fiscal year 98 level of funding. The committee urges the Secretary to maintain this level of funding in future budget requests.

Recruiting

The committee continues to be concerned that the services are not able to attract sufficient high quality recruits to maintain the quality force so critical to military readiness. The Army, traditionally the first service to feel pressure from downturns in recruiting trends, was barely able to meet their recruiting objectives in fiscal year 1997 despite reducing recruit quality objectives, increasing the number of field recruiters, lowering accession goals, and adding over \$100.0 million to recruiting accounts.

As expected, the Navy was the next to experience severe problems. During the first quarter of fiscal year 1998, Navy recruiters missed their mission by over 1,400 recruits and the Navy offered little hope of recovery before the end of the year. Today, all the services acknowledge that recruiting objectives are exceedingly difficult to attain given the increased competition from a strong economy and increasing propensity for youth to attend college.

The committee asked the services to provide lists of unfunded recruiting requirements in the fiscal year 1999 budget request. Following a review of those lists, the committee recommends the following increases in funding.

- (1) Navy recruiting advertising: \$35.0 million.
- (2) Marine Corps recruiting advertising: \$12.0 million.
- (3) Air National Guard recruiting advertising: \$3.0 million.
- (4) Air Force Reserve recruiting advertising: \$3.0 million.
- (5) Navy enlistment bonus: \$9.4 million.

- (6) Navy College Fund: \$13.9 million.
- (7) Navy recruiter support: \$3.6 million.
- (8) Marine Corps enlistment bonus: \$3.0 million.
- (9) Marine Corps College Fund: \$5.9 million.
- (10) Marine Corps recruiter support: \$1.5 million.
- (11) Army enlistment bonus: \$10.0 million.

Reserve Component Full-time Support Force

Since the end of the Cold War, significant reductions in the size of U.S. active forces, combined with a national military strategy that is characterized by unprecedented levels and frequency of peacetime commitment of U.S. military forces, has resulted in an increased reliance on U.S. reserve component forces. As a consequence, in the last decade, the reserve components have been transformed from a force training and waiting to be mobilized for major wars, to a force that is integrated and essential to the success of nearly every military operation during peace and war. The committee notes that the recent recommendations flowing from both the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the National Defense Panel (NDP) portend even broader roles for and greater integration of the reserve components in the day-to-day conduct of the national military strategy.

The committee has long understood that an important component in the ability of the reserve components to be ready when mobilized for a major war was a full-time support force numbering in excess of 150,000 and consisting of military technicians, reservists on active duty, active component personnel and Department of Defense civilians. Heretofore, the principal focus of this full-time force was to facilitate the training, readiness and maintenance of the reserve components for deployment in a major war. Consistent with that focus, Congress constrained in law the roles that the full-time support force may perform. For example, reservists on full-time active guard and reserve duty are limited to duties related to organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components. Neither the support of the active components, nor the performance of full-time operational missions was contemplated as permissible by such congressional limitations.

With the increasing integration of the reserve components into the day-to-day operation of the Total Force—in many cases as a substitute for the active components—the committee is concerned that there has been a de facto, incremental shift in the role of the full-time support force that is not now permitted by law, and the implications of which are only partially understood by the Congress, the Department of Defense and the military services. The committee notes as evidence of such shifts, for example: reserve component assumption of the active Air Force command and control mission for continental air defense; reserve component assumption of control of the Operational Support Aircraft command for the Department; the increasing presence of full-time reservists performing Total Force missions like legislative affairs in the Department's national capital region headquarters; assignment of active duty officers as reserve component unit commanders; the recent formation of Army active/guard integrated divisions; the contemplated formation of Army multi-component units; and, the De-

partment's request in the budget request to expand the role of full time reservists to conduct operational missions in connection with the domestic preparedness and response to the use of weapons of mass destruction.

The committee fully supports further integration of the reserve components into the performance of Total Force missions. However, the proliferation of initiatives that expand the roles and purpose of the full-time force appear to be being applied in an appliqué fashion without a comprehensive understanding of the personnel, force structure or cost-benefit implications. Nor does there seem to be an effort within the Department to redesign the full-time support force in a rational way that anticipates the future Total Force missions contemplated for the reserve components by the QDR and NDP. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment and report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security, not later than May 1, 1999, on the revisions in law and policy necessary to reform the reserve component full-time support force to meet current and anticipated Total Force requirements. The assessment and recommendations should address, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) An overview that provides a comprehensive statement of the future of the reserve component full-time support force;
- (2) The extent to which the reserve components have assumed and will assume peacetime operational missions previously performed by active component forces;
- (3) The extent to which the existing reserve component full-time support force remains capable of performing its traditional role of preparing the reserve components for major war missions while assuming greater responsibility for and involvement in peacetime Total Force missions;
- (4) The nature and extent to which the reserve component full-time support forces are performing missions in support of the Total Force like legislative affairs in the Department's National Capital region headquarters;
- (5) The need for changes in law and policy that would enable military technicians and reservists on active Guard and Reserve duty to serve full careers;
- (6) The need to revise the end-strength;
- (7) The need to continue the various categories of the full-time support force; and
- (8) The development of a system to rationalize the assignment of specific missions to those forces.

Reserve Component Joint Professional Military Education

The committee is concerned about inadequacies in the Department's professional military educational curricula with respect to the preparation of reserve component officers for joint duty assignments. Section 666 of title 10, United States Code, requires only that the Secretary of Defense establish policies emphasizing joint education and experience for reserve component officers. To date, none of the services requires any joint professional military education for reserve officers.

The reality is that reserve component officers serve with increasing frequency with our war-fighting commands in a joint environ-

ment. In order to assure maximum effectiveness in such roles, the committee believes that reserve component officers require joint professional military education. To some extent, the Department has recognized this requirement for its most senior officers and has recently opened the Capstone course to more reserve component officers. However, it is clear to the committee that as the military services participate in more joint military operations than ever before, more active and reserve junior officers will serve in joint duty assignments in the future.

In order to prepare reserve component field grade officers for joint duty assignments, the committee directs that a course similar in content to, but not identical to, the in-residence Armed Forces Staff College course for field grade active component officers be developed as soon as possible. Although the specifics of the course of instruction are best left to the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries, the committee believes that a curriculum including periods of in-residence training, as well as distance learning, presents the best combination of academic rigor, cohort development, and cross-service acculturation. The committee recognizes that even during a full career, the time available to reserve component officers to complete training and education requirements is extremely limited. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to be cognizant of such limitation in developing joint professional military education requirements for reserve component officers.

In addition, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, through the Secretary of Defense, to submit a report by not later than April 1, 1999, setting forth the progress made in establishing a joint professional military education course for mid-career reserve component officers.

Sustaining Education and Teaching Excellence at the National Defense University

The committee notes that the National Defense University has assumed numerous additional functions in recent years which have challenged both the capacity of the current faculty and the available resources. In addition, the committee is concerned that the increasing competition for resources within the Department of Defense is challenging the Department's ability to sustain the requisite level of excellence. The committee is aware of the commitment of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the university's teaching and education excellence. In order to understand that commitment more fully, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to report to the committee on measures both ongoing and projected to ensure that the University is able to recruit and retain the best possible, nationally recognized, military and civilian faculty. The report should address options for maintaining and filling the current 67 civilian faculty positions (51 funded authorizations and 16 additional hires) operated under the authority of title 10, United States Code. The report should be submitted to the committee within 120 days of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501—Codification of Eligibility of Retired Officers and Former Officers for Consideration by Special Selection Boards

This section would clarify that a retired or former officer may be considered for promotion by a special selection board without being returned to active duty.

Section 502—Communication to Promotion Boards by Officers under Consideration

This section would clarify that the Congress intended that written communications from officers to promotion boards authorized in section 614 of title 10, United States Code, be limited to matters that enhance the officer's case for promotion. The committee believes that officers who do not wish to be promoted should discuss their desire for non-selection for promotion and separation from the military with their immediate supervisor so that a solution can be found that serves the mutual interests of the military service and the officer.

Section 503—Procedures for Separation of Regular Officers for Substandard Performance of Duty or Certain Other Reasons

This section would eliminate the requirement to convene boards of review for regular officers who have been recommended for administrative separation by boards of inquiry. The provision would also eliminate the 30-day board of inquiry notification process. The committee believes that boards of review are redundant and their elimination, in addition to the elimination 30-day board of inquiry notification requirement, would not detract from the substantial due process afforded regular officers being considered for separation.

Section 504—Posthumous Commissions and Warrants

Currently, a posthumous promotion may be granted only when the service secretary has approved the results of the promotion board prior to the date of death. This section would authorize the President to promote an officer posthumously when the service secretary approves the results of the board after the date of death of the officer, so long as the officer is selected for promotion by a promotion board before the date of death.

Section 505—Tenure of Chief of the Air Force Nurse Corps

This section would clarify that the Secretary of the Air Force determines the length of the tour served by the Chief of the Air Force Nurse Corps.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MATTERS

Section 511—Composition of Selective Early Retirement Boards of Reserve General and Flag Officers of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convene selective early retirement boards for rear admirals in the Navy Reserve and major generals in the Marine Corps Reserve without complying with the requirement specified in section 14102 of title 10, United States Code, that one half of the selection board members be reserve officers and that all the board members hold higher permanent grades than the officers being considered by the board.

Section 512—Active Status Service Requirement for Promotion Consideration for Army and Air Force Reserve Component Brigadier Generals

This section would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force to consider reserve brigadier generals serving in an inactive status for promotion if the officers had been in an inactive status for less than one year as of the date of the convening of the promotion board, and had continuously served for at least one year on the reserve active status list or the active duty list immediately before transfer to inactive status. Such officers are not currently eligible for promotion consideration.

Section 513—Revision to Educational Requirement for Promotion of Reserve Officers

This section would authorize an exception to the requirement for reserve officers in the Army commissioned through the Army Officer Candidate School to possess a baccalaureate degree before being promoted to the grade of captain. The exception would expire on October 1, 2000.

SUBTITLE C—MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Section 521—Requirements Relating to Recruit Basic Training

This section would amend title 10, U.S. Code, to require each of the military services to assign male and female recruits to same-gender units at the platoon, flight and division levels, and to house male and female recruits in separate barracks or troop housing facilities. It would provide each of the service secretaries the authority to waive the separate barracks requirement initially at specific installations due to a lack of adequate facilities at the installation. However, it would require that no such waiver be in effect after October 1, 2001. This section also would require that if a waiver is granted at a particular installation, the service secretary shall require that male and female recruits be housed on separate floors in military barracks or troop housing facilities at that installation. During the interim period, housing recruits on separate floors is defined to include billeting male and female recruits separately and securely either on separate floors, in separate bays or on same floors with a fire-safe wall separating the recruits. Further, the separate billeting spaces should include independent sleeping

areas, latrines and separate, lockable entrances. To facilitate the Army's ability to make barracks modifications needed for housing by separate floors, the committee recommends an increase of \$8.0 million in that service's operations and maintenance account.

Section 522—After-Hours Privacy for Recruits During Basic Training

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to require each of the service secretaries to restrict after-hours access to recruit housing areas to same-sex training personnel. The provision would allow an exception to this policy in case of an emergency or circumstance requiring immediate action.

Section 523—Extension of Reporting Dates for Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues

This section would amend section 562 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) to extend the reporting dates required of the Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues. This provision would extend the date of the initial report to October 15, 1998, and the final report to March 15, 1999.

Section 524—Improved Oversight of Innovative Readiness Training

The General Accounting Office, following a case-study review of six of the Department's Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) projects, concluded that the IRT program required stronger oversight. This section would require the Department to implement the GAO recommendations to improve program compliance with section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, which governs the IRT program. In addition, the section would require the Department to establish better cost accounting methods so as not only to capture the total costs of the program, but also to provide proper fiscal oversight of the program. The committee believes this latter requirement is needed because an additional GAO review of the documentation and cost accounting records for 143 IRT projects conducted in 1997 found that it was not possible in many cases to determine either an amount requested or an amount approved for each project. In addition, the GAO review found that: some projects were not recorded in the files because the Department approved them orally, with no supporting documentation; additional funding may have been provided but was not documented in the Department files; the military services may have spent the money approved for an IRT project on other approved projects as the military services deemed appropriate; some approved projects may not have been conducted; and some projects may have required less funding that had been approved. As a result of this ineffective oversight and cost accounting by the Department, the committee recommends that the \$16.0 million contained in the budget request for the IRT program be reallocated to other committee priorities.

SUBTITLE D—DECORATIONS, AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS

Section 531—Study of New Decorations for Injury or Death in Line of Duty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of Transportation with regard to the Coast Guard, to determine the appropriate name, policy, award criteria, and design for two new decorations to recognize the services of members of the armed forces who are killed or wounded under non-combat conditions and U.S. civilian nationals who are killed or wounded while serving in an official capacity with a U.S. armed force. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a legislative proposal to establish the two decorations and a recommendation concerning the need for the new decorations to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security not later than July 31, 1999.

Section 532—Waiver of Time Limitations for Award of Certain Decorations to Specified Persons

This section would waive the statutory time limitations for the award of military decorations to individuals who have been recommended for award of the decorations by the secretaries of the military departments.

Section 533—Commendation of the Navy and Marine Corps Personnel who Served in the United States Navy Asiatic Fleet from 1910–1942

This section would express the commendation of the Congress to those personnel who served in the Asiatic Fleet of the United States Navy between 1910 and 1942.

Section 534—Appreciation for Service during World War I and World War II by Members of the Navy Assigned on Board Merchant Ships as the Naval Armed Guard Service

This section would express the appreciation of the Congress and the American people for the service of members of the Navy assigned as gun crews aboard merchant ships as part of the Naval Armed Guard Service during World War I and World War II.

The committee notes that merchant marine officers and crew served with great courage and distinction during World War I and World War II on the same vessels as the Naval Armed Guard Service and are also deserving of the appreciation of a grateful nation.

Section 535—Sense of Congress Regarding the Heroism, Sacrifice, and Service of the Military Forces of South Vietnam and Other Nations in Connection with the United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam Conflict

This section would recognize and honor the significant heroism, sacrifices, and service that the armed forces of South Vietnam and other allies made while fighting together with American military forces during the Vietnam conflict.

Section 536—Sense of the Congress Regarding the Heroism, Sacrifice, and Service of Former South Vietnamese Commandos in Connection with United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam Conflict.

This section would recognize and honor the significant heroism, sacrifices and service that the South Vietnamese commandos made during the Vietnam conflict. The committee notes that section 657 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) authorized compensation for Vietnamese commandos who were incarcerated for 20 years or more.

SUBTITLE E—ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

SECTIONS 541–544—CORRECTIONS OF MILITARY RECORDS

Section 541 would preserve the current level of performance of the Army Review Board Agency, the Air Force Review Boards Agency, and the Board for Correction of Naval Records by requiring a report to the Congress 90 days before the number of employees assigned to those organizations is reduced below the number assigned as of October 1, 1997.

Sections 542–544 would amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code to improve the timeliness, independence, and fairness of actions to correct the military records. The amendments include:

(1) A requirement for each agency to employ an attorney and a physician to serve as advisors to the staff on legal and medical matters being considered by the board.

(2) A requirement for each agency to provide applicants copies of communications that directly apply to or have a material effect on the applicants' cases.

(3) A requirement for each board for the correction of military records to improve the timeliness of board actions over a ten year period beginning in fiscal year 2001 and culminating with a requirement to complete action on 90 percent of the cases within ten months of receipt during fiscal year 2011 and beyond.

The committee is strongly committed to making improvements to the process for correcting military records within each of the military departments. The committee is very sensitive to the many complaints from constituents about the timeliness of actions and perceived problems concerning the independence and fairness of decisions by the boards for the correction of military records. The committee views the boards as administrative arms of the Congress entrusted with the responsibility to be the guarantors of fair and equitable treatment for thousands of active duty military members, veterans, and retirees. The committee expects that the service secretaries will provide the manpower, equipment, and fiscal resources necessary to ensure that the boards are able to meet the timeliness standards specified in the provision.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 551—One-Year Extension of Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities Relating to Personnel Management and Benefits

This section would extend through fiscal year 2000 certain temporary authorities which provide the tools the armed services need to manage personnel reductions and shape the force following the completion of the drawdown of military forces. These authorities include:

- (1) Active duty early retirement authority.
- (2) Special separation benefit authority.
- (3) Voluntary separation incentive authority.
- (4) Increased flexibility in the management of selective early retirement boards.
- (5) Reduction of time-in-grade requirement for retention of grade upon voluntary retirement.
- (6) Reduction of length of commissioned service for voluntary retirement as an officer.
- (7) Increased flexibility in the management of limited duty officer retirements.
- (8) Enhanced travel and transportation allowances and storage of baggage and household effects for certain involuntary separated members.
- (9) Increased flexibility for granting educational leave relating to continuing public and community service.
- (10) Enhanced health, commissary, and family housing benefits.
- (11) Increased flexibility in the management of enrollments of dependents in the Defense Dependents' Education System.
- (12) Definition of the force reduction transition period for reserve forces.
- (13) Force reduction period reserve retirement authority.
- (14) Reduction of length of non-regular service requirements for reserve retirements.
- (15) Reserve early retirement authority.
- (16) Increased flexibility in the management of the affiliation of active duty personnel with reserve units.
- (17) Increased flexibility in the management of eligibility for reserve educational assistance.

The committee has elected to limit the extension of these authorities to one additional year because of concern that further reductions of the armed forces are ill-advised and should be carefully scrutinized before being facilitated by the authorization of these drawdown tools. The committee believes that the continued reductions in end strengths has contributed to the increased personnel tempo within the armed services that has eroded readiness and severely hampered efforts to retain quality military members.

Section 552—Leave Without Pay for Academy Cadets and Midshipmen

This section would authorize the appropriate service secretary, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of the United

States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, to order a cadet or midshipman to be placed on involuntary leave without pay under certain circumstances.

Section 553—Provision for Recovery, Care, and Disposition of the Remains of All Medically Retired Members

This section would authorize military retirees the same recovery, care, and disposition of remains benefits as active duty members when that member is medically retired from active duty while hospitalized and the hospitalization is continuous until date of death.

Section 554—Continued Eligibility under Voluntary Separation Incentive Program for Members who Involuntarily Lose Membership in a Reserve Component

Section 1175 of title 10, United States Code, requires recipients of the Variable Separation Incentive (VSI) to maintain an active status in the reserves to remain eligible for VSI payments. This section would authorize VSI recipients to continue to receive VSI payments after separation from the reserves when the separation was due to age, years of service, failure to be selected for promotion, or medical disqualification, provided the ineligibility does not result from a deliberate action to avoid service.

Section 555—Definition of Financial Institution for Direct Deposit of Pay

This section would amend sections 1053 and 1594 of title 10, United States Code, to specify that the term financial institution means a bank, savings and loan association or similar institution, or credit union chartered by the United States or a State.

Section 556—Increase in Maximum Amount for College Fund Program

This section would increase the maximum payment offered with the College Fund to \$50,000. The current maximum of \$40,000 is not expected to provide an adequate incentive to enlist beyond 1999 due to the 6 percent annual inflation rate in college costs. The increase in authorization is effective October 1, 1999 for service members enlisting after that date.

Section 557—Central Identification Laboratory, Hawaii

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish joint manning requirements for the Central Identification Laboratory, Hawaii (CILHI), and to staff CILHI at 100 percent of its manpower requirements. Although CILHI is an Army activity, it performs the important national mission of identifying the remains of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines lost in previous conflicts. The committee has learned that the Army intends to reduce CILHI staffing by 33 personnel in fiscal year 1999 in anticipation of receiving personnel support from other services. The committee believes this reduction is premature and ill advised given the sensitive mission of CILHI, the workload increase expected by more

open access to sites on the Korean peninsula, and the uncertainty of other service support. This provision would prohibit the Army from executing any personnel reductions until the Secretary of Defense has a comprehensive joint staffing plan in place.

Section 558—Honor Guard Details at Funerals of Veterans

This section would require the secretaries of the military departments to provide, upon request, honor guard details for the funerals of veterans. The provision would specify that the honor guard details be comprised of not less than three persons with the capability to play a recording of Taps, unless a bugler is included in the detail. The honor guard detail would consist of members of the armed forces, members of veterans organizations, or other organizations approved for participation by the Secretary of Defense.

The Secretary of Defense would be required to establish a system for selection of units of the armed forces or other organizations to provide honor guard details. Before issuing regulations to establish the system, the Secretary of Defense would be required to consult with veterans service organizations to determine the views of those organizations regarding methods for providing honor guard details at funerals for veterans, suggestions for organizing the system to provide those details, and estimates of the resources that those organizations could provide for honor guard details. The system required by this provision would apply to burials of veterans that occur on or after October 1, 1999.

The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, would be required to study alternative means for providing the honor guard details at the funerals of veterans and to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security not later than March 31, 1999.

Section 559—Applicability to All Persons in Chain of Command of Policy Requiring Exemplary Conduct by Commanding Officers and Others in Authority in the Armed Forces

Since 1956, title 10 of the United States Code has required commanding officers and others in authority in the Navy and Marine Corps to conduct themselves in an exemplary manner. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) established the same requirement for exemplary conduct for commanding officers and others in authority in the Army and Air Force. This section would extend the requirement for exemplary conduct to the President, as commander in chief, and the Secretary of Defense, both of whom exercise authority in the military chain of command.

Section 560—Report on Prisoners Transferred from United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to Federal Bureau of Prisons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate and report to Congress on the rationale for and effectiveness of the policy of transferring prisoners from the United States Disciplinary Barracks, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, to the Federal Bureau of

Prisons. The section would also require the Secretary of the Army to monitor the parole and recidivism rates of the military prisoners transferred to the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The committee takes these actions in order to understand whether implementation of the transfer policy facilitates or hinders one of the major objectives of the military prison system: rehabilitation of military prisoners.

Section 561—Report on Process for Selection of Members for
Service on Courts-Martial

As now required by title 10, United State Code, the convening authority selects members for service on courts-martial, but is not required to use a statistically random selection process. The committee believes that the use of a statistically random selection process may help to insulate the process from charges of undue command influence. Therefore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the secretaries of the military departments, to develop a plan for random selection of members of courts-martial as a potential replacement for the current selection process. In developing this plan, the Secretary of Defense is required to obtain the views of the members of the code committee for the Uniformed Code of Military Justice on such a plan and submit both the plan and those views to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security no later than April 15, 1999.

Section 562—Study of Revising the Term of Service of Members of
the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

The section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the desirability of revising the term of appointment of judges of the United States Court of Appeals so that they might serve until age 65. At present, a judge is limited to a term of 15 years. The report is due not later than April 15, 1999.

Section 563—Status of Cadets at the Merchant Marine Academy

The section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, to ensure that citizens of the United States appointed as cadets at the United States Merchant Marine Academy are members of the Naval Reserve. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to issue such cadets military identification cards.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains deeply concerned about the level of compensation provided to service members and their families. Although the committee has embarked on a strategy to incrementally increase the various elements of military compensation, the committee has observed with growing alarm that the services are struggling to recruit and retain the quality force that has been the hallmark of the U.S. military over the last 15 years. The committee believes that the continuing erosion in the value of military pay and allowances has contributed to the recruiting and retention problems that plague the armed services.

This year, the committee has elected to add \$186.0 million to increase the military pay raise from the 3.1 percent requested in the President's budget to 3.6 percent. The additional one half of one percent brings the pay raise level in line with pay increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index (ECI). The Committee was again disappointed that the President's budget request for fiscal year 1999 continues to employ the "by law" model for the military pay raise that would allow the gap between pay raises in the private sector and pay raises in the military to grow to 14 percent.

The committee is convinced that the continued erosion in the value of military compensation can only serve to further exacerbate recruiting and retention challenges that confront each of the armed services. So long as the budget request undervalues the high degree of professionalism, long work hours, and extended absences from home demanded from our military personnel, the committee believes that the preservation of a quality force so critical to readiness will grow increasingly difficult. The committee remains committed to improving compensation programs and will continue to seek the additional funding needed to make those improvements in the future.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Retirement

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the services to retain quality officers and enlisted members. The committee continues to receive reports, including the testimony of the service chiefs, that the calculation of retired pay using the high-three average of income implemented in 1980 and the changes associated with the Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-348) have seriously degraded the retirement system as a retention

incentive. The committee believes it is necessary to determine the effect on retention of the retirement changes cited above and assess the need to restore the value of military retirement.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the service secretaries, to examine the implications for retention of the 1980 and 1986 changes to the retirement system and submit a report not later than June 30, 1999 to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security. In addition to the findings concerning the implications for current retention, the report should include the Secretary's recommendation on the need to restore the value of military retirement, a review of the costs associated with restoring the value of retirement, and a proposed plan to facilitate a Congressional review of retirement issues. The plan should include an outline of the studies that would be undertaken, the agencies that would be tasked to complete the studies, and a projected schedule for completion of the studies.

Survivor Benefit Plan

The committee remains concerned that the government subsidy of the Survivor Benefit Plan (SBP) has fallen to 26 percent, well below the objective for a 40 percent subsidy set by the Congress. Although the process for making the necessary changes is complicated by budgetary rules that restrict increases in entitlement spending, the committee remains committed to exploring options that will increase the subsidy and make the program more attractive to military retirees and their families.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 1999

This section would provide a 3.6 percent military pay raise. This is one half of one percent more than the pay raise called for in the President's budget request. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase in funding for the additional one half of one percent increase in the military pay raise during fiscal year 1999 of \$186.0 million over the amount requested in the President's budget.

Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing Outside the United States

This section would authorize the payment of advance deposits and rent for housing in overseas areas when required by local conditions. The provision would also protect the member from losses due to fluctuations in the value of foreign currency and would allow the government to recoup the full amount of advances, to include any gain resulting from currency fluctuations.

Section 603—Basic Allowance for Subsistence for Reserves

This section would clarify the entitlement of reservists to rations in kind when training or payment for meals purchased when rations in kind are not available.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for health care professionals who serve in the selected reserve in critically short wartime specialties, selected reserve reenlistment bonus, the selected reserve enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members of the selected reserve assigned to certain high priority units, the selected reserve affiliation bonus, the ready reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus, and the prior service enlistment bonus until September 30, 2000. The provision would also extend the authority for repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the selected reserve until October 1, 2000.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses, and Nurse Anesthetists

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, the accession bonus for registered nurses, and the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists until September 30, 2000.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, reenlistment bonus for active members, enlistment bonuses for members with critical skills, special pay for nuclear qualified officers extending the period of active service, and nuclear career accession bonus to September 30, 2000. The provision would also extend the authority for the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until October 1, 2000.

Section 614—Aviation Career Incentive Pay and Aviation Officer Retention Bonus

This section would make clarifying amendments to sections 301a and 301b of title 37, United States Code, to facilitate the payment of Aviation Career Incentive Pay and Aviation Continuation Pay to warrant officers.

Section 615—Special Pay for Diving Duty

This section would clarify that the service secretaries may continue paying diving pay to members not assigned to diving duties when the members are required to maintain diving proficiency. The committee believes that members should be required to maintain proficiency as a diver only when they are subject to no notice return to diving duty on a temporary or permanent basis.

Section 616—Selective Reenlistment Bonus Eligibility for Reserve Members Performing Active Guard and Reserve Duty

This section would authorize payment of selective reenlistment bonuses to members of reserve components who are on extended active duty in the Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) program.

Section 617—Removal of Ten Percent Restriction on Selective Reenlistment Bonuses

This section would remove the 10 percent limitation on the number of selective reenlistment bonuses in excess of \$20,000 that may be paid.

Section 618—Increase in Maximum Amount of Army Enlistment Bonus

This section would increase the maximum bonus for enlistment in the Army from \$4,000 to \$6,000.

Section 619—Equitable Treatment of Reserves Eligible for Special Pay for Duty Subject to Hostile Fire or Imminent Danger

This section would authorize reserve members to receive the amount of imminent danger pay authorized for a full month regardless of the number of qualifying days served by the member during the month. The provision makes the imminent danger pay payment policy for reservists consistent with the policy for active duty members. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in funding for reserve imminent danger pay of \$3.0 million over the amount contained in the budget request.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES

Section 631—Exception to Maximum Weight Allowance for Baggage and Household Effects

This section would authorize the service secretaries to exceed the maximum weight allowance for shipment of household goods to a new permanent duty station to accommodate shipment of consumable goods that cannot be reasonably obtained at the new location.

Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Travel Performed by Members in Connection with Rest and Recuperative Leave from Overseas Stations

This section would clarify that the service secretaries may provide the transportation authorized for the rest and recuperation travel using either government or commercial carriers. This amendment would enhance the cost efficiency of the rest and recuperation program being provided to personnel assigned to Operation Joint Guard in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Section 633—Storage of Baggage of Certain Dependents

Section 430 of title 37, United States Code, authorizes dependents of military members assigned to overseas locations annual

round trip visits while those dependents are college students in the United States. This section would authorize the storage of unaccompanied baggage of such dependents in lieu of shipment if advantageous to the government.

SUBTITLE D—RETIRED PAY, SURVIVOR BENEFITS, AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 641—Effective Date of Former Spouse Survivor Benefit Coverage

This section would standardize the effective date of Survivor Benefit Plan coverage for a former spouse as the first day of the first month following the date of the court order directing the coverage.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 651—Deletion of Canal Zone from Definition of United States Possessions for Purposes of Pay and Allowances

This section would delete the Canal Zone from the list of U.S. possessions as defined in title 37, United States Code.

Section 652—Accounting of Advance Payments

The budget request, based upon technical interpretations of law by the Department of Defense general counsel, set aside from the services' personnel accounts \$301.0 million to be available to provide for advance pay obligations or expenditures at the end of a fiscal year. This section would clarify that obligations and expenditures incurred for advanced payment of pay and allowances shall not be accounted for or included in any determination of amounts available for obligation or expenditure except in the fiscal year in which such advances are ultimately earned. The clarification provided by this section would make the \$301.0 million that was included in the President's request available to the committee for other purposes.

Section 653—Reimbursement of Rental Vehicle Costs when Motor Vehicle Transported at Government Expense Is Late

This section would authorize a service member being transferred to an overseas station to rent a car when his privately owned vehicle that he shipped to the overseas location does not arrive as scheduled. The provision would limit the car rental reimbursement to \$30 a day for one week. Prior to any reimbursement for a rental car, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to certify in a report to the Congress that a system is in place and operational to recover the cost of the reimbursement for the rental car from the shipping company that caused the delay.

Section 654—Education Loan Repayment Program for Certain Health Profession Officers Serving in Selected Reserve

This section would increase the authorized caps on the education loan amounts that may be repaid by the Secretary of Defense to

recruit and retain health professionals with shortage wartime critical medical skills who serve in the selected reserve. The provision would increase the repayment amounts from \$3,000 per year and \$20,000 total to \$10,000 and \$50,000, respectively.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee was pleased that the Department, after underfunding the Defense Health Program for two consecutive years, announced that the President's budget request for fiscal year 1999 provides full funding for the Defense Health Program. However, the committee was disappointed to note that, despite repeated encouragement from the congressional defense committees to provide adequate funding for retiree health care coverage, the President's budget request does not include any additional funding for retiree health care; nor does it offer any viable new alternatives for meeting the health care needs of this well-deserving beneficiary population.

This omission is particularly glaring in light of the fact that Department of Defense (DOD) witnesses have testified that the TRICARE program is saving the Department billions of dollars in health care costs. Apparently, though, these savings are not being used to improve health care coverage for military retirees and their families who were promised a lifetime of medical care. The committee believes that the Department should consider using at least part of these savings to ensure the availability of health care for all beneficiaries, including those eligible for Medicare.

In addition, the committee is disappointed that the Department continues to severely limit the manner in which the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) provides reimbursement as a second payer to other health insurance in order to "live within the Defense Health Program budget." Last year the committee expressed concern over this policy change and urged the Secretary of Defense to either improve enforcement of the limitation for health care providers to charge CHAMPUS beneficiaries no more than 115 percent of the CHAMPUS maximum allowable rate, or to continue to use the Department's previous policy on paying for health care services when paying as a second payer to other health insurance. The Department adopted neither of these two recommendations. The committee views this action to limit an important benefit as one more signal being sent to military personnel that benefits are eroding.

With health care benefits being limited or denied to some beneficiaries, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to provide sufficient funding for the Defense Health Program in the budget request for fiscal year 2000 to meet the health care needs of all military beneficiaries who rely on the military health system. Further, the committee directs the Secretary to submit as part of the President's budget request any proposals for legislation that may be needed to correct deficiencies in retiree health care. The committee continues to believe that health care coverage is viewed

as one of the most important quality of life benefits to military members and their families. Failure to provide adequate health care coverage not only constitutes a serious breach of faith with those who have served, it also may have a noticeable, negative effect on recruiting and retention efforts. The committee believes that this very important quality of life issue deserves the full attention and support of the Department of Defense.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Depleted Uranium Training and Health Surveillance

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to institute training programs on the proper safety standards concerning the use of depleted uranium (DU) munitions. DU is radioactive, but more importantly in terms of potential health effects, it is chemically toxic. Studies have shown that exposure to uranium may be associated with some adverse health effects. Lessons learned from the Gulf War show that many service personnel were unaware of the potential health hazards posed by contamination from the use of DU munitions. While some exposure took place as a result of "friendly fire," many soldiers who worked with contaminated combat vehicles hit by DU munitions and other debris were exposed unnecessarily. Attempts by the Department after the conflict to direct the services to enact DU training programs have met with little success.

The committee believes that every attempt should be made to inform soldiers of the proper precautions that must be taken to avoid exposure to DU. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to implement DU training programs across the services and to report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security no later than March 1, 1999, on progress made by each of the services in their implementation of depleted uranium training programs. This report shall include each service's plans to fully implement training, identification of specific units to receive the training, and plans to conduct follow-up training.

Furthermore, the committee supports the DOD and Secretary of Veterans Affairs (VA) efforts to conduct medical surveillance of Gulf War veterans exposed to DU, in particular, the Depleted Uranium Follow-up Program. This program, which is managed by the VA, tracks the health status of Gulf War veterans who were exposed to DU munitions due to "friendly-fire" incidents. The committee believes this program will lead to more definitive answers about the short and long-term effects of exposure to DU. However, the committee understands there have been problems in identifying Gulf War veterans who may have been exposed during "friendly-fire" incidents, as well as in DOD support to the study to ensure that Gulf War veterans and control subjects are made available for needed medical examinations and tests. The committee strongly supports the Department's full cooperation with VA's Depleted Uranium Follow-up Program and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide all support necessary to ensure that the study is completed successfully.

Graduate Medical Education Programs

In response to concerns over a controversial Navy decision to close selected Graduate Medical Education (GME) programs, the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), to evaluate the validity of the recommendations made by the Navy's Medical Education Policy Council. The forthcoming report of this evaluation is expected to conclude that the Department of Defense and the services lack policy guidance and criteria governing site and program selection, including collaboration among decision makers and those affected. Further, the study found that other DOD initiatives, including TRICARE, ongoing sizing studies, and medical modeling application differences can bear on GME decisions and need to be taken into account in the development of GME program closure guidance for the closure process to be effective. While the Department and the Air Force and Navy fully concur with the report and its recommendations, the Army apparently does not.

Based on the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General's evaluation of military graduate medical education programs, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to take the following actions in coordination with each of the military services chiefs:

- (1) Develop GME closure policy guidance and implementing criteria and processes covering such matters as key factors in identifying and screening potential sites; how to project and mitigate potential adverse effects on beneficiary health care and readiness; how and when to involve affected parties in the services and local areas in the decision-making process; how to reach program closure agreement; and how to communicate and implement the resulting decisions;
- (2) Provide in the guidance for the potential effects of DOD and service initiatives, such as TRICARE, that can affect GME decisions; and
- (3) Develop, obtain agreement upon, and publish such policy guidance before any further GME closure decisions are made.

The committee understands that in order to attain the Department's overall policy goal of training to wartime requirements, the services may need the ability to make GME reductions. However, the committee believes that any decisions to reduce service GME programs should be based on well-defined criteria, and should be fully coordinated among decision makers and those affected by the reduction. As exemplified by the Army's apparent non-concurrence with the Comptroller General's recommendations, the committee understands that getting agreement on the criteria and implementing closure decisions will not be easy. Therefore, the committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and report the GME closure policy guidance and implementation criteria to the committee within six months after the issuance of the Comptroller General's report.

Medical Readiness Learning Initiative

The committee understands that the Department of Defense faces significant training challenges if the reserve components are to be adequately prepared to respond to the domestic use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). No more challenging requirement exists than the need to develop and implement cost effective training that increases the core medical readiness of those charged with responding to WMD emergencies. The committee is aware that the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), working in connection with the Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson Foundation, has tested interactive training programs that enabled reserve component units to improve their standard of care and management of mass casualties. The committee urges that the Secretary of Defense give early priority and close scrutiny to the USUHS interactive training initiative to determine its usefulness and cost effectiveness in meeting WMD medical training challenges.

TRICARE Contract Performance

The committee remains very concerned about the delivery of health care services under the TRICARE program. Specifically, the committee is concerned about the complaints of many beneficiaries that the transition to this managed care program is compromising the quality and availability of their health care benefit. Concerns have been raised by beneficiary groups about the program's ability to provide a uniform benefit for all military beneficiaries, its ability to attract well-qualified civilian physicians, and its ability to provide access to quality, low-cost care in remote or rural locations. Additionally, civilian medical providers have expressed concerns about administrative shortcomings under TRICARE such as slow reimbursement, unreliable customer telephone service, and a slow preauthorization process to approve medical treatment, which contribute to their apprehension to participate in the TRICARE program.

Based on these concerns, the committee has questions about TRICARE contractor performance in delivering health care benefits in some regions, particularly the Central Region. The committee is particularly disturbed by reports of cases in which the administrative process has taken precedence over the provision of needed health care services. Therefore, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to closely monitor contractor performance to ensure the delivery of responsive, quality and adequate care. Specifically, the committee encourages the Department to examine contractor performance in the areas of network development, timely reimbursement to providers, overall beneficiary satisfaction, and commitment to patient care.

The committee believes the Secretary should take all appropriate actions to ensure TRICARE contractors comply with the program requirements and to ensure patient care is the number one priority. In cases where the contractor repeatedly has difficulty in complying with these standards, the committee urges the Secretary to consider termination of the contract for the good of the government.

Furthermore, the committee appreciates that implementation of any new system may result in initial issues and problems that

need to be addressed to ensure an effective program. However, the committee believes that if the Department of Defense cannot promptly and efficiently address the concerns associated with the TRICARE program, and make substantive changes to improve it, the Secretary should consider alternative options for delivering health care coverage to military beneficiaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—HEALTH CARE SERVICES

Section 701—Expansion of Dependent Eligibility Under Retiree Dental Program

This section would amend section 1076c of title 10, United States Code, to allow dependents of certain retired service members to enroll in the retiree dental program even if the retired member does not enroll in the program. Presently, dependents may enroll in the program only if the retired member also enrolls. However, some retired members are entitled to receive dental care from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or have medical or dental conditions which preclude their use of the dental program. The committee believes it is not reasonable to ask these retirees to enroll in, and pay premiums for, a program which offers them no benefits only so their dependents may also enroll in the program. Therefore, this provision would allow the dependents of these specific retirees to enroll in the retiree dental program independently.

Section 702—Plan for Provision of Health Care for Military Retirees and Their Dependents Comparable to Health Care Provided Under TRICARE Prime

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress, by March 1, 1999, a plan for ensuring that military retirees, including Medicare-eligible retirees, and their dependents have access to health care benefits comparable to those offered through TRICARE Prime, the managed-care option of the TRICARE program.

The availability of medical care for military retirees and their families has become an issue of tremendous concern to the committee over the past few years. Due to budget cuts, medical personnel reductions and base closures, access to quality care within the Military Health System has become increasingly difficult for military retirees and their dependents. While retirees under age 65 are eligible for TRICARE benefits, retirees over age 65, who are eligible for Medicare, are not. As a result of these factors, many military retirees have discovered that the military health care they “earned” through dedicated career service in the military may be difficult to obtain when they need it.

The committee strongly supports efforts to enact legislation authorizing Medicare subvention, which provides for Medicare reimbursement to the Department of Defense for care rendered to Medicare-eligible military retirees and their spouses in the Military Health Services System. Additionally, in response to concerns that subvention would only help part of the military Medicare-eligible population, the committee directed both the General Accounting

Office (GAO) and the Department of Defense to study alternatives to subvention, including authorizing eligibility in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHBP) for military retirees, and making CHAMPUS/TRICARE a second-payer to Medicare. While GAO completed its study of numerous alternatives in June 1997, the Department to date has not presented any formal recommendations nor offered any viable alternatives for meeting the health care needs of all military retirees.

The committee is extremely disappointed with the Department's inaction on this very important issue, and understands that it is due in part to concerns about the costs of the various options. While the committee appreciates that the cost of some of these options may be substantial, the committee believes that not delivering on the health care promises made to career service members could have an equally substantial cost on recruiting and retention. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan, including a legislative proposal and cost estimate, under which all military beneficiaries will have access to an adequate health care benefit by October 1, 2001. In developing this plan, the committee believes the Department should fairly evaluate all potential options, including TRICARE eligibility and enrollment, Medicare subvention, Medicare Partnering, FEHBP, Medigap supplemental policies, Medicare risk plans, and CHAMPUS as a second-payer to TRICARE. The committee strongly believes the Administration has an obligation to fulfill the commitments made to our military retirees.

Section 703—Plan for Redesign of Military Pharmacy System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to Congress by March 1, 1999, that would provide for a system-wide redesign of the military and contractor retail and mail-order pharmacy system. Additionally, it would require the Secretary to suspend any plans for establishing a national retail pharmacy program until the plan is submitted to Congress and cost-saving reforms have been implemented.

Over the past few years, the committee increasingly has become concerned about the quality and consistency of the military pharmacy benefit, as well as its effectiveness in meeting the needs of all military beneficiaries. The committee has received numerous complaints from beneficiaries about not being able to obtain certain prescribed medications at military pharmacies, and it remains concerned that many military treatment facilities (MTFs) are severely reducing pharmacy formularies as a cost-saving measure. The committee also remains concerned about the tremendous increase in pharmacy costs within the TRICARE retail pharmacy networks, and believes that the use of very restrictive formularies in military treatment facilities may be contributing to these substantial cost increases. As a result of these concerns, the committee directed, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), that the Comptroller General of the United States conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the DOD pharmacy system to identify solutions for providing for a more uniform, cost-effective pharmacy program. The forthcoming report of this evaluation is expected to include a recommendation that the Secretary of Defense

redesign the entire pharmacy system, in consultation with TRICARE and national mail-order contractors and industry experts, to incorporate pharmacy “best practices” of the private sector and to achieve integrated, cost-effective and uniform pharmacy programs. The General Accounting Office estimates that such a comprehensive redesign of the program would result in tremendous cost savings to the Department of Defense.

Based on the findings of the Comptroller General study, and consistent with the committee’s recent efforts to encourage the Department of Defense to make greater use of best business practices, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with TRICARE and national mail-order contractors and industry experts in pharmacy management, to develop a plan that would provide for a completely redesigned pharmacy system. The redesigned system shall provide for a universal, uniform pharmacy benefit that is available to all categories of military beneficiaries, including those eligible for Medicare, and it should incorporate pharmacy best practices. Specifically, this redesigned pharmacy benefit should include:

- (1) A uniform formulary for use by both military treatment facilities and TRICARE and national mail-order pharmacy contractors that is consistent with industry standards;
- (2) Computer integration of pharmacy patient databases to implement automated prospective drug utilization review systems; and
- (3) A system-wide drug benefit for all beneficiaries, including Medicare-eligible beneficiaries.

Additionally, the benefit may include an incentive-based formulary under which non-formulary or “special order” prescription drugs would be available with a higher cost-sharing requirement, even at MTFs. The committee believes that this approach would be beneficial to both the Department and to the beneficiary. By offering non-formulary or special order drugs to beneficiaries at a TRICARE cost sharing level at MTFs, the Department could save money by purchasing pharmaceuticals under the federal pricing schedule, and the beneficiary would not have to run all over town trying to fill a given prescription. However, the committee stresses that this option should not be used as a way to restrict the uniform formulary even further. By applying pharmacy best business practices, the committee hopes that the Department actually would establish a uniform formulary that is less restrictive than the formularies in use by most MTFs today.

The committee understands that the pharmacy program is a very important benefit to military beneficiaries. As such, the committee believes it should be a reliable, consistent, and easily understood benefit that effectively meets the needs of all beneficiaries, regardless of their beneficiary category.

Section 704—Transitional Authority to Provide Continued Health Care Coverage for Certain Persons Unaware of Loss of CHAMPUS Eligibility

The section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to temporarily extend CHAMPUS eligibility to certain beneficiaries who may have been unaware of their loss of eligibility for

CHAMPUS coverage. Under the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992, (Public Law 102-190) CHAMPUS became second payer for beneficiaries entitled to Medicare on the basis of disability, but only if they also enrolled in Medicare Part B. However, many of these beneficiaries were not informed of the change in the law and continued to use CHAMPUS erroneously. Recently, the Department of Defense and the Health Care Financing Administration, the agency that manages the Medicare program, devised a mechanism for notifying these individuals of the requirements of the law. However, this was accomplished too late for many of them to enroll in Medicare Part B during the 1998 open-enrollment period. As a result, this section would provide for continued CHAMPUS coverage of these beneficiaries until they have been given a sufficient opportunity to enroll in Part B during the next open enrollment period, and until that enrollment takes effect on July 1, 1999.

SUBTITLE B—TRICARE PROGRAM

Section 711—Payment of Claims for Provision of Health Care Under the TRICARE Program for which a Third Party May be Liable

This section would amend section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to allow TRICARE contractors to pay certain provider claims for the provision of health care services for accidental injury prior to seeking payment from potential third-party payers.

The committee was distressed to learn at a February 26, 1998, TRICARE hearing that beneficiaries have been subjected to collection actions due to contractor delays in settling claims for health care services provided under the TRICARE program. According to program contractors, this problem is partially due to the TRICARE procedure for processing claims with an indication of third party liability due to accidental injury. The current TRICARE policy requires the contractor to gather information regarding potential third-party payers which will enable the government and/or the contractor to seek reimbursement for the medical care provided, before the TRICARE claims may be paid. This “chase and pay” method is contrary to standard insurance industry practice in which the contractor pays the claim first, and then seeks recovery of payment from the other insurance coverage. TRICARE will remain secondary payer under coordination of benefits rules, and this will not effect other primary health insurance coverage, but will include special coverage such as personal injury protection payments.

The committee believes that the credit records of military beneficiaries should not be tarnished by a cumbersome TRICARE claims processing requirement. Therefore, the committee believes the TRICARE contractors should pay all provider claims in a timely manner, then seek recovery from third parties who may be liable.

Section 712—Procedures Regarding Enrollment in TRICARE Prime

This section would amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to insert a new section 1097a that requires the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for certain enrollments in TRICARE Prime, the managed care option of the TRICARE program.

This section would direct the Department to establish procedures for the automatic enrollment in TRICARE Prime at a military treatment facility for active-duty dependents residing within the catchment area of the facility. These procedures would include advance written notification of this enrollment, and shall allow enrolled family members to disenroll from MTF TRICARE Prime at any time. Since TRICARE Prime is designed to reduce out-of-pocket costs to beneficiaries, and since active-duty family members do not pay an enrollment fee for TRICARE Prime, this provision would facilitate easy enrollment and prompt coverage under this cost-saving option.

This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for the automatic re-enrollment of TRICARE Prime enrollees and to allow retired members and their dependents to pay the annual enrollment fee for TRICARE Prime by monthly allotment.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS**Section 721—Inflation Adjustment of Premium Amounts for Dependents Dental Program**

This section would amend section 1076a(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to allow for the cap on an enrolled member's share of the monthly premium to be adjusted annually for inflation.

Section 722—System for Tracking Data and Measuring Performance in Meeting TRICARE Access Standards

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system for measuring military treatment facilities (MTFs) and TRICARE contractors' performance in meeting the Department of Defense's standards for access to primary care services. Under TRICARE, the Department's managed health care program, the Department established access standards that apply to both military and civilian providers and address areas such as wait times for appointments and the availability of emergency services. However, beneficiary groups and the General Accounting Office have been critical of the Department's ability to monitor adherence to these standards. Therefore, this provision would require implementation of a TRICARE-wide system to collect data on the timeliness of appointments in order to measure TRICARE's performance in improving beneficiary access to care, as well as to capture precise waiting time information.

Section 723—Air Force Research, Development, Training and Education on Exposure to Chemical, Biological, and Radiological Hazards

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct research on the health-related, environmental and ecological effects of exposure to chemical, biological and radiological hazards and to develop more accurate risk assessment tools. This section would specifically recommend research on soil and ground water contamination and its impact on the biosystem and the health risk of exposure to jet fuel. The committee recommends an increase of \$1.8 million in the Defense Health Program to support the Air Force Environmental and Occupational Health Program to conduct this environmental risk assessment program.

Section 724—Authorization to Establish a Level 1 Trauma Training Center

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a Level 1 Trauma Training Center in accordance with the American College of Surgeons standards for trauma centers. The establishment of the trauma training center would allow for forward surgical teams to train together as full teams. The committee recommends an increase of \$4.8 million in the Defense Health Program to support the Army Medical Department in this initiative.

Section 725—Report on Implementation of Enrollment-based Capitation for Funding for Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide Congress with a report by March 1, 1999, on the potential impact of using an enrollment-based capitation methodology to allocate funds to military medical treatment facilities. Under this methodology, referred to as enrollment-based capitation, military treatment facilities would be allocated funding based primarily on the number of eligible beneficiaries who enroll in TRICARE Prime, the program's managed care option, at the military treatment facility (MTF).

The committee previously has expressed concerns over this funding mechanism because it attempts to apply a strict managed-care financing mechanism to facilities that do not operate solely as managed-care facilities. The committee's concerns have increased based on inputs it has received from senior MTF and service officials, TRICARE contractors and beneficiary associations. Specific concerns include the potential impact on the pharmacy benefit; the availability of space-available care for non-enrolled beneficiaries, particularly those eligible for Medicare; and the TRICARE uniform benefit.

As a result of these concerns, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in the committee report on H.R. 3230, (H. Rept. 104-563), to test this concept in one TRICARE region prior to implementing the concept across the military health system. However, to date, that test has not been conducted, and the committee is disappointed to learn that the Department plans to move forward with full implementation of this concept. Therefore, this section would require a report that provides:

- (1) The Department's plans to implement enrollment-based capitation;
- (2) The justification for implementing this concept without conducting a demonstration of the concept;
- (3) The potential impact on space-available care, particularly for Medicare-eligible retirees and beneficiaries residing outside the catchment area of an MTF;
- (4) The potential impact on the MTF pharmacy benefit, since this approach funds MTFs based on the number of Prime enrollees, but any beneficiary is allowed to fill a prescription at an MTF pharmacy;
- (5) An explanation of how additional funding will be provided to ensure the provision of care and pharmacy benefits to non-enrolled eligible beneficiaries; and
- (6) An explanation of how the concept will impact the TRICARE uniform benefit.

The committee commends the Department for trying to provide incentives to MTF commanders to improve the efficiency of their facilities. However, the committee is concerned that using a straight managed-care financing approach to fund military treatment facilities could have a detrimental effect on the availability of military medical care to beneficiaries who either cannot, or elect not to, enroll in TRICARE Prime.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Payments to Subtier Contractors

The committee has become aware of a continuing problem facing subtier contractors in receiving proper compensation from prime or second tier contractors on Department of Defense contracts following delivery of contracted goods and services. In particular, this situation appears to have significantly impacted a number of subtier contractors involved in environmental cleanup activities at military facilities affected by the base closure process. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to assess the extent of this problem and take whatever remedial actions may be necessary to ensure that subtier contractors are properly compensated for services provided under Department of Defense contracts. The committee notes that the Department currently has at its disposal a number of contractual options such as requiring the use of payment bonds, applying past performance criteria to this area, and others. The committee urges the Secretary to determine whether the use of any such options might prove beneficial in ensuring the proper compensation of subtier contractors.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 801—Limitation on Procurement of Ammunition and Components

This section would require that ammunition procured by the Department of Defense be acquired from domestic sources pursuant to section 2534 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 802—Acquisition Corps Eligibility

This section would enable civilian members of the Defense Acquisition Corps who are reduced in grade due to a base closing or downsizing to retain their membership in the Acquisition Corps for the purposes of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (title XII of Public Law 101-510).

Section 803—Amendments Relating to Procurement From Firms in Industrial Base for Production of Small Arms

This section would amend section 2473 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to procure all small arms end items, small arms repair parts, modifications to improve small arms, and repair parts consisting of small arms barrels, bolts and receivers from the small arms production industrial base.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 901—Further Reductions in Defense Acquisition Workforce

The committee recommends a provision (sec. 901) that would annually reduce the defense acquisition workforce, as defined in section 912(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), by a total of 70,000 over three years.

The committee commends the members of the Defense Science Board (DSB) for the report in response to the requirement contained in section 912(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). Specifically, the DSB identified a variety of areas where the Department can and should endeavor to re-organize and streamline its acquisition operations for the purposes of reducing overhead and improving interoperability and jointness among the military services.

While the Department has technically complied with the multiple reporting requirements contained in section 912, the Secretary's implementation plan postpones enacting virtually every major initiative proposed in the DSB study pending further examination and analysis. The committee notes the Congress previously required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a detailed review of the issue in section 906 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106). The committee believes the Department has had ample time to consider the issue and must expeditiously proceed to fundamentally restructure its acquisition organizations.

Further, the committee urges the Secretary not to exercise the waiver authority provided in section 912(a) as personnel streamlining is an essential element of acquisition re-organization. The committee remains convinced that the Department's failure to reduce acquisition overhead will continue to drain critical resources from high priority, combat mission areas.

Section 902—Limitation on Operation and Support Funds for the Office of the Secretary of Defense

The committee notes with particular concern the Department's failure to provide Congress with statutorily mandated reports on the topics of management headquarters and advisory committees. While the committee recognizes the significant progress made by the Department in issuing the Defense Reform Initiative (DRI) to reorganize and streamline the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the committee does not believe the DRI is a substitute for

the Congressionally mandated reports and implementation plans. Additionally, the committee firmly opposes the Department's request for repeal of the personnel reductions and reporting requirements contained in section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85).

The committee reiterates its strong belief that the Department must comply with existing statutory reports on management headquarters contained in section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201) and section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) in addition to the annual justification report for advisory committees contained in section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 902) that would restrict the obligation of 10 percent of funding authorized in fiscal year 1999 associated with the operation and support activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense until the Department complies with the aforementioned reports on management headquarters.

Section 903—Revision to Defense Directive Relating to Management Headquarters and Headquarters Support Activities

The committee understands the Department has begun to examine and improve its definition of management headquarters and headquarters support activities as contained in Department of Defense Directive 5100.73. The committee supports this effort in light of the significant loopholes within the current governing regulation that identifies personnel by organization rather than actual activity. Both the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the study initiated by the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) on the topic have stated the current definition of management headquarters contributes to widespread underreporting of management headquarters personnel.

Section 911 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) requires an overall reduction in personnel dedicated to management headquarters activities of 25 percent over five years. The basis for this action was a concern with the size and cost of the Department's management headquarters relative to an overall diminished force structure. Section 911 also required the Secretary of Defense to provide an implementation plan by January 15, 1998, that includes recommendations on revising, replacing, or augmenting Directive 5100.73. To date, that report has not been forthcoming. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 903) that would require the Department to implement a revised directive, to be applied uniformly throughout the Department, that accounts for management headquarters personnel by function rather than organization.

Section 904—Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to Have Responsibility with Respect to Export Control Activities of the Department of Defense

The committee supports the Department's commitment to reforming its organization and operation consistent with congres-

sional mandate and notes that under the Defense Reform Initiative a new Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) would be created, consolidating the work of a number of existing agencies under the DTRA umbrella. Functionally, the DTRA would be responsible for arms control on-site inspection, technology security, nuclear support, special weapons technology, cooperative threat reduction, chemical and biological weapons defense, counterproliferation, and force protection. The existing On-Site Inspection Agency, Defense Technology Security Administration, and Defense Special Weapons Agency would be disestablished and their activities, along with several program management functions within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, consolidated within DTRA. The Director of DTRA, who has not yet been appointed, would report directly to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology (USD(A&T)).

The committee is concerned that the proposed DTRA reporting chain through the USD(A&T) is incompatible with the role and responsibilities that several DTRA components exercise in policy decision-making. In particular, the committee notes that the mission of the Defense Technology Security Administration, which would be abolished and consolidated within DTRA, has a primarily policy orientation. The committee is further concerned that establishing the reporting chain for this function through the USD(A&T) may create an unhealthy institutional conflict of interest between the sometimes contradictory missions of preventing the acquisition of sophisticated technologies by other countries and promoting technology transfers as a means of reducing unit production costs to the U.S. Government or fostering cooperative development programs with other nations.

The committee's concern is heightened in this regard by the draft DTRA charter, which requires the Director of DTRA to "represent or support the USD(A&T) in departmental processes involving matters relating to the DTRA mission * * *." In the case of a particularly controversial export decision, this might lead to DOD acquisition priorities taking precedence over nonproliferation policy priorities. In addition, the committee believes that important counterproliferation activities that would be carried out by the DTRA also require a more explicit and tangible link to the Department's policy organization. While the committee recognizes that the draft DTRA charter remains a work in progress, the committee is concerned that it may lead to ambiguity and confusion as to who is precisely responsible for policy direction. For instance, the draft charter's direction that the DTRA Director shall fulfill certain technology security-related functions "pursuant to the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy)"—despite the charter's establishment of DTRA "under the authority, direction, and control" of the USD(A&T)—reflects an apparent confusion over who should be responsible for these issues.

The committee is particularly concerned about how the issue of supercomputer exports will be handled by the Department, given the requirements established by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85). This provision establishes a procedure by which the Department is notified in advance of proposed supercomputer exports and may ob-

ject within a 10-day period after notification to such exports taking place without a formal license review. However, the regulations for implementing this provision require that any objection must be raised at the Under Secretary level. Although the committee believes that it is more appropriate for those directly in charge of technology security to exercise this function, requiring action by an Under Secretary illustrates the importance of clarifying the relationship between the Director of DTRA and the Department's policy organization. In light of the concerns expressed above, the committee believes that the responsibility for exercising this requirement should rest within the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) organization.

For these reasons, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 904) that would amend section 134(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to include among the responsibilities of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy issues related to export control. This change would clarify the preeminent role of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in this area. In addition, this provision would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the committee explaining how the Department intends to implement this change organizationally and describing the procedures for Joint Staff involvement in policy decisions on export control issues.

The committee is pleased that the Department has sought congressional input in an effort to deal with these concerns, and believes that they can be addressed within the organizational framework of a new agency. The committee welcomes continued dialogue with the Department on these issues.

Section 905—Independent Task Force on Transformation and Department of Defense Organization

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to create a task force of the Defense Science Board for the purpose of determining the appropriate organization of the Department of Defense in light of the ongoing transformation in the conduct of war. The task force is to be established not later than November 1, 1998 and the Secretary is to transmit its findings along with recommendations and comments to the Congress by March 1, 1999.

Section 906—Improved Accounting for Defense Contract Services

The Congress has repeatedly expressed concern with the volume and cost of Advisory and Assistance Services (AAS) to the Department of Defense (DOD). Despite efforts to reduce annual AAS expenses, the Department has continued to rely heavily upon such support services. While the committee recognizes the value of AAS for short-term, specialized professional or technical advice and assistance, historical steady-state AAS funding levels of approximately \$3.0 billion suggest an institutional dependency by the Department upon the private sector for these services. By definition, AAS are project-based contractual services that are limited in scope and duration. Moreover, DOD Directive 4205.2 specifically prohibits AAS contracts unless readily available, in-house capability does not exist within the Department or another government agency. The committee notes the Department employs over two million

uniformed and civilian personnel and has immediate access to immense resources, to include a technically proficient and highly trained acquisition workforce in excess of 343,000 people.

While the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense budget estimate of AAS is nearly identical to the amount reported in fiscal year 1998, the committee is aware of extensive analysis conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) of the Department's contract action reporting system that indicates AAS was underreported by \$9.0 billion in fiscal year 1996. According to GAO, since 1985, over 30 reports have identified problems with DOD's management and reporting of AAS. In particular, a 1995 DOD Inspector General audit report estimated that AAS was underreported by \$4 billion to \$9 billion. Both GAO and the Inspector General attribute a portion of the underreporting to unclear terminology and lack of consistency in identifying, recording, and reporting advisory and assistance costs.

Of the \$132.4 billion in services expected to be contracted by the Department in fiscal year 1999, less than two percent are identified by the Department as Advisory and Assistance Services while over 50 percent are largely undefined and located in a miscellaneous budget category. According to Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data, this miscellaneous category has grown from \$46.7 billion in fiscal year 1996 to an estimated \$69.2 billion in fiscal year 1999. The committee finds this trend unacceptable and suggestive of a pattern of deficient fiscal management that obscures proper visibility of AAS costs and permits significant underreporting of AAS activity to continue.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 906) that would prohibit the Department from classifying more than 15 percent of its contractual services in a miscellaneous budget category. The provision would provide a transition period by allowing the Department, in the budget request for fiscal year 2000, to report up to 30 percent of its contractual services as miscellaneous services. In addition, the section would provide a statutory definition of AAS for the Department of Defense and require the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to annually review all DOD service contracts for applicability under this definition by February 1, 1999, and prior to the submission of the DOD budget request hereafter. The review would also include a requirement for the Comptroller to identify and report to Congress on the total costs and level of manpower effort involved in contract services. The provision would task the General Accounting Office (GAO) with reviewing the information contained in the Comptroller report and transmitting its findings to Congress. Subsequent to the Comptroller review, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to reduce Advisory and Assistance Services by \$500 million in fiscal year 1999.

Section 907—Repeal of Requirement Relating to Assignment of Tactical Airlift Mission to Reserve Components

This section would repeal section 1438 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1991 (Public Law 101-510) which requires the Department of Defense to shift the tactical airlift mission to the reserves, unless the Secretary of Defense waives this requirement on annual basis. The committee notes that this require-

ment has been routinely waived by the Secretary of Defense every year and therefore finds this provision to be obsolete and serving no particular purpose.

Section 908—Repeal of Certain Requirements Relating to Inspector General Investigations of Reprisal Complaints

This section would eliminate two burdensome administrative requirements in the process of investigating and resolving reprisal complaints. One provision would eliminate the requirement to report to the Secretary of Defense and the member if the complaint cannot be resolved in 90 days. The second provision would eliminate the requirement for a post investigation interview. Although the committee supports the elimination of both requirements, the committee expects the Department to maintain reasonable communication with the member during the course of each investigation.

Section 909—Consultation with Commandant of the Marine Corps Regarding Marine Corps Aviation

The committee is aware that, due to the unique relationship between the Secretary of the Navy and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant has sometimes not been fully consulted on matters related to Marine Corps aviation programs, which are funded in the Navy Aircraft procurement and research, development, test and evaluation accounts. The committee is concerned that this arrangement may be leading to situations where critical decisions affecting the core combat capability of the Marine Corps may be made without the benefit of the input or the perspective of the Commandant, as may have occurred with the decision on how to proceed with depot maintenance support for the V-22 engine. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 909) that would require the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the views of the Commandant of the Marine Corps are obtained before a major acquisition decision is made on Marine Corps aviation matters. The committee notes that this provision is not intended to provide a mechanism by which the Commandant may block the ability of the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with a particular acquisition decision. Rather, the provision is intended to ensure that the Commandant's expertise and important perspective is taken fully into account when acquisition decisions are made that affect Marine Corps aviation.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES

OVERVIEW

The committee remains deeply concerned that the President's request for Department of Defense counter-drug activities once again contains funding for programs beyond its traditional authority, even though the DOD Counter-Drug Program does not adequately support its primary role as the lead agency for detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime transit of illegal drugs into the United States. The committee continues to support the Department's core counter-drug mission, but is concerned by the continuing pattern of expansion into additional missions that jeopardize the critical task assigned to the Department of Defense.

This year, the committee's initiatives include a reprioritization of programs within the DOD counter-drug account to maintain the integrity of the Department's role in disrupting the flow of illegal drugs into the United States. In support of a promising operation in the eastern Pacific Ocean, the committee provides direction and redirects funds from lesser priority projects included in the budget request. In addition, the committee increases funding to enhance intelligence capabilities in support of law enforcement counter-drug efforts worldwide. Finally, the committee, in response to requests for assistance from the National Guard and law enforcement agencies, recommends additional funds for programs aimed at interdicting drugs and drug operations in the United States. These budgetary and legislative initiatives are discussed in greater detail below.

The budget request for Department of Defense fiscal year 1999 drug interdiction and counter-drug activities contained \$727.6 million, plus \$155.3 million for operational tempo which is included within the operating budgets of the military services. This represents a net increase of \$14.7 million from the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level of \$712.9 million, and an increase of \$20.4 million for operational tempo from the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level of \$134.9 million.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 1999 defense counter-drug activities as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]	
FY99 Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Request	727,582
Demand Reduction and Use	12,830
Domestic Law Enforcement Agencies Support	86,669
Demand Reduction for Department of Defense and National Guard Personnel-	72,936
Transit Zone and Southwest Border	301,334
Source Zone and Domestic Marijuana Eradication	253,813

Recommended Decreases:	
Joint Military Intelligence Program	3,500
Southern Air Forces Counter-Drug Support (Project #4419)	19,000
JIATF-South (Project #4450)	15,400
National Guard Cargo/Mail Inspection Support (Project #7401)	29,000
Recommended Increases:	
Joint Military Intelligence Program	3,500
National Guard General Support (Project #7403)	29,000
Gulf States Counter-Drug Initiative (Project #7406)	4,000
Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force (Project #7408)	1,000
Operation Caper Focus	24,400
Southwest Border Fence Project	5,000
Recommendation	727,582

Items of Special Interest

Gulf states counter-drug initiative command, control, communications and computer network

The budget request contained \$1.1 million for the Gulf States Counter-Drug Initiative (GSCI) automated Command, Control, Communications and Computer (C⁴) network.

The committee fully supports the GSCI C⁴ network, which assists law enforcement counter-drug efforts in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Mississippi. The committee notes that although the information system was initiated and is currently funded as a counter-drug program, the state law enforcement agencies have adopted the GSCI network as a Regional Investigative and Intelligence Support System that can also support weapons proliferation, transnational organized crime and counterterrorism efforts. In addition, the committee understands that the role of the Department of Defense (DOD) in the design, development, acquisition and implementation of the information system is nearing conclusion. The GSCI network is fully operational and DOD continues to provide system maintenance and training.

The committee recommends \$4.1 million, an increase of \$3.0 million, for the sustainment of the GSCI network. Given the expanded mission of the GSCI in the final phase of DOD involvement, the committee encourages the designation of non-counter-drug DOD, Department of Justice, state or local funds for additional operation and maintenance and procurement costs identified by law enforcement agencies to sustain the GSCI information system in the out-years.

Gulf states counter-drug initiative regional counter-drug training academy

The budget request contained \$2.2 million for the Gulf States Counter-Drug Initiative Regional Counter-Drug Training Academy (RCTA).

The committee continues to support the efforts of the RCTA in Meridian, Mississippi. This unique, multi-state training facility provides counter-drug courses to civilian law enforcement officers of state, county, and municipal agencies throughout the United States and to National Guard personnel providing support to local law enforcement agencies. The committee understands that the additional funds are necessary to accommodate the increasing number of students from Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Mississippi on the RCTA waiting list.

The committee recommends \$3.2 million, an increase of \$1.0 million, for personnel and administrative costs, operations and maintenance, student expenses (to include quarters and subsistence), and equipment expenses for the RCTA.

Joint interagency task force south

The budget request contained \$23.1 million for Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-S), an increase of almost \$17.0 million from the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level of \$6.1 million.

While the committee is well aware of the role of JIATF-S in the coordination of DOD resources in support of interdiction agencies, it believes there should be a more moderate budget increase in light of the stalled negotiations regarding a post-1999 U.S. presence in Panama. The committee understands that JIATF-S has been operating out of Howard Air Force Base since June 11, 1997 as an interim organization while relocation plans are under consideration. Consequently, the committee wishes to maintain a sufficient funding level to meet mission requirements until a permanent organization is established.

For these reasons, the committee recommends \$7.7 million, a decrease of \$15.4 million for JIATF-S.

Joint military intelligence program

The budget request contained \$4.2 million for a program funded within the Defense Intelligence Counterdrug Program.

The committee recommends \$0.7 million for this program, a decrease of \$3.5 million and a corresponding increase of \$3.5 million for other programs funded within the Defense Intelligence Counterdrug Program. Further discussion of these programs can be found in the classified annex accompanying this report.

Multi-jurisdictional task force

The budget request contained \$2.0 million for the Multi-Jurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force.

The committee understands that additional funds are needed to improve the Multi-Jurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force's training program by increasing the number of conventional courses, distance learning projects and state narcotics conventions for law enforcement officers.

The committee recommends \$3.0 million, an increase of \$1.0 million for the Multi-Jurisdictional Counterdrug Task Force.

National guard state plans

The budget request contained \$29.0 million for National Guard Cargo/Mail Inspection Support and \$118.6 million for National Guard General Support.

The committee notes that beginning in fiscal year 1998, funds for cargo/mail inspection support were transferred from the general support account due to its high priority at the national level. While the committee continues to endorse this program as a means to deny illegal drugs from entering the United States, the committee directs that funding for this project be transferred back to the general support account. The committee encourages the state and territorial governors to include adequate funding for the cargo/mail in-

spection program within the state plans submitted under section 112 of title 32, United States Code.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$147.6 million for National Guard General Support, an increase of \$29.0 million and a corresponding decrease of \$29.0 million for National Guard Cargo/Mail Inspection Support.

Southern air forces counter-drug support

The budget request contained \$24.4 million for Southern Air Forces (SOUTHAF) Counter-Drug Support, including \$19.0 million for the operation and maintenance of ground mobile radars (GMRs) within the US Southern Command area of operations.

The committee recommends \$5.4 million for SOUTHAF Counter-Drug Support, a decrease of \$19.0 million. Further discussion of this program can be found in the classified annex accompanying this report.

Southwest border fence project

The committee continues to support the Southwest border road, fence and lighting project in East San Diego County, California.

The committee has consistently added funds for a reinforced fence along the fourteen miles of international border east of the Pacific Ocean, and the construction of second and third fences, with roads between the fences, to improve border security in this high intensity drug trafficking area (HIDTA). The committee notes that in just three years, the seizure of illegal drugs and the number of murders that occurred along this section of the border have decreased significantly as a result of this initiative, according to "The National Drug Control Strategy, 1998." To ensure the efficient execution of this project, the committee encourages the California National Guard and the Joint Task Force Six (JTF-6) to allocate sufficient resources for this national priority from within their respective counter-drug budgets. Further, the committee directs that funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 1998 be obligated for this project as intended by the Congress.

In addition, the committee recommends \$5.0 million to facilitate completion of the Southwest border fence project from within the domestic law enforcement agencies support component of the Department of Defense Counter-Drug Plan.

Support for counter-drug activities of Peru and Colombia

Section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) authorized the Secretary of Defense to provide support for the counter-drug activities of the Governments of Peru and Colombia. The committee wishes to clarify that the intent of Congress was to provide nonlethal assistance, including unarmed riverine patrol boats, to establish a riverine interdiction program in Peru and Colombia.

OTHER MATTERS

Counterterrorism and Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction

The budget request contained a number of legislative provisions to expand the ability of the Department of Defense to respond to domestic terrorist activity and to the potential use by terrorists of weapons of mass destruction on U.S. territory. Other DOD proposals provide for the procurement, operation, and maintenance of equipment, and the authority to transfer funds among DOD accounts for counterterrorism or force protection purposes. In addition, the Department's fiscal year 1999 legislative proposal for defense reform seeks expanded authority to use the National Guard and reserves to respond to domestic emergencies involving the use of weapons of mass destruction.

After careful review of these proposals, the committee is concerned that the Department's efforts and initiatives are not closely coordinated with other agencies within the government—federal, state, and local—who share responsibility for responding to domestic incidents involving weapons of mass destruction. The need for such coordination was the hallmark theme of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996, enacted into law as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201).

The committee believes strongly in the need for greater overall preparedness to deal with potential terrorist activity within the United States and that a significant amount of counterterrorism expertise and materiel resides with the DOD. However, the committee is troubled that the Department has not provided a comprehensive blueprint detailing the extent to which the expanded authority it seeks is necessary. Nor has the Department addressed critical questions involving the appropriate use of the armed forces for purposes of countering the effects of domestic terrorism. Instead, the Department's proposals appear to reflect a presumption that DOD alone can and should shoulder the response burden, as well as a piecemeal approach for incrementally expanding its authority to counter terrorist activity without an apparent consideration of the broader implications involved. The committee believes that the effort to counter terrorist acts against the United States, especially those involving the use of weapons of mass destruction, goes well beyond the purview of the Department of Defense.

The committee is also troubled by the apparent lack of an effective coordinated effort on the part of other federal departments and agencies that address the overall federal response and support to state and local governments. The committee's concerns in this regard are heightened by the fact that FEMA recently withdrew as chair and administrator of the Senior Interagency Coordination Group, the interagency forum for domestic terrorism-related consequence management issues, and by the results of a draft study commissioned by the U.S. Attorney General, which reportedly concludes that significant deficiencies exist in the inter-agency coordination process. Although a September 1997 GAO report considered the efforts of federal agencies to implement national policy on counterterrorism, it did not evaluate the effectiveness of the federal

government's programs or coordination activities. Accordingly, the committee directs that the GAO should conduct a follow-up assessment of this issue. In addition, the committee expects that a new Presidential Decision Directive reportedly being drafted will clarify the appropriate roles of government agencies in dealing with terrorism.

In this regard, the committee is concerned by reports that the National Security Council may be given a central operational role to oversee the federal government's counterterrorism efforts, including the activities of the DOD. The committee believes this proposal raises questions regarding the statutory role of the National Security Council to advise and make recommendations to the President with regard to national security policy, in contrast to the operational role of executive departments and agencies to carry out that policy. Accordingly, the committee holds serious concerns about where operational control of the Department's counterterrorism efforts will reside. These concerns extend to uncertainty over funding and program prioritization issues. While the committee believes in and strongly endorses the need for a coordinated effort at the national level, the committee does not believe as a matter of policy that it is appropriate to assign operational responsibilities to the National Security Council.

With respect to the DOD, the committee considers that approval by Congress of the Department's suggested changes to law, without a comprehensive understanding of the overall implications for the military's role in countering terrorism, would be premature. Therefore, the committee recommends that action on the changes proposed by the Department be deferred until the committee has received and analyzed the Department's overall plan for addressing these issues. Consequently, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by no later than December 31, 1998 that:

- (1) Outlines the Department's overall strategy for countering terrorism, including the use of weapons of mass destruction on U.S. soil, and explains the existing legal authorities that allow DOD to assist other federal agencies in the event of a terrorist incident;

- (2) Describes how the Department's proposals for changes to existing statutes and statutory prohibitions correspond to its broader counterterrorism strategy;

- (3) Provides a detailed justification for such changes, including an explanation of what specific activities would be prevented if the Department's recommended changes were not enacted, what consequences would ensue, and whether the proposed changes are in response to specific problems that have arisen or represent simply an attempt to prepare for all contingencies;

- (4) Describes how counterterrorism functions will be organizationally integrated into the Department's proposed Defense Threat Reduction Agency;

- (5) Describes the role of the National Guard and reserves in domestic counterterrorism and how these roles are to be integrated with the efforts of state and local authorities responsible for responding to domestic emergencies;

(6) Describes the relationship between federal, state, and local authorities regarding domestic counterterrorism, including the Department's cooperative efforts with other federal agencies to prevent and respond to domestic emergencies involving the use of weapons of mass destruction, and addresses what modifications to the Stafford Act are necessary for the Department to implement these efforts;

(7) Explains the rationale for the current legal prohibition on using the armed forces for civilian law enforcement-type purposes, provides the Department's assessment of whether that demarcation line needs to be revised in light of the nature of terrorist threats, and provides an assessment of whether enacting the changes proposed by the Department will blur this traditional distinction; and

(8) Assesses whether an agreement to expand the Department's authority and role in counterterrorism would set a precedent for greater DOD involvement in countering other types of transnational domestic threats that have traditionally been handled by domestic state and local law enforcement agencies.

The committee notes its intent to work with the other committees of the House of Representatives to formulate a comprehensive and effective approach to the issue of counterterrorism.

Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)

The committee is concerned that U.S. political and military leaders have underestimated the potential impact of electromagnetic pulse on U.S. military systems and critical portions of the nation's infrastructure. The committee is aware of foreign research into the effects of EMP resulting from a high-altitude nuclear explosion and that not all of these effects are well understood or widely recognized. The committee directs that the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Director of Central Intelligence, submit a report by March 1, 1999 to the congressional defense committees on the potential effects of high- and low-frequency EMP, including magneto-hydrodynamic EMP. The report should include an assessment of the effects on U.S. military systems, commercial systems on which the military now relies (such as communications systems), overall military effectiveness, and key aspects of the U.S. civilian infrastructure necessary to sustain life and commerce (such as the power grid, water pumping stations, and data storage and processing systems); steps that might be taken to reduce vulnerability to EMP; the costs associated with those steps; and a judgment concerning preferred courses of action.

Intelligence Community Access to Export Control Information

The committee is troubled by the pattern of delay and obfuscation by the Department of Commerce in providing critical export control information upon request by intelligence agencies engaged in assessing the national security impact of the transfer of U.S. technology abroad. In particular, the committee notes that the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the Department of Energy (DOE) were requested in December 1997 to prepare for the commit-

tee assessments of the impact on national security of high-performance computer exports to certain countries. These assessments were to be submitted to the committee by March 3, 1998 and have not yet been received. Export information necessary to conduct these assessments is in the possession of the Department of Commerce and was not promptly transmitted to DIA and DOE, despite the formal requests by these agencies and the committee's direct request to the Secretary of Commerce to do so.

The committee is particularly perplexed by the failure of the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence to support the committee's request that this information be provided to DIA and DOE. During testimony before the committee on February 25, 1998, the Deputy Director was asked if the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) supported the DIA and DOE's request for access to this information. This question was not answered and a written response was promised. Repeated subsequent inquiries to the CIA have yet to produce the promised response. The committee fails to understand why the CIA would not unequivocally support access by other intelligence agencies to information necessary to conduct assessments of the national security implications of potentially dangerous technology transfers, especially in response to congressional requests. The committee considers this a serious issue and believes it raises important policy and procedural concerns over how the national security agencies are afforded an opportunity to influence the executive branch's formulation of technology transfer and export control policy.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of Central Intelligence to provide the congressional defense and intelligence committees with a report by no later than September 30, 1998 on the steps being taking to ensure that the intelligence community has full and timely access to export license information in order to assess the national security and proliferation consequences of U.S. technology transfers.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—Transfer Authority

This section would permit the transfer of amounts of authorizations made available in Division A of the bill for any fiscal year to any other authorization made available in Division A upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such a transfer would be in the national interest. The provision would provide the authorization for reprogramming involving the transfer of authorization between amounts authorized as set out in bill language.

The authority to transfer could only be used to provide authorization for higher priority items than the items from which authorization was transferred and could not be used to provide authorization for an item that was denied authorization by the Congress. The Secretary of Defense would be required to notify Congress promptly of transfers. The total amount of transfers would be limited to \$2.0 billion. Historically, the transfer authority authorized has changed as follows:

<i>Fiscal year</i>	<i>Billions</i>
1985–1988	\$2.00
1989–1991	3.00
1992	2.25
1993	1.50
1994–1998	2.00

Section 1002—Incorporation of Classified Annex

This section would incorporate the classified annex prepared by the Committee on National Security into the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

Section 1003—Outlay Limitations

This section would restrict the amount of discretionary outlays in the national defense function to the totals provided in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 for fiscal year 1999.

SUBTITLE B—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1011—Revision to Requirement for Continued Listing of Two Iowa-Class Battleships on the Naval Register

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to maintain the U.S.S. Iowa (BB-61) and the U.S.S. Wisconsin (BB-64) on the naval register in compliance with section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106).

Section 1012—Transfer of the U.S.S. New Jersey

This section would direct the Secretary of the Navy to strike the U.S.S. New Jersey (BB-62) from the naval vessel register and transfer that vessel to a non-for-profit entity, in accordance with section 7306 of title 10, United States Code. The section would further direct the Secretary to require that the transferee locate the vessel in the State of New Jersey as a condition of transfer.

Section 1013—Long-Term Charter of Three Vessels in Support of Submarine Rescue, Escort, and Towing

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into contracts in accordance with section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, for the charter of three vessels, the CAROLYN CHOUEST, KELLIE CHOUEST, and DELORES CHOUEST through fiscal year 2003 in support of Navy's submarine rescue, escort and towing missions.

Section 1014—Transfer of Obsolete Army Tugboat

This section would allow the Secretary of the Army to substitute and transfer one obsolete tugboat in place of a previously designated obsolete tugboat to the Brownsville Navigation District, Brownsville, Texas.

Section 1015—Long-Term Charter Contracts for Acquisition of Auxiliary Vessels for the Department of Defense

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to contract for the long-term lease or charter of newly constructed surface

vessels, including their crews. Such leases or charters would apply to the Navy's combat logistics force and strategic sealift programs, as well as other auxiliary support vessels of the Department of Defense.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1021—Department of Defense Support for Counter-Drug Activities

This section would amend section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510), as amended, to extend the current authority governing Department of Defense (DOD) support for other agencies for counter-drug activities.

The DOD counter-drug objectives include assistance to international and domestic law enforcement agencies to disrupt the illegal drug traffic into the United States and support for domestic law enforcement to interdict drugs and drug operations in the United States. To achieve these objectives, the Secretary of Defense is authorized under current law to provide the following types of support to facilitate counter-drug activities within or outside the United States:

- (1) The maintenance, repair and upgrading of equipment made available to any federal department or agency or to any state or local government by DOD;
- (2) The transportation of U.S. and foreign personnel and the transportation of equipment;
- (3) The establishment and operation of training facilities and bases of operation;
- (4) The training of law enforcement personnel of the federal, state, local or foreign governments;
- (5) The detection, monitoring and communication of the movement of air, sea and surface traffic;
- (6) The construction of roads, fences and installation of lighting across international boundaries;
- (7) The establishment of command, control, communications and computer networks for integration of law enforcement, active military, and National Guard activities;
- (8) The provision of linguist and intelligence analysis services;
- (9) Aerial and ground reconnaissance.

This section would reauthorize DOD assistance for the counter-drug activities of any other department or agency of the federal government or of any state, local or foreign law enforcement agency through fiscal year 2000. In addition, this section would clarify that the expanded establishment of training facilities and bases of operation shall comply with section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, regarding unspecified minor construction.

Section 1022—Support for Counter-Drug Operation Caper Focus

The committee understands that although the Department of Defense continues to serve as the single lead federal agency for the detection and monitoring of suspected drug-trafficking activities

within the transit zone, the Department's budget in this region has declined dramatically since 1993. This decline is a result of presidential guidance in 1993 that directed a gradual shift in emphasis from the transit zone to the source zone counter-drug activities. While the Administration's strategic focus moved to South America, illegal drugs continued to flow through the eastern Pacific Ocean and Caribbean Sea to U.S. markets. In fact, according to the Department of State's 1997 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, about 760 metric tons were produced in South America in 1996 and about 608 metric tons of cocaine moved through the transit zone into the United States. Of this amount, approximately 234 metric tons flowed through the Eastern Pacific.

The committee is disturbed by the recent testimony of General Charles E. Wilhelm, Commander-in-Chief, United States Southern Command (CINCSOUTH), regarding the Department's inability "to mount effective detection, monitoring and tracking operations in the Eastern Pacific, a pipeline which feeds Mexico and ultimately the U.S." As a result of competing demands for maritime patrol aircraft, the Secretary of Defense postponed the final phase of Operation Caper Focus, a promising operation targeting multiton cargo vessels in the eastern Pacific. During the initial phases of Operation Caper Focus, Joint Interagency Task Force East (JIATF-E) assets interdicted 27 metric tons of cocaine and gained valuable intelligence on regional trafficking methods. Despite these preliminary results, the Secretary of Defense has not made available the additional air or maritime assets necessary to execute the operation, nor has the Director of JIATF-E transferred assets from the Caribbean because the "movement of assets may have undesirable political consequences," according to an October 1997 study by the General Accounting Office entitled "Update on U.S. Interdiction Efforts in the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific" (GAO/NSIAD-98-30).

The committee is convinced of the need to take advantage of this opportunity to seize large amounts of cocaine through the execution of Operation Caper Focus. The committee further understands that JIATF-E has requested a total of four surface ships and 650 aircraft surveillance flight hours per month to support an 18-month Eastern Pacific operation. Therefore, the committee includes a provision (sec. 1022) that would direct that the Secretary of Defense reevaluate the Department's priorities and make available the requisite number of maritime patrol aircraft and surface assets and crews currently available within the existing DOD infrastructure for the purposes of executing Operation Caper Focus.

In addition, the provision would authorize \$24.4 million to support this operation. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to seek the views of the CINCSOUTH in identifying the capabilities needed to determine how these funds should be applied. Finally, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense provide the Congressional defense committees a report outlining the recommendations of CINCSOUTH and an implementation plan detailing DOD's expanded operational support to Operation Caper Focus no later than September 30, 1998.

SUBTITLE D—MISCELLANEOUS REPORT REQUIREMENTS AND
REPEALS

Section 1031—Annual Report on Resources Allocated to Support and
Mission Activities

The committee is increasingly concerned over the growing gap between the level of resources within the Department of Defense (DOD) dedicated to support versus mission activities. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has estimated that the Department of Defense will spend nearly 60 percent of its budget on mission support programs from fiscal year 1997 through 2001. Furthermore, GAO calculates that 45 percent of all active duty military personnel are currently assigned to support programs. A 1996 Defense Science Board report concurs with GAO's findings and adds that only 20 percent of all active duty military personnel serve in combat related positions.

During a period of steadily declining defense budgets and growing readiness, quality of life, and modernization shortfalls, the committee is alarmed by these trends and believes increased understanding and clarification of the issue is imperative. Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1031) that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide in his annual report to the Congress a detailed description of the personnel and budgetary resources dedicated to support activities as compared to mission related activities.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1041—Clarification of Land Conveyance Authority, Armed
Forces Retirement Home, District of Columbia

This section would clarify subsection (a) of section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public law 104-201), to state clearly that the original purpose of this disposal provision was to authorize only the sale of a specific parcel of land at the Armed Forces Retirement Home, Washington, DC. The committee understands that the Armed Forces Retirement Homes Board of Directors may be considering a development strategy for the property. The intention of the original provision was for the outright sale, at fair market value, of this property with the receipts of the sale to be deposited in the Armed Forces Retirement Homes Trust Fund. The committee believes that if the Armed Forces Retirement Homes Board of Directors wishes to propose a development plan for any portion of either the Soldiers' and Airmen's Retirement Home or the Naval Retirement Home, the board should provide a proposal to Congress for review.

Section 1042—Content of Notice Required to be Provided
Garnishees Before Garnishment of Pay or Benefits

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to notify service members and DOD civilian employees, in cases where the secretary has been directed by court order to withhold pay from a service member or DOD civilian employee in order to enforce child support or alimony payments, that their pay will be withheld by in-

cluding a description of the legal document that authorizes the garnishment of wages. Currently, the secretary is required to forward a copy of the legal document to the service member or civilian employee. The secretary would continue to be required to provide written notice of the intent to withhold pay to the affected individual, and to inform the individual of the means to obtain a copy of the notice, but the secretary would be relieved of the obligation of sending a copy of the actual legal notice directing the garnishment. This requirement has served little purpose since the individual had already been through a full judicial process to have the obligation decreed.

Section 1043—Training of Special Operations Forces with Friendly Foreign Forces

This section would amend section 2011 of title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the Commander of the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to pay for the costs to conduct training activities with the forces of other nations. The amendments would improve the level of reporting associated with the use of this authority and require that any training program that occurs under this authority receive the prior approval of the Secretary of Defense.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Authority for Release to Coast Guard of Drug Test Results of Civil Service Mariners of the Military Sealift Command

This section would permit the Secretary of the Navy to release to the Coast Guard the results of a drug test of a former employee of the Department of the Navy who was employed as a civil service mariner. This authority would allow the Coast Guard full disclosure of positive drug results as part of Coast Guard mariner licensing procedures.

Section 1102—Limitations on Back Pay Awards

This section would clarify that any award of back pay to Civil Service employees, resulting from a finding of an unjustified personnel action adjudged under section 5596 of title 5, United States Code, shall not exceed six years, unless a shorter limitation period applies. Arbitrators and administrators have, in some cases, applied the six year limit found in section 2402 of title 28, United States Code, and in section 3702 of title 31, United States Code. In other cases, some arbitrators and administrators have applied no time limit, since none is specified within section 5596 of title 5, United States Code. This provision would remove the ambiguity of these various sections by establishing a standard six year limit in title 5, United States Code, and would ensure that the amount of redress available to employees would be the same regardless of the statutory avenue chosen to seek that redress.

Section 1103—Restoration of Annual Leave Accumulated by Civilian Employees at Installations in the Republic of Panama to be Closed Pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977

This section would provide federal employees, working to close installations in the Republic of Panama in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaty Implementation Plan, the same automatic restoration of excess annual leave that is provided to employees at bases closed under current Base Realignment and Closure procedures. The committee has learned that as the 1999 deadline for the turnover of the Canal Zone nears, there are fewer employees available to perform the required work of preparing bases for reversion to the Republic of Panama, thereby reducing the opportunity for those employees to take annual leave.

**Section 1104—Repeal of Program Providing Preference for
Employment of Military Spouses in Military Child Care Facilities**

This section would repeal section 1792d of title 10, United States Code, which provides military spouses with an additional hiring preference in the civil service. This job preference has proven unnecessary given the more general military spouse preferences provided by section 1784 of title 10, United States Code. Additionally, the provision had the unintended effect of incentivizing applicants to use the child care preference as a stepping stone to other civil service positions, after undergoing extensive child care training but working minimal time in child care.

**Section 1105—Elimination of Retained Pay as a Basis for
Determining Locality Based Adjustments**

This section would eliminate windfall pay adjustments that have been made to some federal employees. In cases where special pay rates are no longer required to retain employees, sections 5302(8)(B) and 5363(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, requires that pay adjustments continue to be made against those unnecessary higher rates, resulting in pay that is more generous than is needed to compensate and retain those employees. This provision would require that future pay adjustments be measured against the pay rate necessary to retain the employees, and eliminate the windfall.

**Section 1106—Observance of Certain Holidays at Duty Posts
Outside the United States**

This section would allow Civil Service employees, working in foreign areas where the regular work week is other than Monday through Friday, to observe federal holidays in conjunction with a weekend. Since the enactment of section 6103 of title 5, United States Code, which established five public holidays that are to be observed on a Monday, federal employees working in foreign countries where the work week begins on Saturday or Sunday, have lost the opportunity to observe these holidays as part of a three day weekend.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Control Implementation

The fiscal year 1999 budget request contained \$275.2 million, representing a slight decrease from the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level of \$288.8 million. The committee recommends \$237.2 million, a decrease of \$38.0 million.

The committee finds that the requested level of funding is based in large measure on optimistic planning assumptions regarding a number of treaties that have not yet entered into force, including START II, the Open Skies Treaty, and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). For example, according to the budget justification documents on which the START II budget request was based, “the current EIF assumption is first/second quarter 1998; however, we anticipate revised planning assumptions will be issued in the near future which will slip the EIF date until the third quarter 1998.” Because of START II’s delayed entry into force, the additional time allowed for the elimination of strategic offensive arms as a result of the March 1997 Helsinki summit agreement, and the likely relaxation in the schedule of inspection activity, the committee recommends a reduction of \$1.5 million for START II implementation activities.

The Department’s planning assumption regarding entry into force of the Open Skies Treaty also appears optimistic. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$1.0 million for Open Skies Treaty implementation activities.

In addition, the Department is still planning for entry into force of the CTBT sometime in fiscal year 1999. This assumption appears unrealistic. Forty four specific states—including the United States—are required to ratify the treaty before it can enter into force. Only six of these states have ratified it so far. Three required ratifiers—India, Pakistan, and North Korea—have so far refused even to sign the treaty and are unlikely to do so anytime soon. For this reason, the committee recommends a reduction of \$1.0 million in the operations and maintenance request to support CTBT activities.

The budget request also contained \$35.2 million for research, development, testing and evaluation activities to be conducted in support of CTBT requirements. However, a portion of this activity does not appear to be strictly “research and development” (R&D) type activity and may duplicate the activities of the U.S. Geological Survey. For these reasons, the committee recommends a reduction of \$25.0 million for CTBT R&D activities and directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the committee no later than Septem-

ber 30, 1998 that provides a detailed explanation of CTBT-related projects using R&D funds.

With respect to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), the committee disapproves of the Department's plan to reimburse the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons for costs associated with CWC inspections of DOD facilities. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$9.0 million for CWC activities.

Finally, as many of the responsibilities for arms control treaty implementation transfer from existing agencies to the new Defense Threat Reduction Agency, the committee expects additional savings beyond the projected five percent consolidation savings and recommends an additional \$0.5 million reduction in the general and administrative support function for the new agency.

Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States

Subtitle B of Title XIII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104-201), as amended by section 1306 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), established a Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States and notes that the commission's work is proceeding in accordance with its legislative mandate. The committee anticipates receiving the commission's report, as called for in section 1323 of Public Law 104-201, this summer.

The committee regrets the delay in constituting the commission according to the original legislation, necessitating an amendment last year to the original fiscal year 1997 enabling legislation. The delay has also made it difficult for the results of the commission's work to be considered in this year's legislative cycle. The committee believes in the value of competitive intelligence assessments and anticipates that the commission's work will play a valuable role in the debate next year over ballistic missile defense policy. The recent release of a classified intelligence assessment, "Annual Report to Congress on Foreign Missile Developments," prepared by the National Intelligence Council in response to a request from members of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, is also likely to contribute to this debate. Consequently, the committee encourages the Director of Central Intelligence to extend the security clearances of commission members and key staff until the end of 1999 so that they may continue to have access to up to date information in the event the Congress wishes to call on them to provide updated assessments of the conclusions reached in their report.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1201—Limitation on Funds for Peacekeeping in the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina

This section would limit the Secretary of Defense from expending funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1999 in excess of \$1,858.6 million for the purpose of providing for United States participation in Bosnia peacekeeping operations. The

section also contains a provision for an emergency exception of not more than \$100.0 million for the purpose of safeguarding United States forces in the event of hostilities, and requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress by April 1, 1999 projecting any additional funds required for Bosnia operations in fiscal year 1999.

Section 1202—Reports on the Mission of United States Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina

This section would require the President to prepare a report on progress in tasks related to implementation of civilian tasks associated with the Dayton Accords. The committee believes that President Clinton's decision to extend the participation of U.S. military forces in the NATO mission in Bosnia has changed the character of their mission. In particular, the duration of the NATO mission will be measured by the achievement of an "end-state"—reconstructing Bosnian society and political life along the guidelines established in Dayton—rather than as previously by an "end-date."

The duration of the associated deployment of U.S. ground combat forces in Bosnia will be determined by the pace of progress in implementing these civilian tasks, which are well defined and understood. The report required by this section is based upon those measures identified by the Administration as appropriate for judging progress.

In addition, the committee believes this change of mission will have a variety of effects upon U.S. military forces in Bosnia, in Europe, and around the world. Thus, this section also would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report on the effects of U.S. military operations in Bosnia and the Balkans on the ability of U.S. military forces to execute the missions called for in the National Military Strategy and, in particular, the ability to conduct successfully two nearly simultaneous major theater wars.

The committee recognizes that security and stability in Europe constitute a vital national security interest of the United States. Yet the ability to successfully conduct two major theater wars in Southwest Asia and on the Korean peninsula remains the heart of U.S. national military strategy. The new Bosnia mission will have a substantial impact on U.S. forces in Europe and the entire U.S. Army, as the recent decision to deploy the 1st Cavalry Division to Bosnia makes clear. The combined effects of an open-ended mission and the repeat deployments, often of understrength units, will limit the number of Army units available to participate in a major theater war.

The committee believes that this report is essential to measuring the true risk—measured not in dollars but in terms of reduced ability to respond to other crises including major theater wars—of repeated contingency operations in Bosnia and the Balkans. Without such an accounting, the complete costs of the Bosnia mission to U.S. national security strategy and interests will be elusive.

Section 1203—Report on Military Capabilities of an Expanded NATO Alliance

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report on the planned future military capabilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The committee has found that past U.S. and NATO reports on the costs of alliance expansion to include Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic have been confusing and contradictory. More significantly, the focus of these reports on cost, though important, is misdirected in that these reports have not adequately addressed the more fundamental issue of future alliance military capability and requirements.

The expansion of NATO raises a host of basic questions of concern to the committee, such as: What are alliance plans for defending the territory of the new, candidate member states, particularly Hungary, which is not contiguous to the current alliance? What abilities do the national militaries of Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary possess for their own territorial defense? What abilities do current alliance members have to project forces forward to defend new members? Can they sustain these forces? What additional burdens will the United States be required to shoulder? What are the plans of current and candidate members for addressing these shortfalls? Detailed committee inquiries on these and related questions, including a letter sent by the chairman and former ranking member to the President, have failed to provide satisfactory answers.

The committee supports the concept of NATO expansion, believing that it will help preserve the current general peace in Europe and advance U.S. national security interests in the region and around the world. However, the committee is equally concerned that the decision to expand the alliance has been made without adequate discussion and debate about the additional military responsibilities imposed by expansion or an understanding of how alliance members will address these new responsibilities separately and collectively.

Section 1204—One-Year Extension of Counterproliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Special Commission on Iraq

This section would extend the authority through fiscal year 1999 for the Department of Defense to provide support to the UN Special Commission on Iraq (UNSCOM) under the Weapons of Mass Destruction Control Act of 1992.

The committee supports the extension of this authority given Iraq's continued efforts to preserve a weapons of mass destruction capability and its interference with the work of the Special Commission. The committee notes that the work of UNSCOM has been made more difficult as a result of the disruption in the weapons inspection process resulting from Iraq's expulsion of U.S. inspectors last year and the temporary suspension of the UN weapons monitoring program. This action by Iraq was a flagrant violation of its obligations under UN Security Council resolutions. While the agreement reached in February 1998 between Iraq and the UN Secretary General to allow inspections to resume under a modified inspection regime forestalled military action, the committee is con-

cerned that the conditions attached to the agreement regarding the inspection of so-called presidential sites represent a retreat from previous UN Security Council resolutions calling for “immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation” and may undermine the ultimate viability of the UNSCOM inspection regime.

Although supportive of an extension of this authority in light of recent events, the committee reiterates its view that the costs of providing specialized support to UNSCOM should not be permanently borne by the Department of Defense. The committee notes that much of the cost of UNSCOM activities is funded from a portion of the revenues generated by Iraqi oil sales. Under UN Security Council Resolution 1153, adopted on February 20, 1998, the quantity of oil that Iraq is allowed to sell was more than doubled. Because existing oil revenues are sufficient to fund UNSCOM’s annual operating budget, no additional revenues from increased oil sales are expected to flow to UNSCOM. However, the committee reiterates its belief that the Department should seek reimbursement for expenses incurred in providing support to UNSCOM, and encourages the Department to seek an agreement with the United Nations that would reimburse the Department for the specialized services it provides to UNSCOM through a portion of the increased revenues generated by additional Iraqi oil sales. The committee notes that the Department of Defense and the Department of State have discussed the possibility of seeking an agreement with the United Nations that would allow U.S. government support to be provided on a reimbursable basis, along the lines provided for by section 607 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The committee supports this effort and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide it with a report no later than September 30, 1998 detailing the efforts being pursued by the Department to seek reimbursement, the specific support activities for which reimbursement would be sought, and the results of any discussions with United Nations officials on this issue.

Section 1205—Repeal of Landmine Moratorium

This section would repeal the one-year moratorium on the use by U.S. armed forces of antipersonnel landmines mandated by section 580 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–107).

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF FORMER SOVIET UNION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$442.4 million for cooperative threat reduction (CTR) activities, representing an increase of \$60.2 million over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1998. The request included \$9.4 million for warhead dismantlement processing in Russia, \$10.3 million for weapons transportation security in Russia, and \$2.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention in Russia. Funding for these programs was not included in last year's CTR budget request.

The request also included \$287.7 million for destruction and dismantlement, \$112.9 million for fissile materials and nuclear weapons safety and storage, \$29.8 million for reactor core conversion in Russia, and \$12.0 million for other program support, including defense and military contacts.

The committee recommends a total of \$417.4 million for CTR activities in fiscal year 1999, a reduction of \$25.0 million from the budget request and an increase of \$35.2 million over the amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1998. The committee recommends the request of \$142.4 million for strategic offensive arms elimination activities in Russia; \$47.5 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine; \$60.9 million for a fissile material storage facility in Russia; \$9.4 million for warhead dismantlement processing in Russia; \$10.3 million for weapons transportation security in Russia; \$41 million for weapons storage security in Russia; \$29.8 million for reactor core conversion in Russia; and \$2.0 million for biological weapons proliferation prevention. In addition, the committee recommends an additional \$31.4 million for strategic arms elimination activities in Russia and Ukraine. The committee recommends the following reductions to the budget request: \$53.4 million for chemical weapons destruction; \$2.0 million for defense and military contacts; and \$1.0 million for other program support. The discussion below provides the rationale for these reductions and raises other matters of interest and concern to the committee.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Arms Elimination Projects in Russia

The budget request contained \$142.4 million for strategic offensive arms elimination projects in Russia, almost double the fiscal year 1998 appropriated amount of \$77.9 million.

The committee again emphasizes its support for the accelerated dismantlement and destruction of strategic offensive weapons in Russia under the terms of the START I Treaty. However, the com-

mittee is concerned over Russia's willingness, in the absence of U.S. funding, to eliminate certain strategic systems in accordance with its START I Treaty obligations. The committee believes that the United States should not have to buy Russian compliance with its arms control commitments.

The committee also supports efforts to reduce Russian strategic offensive arms in accordance with START II limitations, even though Russia has still not ratified the treaty. The committee understands that the increased budget request for strategic offensive arms elimination reflects a greater level of activity in this area and approves the requested amount. However, the committee remains concerned with Russia's delay in ratifying START II while it continues to invest scarce resources in the modernization of its land-based and sea-based strategic missile force despite its purported inability to contribute financially to the strategic arms elimination effort. Moreover, the committee notes that the certification required by section 1404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) with respect to START II Treaty-related elimination activities in Russia has not yet been received by the Congress. For these reasons, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1999 funds for START II-related elimination activities until the requirements of section 1404 of Public Law 105-85 have been met. Because the committee believes that strategic arms eliminations should take priority over chemical weapons elimination activities, the committee also recommends that additional funds be directed toward strategic arms elimination activities in Russia in lieu of increases for chemical weapons destruction purposes. Specifically, the committee recommends that \$31.4 million be allocated for additional strategic arms elimination activities in Russia and Ukraine, and recommends a provision (sec. 1310) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of these funds until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has notified the congressional defense committees of the Department's plan for using these funds.

Arms Elimination Projects in Ukraine

The budget request contained \$47.5 million for strategic nuclear arms elimination projects in Ukraine, a reduction of \$29.2 million from the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level. The committee supports this effort and approves the requested amount for strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine. As noted above, the committee recommends that additional funds be directed toward strategic arms elimination activities in Ukraine in lieu of increases for chemical weapons destruction purposes, and recommends a provision (sec. 1310) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of these funds until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense has notified the congressional defense committees of the Department's plan for using these funds.

Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention in Russia

The budget request contained \$2.0 million to initiate a new project that would fund collaborative research work with scientists

currently employed at Russian institutes where biological weapons work has been carried out. This effort appears to be similar to the Department of State-funded scientific exchange program carried out under the auspices of the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC), and would channel DOD funds through the ISTC for this purpose.

The committee recognizes the serious threat posed by the proliferation of biological weapons and the unique difficulties of countering that threat, given the extensive nature of the former Soviet Union's biological weapons activities. However, the committee questions whether this new project will achieve the desired objective and is skeptical that non-weapons-related work on biological toxins can be divorced from potential weapons applications.

The committee notes that the Russian biological weapons program remains shrouded in secrecy, despite the fact that Russian President Yeltsin officially canceled the program in 1992 (former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev also officially canceled it in 1990). In addition, Russia has reportedly refused repeated requests to allow international inspection of its biological weapons facilities and has rejected U.S. proposals to expand the coverage of a trilateral confidence-building agreement it signed with the United States and the United Kingdom in 1992 to include military sites. While an October 1997 National Academy of Sciences report asserts that "by increasing linkages between the civilian and military sectors, transparency will increase * * *" it also notes that the Russian Ministry of Defense (MOD) has been unwilling to participate in these collaborative efforts. The committee believes that no level of cooperative research will produce the desired level of transparency in Russia's biological weapons program as long as the Russian MOD continues its work in secrecy.

The committee is also troubled to learn that Russian scientists working at the State Research Center for Applied Microbiology in Obolensk, one of the facilities at which pilot collaborative research projects have taken place and additional projects are planned with this funding, have developed a genetically-engineered strain of anthrax that is reportedly resistant to the anti-anthrax vaccine being administered to U.S. military personnel. The Russians have reportedly refused U.S. requests to inspect this anthrax strain.

The committee believes that far greater transparency on Russia's part is essential. Without greater U.S. visibility into the kinds of activities Russian biological weapons scientists are pursuing and the relationship of these activities to actual weapons development, collaborative efforts to channel Russian scientific activity into more peaceful pursuits may produce the opposite result from that intended. The committee notes the statement earlier this year of Ken Alibek, the former First Deputy Director of the Soviet Union's main biological weapons directorate: "Unfortunately, until Russia opens its military biological weapons sites to full-scale inspections, as the United States did many years ago, such cooperation is not only senseless, but also dangerous."

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1309) that would prohibit the obligation of expenditure of fiscal year 1999 CTR funds on this project until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense has certified to Congress that CTR funds have not been used

to support activities that have resulted in the development by Russia of new strains of anthrax and has notified the congressional defense committees that the United States has inspected and tested the new anthrax strain developed at the aforementioned Obolensk institute. In addition, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1308) that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress by no later than December 31, 1998 detailing Russia's activity in the biological weapons area, outlining the security benefits expected to accrue to the United States through collaborative biological programs with Russia, and detailing the effect previous pilot projects have had in increasing transparency in Russia's biological weapons program.

Chemical Weapons Destruction in Russia

The budget request contained \$88.4 million for chemical weapon destruction activities in Russia, including funding for construction activities and procurement of equipment for a chemical weapons destruction facility to be built near Shchuch'ye, Russia. This represents a nearly 150 percent increase over the fiscal year 1998 appropriated level for this particular project.

The committee has a number of continuing concerns about this project. Unlike strategic nuclear weapons and long-range ballistic missiles, which pose a direct threat to U.S. security, the Russian chemical weapons stockpile poses more of a local environmental threat than it does a security threat to Americans.

According to the Department, the ultimate cost of this project may be as much as \$800.0 million. Moreover, the committee is concerned with Russia's ability to absorb its share of the costs associated with chemical weapons destruction, a situation which the Department acknowledges "remains problematic." The costs of destroying Russia's 40,000 tons of declared chemical weapons agents has been estimated at between roughly \$5.0 billion and \$10.0 billion. Although Russia budgeted a modest amount—approximately \$24.0 million—for this activity in fiscal year 1997, only about one-third of these funds were actually made available. For fiscal year 1998, Russia has budgeted approximately \$85.0 million for chemical weapons destruction activities. However, it is again unlikely that all of these resources will be made available to support work on this project, as the focus of Russia's chemical weapons destruction efforts involves activities at other chemical weapons sites. In the words of one CTR official, "Shchuch'ye is not their top priority."

While the committee believes that initial CTR expenditures on this project indirectly contributed to U.S. security by funding research and development of the two-stage neutralization process for demilitarizing chemical agents, the development of that neutralization technology was essentially completed last year. The project is now transitioning to the construction of the Shchuch'ye facility, which raises the broader concerns discussed above. Despite the fact that a final site for construction has yet to be chosen, more than one-half of the CTR budget request for chemical weapons destruction for fiscal year 1999 is to fund preliminary construction work at Shchuch'ye.

The committee notes that sections 1405 and 1406 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–

85) required that notifications and certifications be sent to Congress regarding Russia's political and financial commitment to chemical weapons destruction prior to the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1998 funds on this project. These notifications and certifications have not yet been received and no fiscal year 1998 funds have yet been obligated. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1999 funds for chemical weapons destruction purposes until the requirements of sections 1405 and 1406 of Public Law 105-85 are met. In addition, because of the concerns expressed above, the committee denies the request for \$53.4 million in construction funds for this project and recommends a provision (sec. 1304) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any fiscal year 1999 or prior year CTR funds for construction of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia. As previously noted, the committee believes that additional CTR funds can more productively be used for strategic arms elimination projects in Russia and Ukraine rather than for chemical weapons destruction purposes.

Fissile Material Storage Facility

The budget request contained \$60.9 million for equipment and construction of a fissile material storage facility in Russia to house materials from dismantled strategic nuclear weapons. This is a modest increase from the \$57.7 million appropriated for fiscal year 1998. The committee reiterates its support for efforts to ensure the safe and secure storage of fissile materials in Russia and approves the requested amount for this project.

Nevertheless, the committee continues to be concerned over the total cost of the facility and the U.S. share, which the Department has indicated will be capped at \$275.0 million. The committee also remains concerned over the lack of a transparency agreement with Russia that would ensure the facility is in fact being used for its intended purpose and that materials stored there are not capable of being used in the construction of additional weapons. Section 1407 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) requires the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress that cost-sharing and transparency agreements have been reached prior to the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1998 funds. That certification has not yet been received and no fiscal year 1998 funds have been obligated. Consequently, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1999 funds for this purpose until 15 days after the notification required by section 1407 of Public Law 105-85 has been received.

The committee is also concerned by recent Russian press reports indicating that the State Committee on the Environment ordered a halt to construction of the fissile material storage facility on March 27, 1998 on the grounds that the necessary environmental impact study was not conducted. A halt in construction would likely impact the funding and schedule for completion of the project and raise questions about the Department's ability to execute its plans with the requested level of funding. The Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy has reportedly asserted that this situation devel-

oped as a consequence of the lack of Russian government funding for the project. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 1998 on how this issue is being addressed by U.S. and Russian authorities and what impact it will have on project completion and cost.

Nuclear Reactor Core Conversion

The budget request included \$29.8 million for nuclear reactor core conversion projects in Russia to support the goal of eliminating Russian plutonium production by 2000. This is a reduction from the \$41.0 million appropriated for fiscal year 1998 and, according to the Department, represents the last fiscal year they intend to request CTR funds for this project.

The committee supports this objective, but continues to believe that this activity is more appropriately the responsibility of the Department of Energy, which initially began this project and is primarily responsible for its execution. The committee approves the requested amount for this project.

Nuclear Warhead Dismantlement Processing in Russia

The budget request contained \$9.4 million to initiate a project that would assist Russia in processing the fissile components of dismantled nuclear warheads for long-term storage. The committee understands that this project was considered as a result of Russia's July 1997 request for U.S. assistance. The committee supports this effort, which is consistent with the core objectives of the CTR program, and approves the requested amount for this purpose.

Nuclear Weapons Storage Security in Russia

The budget request included \$41.7 million for nuclear weapons storage security activities in Russia, a \$5.7 million increase over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1998.

The committee reiterates its support for efforts to ensure the safe and secure storage of fissile materials. The committee also notes the establishment in February 1998 of a Security Assessment and Training Center in Sergiev Possad that, according to the Department of Defense, is intended to serve as a testing and evaluation facility for "advanced security protection technologies and procedures."

Last year, the committee noted its concern over Russia's unwillingness to allow the United States access to certain weapons storage sites, raising questions regarding the use of CTR-provided equipment. Consequently, section 1408 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report "on the status of negotiations between the United States and Russia on audits and examinations with respect to weapons storage security" prior to the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1998 funds. Although the committee has been informed that audit and examination issues have been resolved, the report required by section 1408 of Public Law 105-85 has not been received and no fiscal year 1998 funds have yet been obligated. Therefore, the committee rec-

ommends a provision (sec. 1307) that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1999 funds for weapons storage security purposes in Russia until the reporting requirements noted above have been met.

Nuclear Weapons Transportation Security

The budget request contained \$10.3 million for nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia. No funds were requested for this activity for fiscal year 1998. The bulk of the requested fiscal year 1999 funds would be used to pay the costs of rail transportation of nuclear weapons from operational deployment sites to storage facilities, a cost that has, to date, been borne by the Russian Ministry of Defense (MOD). However, the Russian MOD has informed the United States that it can no longer afford to pay these transportation costs. Consequently, the Department of Defense is proposing to fund this effort.

The committee supports continuing with the nuclear weapons elimination process and the transportation of nuclear weapons safely and securely as part of that process. Consequently, the committee approves the requested amount for this purpose. However, the committee emphasizes that its support for this funding for fiscal year 1999 should not be interpreted by Russia as an open-ended willingness on the part of the United States to pay any and all future expenses associated with weapons elimination for which the Russians decide they will no longer pay. In addition, the committee encourages the Department to work with Russia toward a prompt resolution of this issue in a manner that will alleviate the need for future U.S. funding for this purpose.

Other Support Programs

The budget request contained \$2.0 million for defense and military contacts with the states of the former Soviet Union, an amount that is significantly less than previous requests as a result of a backlog of unobligated prior-year balances. The committee does not support the Department's request for an additional \$2.0 million for fiscal year 1999 when more than \$25.0 million in unobligated prior year funds remain available for this purpose. Consequently, the committee denies this request.

Program Overhead

The budget request contained \$8.0 million for management and administrative costs, project development, and audits and examinations, a reduction from the \$20.5 million appropriated for fiscal year 1998. As the Department has noted, this reduction is made possible as a result of funds appropriated in prior years in excess of requirements. Indeed, a significant portion of prior-year appropriated funds were used from this account last year to help fund the purchase of MiG aircraft from Moldova.

While the committee welcomes the Department's admission that prior-year requests exceeded requirements, the committee also believes that additional efficiencies and savings are possible in this account as a result of the consolidation of much of the CTR program within the proposed Defense Threat Reduction Agency

(DTRA), scheduled to stand up on October 1, 1998. As the consolidated DTRA budget request for fiscal year 1999 does not reflect all of the management savings that the Department acknowledges are likely to be achieved as a result of the consolidation of various agencies into the DTRA, the committee recommends a reduction in the budget request of \$1.0 million for this purpose. The committee intends that this reduction not impact the number, frequency, or thoroughness of audits conducted.

Prohibition of Specified Activities

The committee reiterates its belief that funding for CTR activities should be directed toward facilitating the safe transportation, storage, and elimination of weapons of mass destruction, their delivery vehicles, and components, and for programs and activities to prevent proliferation. The committee has an established record of not supporting CTR funding for activities outside these basic purposes.

In this regard, the committee is troubled by the Department's often broad interpretation of what constitutes a duly authorized nonproliferation program eligible for CTR funding. Specifically, the committee notes the Department's use of CTR funds last year to purchase from Moldova MiG-29 aircraft sought by Iran. The Department contends that it has the legal authority under CTR legislation to fund "preemptive acquisition" programs involving any former Soviet weapons, including conventional arms, although it acknowledges that "as a matter of policy—and consistent with congressional preference—CTR programs have addressed exclusively nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, and related delivery vehicles, materials and expertise." The committee does not challenge the wisdom or desirability of acquiring from foreign suppliers sophisticated conventional weaponry or delivery systems as a means of preventing their proliferation. However, since, for example, all tactical aircraft have an inherent capability to deliver weapons of mass destruction, the committee does not understand where the Department draws the line in cases of using CTR funds for the "preemptive acquisition" of items for nonproliferation purposes. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to work with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Energy, and other appropriate U.S. government officials involved in nonproliferation policy to identify appropriate options for addressing and funding such non-proliferation initiatives in the future.

For these reasons, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 1303) that would maintain a prohibition on the use of CTR funds for peacekeeping-related activities, housing, environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion. The committee also recommends a provision (sec. 1305) that would clarify the definition of CTR programs.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would specify the kinds of programs to be funded under this title.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate fiscal year 1999 funding for various CTR purposes and activities.

Section 1303—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Specified Purposes

This section would prohibit the use of CTR funds for specified activities, including peacekeeping-related, housing, environmental restoration, job retraining, and defense conversion purposes.

Section 1304—Limitation on Use of Funds for Chemical Weapons Destruction Facility

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 1999 or prior year funds for the construction of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

Section 1305—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for a Specified Period

This section would amend title 10, United States Code to limit the use of all appropriated funds for CTR purposes to a period of three years. It would also clarify the definition of CTR programs.

Section 1306—Requirement to Submit Breakdown of Amounts Requested by Project Category

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit, within 30 days of the President's annual budget submission, a detailed breakdown of requested funding by CTR project category and a comparison of that request with the previous fiscal year's allocations.

Section 1307—Limitation on Use of Funds Until Completion of Fiscal Year 1998 Requirements

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds for various CTR projects until the requirements established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) are met.

Section 1308—Report on Biological Weapons Programs in Russia

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 1998 a detailed report on Russia's biological weapons program, Russia's compliance with international agreements relating to the control of biological weapons, and the political and military utility of collaborative U.S.-Russia biological research programs.

Section 1309—Limitation on Use of Funds for Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention Activities in Russia

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds on biological weapons proliferation prevention programs in Russia until 15 days after the Secretary of Defense certifies that CTR funds have not been used for illegitimate purposes and notifies the congressional defense committees that the United States has inspected the new strain of anthrax developed in Russia.

Section 1310—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds for Strategic Arms Elimination in Russia or Ukraine

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of certain funds for strategic arms elimination purposes in Russia and Ukraine until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees notification on how these funds are to be used.

Section 1311—Availability of Funds

This section would make fiscal year 1999 CTR funds available for obligation for three years.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

The purpose of Division B is to provide military construction authorizations and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1999. As approved by the committee, Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of \$8,228,074,000 for construction in support of the active forces, reserve components, defense agencies for fiscal year 1999.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW

The military construction authorization request for fiscal year 1999 was introduced by request as H.R. 3695 on April 21, 1998.

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$4,300,744,000 for fiscal year 1999 for military construction, including \$1,730,704,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and \$3,477,330,000 for family housing construction and support. The committee recommends \$4,721,521,000 for military construction, including \$1,730,704,000 for activities associated with base closure and realignment, and \$3,506,553,000 for family housing construction and support for fiscal year 1999.

The committee restates its serious concern about the condition of the Nation's military installations and facilities and continues to be troubled by the continuing and persistent underinvestment by the Administration in military facilities and infrastructure. The budget request for the military construction and military family housing programs of the Department of Defense (DOD) represents a 15 percent reduction from current spending levels, a seven percent reduction from the budget submission for fiscal year 1998, and a four percent reduction from the budget estimates for the coming fiscal year presented to Congress one year ago. If enacted, the Administration's program would represent a 30 percent reduction in funding for basic construction requirements and facilities upgrades than the program authorized by Congress for fiscal year 1996. The committee notes that the service chiefs have identified a shortfall over of \$7.6 billion in military construction and military family housing funding within the current Future Years Defense Program.

The effects of sustained and structural inattention by DOD and the military departments to basic infrastructure are apparent on nearly every military installation. The committee has noted on prior occasions the findings of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Quality of Life which reported that 62 percent of barracks and dormitories are unsuitable and 64 percent of military family housing units are in a similar condition. Likewise, the committee

has noted on prior occasions the effects of underfunding for military construction on facilities which support the training and readiness of the active and reserve components. While the committee notes the progress of the military departments in addressing a select group of facilities problems, such as the implementation of an improved standard for permanent party troop housing construction and the modernization of infrastructure to support strategic mobility, the committee regrets the lack of comprehensive, long-term, and sustainable facilities modernization planning by DOD and the military departments.

In an effort to improve the quality of life for military personnel and their families, the committee reiterates its support for the authorities provided in subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code. The Military Housing Privatization Initiative remains a central component of the ultimate resolution of the military housing crisis. The committee, however, reiterates its view that the Initiative should not be viewed by the military departments as a substitute for military family housing construction projects where those projects are necessary to alleviate immediate housing problems or in those locations where the privatization initiative is not economically or otherwise feasible. The committee urges the Department to ensure that the military departments provide a sustained level of investment in military family housing construction that will permit the resolution of the military housing crisis within the next decade. The committee further urges the Department to ensure the timely execution of military family housing construction projects authorized by Congress in prior years.

To alleviate some of the facilities shortfall, the committee recommends an increase in new budget authority for these programs of \$450,000,000.

A tabular summary of the authorizations provided in Division B for fiscal year 1999 follows:

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1999	
	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Military Construction, Army	790,876	(10,277)	780,599	780,599
Military Construction, Navy	468,150	102,493	570,643	570,643
Military Construction, Air Force	454,810	95,665	550,475	550,475
Military Construction, Defense-Wide	491,675	119,400	611,075	611,075
NATO Security Investment Program	185,000	(16,000)	169,000	169,000
BRAC III	433,464	-	433,464	433,464
BRAC IV	1,297,240	-	1,297,240	1,297,240
Military Construction, Army National Guard	47,675	22,663	70,338	70,338
Military Construction, Air National Guard	34,761	62,940	97,701	97,701
Military Construction, Army Reserve	71,287	607	71,894	71,894
Military Construction, Navy Reserve	15,271	18,450	33,721	33,721
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve	10,535	24,836	35,371	35,371
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	4,300,744	420,777	4,721,521	4,721,521
Family Housing Construction, Army	103,440	20,800	124,240	124,240
Family Housing Support, Army	1,104,733	(7,036)	1,097,697	1,097,697
Family Housing Construction, Navy	280,790	10,000	290,790	290,790
Family Housing Support, Navy	915,293	-	915,293	915,293
Family Housing Construction, Air Force	226,035	15,550	241,585	241,585
Family Housing Support, Air Force	789,995	(4,791)	785,204	785,204
Family Housing Construction, Defense-Wide	345	-	345	345
Family Housing Support, Defense-Wide	36,899	-	36,899	36,899
Family Housing Improvement Fund	7,000	-	7,000	7,000
Homeowners Assistance	12,800	(5,300)	7,500	7,500
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING	3,477,330	29,223	3,506,553	3,506,553
TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION & FAMILY HOUSING	7,778,074	450,000	8,228,074	8,228,074

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
 (Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1989		FY 1990		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
1	Alabama	Army	Annis AD	Ammunition Contamination Complex	3,550	-	3,550	3,550	
2	Alabama	Army	Fort Rucker	PM/Fire Station Complex	-	4,300	-	4,300	
3	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Airfield Operations Center	-	1,550	-	1,550	
4	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Missile Software Engineering Annex (Phase II)	13,600	-	13,600	13,600	
5	Alabama	AF Force	Maxwell AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,837	-	1,837	1,837	
6	Alabama	AF Force	Maxwell AFB	Officer Training School Dining Facility	4,796	-	4,796	4,796	
7	Alabama	AF Force	Maxwell AFB	Officer Training School Student Dormitories	12,765	-	12,765	12,765	
8	Alabama	Army National Guard	Montgomery	USPFO Building	-	6,000	-	6,000	
9	Alabama	AF Force Reserve	Maxwell AFB	Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Facility	5,200	-	5,200	5,200	
10	Alabama	AF Force	Edison AFB	Consolidated Munitions Facility	4,352	-	4,352	4,352	
11	Alaska	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSC Elmendorf AFB	Replace Hybrid Fuel System (Phase I)	19,500	-	19,500	19,500	
12	Alaska	AF National Guard	Keller AFB	Replace Vehicle Maint and Fire Station Complex (Phase I)	-	3,500	-	3,500	
13	Arizona	Navy	MCAS Yuma	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	11,010	-	11,010	11,010	
14	Arizona	Navy	Navel Observatory Flagstaff	Optic Interometer Support Facility	990	-	990	990	
15	Arizona	AF Force	Little AFB	Control Tower	-	3,400	-	3,400	
16	Arizona	AF National Guard	Papago Military Reservation	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	10,640	-	10,640	10,640	
17	Arizona	AF National Guard	Tucson	Composite Support Complex	-	7,500	-	7,500	
18	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	16,500	(16,500)	-	16,500	
19	Arkansas	Army	Pine Bluff Arsenal	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase III)	-	16,500	-	16,500	
20	Arkansas	Chemical Demilitarization	Benton	Readiness Center	-	1,988	-	1,988	
21	California	Army National Guard	Fort Irwin	Child Development Center	-	2,700	-	2,700	
22	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Education Center	-	5,100	-	5,100	
23	California	Army	Fort Irwin	Heliport (Phase III)	7,000	-	7,000	7,000	
24	California	Navy	MCAS Miramar	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	29,570	-	29,570	29,570	
25	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	15,840	-	15,840	15,840	
26	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	12,400	-	12,400	12,400	
27	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Phase Center	-	5,010	-	5,010	
28	California	Navy	MCB Camp Pendleton	Helicopter Outlying Landing Field	-	7,180	-	7,180	
29	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Airframe Facility Modifications	1,510	-	1,510	1,510	
30	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Hangar Renovations	5,430	-	5,430	5,430	
31	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Training Facility Addition	4,270	-	4,270	4,270	
32	California	Navy	NAS Lemoore	Weapons Assembly Facility Improvements	9,450	-	9,450	9,450	
33	California	Navy	NANFAC San Clemente	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	8,350	-	8,350	8,350	
34	California	Navy	NANFAC San Clemente	Missile Magazines	3,240	-	3,240	3,240	
35	California	Navy	NANFAC San Clemente	Survivability Live Fire Complex	-	6,900	-	6,900	
36	California	Navy	NSB San Diego	Submarine Support Facility	11,400	-	11,400	11,400	
37	California	AF Force	Edwards AFB	Remotely Piloted Vehicle Facility	10,361	-	10,361	10,361	
38	California	AF Force	Edwards AFB	Control Tower	-	4,250	-	4,250	
39	California	AF Force	Vandenberg AFB	Add/Alter Missile Maintenance Facility	9,500	-	9,500	9,500	
40	California	AF Force	Vandenberg AFB	Space Initial Qualification Training Academic Facility	9,209	-	9,209	9,209	
41	California	Defense Medical Activities	Beale AFB	Add/Alter Physiological Support Facility	3,500	-	3,500	3,500	
42	California	Defense Medical Activities	Edwards AFB	Add/Alter Aerospace Medical Clinic	8,000	-	8,000	8,000	

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1999		FY 1998		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
43	California	Defense Medical Activities	MCS Camp Pendleton	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (Mergante)	3,100	-	3,100	3,100	
44	California	Defense Medical Activities	MCS Camp Pendleton	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement (San Mateo)	3,200	-	3,200	3,200	
45	California	Defense Medical Activities	NAVSTA San Diego	Water Storage Tank	1,350	-	1,350	1,350	
46	California	Defense Medical Activities	Trevi AFB	Patient Movement Items Ops and Distribution Center	1,700	-	1,700	1,700	
47	California	Special Operations Command	MAB Coronado	SOF Amphibious Operations Facility	3,800	-	3,800	3,800	
48	Colorado	Army	Fort Carson	Railyard Expansion (Phase B)	-	23,000	-	23,000	
49	Colorado	Air Force	US Air Force Academy	Add/Alter Prep School Buildings	4,413	-	4,413	4,413	
50	Colorado	Air Force	Falcon AFS	Operational Support Facility	9,801	-	9,801	9,801	
51	Colorado	Army Reserve	Fort Carson	Add/Alter Org Maint Shop/Equip Concentration Site	1,101	-	1,101	1,101	
52	Connecticut	Army Reserve	West Hartford	Land Acquisition	1,491	-	1,491	1,491	
53	District of Columbia	Navy	NAVDBST Washington	Fitness Center	790	-	790	790	
54	District of Columbia	Air Force	Bolling AFB	Honor Guard Technical School	2,948	-	2,948	2,948	
55	Florida	Army	SOUTHCOM Miami	SOUTHCOM Headquarters & Land Acquisition	28,700	(28,700)	-	-	
56	Florida	Navy	MAB Key West	Child Development Center	3,730	-	3,730	3,730	
57	Florida	Navy	MAB Jacksonville	Add/Alter Building #118	-	1,500	-	1,500	
58	Florida	Navy	NAS Whiting Field	Runway Alterations (OPATS)	-	1,400	-	1,400	
59	Florida	Navy	NAVSTA Mayport	Afloat Training Group Facility	-	3,163	-	3,163	
60	Florida	Navy	NAVSTA Mayport	Wharf Electrical Improvements	-	3,000	-	3,000	
61	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Dormitory	7,966	-	7,966	7,966	
62	Florida	Air Force	Eglin AFB	Smith Ross Island Test Sites	12,571	-	12,571	12,571	
63	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Control Tower	2,014	-	2,014	2,014	
64	Florida	Air Force	Eglin Aux Field 9	Fire Training Facility	1,823	-	1,823	1,823	
65	Florida	Air Force	MacDIA AFB	Dining Facility	-	4,800	-	4,800	
66	Florida	Air Force	MacDIA AFB	Fire Training Facility	2,484	-	2,484	2,484	
67	Florida	Air Force	MacDIA AFB	KC-135 Simulator Facility	2,514	-	2,514	2,514	
68	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Control Tower	-	3,600	-	3,600	
69	Florida	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Jacksonville	Replace Fuel Tanks	11,000	-	11,000	11,000	
70	Florida	Defense Logistics Agency	DFSP Jacksonville	Replace Fuel Tanks	11,020	-	11,020	11,020	
71	Florida	Defense Medical Activities	Eglin AFB	Control Energy Plant (Eglin Hospital)	9,200	-	9,200	9,200	
72	Florida	Defense Medical Activities	Eglin AFB	Add/Alter Hospital Life Support Upgrade	25,400	-	25,400	25,400	
73	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin AFB	Asphalt Strip at Duke Field, Aut 3	-	5,100	-	5,100	
74	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin AFB, Aut Field 3	General Purpose Aircraft Maintenance Shop	2,210	-	2,210	2,210	
75	Florida	Special Operations Command	Eglin AFB, Aut Field 9	Clear Water Aircraft Vehicle	2,400	-	2,400	2,400	
76	Florida	Special Operations Command	MacDIA AFB	Renovate Command & Control Facility	8,400	-	8,400	8,400	
77	Florida	Air Force Reserve	Homestead AFB	Dormitory Renovation	-	4,800	-	4,800	
78	Georgia	Army	Fort Benning	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	28,600	-	28,600	28,600	
79	Georgia	Navy	NSB Kings Bay	Magnetic Blending Facility Modifications	-	2,550	-	2,550	
80	Georgia	Navy	MCLB Albany	CHD Development Center	-	2,800	-	2,800	
81	Georgia	Navy Reserve	MAB Atlanta	Hanger Addition	-	4,100	-	4,100	
82	Georgia	Navy Reserve	MAB Atlanta	Fitness Center Addition	-	3,100	-	3,100	
83	Georgia	Air Force	Robins AFB	Depot Plant Services Facility	11,884	-	11,884	11,884	
84	Georgia	Defense Medical Activities	Fort Stewart/Hunter AAF	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	10,400	-	10,400	10,400	

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1998		COMMITTEE		FY 1998
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	
86	Georgia	Defense Medical Activities	Moody AFB	Central Med Facility Alteration, Dental Clinic Addition	11,000	-	-	11,000	
87	Hawaii	Air National Guard	Robins AFB	B-1 Wings Release Systems Shop and Crew Trng Fac	3,250	-	20,000	3,250	
88	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Land Acquisition, Kuliuku	47,500	-	-	47,500	
89	Hawaii	Army	Schofield Barracks	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	9,730	-	-	9,730	
90	Hawaii	Navy	FISC Pearl Harbor	Central Receiving Facility	27,410	-	-	27,410	
91	Hawaii	Navy	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	1,970	-	-	1,970	
92	Hawaii	Navy	NAVCOMS EASTPAC, Wakeleve	Fire Station	18,180	-	-	18,180	
93	Hawaii	Navy	NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	Electrical Distribution System Upgrades	22,877	-	-	22,877	
94	Hawaii	Navy	NPWC Pearl Harbor	Sewer Outfall Extension	6,090	-	-	6,090	
95	Hawaii	Navy	NPWC Pearl Harbor	Steam Condensate Return System	8,000	-	-	8,000	
96	Hawaii	Navy	NSB Pearl Harbor	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters Modernization	11,400	-	-	11,400	
97	Hawaii	Navy	Hickam AFB	Engineering Management Building	5,890	-	4,100	5,890	
98	Hawaii	Air Force	Hickam AFB	Recall Afloat Program	8,897	-	-	8,897	
99	Idaho	Air Force	Houlihan Home AFB	Land Acquisition	1,000	-	-	1,000	
100	Idaho	Air Force	Houlihan Home AFB	Range Improvements	2,400	-	-	2,400	
101	Idaho	Air Force	Houlihan Home AFB	Add/Alter Readiness Center	4,224	-	-	4,224	
102	Idaho	Army National Guard	Gowen Field	Electrical Distribution System	5,300	-	-	5,300	
103	Illinois	Army	Rock Island Arsenal	Applied Instruction Building Modification	5,750	-	-	5,750	
104	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Gas Turbine Training Facility	7,410	-	7,120	7,410	
105	Illinois	Navy	NTC Great Lakes	Small Arms Range	7,100	-	-	7,100	
106	Illinois	Navy	NAVHOSP Great Lakes	Hospitalman School Addition	7,100	-	-	7,100	
107	Illinois	Navy	NAVHOSP Great Lakes	Ammunition Container Complex (Phase II)	27,500	(27,500)	-	-	
108	Indiana	Army	Crane AAA	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	2,000	-	2,000	2,000	
109	Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Support	-	-	2,000	-	
110	Indiana	Army	Newport AD	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	-	-	2,000	-	
111	Indiana	Navy	NSWC Crane	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	-	-	6,500	-	
112	Indiana	Navy	Newport AD	Food Dispensing Facility	737	-	-	737	
113	Indiana	Chemical Demilitarization	Newport AD	Add Ship Paint Facility	29,000	-	-	29,000	
114	Illinois	Chemical Demilitarization	Newport AD	US Disciplinary Barracks (Phase II)	-	-	3,600	-	
115	Iowa	Army National Guard	Camp Dodge	Water Storage and Pumping Facility	-	-	4,450	-	
116	Iowa	Air National Guard	Shoie City	Add/Alter Avionics Shop	5,300	-	-	5,300	
117	Kansas	Army	Fort Leavenworth	Ammunition Containerization Complex	41,000	-	-	41,000	
118	Kansas	Army	Fort Riley	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	-	-	7,000	-	
119	Kansas	Air National Guard	McConnell AFB	Multi-Purpose Digital Training Range (Phase I)	15,000	-	-	15,000	
120	Kentucky	Army	Blue Grass AD	Accret Maintenance Hangar	5,435	-	-	5,435	
121	Kentucky	Army	Fort Campbell	Training Complex (Phases IV and V)	8,300	-	-	8,300	
122	Kentucky	Army	Fort Knox	Consolidated Ball Complex	-	-	9,520	-	
123	Kentucky	Special Operations Command	Fort Campbell	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	-	-	-	-	
124	Kentucky	Army National Guard	W. Kentucky Training Range						
125	Louisiana	Army	Fort Polk						
126	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	NAS New Orleans						

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1989 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1989 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
127	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	HSA New Orleans	Galley Addition	-	1,730	1,730
128	Louisiana	Defense Medical Activities	Barksdale AFB	Additional Medical Clinics	3,480	-	3,480
129	Louisiana	Air Force Reserve	MAS New Orleans	Revised Maintenance Hangar 4	-	5,200	5,200
130	Louisiana	Navy Reserve	MAS New Orleans	Engine Test Cell Modifications	2,300	-	2,300
131	Maryland	Army	Abertan Proving Ground	Armament Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	26,500	(26,500)	-
132	Maryland	Army	Abertan Proving Ground	Armament Demilitarization Support	1,850	(1,850)	-
133	Maryland	Army	Fort Detrick	Physical Fitness Training Center	3,550	-	3,550
134	Maryland	Army	MWPC Indian Head	Annexing Open Facility	6,880	-	6,880
135	Maryland	Navy	MWPC Indian Head	Continental Processing Facility	6,590	-	6,590
136	Maryland	Air Force	Abertan AFB	Child Development Center	4,448	-	4,448
137	Maryland	Chemical Demilitarization	Abertan Proving Ground	Armament Demilitarization Facility (Phase I)	-	26,500	26,500
138	Maryland	Chemical Demilitarization	Abertan Proving Ground	Armament Demilitarization Support	-	1,850	1,850
139	Maryland	National Security Agency	Fort Meade	Performer Force (RHC)	668	-	668
140	Massachusetts	Army National Guard	Kearns AMSG	Army Aviation Support Facility	3,335	9,274	9,274
141	Massachusetts	Army Reserve	Fort Devens	Reserve Regional Support Command Hodges Facility	840	-	840
142	Massachusetts	Army Reserve	Fort Devens	Reserve Center Renovations	3,800	-	3,800
143	Michigan	Air National Guard	Alpena County Regional Airport	Replace Server System	5,200	-	5,200
144	Michigan	Air National Guard	Saginaw JAOB (SL Clements)	US Army Reserve Center and Organizational Market Shop	9,438	-	9,438
145	Michigan	Army Reserve	Walker	Multi-Purpose Machine Shop/Printer Range	1,023	-	1,023
146	Minnesota	Army National Guard	Camp Ripley	Consolidated Lodging Facility (Phase I)	3,236	-	3,236
147	Minnesota	Air Force Reserve	Minneapolis-St. Paul IAP	Administrative Headquarters Building	3,530	-	3,530
148	Minnesota	Navy Reserve	MWPC Minneapolis	Administrative Facility	3,280	-	3,280
149	Mississippi	Navy	MSC Norfolk	Backdoor Enhanced Quarters Replacement	10,870	-	10,870
150	Mississippi	Navy	MSC Norfolk	Student Dormitories	29,770	-	29,770
151	Mississippi	Air Force	Keesler AFB	Training Support Facility	5,756	-	5,756
152	Mississippi	Air Force	Camp Shelby	Replace Ball Field Facility	5,300	-	5,300
153	Mississippi	Defense Medical Activities	Keesler AFB	Biomedical Engineering Facility	700	-	700
154	Mississippi	Special Operations Command	Brookhaven	Administrative Training Center	-	5,500	5,500
155	Mississippi	Army National Guard	Brookhaven	Reception Center	-	2,787	2,787
156	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Engineer Branches	-	23,000	23,000
157	Missouri	Army	Fort Leonard Wood	Engineer Qualification Range	5,200	-	5,200
158	Missouri	Air National Guard	Luxion Municipal Airport	Self-Use Medical Facility	3,988	-	3,988
159	Nebraska	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	UN Command Facility/Infrastructure/Utilities	3,985	-	3,985
160	Nebraska	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	UN Logistics and Training Facility	7,098	-	7,098
161	Nebraska	Air Force	Indian Springs AAF	UN Logistics and Training Facility	7,098	-	7,098
162	Nebraska	Air Force	Holls AFB	Dormitory	6,378	-	6,378
163	Nebraska	Air Force	Holls AFB	Software Engineering Center Addition	-	7,800	7,800
164	New Jersey	Army	Piscataway Arsenal	Precision Munitions Facility	-	8,400	8,400
165	New Jersey	Army	McGuire AFB	Dining Facility	6,044	-	6,044
166	New Jersey	Air Force	Fort Dix	Armament Supply Point	-	8,731	8,731
167	New Jersey	Army Reserve	Fort Dix	Physical Fitness Center	-	11,100	11,100
168	New Mexico	Air Force	Holloman AFB		-	-	-

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1998		COMMITTEE		FY 1998 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST			
90	New Mexico	Air Force	Hollend AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,774	-	1,774	1,774	
91	New Mexico	Delaware Medical Activities	Holloman AFB	War Readiness Material Warehouse	1,300	-	1,300	1,300	
92	New Mexico	Army National Guard	Tule	Readiness Center	-	3,300	3,300	3,300	
93	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	-	9,000	9,000	9,000	
94	New York	Army	Fort Drum	Aviation Support Range (Phase II)	-	4,850	4,850	4,850	
95	New York	Delaware Education Activity	US Military Academy (West Point)	Cadet Physical Development Center (Phase I)	12,000	-	12,000	12,000	
96	New York	Air National Guard	US Military Academy (West Point)	Aviation Support Range (Phase II)	2,840	-	2,840	2,840	
97	New York	Army Reserve	West Point	Upgrade Parking Areas and Turnways	-	9,500	9,500	9,500	
98	New York	Air Force Reserve	West Point	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	6,424	-	6,424	6,424	
99	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Commissary Maintenance Facility	-	3,900	3,900	3,900	
100	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Commissary Upgrade (Phase II)	-	10,800	10,800	10,800	
101	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Equipment Storage Complex	30,000	-	30,000	30,000	
102	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Force Protection Plan	-	8,300	8,300	8,300	
103	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Vehicle Maintenance Complex Renovation	47,000	-	47,000	47,000	
104	North Carolina	Navy	Naval Air Station	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	1,620	-	1,620	1,620	
105	North Carolina	Navy	Naval Air Station	Aviation Support Range (Phase II)	4,420	-	4,420	4,420	
106	North Carolina	Navy	Naval Air Station	Child Development Center	1,830	-	1,830	1,830	
107	North Carolina	Navy	Naval Air Station	Fire Station	12,770	-	12,770	12,770	
108	North Carolina	Delaware Education Activity	Fort Bragg	Infrastructure Physical Security	-	6,100	6,100	6,100	
109	North Carolina	Delaware Logistics Agency	Fort Bragg	Substance Abuse Center and Library	16,800	-	16,800	16,800	
110	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Brevard Middle School	4,100	-	4,100	4,100	
111	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Hydrant Fuel System	6,000	-	6,000	6,000	
112	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	4th Med Brigade War Reserve Material Warehouse	2,886	-	2,886	2,886	
113	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Fire Training Facility	5,800	-	5,800	5,800	
114	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Medical/Aviation Clinic Addition/Alteration	6,240	-	6,240	6,240	
115	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	-	3,650	3,650	3,650	
116	North Carolina	Delaware Medical Activities	Fort Bragg	Aviation Support Range (Phase II)	-	800	800	800	
117	Ohio	Army National Guard	Wright-Patterson AFB	Regional Fire Training Facility	22,000	-	22,000	22,000	
118	Ohio	Army National Guard	Wright-Patterson AFB	Operational Maintenance Shop	-	2,300	2,300	2,300	
119	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Base Civil Engineering/Fence Complex	-	5,000	5,000	5,000	
120	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Taylor Field IMA/IC Facilities	3,115	-	3,115	3,115	
121	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	13,800	-	13,800	13,800	
122	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Tactical Equipment Shop (Phase I)	20,500	-	20,500	20,500	
123	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Waste Barracks Complex Renovation	10,800	-	10,800	10,800	
124	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Aviation Support Range (Phase II)	-	5,300	5,300	5,300	
125	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Ramp and Airfield Lighting	5,065	-	5,065	5,065	
126	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Dormitory	9,100	-	9,100	9,100	
127	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Repair Primary Runway	-	11,200	11,200	11,200	
128	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Aviation Support Range (Phase I)	-	4,400	4,400	4,400	
129	Ohio	Army Reserve	Wright-Patterson AFB	Fire Training Facility	1,823	-	1,823	1,823	
130	Ohio	Delaware Logistics Agency	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace Fuel Storage Facility	3,500	-	3,500	3,500	

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1996 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1996 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
211	Oklahoma	Army Medical Guard	Leitchfield	Army Aviation Support Facility Expansion	7,382	-	7,382
212	Oregon	Army	Unalaska Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase IV)	80,940	(80,980)	-
213	Oregon	Chemical Demilitarization	Unalaska Depot Activity	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility (Phase IV)	-	50,980	50,980
214	Pennsylvania	Navy	HSPCCSBS Philadelphia	Integrated Ship Control and Diagnostic Facility	-	2,610	2,610
215	Pennsylvania	Navy	Carlisle Barracks	Health Clinic Addition	4,678	-	4,678
216	Pennsylvania	Defense Medical Activities	LtPhe	Readiness Center	-	2,479	2,479
217	Rhode Island	Navy	NETC Newport	Seller Plant Modifications	5,530	-	5,530
218	Rhode Island	Navy	NAFPC Division Newport	Undersea Warfare Facility	9,140	-	9,140
219	South Carolina	Navy	MCAS Beaufort	Health Wing/Chairs	1,770	-	1,770
220	South Carolina	Navy	MCRD Parris Island	Female Recruit Barracks	-	6,030	6,030
221	South Carolina	Navy	NWS Charleston	Weapons Battalion Mess Hall	7,980	-	7,980
222	South Carolina	Navy	NWS Charleston	Outboard Railroad Readjustment	9,737	-	9,737
223	South Carolina	Navy	NWS Charleston	C-17 L3 Support Facility	4,701	-	4,701
224	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Inflight Maintenance Unit	7,638	-	7,638
225	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Inflight Maintenance Unit	6,796	-	6,796
226	South Carolina	Air Force	Charleston AFB	Dining Facility	5,221	-	5,221
227	South Carolina	Air National Guard	McClure AFB	Auditor Aircraft Maintenance Complex	-	9,000	9,000
228	South Dakota	Air Force	Ellsworth AFB	Auditor Squadron Operations Facility	-	8,800	8,800
229	Tennessee	Air National Guard	Arnold AFB	Test Facilities Coding Tower	-	11,800	11,800
230	Tennessee	Army	McChes-Tyson Airport	Helicopter Landing Pad	-	10,000	10,000
231	Texas	Army	Fort Bliss	Tactical Vehicle Overpass	-	4,100	4,100
232	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Railroad Facility (Phase I)	17,500	-	17,500
233	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	White Barracks Complex Renovation	21,800	-	21,800
234	Texas	Navy	NAVSTA Ingalls	Boatyard Enlisted Quarters (Phase IV)	-	12,300	12,300
235	Texas	Air Force	Dryden AFB	B-1 Numbers Maintenance Facility	-	3,350	3,350
236	Texas	Air Force	Brewster AFB	Medical Systems Training Facility	-	7,000	7,000
237	Texas	Air Force	Lubbock AFB	Operational Facility	6,800	-	6,800
238	Texas	Air Force	Lubbock AFB	Operational Facility	6,130	-	6,130
239	Texas	Air Force	Lubbock AFB	Consolidated Base Operations Facility	-	3,815	3,815
240	Texas	Air Force	Lubbock AFB	Control Tower	-	3,800	3,800
241	Texas	Air Force	Lubbock AFB	Base Operations Facility	3,186	-	3,186
242	Texas	Air Force	Fort Hood	Base Outer Center	3,100	-	3,100
243	Texas	Defense Medical Activities	Fort Hood	Primary Care Clinic	11,000	-	11,000
244	Texas	Defense Medical Activities	Fort Hood	Nurse Reserve Training Center	4,080	-	4,080
245	Utah	Navy Reserve	Tucson Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Complex	3,800	-	3,800
246	Utah	Army	Fort Lute City	USARMC and OHS	13,260	-	13,260
247	Utah	Air Force Reserve	Hill AFB	Numbers Handling and Storage Facility	-	4,880	4,880
248	Virginia	Army	HSCC Charlottesville	National Ground Intelligence Center Facility	46,200	-	46,200
249	Virginia	Army	Fort Belvoir	White Barracks Complex Renovation	36,531	-	36,531
250	Virginia	Navy	PSC Norfolk	Fire Station	1,770	-	1,770
251	Virginia	Navy	FTC Norfolk	Engineering Training Facility Addition and Renovation	6,700	-	6,700
252	Virginia	Navy	NAS Oceana	Phase Center	-	6,400	6,400

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	PY 1998 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	PY 1998 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
253	Virginia	Navy	NAVSTA Norfolk	Berthing Pier (Phase 9)	32,000	-	32,000
254	Virginia	Navy	NSWC Dahlgren	Weapons Systems Development Laboratory Addition	10,550	-	10,550
255	Virginia	Navy	Naval Air Station	Drilling	5,130	-	5,130
256	Virginia	Navy	Naval Air Station	Training Building Addition	2,430	-	2,430
257	Virginia	Navy	Naval Air Station	Current Warehouse to Administrative Space	10,000	-	10,000
258	Virginia	Delaware Logistics Agency	Delaware	PHSO Administrative Office	1,000	-	1,000
259	Virginia	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	PHSO Operational Warehouse	9,400	-	9,400
260	Virginia	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	Hospital Replacement (Phase X)	17,964	-	17,964
261	Virginia	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	Readiness Center	2,435	-	2,435
262	Virginia	Army National Guard	Fort Belvoir	USARMC/AMMA	10,314	-	10,314
263	Virginia	Army Reserve	Fort Belvoir	Aviation Support Facility	11,818	-	11,818
264	Virginia	Army Reserve	Fort Belvoir	Hangar Alterations	1,060	-	1,060
265	Washington	Navy	MARC Markab	Current Vehicle Wash Facility	4,650	-	4,650
266	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Class Conclude Tactical Trainer Building	7,800	-	7,800
267	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Completed Fuel Facility	3,860	-	3,860
268	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Tank Trail Erosion Mitigation-Yakima	2,000	-	2,000
269	Washington	Army	Fort Lewis	Community Support Facility	-	4,300	4,300
270	Washington	Navy	NSY Pagan Sound	Security Facility Upgrade	2,790	-	2,790
271	Washington	Navy	Spitt Ways Fsc, Pacific, Bangor	Convert Warehouse to Warehouse Facility	-	3,700	3,700
272	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	RC-119 Squadron Operations/Act Maint Unit Facility	7,630	-	7,630
273	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Upgrade Fuel Cell Warehouse	2,800	-	2,800
274	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Air Support Ground Maint Facility	2,110	-	2,110
275	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shop	2,321	-	2,321
276	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Aircraft Maintenance Shop	1,823	-	1,823
277	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Add/Alter Simulator Facility	1,630	-	1,630
278	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Alter Maintenance Hangars	6,427	-	6,427
279	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Repair Support Facility	4,029	-	4,029
280	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Life Support Equipment Facility	4,413	-	4,413
281	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Respiratory Filter System	18,025	-	18,025
282	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Repair Shop Needs	2,224	-	2,224
283	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Structural Asset Strip	2,321	-	2,321
284	Washington	Air Force	McChord AFB	C-17 Squadron Operations/Aviation Maint Unit Facility	6,524	-	6,524
285	Washington	Air Force Reserve	McChord AFB	Consolidated Medical Training Facility	-	3,400	3,400
286	Washington	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	Chick/War Reserve Marine Warehouse Replacement	20,000	-	20,000
287	Washington	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	Hospital Addition/Alteration	28,000	-	28,000
288	Washington	Delaware Medical Activities	Delaware	Delaware Vehicle Ecology and Control Ctr Replacement	5,700	-	5,700
289	West Virginia	Army National Guard	NSB Bangor	Readiness Center	4,465	(4,465)	-
290	West Virginia	Army National Guard	Camp Dawson	Upgrade Runway and Taxiway	9,800	-	9,800
291	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Valk Field	Crash Rescue Station	1,850	-	1,850
292	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Fort McCoy	Machine Gun Range	2,032	-	2,032
293	Wisconsin	Army Reserve	Fort McCoy	Classified Project	4,800	-	4,800
294	COMUS Classified						

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1999		COMMITTEE	
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION	
286	COMUS Various	Defense Logistics Agency	COMUS Various	Conforming Storage Facilities	1,300	-	1,300	
287	Belgium	Army	8th AGO	Child Development Center	6,300	-	6,300	
288	Germany	Army	Schwelmurt	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	18,000	-	18,000	
289	Germany	Army	Wetzlar	Child Development Center	4,250	-	4,250	
290	Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Dormitory	9,501	-	9,501	
291	Germany	Air Force	Spangdahlem AB	Consolidated Air Control Squadron Operations Facility	4,466	-	4,466	
292	Guam	Navy	NSA Soledad Bay	Seabee's Enlisted Quarters	5,260	-	5,260	
293	Guam	Navy	MAVACTS Guam	Special Warfare Unit Facility	5,500	-	5,500	
294	Guam	Defense Education Activity	MAVACTS Guam	Waterfront Consolidation Facilities	4,810	-	4,810	
295	Guam	Defense Education Activity	MAVACTS Guam	Elementary School Addition and Renovation	8,600	-	8,600	
296	Guam	Defense Education Activity	MAVACTS Guam	High School Addition and Renovation	4,500	-	4,500	
297	Italy	Defense Medical Activities	NSA Naples	MI Public Works Facility	18,270	-	18,270	
298	Korea	Army	Camp Stanek	Flight Line Clinic	5,300	-	5,300	
299	Korea	Army	Camp Clark	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	13,400	-	13,400	
300	Korea	Army	Camp Humphreys	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	18,228	-	18,228	
301	Korea	Army	Camp Stanley	Whole Barracks Complex Renewal	8,500	-	8,500	
302	Korea	Air Force	Kunsan AB	Dormitory	5,958	-	5,958	
303	Korea	Air Force	Osan AB	Dormitory	7,486	-	7,486	
304	Korea	Army	Ulsan	Power Plant - Not Memorandum (Phase 1)	12,800	-	12,800	
305	Korea	Ballistic Missile Defense Organization	Ulsan	Multipurpose Missile Test Facility	4,800	-	4,800	
306	Portugal	Defense Logistics Agency	Lajes Field, Azores	Fuel Pumphouse and Tanks	7,700	-	7,700	
307	Puerto Rico	Special Operations Command	MANSTA Reserve/Route	SOJ Operations Facility	9,800	-	9,800	
308	Puerto Rico	Defense Education Activity	Fort Buchanan	Elementary School	8,805	-	8,805	
309	Turkey	Air Force	Incirk AB	Central Security Control Facility	2,949	-	2,949	
310	United Kingdom	Navy	AMCC St. Margaret	Education Center	2,010	-	2,010	
311	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Lakenheath	Dormitories	15,838	-	15,838	
312	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	RC-119 Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maint Unit	14,034	-	14,034	
313	United Kingdom	Air Force	RAF Mildenhall	Dormitories	10,928	-	10,928	
314	United Kingdom	Defense Medical Activities	RAF Lakenheath	Hospital Annex Replacement	10,800	-	10,800	
315	Workshops Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	10,000	(5,000)	5,000	
316	Workshops Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	41,819	1,823	43,642	
317	Workshops Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	Hotel Helms Support	20,450	-	20,450	
318	Workshops Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Worldwide	General Relocation	6,000	(6,000)	(0,000)	
319	Workshops Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	58,346	2,000	60,346	
320	Workshops Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,900	-	8,900	
321	Workshops Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Worldwide	General Relocation	-	(5,000)	(5,000)	
322	Workshops Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,135	-	7,135	
323	Workshops Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	35,982	2,000	37,982	
324	Workshops Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	General Relocation	-	(11,000)	(11,000)	
325	Workshops Unspecified	Defense Medical Activities	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,900	-	1,900	
326	Workshops Unspecified	Defense Medical Activities	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	8,555	-	8,555	

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1996		COMMITTEE	
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	RECOMMENDATION	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
337	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,480	-	-	1,480
338	Worldwide Unspecified	Special Operations Command	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,200	-	-	4,200
339	Worldwide Unspecified	Baltic Missile Defense Organization	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	12,261	-	-	12,261
340	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Contingencies	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	9,200	(4,900)	-	4,300
341	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Minor Construction	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000	-	-	3,000
342	Worldwide Unspecified	OSD Planning & Design	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	15,000	-	-	15,000
343	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense-Wide	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	-	(12,000)	-	(12,000)
344	Worldwide Unspecified	NATO Security Investment Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	185,000	(18,000)	-	167,000
345	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,548	1,000	-	5,548
346	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	General Production	546	-	-	546
347	Worldwide Unspecified	Army National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	-	(2,000)	-	(2,000)
348	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	8,549	1,000	-	9,549
349	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,482	2,040	-	5,522
350	Worldwide Unspecified	Air National Guard	Unspecified Worldwide	General Reduction	-	(4,000)	-	(4,000)
351	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	7,368	-	-	7,368
352	Worldwide Unspecified	Army Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Termination Fiscal Year 1996 Authority	-	(12,714)	-	(12,714)
353	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,974	-	-	1,974
354	Worldwide Unspecified	Navy Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	877	-	-	877
355	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	2,432	1,000	-	3,432
356	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force Reserve	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500	-	-	1,500
357	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Finance & Accounting Service	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,903	-	-	2,903
358	Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure III	BRAC III	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500	-	-	1,500
359	Worldwide Unspecified	Base Closure IV	BRAC IV	Unspecified Minor Construction	433,464	-	-	433,464
360	Worldwide Unspecified	Joint Chiefs of Staff	Unspecified Worldwide	Base Realignment and Closure Account Part IV	1,287,240	-	-	1,287,240
361	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Education Activity	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	998	-	-	998
362	Worldwide Unspecified	Def Threat Robot & Treaty Compliance Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	900	-	-	900
363	Worldwide Unspecified	Def Threat Robot & Treaty Compliance Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	100	-	-	100
364	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Manpower Data Center	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	2,200	-	-	2,200
365	Worldwide Unspecified	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Improvement Program	46,950	-	-	46,950
366	Alabama	Army	Redstone Arsenal	Whole Neighborhood Replacement (118 units)	14,000	-	-	14,000
367	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase I (48 units)	18,300	-	-	18,300
368	Alabama	Air Force	Maxwell AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase II (48 units)	12,832	-	-	12,832
369	California	Navy	Gilston AFB	Replacement Homes (102 units)	30,378	-	-	30,378
370	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase IV (68 units)	12,560	-	-	12,560
371	California	Air Force	Edwards AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase V (68 units)	18,489	-	-	18,489
372	Delaware	Air Force	Dover AFB	Replace Family Housing (68 units)	8,986	-	-	8,986
373	Florida	Air Force	MacDill AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase III (48 units)	7,809	-	-	7,809
374	Florida	Air Force	Patrick AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase I (68 units)	9,892	-	-	9,892
375	Florida	Air Force	Tyndall AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase V (122 units)	14,500	-	-	14,500
376	Florida	Air Force	Schöffel Barracks	Whole Neighborhood Replacement (84 units)	14,700	-	-	14,700
377	Hawaii	Army	NPWC Pearl Harbor	Replacement Homes (150 units)	29,125	-	-	29,125
378	Nebraska	Air Force	Offutt AFB	Replace Family Housing Phase IV (68 units)	12,212	-	-	12,212

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1989		COMMITTEE		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	
278	Midlands	Air Force	Orbit AFB	Replace Housing Office	870	-	-	870	
280	Midlands	Air Force	Orbit AFB	Replace Housing Maintenance Facility	900	-	-	900	
281	Nevada	Air Force	Nellis AFB	Replace Family Housing Phases VI (69 units)	-	10,350	-	10,350	
282	New Mexico	Air Force	Wurtsmith AFB	Replace Family Housing Phases V (37 units)	6,400	-	-	6,400	
283	North Carolina	Army	Fort Bragg	Whole Neighborhood Replacement (179 units)	19,800	-	-	19,800	
284	Ohio	Army	Wright-Patterson AFB	Replace Family Housing (66 units)	5,800	-	-	5,800	
286	Texas	Army	Fort Hood	Whole Neighborhood Replacement (184 units)	21,800	-	-	21,800	
287	Texas	Air Force	Sheppard AFB	Construction Family Housing Phase I (84 units)	9,415	-	-	9,415	
288	Virginia	Air Force	Fort Lee	Replace Family Housing Phases I (84 units)	-	7,000	-	7,000	
289	Washington	Army	Fairchild AFB	Whole Neighborhood Replacement Phase II (89 units)	2,300	-	13,000	13,000	
290	Washington	Air Force	Fairchild AFB	Replace Family Housing (14 units)	1,892	-	-	1,892	
291	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Replace Housing Office and Maintenance Facility	(1,639)	-	(1,000)	(2,639)	
292	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Planning	6,350	-	-	6,350	
293	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Management Account	87,125	(7,038)	-	80,087	
294	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Services Account	52,222	-	-	52,222	
295	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Utilities Account	259,407	-	-	259,407	
296	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Homeowners Assistance Program	12,800	(5,300)	-	7,500	
297	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Construction Improvements	28,928	8,800	-	37,728	
298	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Interest Payments	3	-	-	3	
299	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Furniture/Account	44,482	-	-	44,482	
300	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Miscellaneous Account	415	-	-	415	
301	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Leasing	202,155	-	-	202,155	
302	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Maintenance of Real Property	487,914	-	-	487,914	
303	Workshide Unspecified	Army	Unspecified Workshide	Planning	15,818	-	-	15,818	
304	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	78	-	-	78	
305	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Maintenance of Real Property	414,967	-	-	414,967	
306	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Leasing	135,079	-	-	135,079	
307	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Miscellaneous Account	293	-	-	293	
308	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	General Reduction	(8,323)	-	-	(8,323)	
309	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Furniture/Account	33,199	-	-	33,199	
310	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Utilities Account	184,519	-	-	184,519	
311	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Management Account	82,331	-	-	82,331	
312	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Construction Improvements	211,991	10,000	-	221,991	
313	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Services Account	64,829	-	-	64,829	
314	Workshide Unspecified	Navy	Unspecified Workshide	Mortgage Insurance Premiums	32	-	-	32	
315	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	General Reduction	(7,864)	(2,000)	-	(9,864)	
316	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	Construction Improvements	81,778	-	-	81,778	
317	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	Planning	11,342	-	-	11,342	
318	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	Management Account	52,485	(3,783)	-	48,702	
319	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	Services Account	36,068	(817)	-	35,251	
320	Workshide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Workshide	Utilities Account	152,214	-	-	152,214	

TITLES XXI THROUGH XXVI - MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS
(Dollars in Thousands)

LINE NO.	LOCATION	SERVICE/AGENCY/PROGRAM	INSTALLATION	PROJECT TITLE	FY 1989		FY 1990	
					AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	CHANGE FROM REQUEST	AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
421	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Furniture Account	37,218	(791)	36,427	
422	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance Account	5,240	-	5,240	
423	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	118,071	-	118,071	
424	Worldwide Unspecified	Air Force	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	388,088	-	388,088	
425	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	295	-	295	
426	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	424	-	424	
427	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furniture Account	125	-	125	
428	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	51	-	51	
429	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	531	-	531	
430	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Logistics Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	244	-	244	
431	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	498	-	498	
432	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	12,292	-	12,292	
433	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	355	-	355	
434	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Construction Improvements	90	-	90	
435	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	450	-	450	
436	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furniture Account	126	-	126	
437	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	735	-	735	
438	Worldwide Unspecified	National Security Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	70	-	70	
439	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	18,847	-	18,847	
440	Worldwide Unspecified	Defense Intelligence Agency	Unspecified Worldwide	Furniture Account	2,153	-	2,153	
441	Worldwide Unspecified	Family Housing Improvement Fund	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	7,000	-	7,000	

A tabular summary of the military construction projects included with the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the BRAC III and BRAC IV accounts follows:

**FY 1999 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)**

Army: BRAC IV Construction, Fiscal Year 1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alaska	Fort Greely	Munitions Storage Facility	1,550
Colorado	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center Fitzsimons Army Medical Center	Warehouse Addition Reserve Center	1,550 2,750
Indiana	Crane Army Ammunition Activity	Surveillance Test Facility	1,850
Maryland	Fort Detrick Fort Meade Fort Meade Fort Meade	Physical Fitness Center Administrative Facility DIS Administrative Facility ESSD Renovation SDC-W Renovation-Pershing Hall	3,050 12,000 2,900 6,300
New York	Fort Totten	Storage Facility	1,900
Pennsylvania	Letterkenny Army Depot	Enclave Fencing	1,150
Virginia	Fort Eustis Fort Pickett Fort Lee	MTMC Headquarters Reserve Center WAC Museum	9,600 3,100 2,400
Various Locations		Program Management	2,350
		Total Army-BRAC IV Construction	52,450

FY 1999 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

Army: BRAC IV Family Housing Construction, FY 1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	Family Housing	1,700
		Total Army-BRAC IV Family Housing	1,700

Navy: BRAC III Construction, Fiscal Year 1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
District of Columbia	Naval District of Washington	Building Renovation	4,300
Nevada	Naval Air Station Fallon	Bachelor Office Quarters, PH II	11,100
		Total Navy - BRAC III Construction	15,400

Navy: BRAC IV Construction, FY 1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
California	Naval Air Weapons Station Point Mugu	Aviation Support Facilities	1,500
	Naval Air Weapons Station Point Mugu	Maintenance and Training Facilities	12,800
District of Columbia	Naval District of Washington	NAVSEASYSKOM Headquarters Building Relocation	71,543
	Naval District of Washington	Building Modernization	7,350
Hawaii	Naval Telecommunications Center Makalapa	Building Addition	920

FY 1999 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Massachusetts	Naval Security Group Activity Boston	Defense Courier Service Building	850
Tennessee	Naval Support Activity Memphis	Building Renovation	4,200
Texas	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	Slop Ramp Facility and Land Acquisition	13,313
Virginia	Naval Station Norfolk	Building Renovations and Alterations	3,970
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Training Facility Additions and Renovations	5,784
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Strike Fighter Weapons School Additions	4,073
	Naval Air Station Oceana	Corrosion Control Hanger	4,868
		Total Navy-BRAC IV Construction	131,171

376

Air Force: BRAC IV Construction, FY1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
New York	Stewart International Airport	Communications Training Complex	6,000
Oklahoma	Tinker Air Force Base	Alter Product Management	2,300
	Tinker Air Force Base	Alter Engine Test Cell	3,800
	Tinker Air Force Base	ADAL Fuel Air Facility	1,300
Texas	Kelly Air Force Base	Security Fence/Gates	400
	Kelly Air Force Base	VehicleOPS/Maintenance Complex	6,200
	Kelly Air Force Base	Fuel Operations Facility	1,200
	Kelly Air Force Base	Consolidated Fire Station	1,200
	Kelly Air Force Base	Reconfigure Utility Systems	2,500

FY 1999 BRAC Military Construction Projects
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	GTE Test Cell	2,100
	Hill Air Force Base	Alter Product Management/Composites	5,300
	Hill Air Force Base	F-117 Radar Facility	1,100
Various Locations		Planning and Designs	700
		Total Air Force-BRAC IV Construction	34,100

377

Defense Logistics Agency: BRAC IV Construction, FY 1999

<u>State</u>	<u>Installation or Location</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Utah	Defense Distribution Region West Defense Depot Hill	General Purpose Warehouse	31,000
		Total DLA- BRAC IV Construction, FY 1999	31,000

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$790,876,000 for Army military construction and \$1,220,973,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$780,599,000 for military construction and \$1,229,437,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Improvements of Military Family Housing

The committee recommends that, within authorized amounts for improvements of military family housing and facilities, the Secretary of the Army execute the following project: \$8,800,000 for Whole Neighborhood Revitalization, Phase II (104 units) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 1999. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item contained in the Army's budget for fiscal year 1999. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Army may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2105—Increase in Fiscal Year 1998 Authorization for Military Construction Project at Fort Drum, New York, and Fort Sill, Oklahoma

This section would amend the table in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (division B of Public Law 105-85) to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for the construction of an aerial gunnery range at Fort Drum, New York, and a barracks at Fort Sill, Oklahoma.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$468,150,000 for Navy military construction and \$1,196,083,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$570,643,000 for military construction and \$1,206,083,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Condition of Laboratory Facilities, Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey

The committee notes the continuing importance to the safety and efficiency of carrier-based naval aviation of advancements in aircraft/platform interface systems and equipment. The committee is concerned that current engineering and testing facilities at Naval Air Warfare Center, Aircraft Division, Lakehurst, New Jersey, are inadequate to the requirements imposed by advances in technology and the tolerances demanded by contemporary equipment and is further concerned about the serious safety deficiencies present in the current facility. The committee understands that funding for a military construction project to provide for needed laboratory and other facilities upgrades is currently programmed within the Future Years Defense Program of the Department of the Navy. The committee supports the funding for planning and design for this facility included in the budget request for fiscal year 1999 and further urges the Secretary of the Navy to make every effort to include this construction requirement in the fiscal year 2000 budget request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 1999. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Navy's budget for fiscal year 1999. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Navy may spend on military construction projects.

**Section 2205—Authorization to Accept Road Construction Project,
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina**

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept a road construction project valued at \$2,000,000 from the State of North Carolina at Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$454,810,000 for Air Force military construction and \$1,016,030,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$550,475,000 for military construction and \$1,026,789,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 1999. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 1999.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Air Force's budget for fiscal year 1999. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Air Force may spend on military construction projects.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$491,675,000 for defense agencies military construction, \$1,730,704,000 for base closure and realignment activities, and \$44,244,000 for family housing for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends authorization of \$611,075,000 for military construction, \$1,730,704,000 for base realignment and closure activities, and \$44,244,000 for family housing.

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Department of Defense Education Activity, Guam

The committee recognizes the decision by the Secretary of Defense to establish a system of Department of Defense Dependents Schools (DODDS) in Guam. The committee acknowledges the inadequate conditions of facilities currently being utilized for educational purposes which were not designed for that purpose. The committee supports the \$13,200,000 contained in the budget request for military construction projects to provide facilities for the elementary and secondary education needs of the dependents of U.S. military personnel stationed in Guam. The committee also acknowledges questions raised by representatives of the Government of Guam about the basis for the decision to establish DODDS schools in Guam. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the Department's findings which led to the decision to establish DODDS schools in Guam, the prospects and conditions for reintegration of the educational system, and to identify any additional military construction requirements associated with the establishment of a DODDS system in Guam. The Secretary shall submit a report on the Department's findings to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 1998.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section contains the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 1999. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 1999 in an amount not to exceed \$345,000.

Section 2403—Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Section 2404—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize specific appropriations for each line item in the Defense Agencies' budget for fiscal year 1998. This section would also provide an overall limit on the amount the Defense Agencies may spend on military construction projects.

Section 2405—Increase in Fiscal Year 1995 Authorization for Military Construction Projects at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, and Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon

This section would amend the table in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103-337), as amended, to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for military construction projects to support chemical weapons and munitions destruction at Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, and Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon.

Section 2406—Increase in Fiscal Year 1990 Authorization for Military Construction Project at Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia

This section would amend the table in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (division B of Public Law 100-189) to provide for an increase in the amount authorized for the construction of a replacement hospital at Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$185,000,000 for the NATO infrastructure fund (NATO Security Investment Program) for fiscal year 1999. The committee recommends \$169,000,000.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security investment program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this bill and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations of \$169,000,000 as the U.S. contribution to the NATO security investment program.

**TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES
FACILITIES**

SUMMARY

The budget request contained \$179,529,000 for fiscal year 1999 for guard and reserve facilities. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 1999 of \$321,739,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	\$70,338,000
Air National Guard	97,701,000
Army Reserve	84,608,000
Air Force Reserve	35,371,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	33,721,000
Total	321,739,000

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

**Section 2601—Authorized Guard and Reserve Construction and
Land Acquisition Projects**

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction for the guard and reserve by service component for fiscal year 1999. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Section 2602—Army Reserve Construction Project,
Salt Lake City, Utah**

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to accept financial or in-kind contributions from the State of Utah in connection with the construction of a reserve center and organizational maintenance shop in Salt Lake City, Utah. This section would also terminate the authorization for a similar military construction project at Camp Williams, Utah, authorized in section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (division B of Public Law 105-85).

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would provide that authorizations for military construction projects, repair of real property, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program, and guard and reserve projects will expire on October 1, 2001 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2002, whichever is later. This expiration would not apply to authorizations for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 2001 or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for these projects, whichever is later.

Section 2702—Extensions of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1996 Projects

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1996 military construction authorizations until October 1, 1999, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2000, whichever is later.

Section 2703—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 1995 Projects

This section would provide for selected extension of certain fiscal year 1995 military construction authorizations until October 1, 1999, or the date of the enactment of the Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2000, whichever is later.

Section 2704—Effective Date

This section would provide that Titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, and XXVI of this bill shall take effect on October 1, 1998, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Incorporation of Energy Conservation Criteria in the Planning and Design of Facilities

The committee notes a recent report conducted by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense concerning the inadequacies in the Department's performance measurements in reaching targets for energy conservation in the planning and design of new facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance to the military departments to re-emphasize existing design requirements to perform energy studies and life-cycle cost analyses in the development of new facilities. The committee further directs the Secretary, in consultation with the secretaries of the military departments, to establish a system to validate the accuracy of design energy targets. The committee further directs the Secretary and the secretaries of the military departments to indicate as part of the budget justification for specific new military construction projects whether an energy study and a life-cycle cost analysis was performed in support of the design of proposed new facilities.

Military Family Housing Referral and Set-Aside Programs

The committee continues to be seriously concerned about the condition and adequacy of military housing. In addition to the military housing privatization program, the committee encourages the military departments to accelerate the development of referral and set-aside arrangements with local housing interests in the private sector. The committee notes the success of such arrangements at a number of military installations, particularly those of the Marine Corps. The committee believes such arrangements may work effectively on a broader basis at little cost to the military departments. The committee notes, however, that the military departments have not made a serious effort to expand existing programs or to coordinate programs jointly at locations containing a number of military installations. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, to conduct a study on the effectiveness of referral and set-aside arrangements in addressing military housing shortfalls, including a detailed list of installations where such arrangements are in use and the number of units provided under such arrangements. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report on the Department's findings, including any recommendations, to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 1999.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Definition of Ancillary Supporting Facilities under the Alternative Authority for Acquisition and Improvement of Military Housing

This section would amend section 2871 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the development of ancillary supporting facilities in military housing projects undertaken under the authority of subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, may include the development of educational facilities to support the needs of dependents of military personnel. The committee encourages the military departments, where economically feasible and without a significant effect on the number of housing units to be provided, to incorporate plans for the development of dependent educational facilities into future requests for proposals for the development of military family housing, particularly in those instances where the development is intended to address comprehensively the housing requirements at a military installation.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Restoration of Department of Defense Lands Used by Another Federal Agency

This section would amend section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the authority for the secretary of a military department to require, as a condition of a lease, permit, license, or other grant of access to lands under the control of the secretary to another federal agency, the removal of any improvements or the taking of any corrective action necessary to restore the land used by another federal agency to the condition the land was in prior to such use.

Section 2812—Outdoor Recreation Development on Military Installations for Disabled Veterans, Military Dependents with Disabilities, and Other Persons with Disabilities

This section would amend section 103 of the Sikes Act to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that opportunities for outdoor recreation on military installations would be equally available, without substantial modification of the natural environment, to disabled veterans, military dependents with disabilities, and other persons with disabilities.

Section 2813—Report on Use of Utility System Conveyance Authority

This section would require the secretary of each military department to submit to Congress not later than March 1, 1999, a report describing the criteria to be used by the secretary in the selection of utility systems and related real property for conveyance pursuant to the authority provided by section 2688 of title 10, United States Code, a description of the manner in which the secretary

will ensure that any such conveyance would not adversely affect the national security of the United States, and a list of utility systems which are likely to be conveyed.

SUBTITLE C—DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Payment of Stipulated Penalties Assessed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 in Connection with McClellan Air Force Base, California

This section would authorize payments from the base closure and realignment accounts for stipulated penalties assessed under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) in connection with the closure of McClellan Air Force Base, California. The committee wishes to make clear that this provision shall not result in any limitation on the ability of the Secretary of Defense to pay CERCLA stipulated penalties from non-Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) accounts.

Section 2822—Elimination of Waiver Authority Regarding Prohibition Against Certain Conveyances of Property at Naval Station, Long Beach, California

This section would amend section 2826 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (division B of Public Law 105–85) to eliminate the authority of the President to waive the prohibition against the direct or indirect conveyance, by sale, lease, or other method, of real property at the former Naval Station, Long Beach, California, under the authority provided by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510) to the China Ocean Shipping Company or any successor of that company.

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Part I—Army Conveyances

Section 2831—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Massena, New York

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements in Massena, New York, to the Village of Massena. The property is to be used for recreational, educational, or other public purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Village.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center, Ogdensburg, New York

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements in Ogdensburg, New York, to the Town of Ogdensburg. The property is to be used for recreational, educational, or other public

purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Town.

Section 2833—Land Conveyance, Army Reserve Center,
Jamestown, Ohio

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements in Jamestown, Ohio, to the Greeneview Local School District. The property is to be used for educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the District.

Section 2834—Land Conveyance, Stewart Army Sub-Post, New
Windsor, New York

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 391 acres, to the Town of New Windsor, New York. The property is to be used for economic development purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the Town.

Section 2835—Land Conveyance, Indiana Army Ammunition Plant,
Charlestown, Indiana

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 4,660 acres at the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Charlestown, Indiana, to the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant Reuse Authority. The property is to be used for economic development purposes. As consideration for the conveyance, the Authority would pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property at the end of the ten year period beginning on the date the conveyance is completed. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance, and any additional administrative expenses, would be borne by the Authority. This section would also amend section 2858(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (division B of Public Law 104-106), as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, an additional parcel of real property consisting of approximately 2,000 acres at the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Charlestown, Indiana, to the State of Indiana. The property is to be used for recreational purposes.

Section 2836—Land Conveyance, Volunteer Army Ammunition
Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 1,033 acres at the Volunteer Army Ammunition Plant, Chattanooga, Tennessee, to Hamilton County, Tennessee. The property is to be used for economic development purposes. As consideration for the conveyance, the County would pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property at the end of the ten year period beginning on the date the convey-

ance is completed. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance, and any additional administrative expenses, would be borne by the County.

Section 2837—Release of Reversionary Interest of United States in Former Redstone Army Arsenal Property Conveyed to Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to release, without consideration and to such extent necessary to protect the interests of the United States, the reversionary interests of the United States in a parcel of real property conveyed to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission pursuant to Public Law 90-276, section 813 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1980 (Public Law 96-125), and section 813 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115).

Part II—Navy Conveyances

Section 2841—Easement, Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant an easement in perpetuity over a parcel of real property, consisting of approximately 340 acres, to the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency. The easement is to be used to permit the construction, operation, and maintenance of a restricted access highway. As consideration for the easement, the Agency would pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the easement. The cost of any surveys necessary for the easement would be borne by the Agency.

Section 2842—Land Conveyance, Naval Reserve Readiness Center, Portland, Maine

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property, with improvements, consisting of approximately 3.72 acres, to the Gulf of Maine Aquarium Development Corporation. As consideration for the conveyance, the Corporation would pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property. The Secretary would use the funds paid by the Corporation for the design, construction, or acquisition of facilities suitable for use by the Naval Reserve.

Part III—Air Force Conveyances

Section 2851—Land Conveyance, Lake Charles Air Force Station, Louisiana

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 4.38 acres, at Lake Charles Air Force Station, Louisiana, to McNeese State University. The property is to be used for educational purposes and for agricultural research. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the University.

Section 2852—Land Conveyance, Air Force Housing Facility, La Junta, Colorado

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, a parcel of real property with improvements, consisting of approximately 28 acres, to the City of La Junta, Colorado. The property is to be used for housing and educational purposes. The cost of any surveys necessary for the conveyance would be borne by the City.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Repeal of Prohibition on Joint Use of Gray Army Airfield, Fort Hood, Texas, with Civil Aviation

This section would repeal the prohibition on joint civilian and military use of Gray Army Airfield, Fort Hood, Texas, contained in section 319 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (Public Law 99-661).

Section 2862—Designation of Building Containing Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center, Augusta, Georgia

This section would designate the building housing the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Center in Augusta, Georgia, as the A. James Dyess Building.

Section 2863—Expansion of Arlington National Cemetery

This section would authorize the transfer of real property, and exchange of jurisdiction, between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army to provide for an expansion of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia. The property to be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army consists of three parcels, totaling approximately 36.5 acres, located at the Navy Annex of the Pentagon. The provision would also require the Secretary of the Army modify the boundary of Arlington National Cemetery to include two parcels of real property, totaling approximately eight acres, situated in Fort Myer, Virginia, contiguous to the Cemetery.

Section 2864—Reporting Requirements Under Demonstration Project for Purchase of Fire, Security, Police, Public Works, and Utility Services from Local Government Agencies

This section would amend section 816(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337) to extend the period under which a demonstration project is authorized for the purchase of fire, security, police, public works, and utility services from local government at specified locations in Monterey, California.

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

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained \$12.1 billion for DOE national security programs, including \$4.5 billion for weapons activities, \$5.8 billion for environmental restoration and waste management, \$1.7 billion for other defense activities, and \$190.0 million for defense nuclear waste disposal. The committee recommends \$11.7 billion, a reduction of \$400.7 million. The following table summarizes the request and the committee recommendations:

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

ACCOUNT TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Weapons Activities	4,500,000	(357,900)	4,142,100
Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management	4,259,903	113,650	4,373,553
Defense Environmental Management Privatization	516,857	(230,000)	286,857
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal	190,000	-	190,000
Other Defense Activities	1,667,160	33,600	1,700,760
Defense Facilities Closure Projects	1,006,240	40,000	1,046,240
Total DoE National Security Programs	12,140,160	(400,650)	11,739,510

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
Stockpile Stewardship			
Core stockpile stewardship			
Operation and maintenance	1,505,832	(30,000)	1,475,832
Construction:			
99-D-102 Rehabilitation of maintenance facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	6,500	0	6,500
99-D-103 Isotope sciences facility, LLNL Livermore, CA	4,000	0	4,000
99-D-104 Protection of real property (roof reconstruction-Phase II), LLNL, Livermore, CA	7,300	0	7,300
99-D-105 Central health physics calibration facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	3,900	0	3,900
99-D-106 Model validation & system certification test center, SNL Albuquerque, NM	1,600	0	1,600
99-D-107 Joint computational engineering laboratory, JCEL, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	1,800	0	1,800
99-D-108 Renovate existing roadways, Nevada Test Site, NV	2,000	0	2,000
97-D-102 Dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	36,000	0	36,000

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
96-D-102 Stockpile stewardship facilities revitalization, Phase VI, various locations	20,423	0	20,423
96-D-103 ATLAS, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	6,400	0	6,400
96-D-104 Processing and environmental technology laboratory, SNL, Albuquerque, NM	18,920	0	18,920
96-D-105 Contained firing facility addition, LLNL, Livermore, CA	6,700	0	6,700
Total Construction	115,543	0	115,543
Total Core stockpile stewardship	1,621,375	(30,000)	1,591,375
Inertial fusion			
Operation and maintenance	213,800	0	213,800
Construction:			
96-D-111 National ignition facility site, TBD	284,200	0	284,200
Total: Construction & inertial fusion	498,000	0	498,000
Technology partnerships/education			
Technology partnership	60,000	(20,000)	40,000
Education	9,000	0	9,000
Total Technology partnership/education	69,000	(20,000)	49,000
Total Stockpile stewardship	2,188,375	(50,000)	2,138,375

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Stockpile management			
Operation and maintenance	1,935,803	83,500	2,019,303
Construction:			
99-D-122 Rapid reactivation, various locations	11,200	0	11,200
99-D-123 Replace mechanical utility systems, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	1,900	0	1,900
99-D-125 Replace boilers & controls, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	1,000	0	1,000
99-D-127 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, MO	13,700	0	13,700
99-D-128 Stockpile management restructuring initiative Pantex consolidation, Amarillo, TX	1,108	0	1,108
99-D-132 SMRI nuclear material S&S upgrade project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	9,700	0	9,700
98-D-123 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Tritium factory modernization and consolidation, Savannah River, SC	27,500	0	27,500
98-D-124 Stockpile management restructuring initiative, Y-12 consolidation, Oak Ridge, TN	10,700	0	10,700
97-D-122 Nuclear materials storage facility renovation, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	9,164	0	9,164
97-D-123 Structural upgrades, Kansas City plant, Kansas City, KS	6,400	0	6,400

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
96-D-122 Sewage treatment quality upgrade (STQU), Pantex plant, Amarillo, TX	3,700	0	3,700
95-D-102 Chemistry and metallurgy research (CMR) upgrades project, LANL, Los Alamos, NM	16,000	0	16,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 plant, Oak Ridge, TN	3,250	0	3,250
Total Construction	115,322	0	115,322
Total: Construction & Stockpile management	2,051,125	83,500	2,134,625
Program direction	260,500	(20,500)	240,000
Stockpile stewardship and management construction general reduction	0	(30,000)	(30,000)
Subtotal Weapons activities	4,500,000	(17,000)	4,483,000
Use of prior year balances	0	(340,900)	(340,900)
TOTAL WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	4,500,000	(357,900)	4,142,100
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION & WASTE MANAGEMENT			
Site/project completion			
Operation and maintenance	846,090	38,000	886,090
Construction:			
99-D-402 Tank farm support services, F&H area, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	2,745	0	2,745
99-D-404 Health physics instrumentation laboratory, INEL, Id	950	0	950

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
98-D-401 H-tank farm storm water systems upgrade, Savannah River, SC	3,120	0	3,120
98-D-453 Plutonium stabilization and handling system for PFP, Richland, WA	26,814	0	26,814
98-D-700 INEL road rehabilitation, INEL, ID	7,710	0	7,710
97-D-450 Actinide packaging and storage facility, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	79,184	0	79,184
97-D-470 Regulatory monitoring and bioassay lab, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	7,000	0	7,000
96-D-406 Spent nuclear fuels canister storage and stabilization facility, Richland, WA	38,680	0	38,680
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, Kansas City Plant and SR	4,512	0	4,512
96-D-464 Electrical & utility systems upgrade, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, ID	11,544	0	11,544
96-D-471 CFC HVAC/chiller retrofit, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC	8,000	0	8,000
95-D-456 Security facilities consolidation, Idaho Chemical Processing Plant, INEL, ID	485	0	485
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades Savannah River, SC	3,667	0	3,667

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA	4,752	0	4,752
Total Construction	199,163	0	199,163
Total: Construction & Site/project completion	1,047,253	38,000	1,085,253
Post 2006 completion			
Operation and maintenance	2,592,195	92,000	2,684,195
Construction:			
99-D-403 Privatization phase I infrastructure support, Richland, WA	14,800	0	14,800
97-D-402 Tank farm restoration and safe operations, Richland, WA	22,723	0	22,723
96-D-408 Waste management upgrades, Richland, WA	171	0	171
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, Richland, WA	32,860	0	32,860
93-D-187 High-level waste removal from filled waste tanks, Savannah River, SC	10,702	0	10,702
Total Construction	81,256	0	81,256
Total: Construction & Post 2006 completion	2,673,451	92,000	2,765,451

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Science and technology Program direction	193,000 346,199	77,750 0	270,750 346,199
Defense Facilities Closure Projects Site closure	1,006,240	40,000	1,046,240
Defense Environmental Management Privatization Privatization initiatives, various locations	516,857	(230,000)	286,857
Subtotal: Def environmental restoration & waste mgmt	5,783,000	17,750	5,800,750
Use of prior year balances	0	(94,100)	(94,100)
TOTAL DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL REST. & WASTE MGMT.	5,783,000	(76,350)	5,706,650
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
Nonproliferation and national security			
Verification and control technology			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D	210,000	0	210,000
Arms control	256,900	0	256,900
Intelligence	33,600	0	33,600
Total Verification and control technology	500,500	0	500,500
Nuclear safeguards and security	53,200	0	53,200
Security investigations	30,000	0	30,000
Emergency management	23,700	(2,400)	21,300
Program direction	88,900	0	88,900
Total: Nonproliferation and national security	696,300	(2,400)	693,900

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Worker and community transition			
Worker and community transition	41,000	0	41,000
Program direction	4,000	0	4,000
Total Worker and community transition	45,000	0	45,000
Fissile materials control and disposition			
Operation and maintenance	111,372	0	111,372
Construction			
99-D-141 Pit disassembly and conversion Facility, Various locations	25,000	0	25,000
99-D-143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Various locations	28,000	0	28,000
Total Construction	53,000	0	53,000
Program direction	4,588	0	4,588
Total: Construction & Fissile materials control and disposition	168,960	0	168,960
Environment, safety & health			
Office of environment, safety and health (defense) Program direction	69,231 4,769	20,000 0	89,231 4,769
Total Environment, safety and health	74,000	20,000	94,000
Office of hearings and appeals	2,400	0	2,400
Nuclear Energy			
International nuclear safety	35,000	0	35,000
Total Nuclear Energy	35,000	0	35,000

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
Naval reactors			
Naval reactors development Operation and maintenance	623,600	16,000	639,600
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations	9,000	0	9,000
Construction:			
98-D-200 Site laboratory/facility upgrade, various locations	7,000	0	7,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID	5,800	0	5,800
Total Construction	12,800	0	12,800
Total: Construction & Naval reactors development	645,400	16,000	661,400
Program direction	20,100	0	20,100
Total Naval reactors	665,500	16,000	681,500
SUBTOTAL: OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,667,160	33,600	1,720,760
Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Offset to user organizations	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
Total Adjustments	(20,000)	0	(20,000)
TOTAL OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	1,667,160	33,600	1,700,760

TITLE XXXI - DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
 (Dollars in Thousands)

PROGRAM TITLE	FY 1999 AUTHORIZATION REQUEST	COMMITTEE CHANGE FROM FY 1999 REQUEST	FY 1999 COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL			
Defense nuclear waste disposal	190,000	0	190,000
TOTAL ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	12,140,160	(400,650)	11,739,510

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative

The budget request contained \$517.8 million for stockpile stewardship computing needs, of which \$329.1 million is for the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative (ASCI).

ASCI is a centerpiece of the science based stockpile stewardship effort being pursued by the Department to assure the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile while the United States observes a nuclear test ban. The goal of the ASCI program is to develop computers that perform 100 trillion operations (teraflops) a second, software for three dimensional simulation of nuclear weapons performance, and storage, communications, and visualization technology capable of handling the massive quantities of data required. The committee notes that the ASCI funding request represents an increase of 47 percent over fiscal year 1998 in order to aggressively advance the state-of-the-art in computer hardware and software.

The committee is concerned that ASCI remains a high risk program. The committee is aware that ASCI computer hardware development has resulted in some impressive accomplishments, including the one teraflop Option Red computer at Sandia National Laboratory. However, the committee understands that Option Red architecture is not optimal for the tasks for which it was designed and that contractors have not met early milestones for the three teraflop Option Blue computers at Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories. The committee has also received information indicating that software development needed for science based stockpile stewardship remains a significant challenge and has not proceeded at the pace necessary to fully utilize the computer hardware in place.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$279.1 million for ASCI, a reduction of \$50.0 million. The committee believes that this level of funding, which would represent a 25 percent increase over fiscal year 1998, will provide a healthy infusion of funds to keep the program on an aggressive, but more measured, pace.

The committee is also concerned over the adequacy of compliance with section 3157 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85), requiring that ASCI contractors report, on a quarterly basis, all exports to Tier III countries of computers capable of operating at speeds in excess of 2,000 millions of theoretical operations per second (MTOPS). The committee continues to believe that DOE should use these reports to monitor exports of U.S.-origin high performance computers to end-users of proliferation concern. The committee remains committed to monitoring compliance with this statutory requirement and expects that the Department will notify the committee of any systemic compliance problem it should encounter in fulfilling the requirements of this provision of law.

Advanced Manufacturing, Design and Production Technologies

The budget request contained \$62.6 million for the advanced manufacturing, design and production technologies (ADAPT) pro-

gram. The committee notes that this funding level represents a 15 percent reduction from fiscal year 1998. The committee believes that ADAPT funding is essential to the development of technologies critical to an efficiently operated nuclear weapons production complex and that the funding requested is inadequate. The Kansas City plant, for example, may have to lay off a significant portion of its engineering staff without additional funding for this program. Consequently, the committee recommends \$78.1 million, an increase of \$15.5 million.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Safeguards

The President has established six necessary conditions which must be met for the United States to enter into the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). These include:

- (1) The conduct of a broad range of experimental tests which do not result in a sustained nuclear reaction;
- (2) The maintenance of very capable weapons labs;
- (3) The maintenance of the ability to resume nuclear testing;
- (4) The development of strong treaty monitoring capabilities;
- (5) The development of strong intelligence capabilities to monitor nuclear weapons programs in other nations; and
- (6) The definition of a process under which the President would withdraw from the CTBT for reasons of "supreme national interest."

The committee believes that strong manufacturing capabilities and a viable production complex to support our nuclear stockpile are also essential, whether or not the United States enters into the CTBT. Consequently, the committee urges the Department to recognize the importance of the production complex in this context, to advise the committee on any shortfalls in the ability of the production complex to support stockpile needs in the absence of testing, and to include the maintenance of a robust production complex in any future delineation of safeguards required for U.S. entry into the CTBT.

Core Stockpile Management Weapons Program

The budget request contained \$307.4 million for the core stockpile management weapons program. The committee understands that the request is not adequate to meet requirements for surveillance of the B61-3/4/10, the B61-7/11, and the W62; dismantlement of the W79, W56, and W70; maintenance for a number of weapons; and other projects pertaining to component disposition and containers performed at the Pantex plant. Accordingly, the committee recommends \$332.4 million, an increase of \$25.0 million.

Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Science and Technology

The budget request contained \$193.0 million for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Science and Technology. The committee recommends \$279.5 million, an increase of \$77.8 million. The committee intends that the additional resources will be used to develop new technologies for defense nuclear waste cleanup. The committee believes that such new technologies are

necessary to expedite site cleanup so that landlord costs at the sites can be reduced. The committee directs that \$30.0 million of the additional resources be allocated to the use of innovative environmental restoration technologies at projects designated as “Site/project completion” projects, and \$30.0 million be allocated to the use of innovative environmental restoration technologies at projects designated as “Post 2006 completion” projects.

Defense Programs Construction Projects

The budget request contained \$515.1 million for construction projects at the laboratories and production facilities, of which \$65.7 million would be for 13 new starts.

The committee is aware that a number of the projects for which the Department is requesting funding have suffered cost overruns and delays and have been reviewed for management deficiencies. The committee appreciates the Department’s self-critique, which attributes the poor performance on these and other construction projects to inadequate oversight from headquarters, poor input and support from the intended end users of the facilities, lack of adequate definition in the design phase, and a poor requirements review process.

The committee is encouraged that the Department is taking action to avoid the recurrence of these problems. However, the committee is concerned that the budget request fails to consider the time necessary to implement the Department’s reforms and consequently believes that the number of new starts in the request is excessive. The committee also believes that continuing construction projects which have experienced these systemic difficulties should be carefully reviewed to determine appropriate corrective actions.

Therefore, the committee recommends \$200.9 million, a reduction of \$30.0 million to the construction accounts in stockpile stewardship and management. The committee believes that this amount would allow the Department to proceed with the high priority construction projects necessary to assure the future safety, reliability and effectiveness of the stockpile while at the same time implementing needed reforms.

Emergency Management

The budget request contained \$23.7 million for Emergency Management. The committee believes that two of the activities for which funds were requested involve responses to non-radiological events—expanding the Atmospheric Release Advisory Capability for chemical and hazardous material releases and assisting state and local governments in their response to natural and manmade disasters—and are more appropriately funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Therefore, the committee recommends \$21.3 million, a reduction of \$2.4 million.

Hanford Tank Safety and Remediation Projects

The budget request contained \$273.8 million for High-Level Waste Management in the Post 2006 Completion project at the Hanford Site. The committee recommends \$308.8 million, an increase of \$35.0 million. The committee directs that this increase be

provided for the following activities: \$18.0 million to drain single-shell tanks that contain high-level waste, \$7.0 million for implementation of the final safety analysis report for tank farm operations, \$9.0 million for timely resolution of flammable gas and organic safety issues, and \$1.0 million for reduction of vadose zone contamination.

Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Privatization Phase I

The budget request contained \$330.0 million for the Hanford Tank Waste Remediation System Privatization Project, Phase I.

The committee understands that the two contractors working on Phase IA of the project have submitted their proposals for proceeding with Phase IB and that each of the contractors has stated the need to conduct further development work for a period of 16 to 24 months before they are ready to proceed with Phase IB work. The contractors have indicated that this additional development work is necessary to reduce technical uncertainty. Therefore, the committee believes that the \$330.0 million requested is not needed in fiscal year 1999. However, consistent with its commitment to cleanup the Hanford tank wastes, the committee recommends authorization of \$100.0 million to be added to the accumulated budget authority currently held in reserve for this project. This recommendation represents a reduction of \$230.0 million.

In addition, the committee recommends the requested amounts for two other projects that support the Hanford privatization project: \$14.8 million for the Privatization Phase I infrastructure support project (99-D-403), and \$16.1 million for the Pretreatment and Immobilization Science and Technology Development project.

Hazardous Material Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) Program

The budget request contained \$65.1 million for program direction at the Richland, Washington Field Office. The committee recommends that \$0.8 million of that amount be used to support the HAMMER program for training in emergency response to hazardous materials release at DOE's Hanford, Washington site.

Heavy Water Processing

The budget request contained \$2.6 million for the Heavy Water Processing project at the Savannah River Site. The committee recommends \$22.6 million, an increase of \$20.0 million.

The budget request would support the continued consolidation and storage of 3,000 drums of tritium-contaminated heavy water into the former K-Reactor at Savannah River. However, the committee believes that this excess heavy water, a potential pollution source, should be removed from the site since its monitoring and maintenance will continue to cost millions of dollars. The committee understands that the heavy water is contaminated with tritium. The committee also understands that if the tritium is removed from the heavy water, the heavy water can be removed from the Savannah River Site and sold. The committee believes that this would have two beneficial effects: (1) it would remove a potential pollution source from Savannah River, and (2) the sale of the heavy

water would generate revenue for the government. The committee directs that the additional resources provided by this increase be used to implement such a project.

Inertial Confinement Fusion

The budget request contained \$213.8 million for the inertial confinement fusion (ICF) program. The committee believes that work by the University of Rochester's Laboratory for Laser Energetics with the Omega laser is an essential element of the ICF program. The committee recommends the requested amount and directs that, within this total, the Department make available the \$29.0 million requested for the Laboratory for Laser Energetics.

In-Tank Precipitation Process

The budget request contained \$382.7 million for the High-Level Waste Treatment at the Savannah River Site. The committee recommends \$412.7 million, an increase of \$30.0 million. The committee directs that the additional resources provided by this increase be used to modify the In Tank Precipitation Process equipment to address equipment problems associated with the release of explosive benzene that were identified in recent startup testing.

International Nuclear Safety

The budget request contained \$35.0 million for the International Nuclear Safety program. The committee recommends the requested amount, but believes DOE should broaden the program's focus beyond reducing environmental threats from unsafe Soviet-designed reactors. The committee directs DOE to begin to address nuclear materials safety during the disposition of excess weapons plutonium and HEU in Russia.

Laboratory Collaboration With the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization

The budget request contained no funding for the use of Department of Energy assets or expertise to assist the Department of Defense Ballistic Missile Defense Organization's (BMDO) test program. The committee notes that in fiscal year 1998, \$49.9 million in BMDO funding is expected to be spent at the DOE national laboratories and that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85) required the Secretaries of Energy and Defense to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to facilitate the use of assets and expertise at the national laboratories for ballistic missile defense programs.

The committee understands that this MOU has now been signed and the Department of Energy and BMDO have identified several additional projects in which laboratory expertise could meet legitimate BMDO needs. The committee believes these projects, like other laboratory projects that are not directly related to DOE's nuclear weapons programs, will assist the laboratories in the development of tools and expertise necessary for effective stockpile stewardship and further believes that this proposed expansion of collaboration between BMDO and the Department of Energy will be

beneficial for both organizations. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to the core stockpile stewardship program to implement the additional projects identified by BMDO and the DOE laboratories. The committee expects that regular reviews by BMDO and the Department of Energy will continue to refine and improve this cooperative arrangement and that future budget requests will reflect appropriate cost sharing between the two organizations.

In addition, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 3133) that would require the Secretary of Energy to make available, of the funds authorized for Department of Energy defense programs, no less than \$60.0 million for additional missile technology development in cooperation with BMDO for the purpose of developing, demonstrating, and testing hit-to-kill interceptor vehicles for theater missile defense systems. The committee recognizes that the development of such vehicles remains a significant technical challenge. The committee believes that this effort should be in parallel to ongoing BMDO-managed system and technology development programs.

Naval Reactors

The budget request contained \$665.5 million for the naval reactors program.

The committee understands that the current program for shutdown and environmental remediation of land-based training and research and development reactors is making substantial progress and the Navy is managing a successful on-going program for the disposal of defueled decommissioned nuclear propulsion plants.

However, the committee understands that planned non-pressure vessel removal work at the Kesselring site in New York was deferred and other remediation work was scaled back in response to fiscal year 1998 funding shortfalls. The committee is concerned that the budget request for inactivation of prototype reactors failed again to fully fund these efforts as well as planned remediation efforts in Idaho.

The committee believes that additional funding is required to proceed with the shutdown and environmental remediation of naval reactor sites in New York and Idaho at a prudent and efficient pace. Therefore, the committee recommends \$681.5 million, an increase of \$16.0 million for this purpose.

Office of Environment, Safety, and Health

The budget request contained \$74.0 million for the defense component of the Office of Environment, Safety, and Health. The committee recommends \$94.0 million, an increase of \$20.0 million. This increase would restore funding for the defense component of the program to the fiscal year 1998 level. The committee does not endorse the Department's transfer of half of the Environment, Safety, and Health staff to the DOE Energy Supply program. The DOE workforce at the current and former weapons production sites are those most at risk, and the committee believes emphasis should be placed on their health and safety.

Program Direction

The budget request contained \$260.5 million for defense programs program direction, which includes salaries, personnel, contractor support, and advisory and assistance funding. This amount represents a \$10.5 million increase to the level of funding approved by Congress for fiscal year 1998. The committee recommends \$240.0 million, a reduction of \$20.5 million to advisory, assistance, and support services.

Reactor Decontamination and Decommissioning

The budget request contained \$4.8 million for Facility Decommissioning at the Hanford Site. The committee recommends \$16.8 million, an increase of \$12.0 million. The committee directs that these additional resources be used to continue progress on the cocooning of the F and H reactors at the Hanford site. Such safe storage of the reactor cores on an interim basis will allow the Department to target remediation funds to decontaminate and decommission ancillary buildings at Hanford, potentially saving millions of dollars in annual maintenance and surveillance costs.

Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project

The budget request contained \$625.2 million for the Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site Closure Project. For the last two years, the committee has emphasized the importance of providing adequate funding for the cleanup efforts at sites that are nearing closure. The Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site is scheduled for closure by 2010 at a projected total cost of \$7.3 billion. However, the Secretary has challenged the Department staff and associated contractors to close the site by 2006, which would save an estimated \$1.3 billion. The committee endorses the Secretary's challenge and recommends \$665.2 million, an increase of \$40.0 million for this cleanup acceleration.

Savannah River Site Infrastructure Investment

The budget request contained \$492.3 million for site and project completion at the Savannah River site. The committee is concerned that capital equipment projects and spare equipment needs have gone unmet due to funding shortfalls, resulting in recent operational shutdowns at the defense waste processing facility (DWPF). Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$18.0 million to replace required equipment and thus ensure continuity of operations at the DWPF.

Stockpile Management at Y-12 Plant

The budget request contained \$2.1 billion for the stockpile management program.

The committee believes that additional funding is required for reprocessing of uranium materials and infrastructure upgrades, as well as completion of priority actions recommended by the 1997 Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Study, including seismic upgrades to storage fixtures and removal of HEU from inadequate Y-

12 facilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$13.0 million for these purposes.

Technology Partnerships

The budget request contained \$60.0 million for the technology partnership program.

Funding for technology partnerships is used at the discretion of the Department's laboratory directors to enter into cooperative research and development agreements with industry to help commercialize DOE technology and provide the Department with information useful to its stockpile stewardship program.

The committee understands the value of leveraging investment in the commercial sector, but notes that the program remains too diffuse and lacks insufficient overall direction and coordination. Moreover, the committee believes that the Department has done a poor job of justifying its budget request.

Accordingly, the committee recommends \$40.0 million for technology partnerships, a reduction of \$20.0 million. Of the remaining amount, the committee expects \$10.0 million to be used for the American Textiles Partnership project.

Tritium production

The budget request contained \$157.0 million for production of tritium.

The committee understands that the Department is examining two technical options, a commercial light water reactor and an accelerator, to produce tritium necessary to meet its future requirements and that the Department will sustain the option not selected as a potential back-up source. The committee is concerned that the request fails to support the design work necessary for the accelerator produced tritium (APT) option. The committee notes that this design work will be necessary whether APT is selected as the primary or back-up source and, therefore, recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to support this effort.

The committee also understands that the performance of tritium collecting fuel rods is being tested at the Watts Bar nuclear plant. The committee believes that the information generated by this test is essential to the selection of a primary technology for future tritium production. Therefore, the committee recommends a provision (sec. 3134) that would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a report on the results of the test and would defer the selection date for tritium production technology to December 31, 1999.

Uncosted Obligations and Unobligated Balances

The committee concurs with the Department's assessment that efficient operations require uncosted obligations and unobligated balances from prior year funding be carried over to succeeding fiscal years. These funds, also known as carryover balances, serve as a financial bridge from one fiscal year to the next. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has recommended that targets be set for these balances to help determine whether they are excess to Departmental needs. In its initial reports, GAO used targets, developed by DOE, of 8 percent of operating funds and 50 percent of

funds for capital equipment and general plant projects, equating to a weighted carryover target of 9 to 10 percent. More recently, targets ranging from 12 to 15 percent have been proposed.

The committee understands that the Department uses a 15 percent target and calculates the target in a manner that further inflates its value compared to the methodology used by GAO. Until the Department transitions to a budget that incorporates limited-term funding rather than no-year funding, the committee believes, for several reasons, that a 12 percent carryover provides the Department with adequate prior year funds to meet its needs. First, such a target is substantially in excess of the 9 to 10 percent originally used by the Department and offers a considerable safeguard against any unanticipated spending variations. Second, both GAO and DOE have historically overestimated Departmental spending rates. Such overestimates mean that the Department typically has a larger carryover balance entering a new fiscal year than estimates would have indicated. Third, the carryover balance pertains only to program direction, capital equipment, and general plant projects, not to construction projects. Construction projects manage their own funds and “bank” their own appropriations.

The committee notes that GAO projects that both the environmental management and defense program accounts will carry over prior year uncosted obligations and unobligated balances to fiscal year 1999 in excess of this 12 percent target. The committee understands that much of this excess can be attributed to greater-than-expected savings from internal reorganizations and is unrelated to any specific program spending.

Therefore, consistent with maintaining a prior year carryover balance of 12 percent, the committee recommends a reduction of \$94.1 million to defense environmental restoration and waste management program accounts and a reduction of \$340.9 million to defense program accounts. The committee makes this reduction without prejudice and does not believe that requiring the Department to operate with a lower carryover balance should have a negative impact on ongoing programs.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Waste Transportation

The budget request contained \$23.8 million for transportation of transuranic waste to the WIPP in Carlsbad, New Mexico. The committee recommends \$38.8 million, an increase of \$15.0 million, to assist the State of New Mexico in completing a bypass around Santa Fe as expeditiously as possible so as to avoid the transportation of radioactive waste through the city.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

Section 3101—Weapons Activities

This section would authorize DOE weapons activity funding for fiscal year 1999.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management

This section would authorize funds for DOE defense environmental restoration and waste management activities for fiscal year 1999.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize funds for DOE other defense activities for fiscal year 1999.

Section 3104—Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

This section would authorize funds for defense nuclear waste disposal activities of the Department for fiscal year 1999.

SUBTITLE B—RECURRING GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3121—Reprogramming

This section would prohibit the reprogramming of funds in excess of 110 percent of the amount authorized for the program, or in excess of \$1.0 million above the amount authorized for the program until the Secretary of Energy has notified the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations and National Security of the House of Representatives and a period of 30 calendar days has elapsed after the date on which the notification is received.

Section 3122—Limits on General Plant Projects

This section would limit the initiation of “general plant projects” authorized by the bill if the current estimated cost for any project exceeds \$5.0 million. However, if the Secretary of Energy finds that the estimated cost of any project will exceed \$5.0 million, the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations and National Security of the House of Representatives must be notified of the reasons for the cost variation.

Section 3123—Limits on Construction Projects

This section would permit any construction project to be initiated and continued only if the estimated cost for the project does not exceed 125 percent of the higher of: (1) the amount authorized for the project, or (2) the most recent total estimated cost presented to the Congress as justification for such project. To exceed such limits, the Secretary of Energy must report in detail to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations and National Security of the House of Representatives and the report must be before the committees for 30 legislative days. This section would also specify that the 125 percent limitation would not apply to projects estimated to cost under \$5.0 million.

Section 3124—Fund Transfer Authority

This section would permit funds authorized by the bill to be transferred to other agencies of the government for performance of work for which the funds were authorized and appropriated. The provision would permit the merger of such funds with the authorizations of the agency to which they are transferred. This section would also limit to no more than five percent the amount of funds that may be transferred between accounts in the Department of Energy that were authorized pursuant to this bill.

Section 3125—Authority for Conceptual and Construction Design

This section would limit the Secretary of Energy's authority to request construction funding until the Secretary has certified a conceptual design has been completed. This limitation would not apply in the case of emergencies.

Section 3126—Authority for Emergency Planning, Design and Construction Activities

This section would permit, in addition to any advance planning and construction design otherwise authorized by the bill, the Secretary of Energy to perform planning and design utilizing available funds for any Department of Energy national security program construction project whenever the Secretary determines that the design must proceed expeditiously to protect the public health and safety, to meet the needs of national defense, or to protect property.

Section 3127—Funds Available for All National Security Programs of the Department of Energy

This section would authorize, subject to section 3121 of this bill, amounts for management and support activities and for general plant projects to be made available for use, when necessary, in connection with all national security programs of the Department of Energy.

Section 3128—Availability of Funds

This section would allow amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance or for plant projects to remain available until expended. However, funds authorized to be appropriated for program direction activities in fiscal year 1999 would be available to be expended only until the end of the fiscal year 2000.

Section 3129—Transfers of Defense Environmental Management Funds

This section would provide the manager of each field office of the Department of Energy with the limited authority to transfer defense environmental management funds from a program or project under the jurisdiction of the office to another such program or project.

SUBTITLE C—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND
LIMITATIONS

Section 3131—Prohibition on Federal Loan Guarantees for Defense
Environmental Privatization Projects

This section would prohibit the use of federal government loan guarantees in DOE Defense Environmental Management Privatization projects.

The committee understands that the objectives of the DOE environmental management privatization program are to reduce the near-term costs to the government of environmental cleanup projects and to shift the risk from the government to the performing contractors. In addition, the committee understands that the concept of the privatization program was based upon the contractor seeking private funds to finance the construction of waste treatment facilities. By making such a financial commitment, a private contractor would have a greater incentive to succeed.

However, the committee understands that government loan guarantees may be considered to make it easier for the contractors to obtain private funding. The committee believes that if government loan guarantees are extended to cover loans DOE contractors obtain to finance cleanup projects, the government will continue to suffer the financial consequences of failures by these contractors, thereby defeating one of the principal justifications behind the privatization initiative.

Section 3132—Extension of Funding Prohibition Relating to
International Cooperative Stockpile Stewardship

This section would prohibit expenditure of funds on cooperative stockpile stewardship efforts with any countries except for France, Great Britain, or as specifically authorized, with nations of the former Soviet Union.

Section 3133—Use of Certain Funds for Missile Defense
Technology Development

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to make available, from funds authorized for Department of Energy atomic energy weapons activities, no less than \$60.0 million for missile defense technology development in cooperation with BMDO for the purpose of developing, demonstrating, and testing hit-to-kill interceptor vehicles for theater missile defense systems.

Section 3134—Selection of Technology for Tritium Production

This section would delay the date by which the Secretary of Energy must select a primary technology for the production of tritium to no later than December 31, 1999. The section would also prohibit this selection until completion of an ongoing test at the Watts Bar Nuclear Station and submission of a report on the results of that test by the Secretary of Energy.

Section 3135—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds at Hanford Site

This section would prohibit the use of certain funds at the Hanford site until the Secretary of Energy certifies to Congress that the Department does not intend to pay overhead costs of more than 33 percent of total contract costs at the Hanford site. Until the Secretary completes the certification, the use of \$12.0 million for reactor decontamination and decommissioning and \$18.0 million for drainage of single-shell waste tanks at the Hanford site would be prohibited.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3151—Worker and Community Transition

This section would repeal the requirements of section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-484). Section 3161 required the implementation of a worker and community transition program to restructure the DOE private contractor workforce at the end of the Cold War. This section would also prohibit the expenditure of funds for the DOE Worker and Community Transition program after September 30, 1999.

The committee, in its report on H.R. 1119 (H. Rept. 105-132), recommended that the provisions contained in section 3161 should be phased out by the end of fiscal year 1999. The committee believes that the expenditure of nearly \$811.1 million by the Worker and Community Transition program to date has already significantly mitigated the effect of post-Cold War downsizing of the DOE contractor base. The committee notes that this program benefits DOE contractor employees only, and that similar programs are not available to other private sector contractor employees who have lost their jobs as a result of downsizing of the national security industrial base in the post-Cold War world.

Notwithstanding the repeal of section 3161, like assistance would still be made available to workers of the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) through the 270 budget function. The committee understands that one of the two gaseous diffusion plants of the USEC may close by 2002. In 1996 Congress passed the USEC Privatization Act (Public Law 104-134). Section 3110 of the act made the workers of USEC eligible for the Worker and Community Transition program to lessen the impact of a plant closure.

Section 3152—Requirement for Plan to Modify Employment System Used by Department of Energy in Defense Environmental Management Programs

This section would prohibit the use of more than 75 percent of Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management program direction funds for fiscal year 1999 until the Secretary of Energy submits a plan for improvement of the DOE federal employment system. The committee notes the Department's poor record in the area of environmental management and believes that too often failures in environmental cleanup have occurred because of management and personnel problems. Therefore, the requested plan should address strategies to recruit and hire individuals for the De-

fense Environmental Management program who are highly skilled and who have experience as project and construction managers. The plan should also identify any provisions of federal law that must be altered to allow its implementation.

Section 3153—Report on Stockpile Stewardship Criteria

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on National Security by March 1, 1999, on DOE efforts to develop a clear set of criteria pertaining to the technical performance of SBSS tools and their relationship to key nuclear weapons technologies, that, if met, will offer a sufficient degree of certainty that the U.S. stockpile is safe and reliable.

Because national policy prescribes a testing moratorium and supports a complete ban on underground nuclear testing, development of science based tools to assure the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons is absolutely necessary. The committee is concerned that the criteria the Department will use to determine if SBSS is providing sufficient confidence in stockpile safety and reliability have not been well defined. These criteria need to be more clearly understood, more accurately detailed, and portrayed in such a way that they support decision-makers in their consideration of future science based stockpile stewardship and nuclear testing requirements.

**TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES
SAFETY BOARD**

LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize \$17.5 million for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Materials Research

The committee remains concerned with the direction of materials research within the Department of Defense, and believes that such research should seek to reduce long-term dependence upon foreign sources for critical defense materials. The committee believes that materials research, by agencies such as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, is necessary in maintaining a technology edge to preserve long term national security. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a basic review of the policies and programs regarding defense critical materials and critical materials research. This review should address, at a minimum, the issue of the vulnerabilities of the domestic and foreign supplier base for critical defense materials needed in the production of future defense systems, and issues ranging from current funding for basic research to the critical weaknesses within production research which may have an impact of the fielding of future defense systems. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the committee by February 15, 1999, the results of this review.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3301—Definitions

This section would provide specific definitions of the National Defense Stockpile and the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

Section 3302—Authorized Uses of Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize \$82.647 million from the National Defense Stockpile

Transaction Fund for the operations and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 1999. The provision would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions after a notification to Congress.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Definitions

This section would provide specific definitions of the Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Section 3402—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize \$22.5 million for fiscal year 1999 for the Naval Petroleum Reserves.

Section 3403—Price Requirement on Sale of Certain Petroleum During Fiscal Year 1999

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to sell petroleum produced for the Naval Petroleum Reserves at established prices.

Section 3404—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to sell, lease, or transfer to the Department of the Interior, the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2 located in the state of California. The committee does not intend for this provision to relieve the Secretary of any obligations he may have pursuant to section 120 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), more commonly known as the Superfund law, or other applicable environmental laws.

Section 3405—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy, after a determination to abandon oil and gas operations is made, to sell, lease, or transfer the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3, located in the state of Wyoming.

Section 3406—Disposal of Naval Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2

This section would authorize the Secretary of Energy to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Naval Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2 located in the state of Utah.

Section 3407—Administration

This section would provide administrative requirements to be used in the sale, lease, or transfer of Naval Petroleum Reserves Numbered 2 and 3, and for Naval Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2.

TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Short Title; References to Panama Canal Act of 1979

This section would establish the Act as the “Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.”

Section 3502—Authorization of Expenditures

This section would authorize the Panama Canal Commission (the Commission) to make expenditures from the Panama Canal Commission Revolving Fund within existing statutory limits. The Commission operates as a wholly-owned government corporation and is supervised by a nine member supervisory board, commonly referred to as the Panama Canal Commission Board of Directors. The Commission does not draw from U.S. taxpayer funds for the operation of the Canal, but receives funding to cover its operating, administrative and capital improvement expenses from tolls and other revenues collected. The Commission’s total operating costs, including depreciation and interest payments, in fiscal year 1999 are estimated to be \$628.5 million.

Section 3503—Purchase of Vehicles

This section would authorize the Commission to purchase passenger motor vehicles provided that the purchase price is less than \$23,000 per vehicle.

Section 3504—Expenditures Only in Accordance with Treaties

This section would restrict expenditures to those in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaties of 1977 and any United States laws implementing those treaties.

Section 3505—Donations to the Commission

This section would authorize the Commission to seek and accept donations of funds, property and services for the purpose of carrying out promotional activities. It would also require the Commission to establish written guidelines to set forth criteria to ensure that any donations do not reflect unfavorably upon the Commission or its employees or give the appearance of compromising the ability of the Commission or its employees to carry out their duties.

Section 3506—Sunset of United States Overseas Benefits Just Before Transfer

This section would terminate selected benefits available to certain United States Government employees in Panama on December

30, 1999. These benefits include tropical differential pay, leave and travel, transportation and repatriation rights, and group health and life insurance. The purpose in terminating these benefits immediately prior to the transfer of the Canal is to prevent an interpretation of Panamanian law which would require the Panama Canal Authority, the Panamanian entity which will succeed the Commission after the transfer, to continue to provide these benefits after the transition. These changes will enable the Panama Canal Authority to establish appropriate wages and benefits for its employees according to prevailing market conditions and will not have any effect upon Commission employees prior to the transfer.

Section 3507—Central Examining Office

This section would repeal the statutory authorization for the Central Examining Office. The office was originally established in 1979 coordinate policies and activities of all U.S. Government agencies participating in the Panama Canal Employment System. Since September 1966, the Commission has had sole responsibility for these functions. The Central Examining Office no longer exists and the Commission's Department of Human Resources now has sole responsibility for these functions.

Section 3508—Liability for Vessel Accidents

This section would limit the Commission's exposure to liability for damage to vessels and cargo, as well as for injuries to crew and passengers, for vessels transiting the canal to those cases in which the claimant is covered by insurance against mishaps in the Canal in the amount of \$1.0 million. This section would require the Commission to pay only those damages that are in excess of the amounts recovered or recoverable by the claimant from its insurer. This section would also foreclose any claim in the nature of subrogation against the Commission by an insurer. These changes will make the Commission's liability for damages more consistent with existing practices in ports and waterways in other parts of the world.

Section 3509—Panama Canal Board of Contract Appeals

This section would eliminate the mandatory date for establishment and functioning of the Panama Canal Board of Contract Appeals and allow more time to establish the board. This change would allow the United States and Panama sufficient time to establish the board in a manner that will meet the long term needs of the transition. This section would also permit the Commission's supervisory board to establish compensation levels for board members so as to be more consistent with local salary conditions.

Section 3510—Technical Amendments

This section would carry out various technical amendments.

TITLE XXXVI—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEM OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Merchant Marine Academy

The committee is concerned about the deteriorating material condition of the physical plant of the midshipmen barracks at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. The plant is antiquated and in need of replacement before it becomes a health and safety concern to the midshipmen and staff. The committee understands that the Maritime Administration is conducting a feasibility study for the design of a replacement utility system and intends to closely monitor the progress of this and other important capital improvement projects at the academy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3601—Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999

This section would authorize \$90.6 million for fiscal year 1999, as contained in the budget request, for the United States Maritime Administration. Of the funds authorized, \$70.6 million would be for operations and training programs, \$16.0 million would be for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of loan guarantees authorized by Title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), and \$4.0 million would be for administrative expenses related to these loan guarantee commitments.

Section 3602—Conveyance of NDRF Vessel M/V Bayamon

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to sell, at fair market value, a surplus National Defense Reserve Fleet vessel to the Trade Fair Ship Company of New York, New York for use as a floating trade exposition.

Section 3603—Conveyance of NDRF Vessels Benjamin Isherwood and Henry Eckford

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to sell, at fair market value, two surplus TAO class vessels that were not completed and transferred to the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

Section 3604—Clearinghouse for Maritime Information

This section would authorize the establishment of a clearinghouse for maritime information by providing an online trade information database at a State maritime academy. The clearinghouse

would provide access to economic resource and transportation data via the Internet.

Section 3605—Conveyance of NDRF Vessel Ex-USS Lorain County

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to convey, at no cost to the government, a surplus National Defense Reserve Fleet vessel to Ohio War Memorial, Inc. for use as a memorial to Ohio veterans.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1998.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Defense proposes the enclosed draft of legislation, "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes."

This legislative proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for the Second Session of the 105th Congress and is needed to carry out the President's budget plans for fiscal year 1999. The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

This bill provides management authority for the Department of Defense and makes several changes to the authorities under which we operate. These changes are designed to permit a more efficient operation of the Department of Defense.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) requires that all revenue and direct spending legislation meet a pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirement. That is, no bill should result in an increase in the deficit; and if it does, it could contribute to a sequester if it is not fully offset. This legislation would affect direct spending and receipts; therefore, it is subject to the PAYGO requirement. The Office of Management and Budget's preliminary scoring estimates indicate that this bill's direct spending is fully offset.

Enactment of this legislation is of great importance to the Department of Defense and the Department urges its speedy and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. MILLER.

Enclosures.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, DC, February 17, 1998.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is proposed legislation to authorize military construction and related activities of the Department of Defense. Enactment of this legislation is necessary to carry out the President's Fiscal Year 1999 budget plan.

If enacted, this legislation would make several improvements to the efficiency of managing military construction, base housing, and the use of defense lands. These improvements would include authority to purchase leased family housing at Eielson Air Force Base and to require federal agencies using defense lands to restore those lands. The legislation also would make an inflationary increase in the threshold for notification of construction design undertaken with respect to a military construction project not otherwise authorized by law.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal to Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JUDITH A. MILLER.

Enclosure.

 COMMITTEE POSITION

On May 6, 1998 the Committee on National Security, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 3616, as amended, by a vote of 50 to 1.

 COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that on May 6, 1998 the Committee on National Security ordered reported H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. As ordered reported by the National Security Committee, this legislation contains a number of provisions which fall within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. These provisions include the following:

Section 601—Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 1999
Section 602—Basic Allowance for Housing Outside the U.S.
Section 603—Basic Allowance for Subsistence for Reserves

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonuses and Special Pay Authorities for Nurse Officer Candidates, Registered Nurses, and Nurse Anesthetists

Section 613—One-year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays

Section 614—Aviation Career Incentive Pay and Officer Retention Bonus

Section 617—Removal of Ten Percent Restriction on Selective Reenlistment Bonuses

Section 619—Equitable Treatment of Reserves Eligible for Special Pay for Duty Subject to Hostile Fire or Imminent Danger

Section 631—Exception to Maximum Weight Allowance for Baggage and Household Effects

Section 632—Travel and Transportation Allowances for Travel Performed by Members in Connection with Rest and Recuperative Leave from Overseas Stations

Section 633—Storage of Baggage of Certain Dependents

Section 641—Effective Date of Former Spouse Survivor Benefit Coverage

Section 652—Accounting of Advance Payments

Section 653—Reimbursement of Rental Vehicle Costs When Motor Vehicle Transported at Government Expense is Late

Section 701—Expansion of Dependent Eligibility Under Retiree Dental Program

Section 3151—Termination of Worker and Community Transition Assistance

Section 3211—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Authorization

Section 3401—Naval Petroleum Reserves—Definitions

Section 3403—Price Requirement on Sale of Certain Petroleum During Fiscal Year 1999

Section 3404—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2

Section 3405—Disposal of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 3

Section 3406—Disposal of Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2

Section 3407—NPR—Administration

Recognizing your interest in bringing this legislation before the House expeditiously, the Commerce Committee agrees not to seek a sequential referral of the bill based on the provisions listed above. By agreeing not to seek a sequential referral, the Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over the provisions listed above or any other provisions of the bill that may fall within its jurisdiction. In addition, the Commerce Committee reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in the House-Senate conference.

I want to thank you and your staff for their assistance in providing the Commerce Committee with an opportunity to review the text of H.R. 3616. I would appreciate your assistance in including this letter as a part of the National Security Committee's report on

H.R. 3616 and as part of the record during consideration of this bill by the House.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

Hon. TOM BLILEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 12, 1998 regarding H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

I agree that the Committee on Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation. I understand that the Committee on Commerce would be successful in asserting its right to a sequential referral of H.R. 3616, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 1998.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SPENCE: Thank you for working with me in your development of H.R. 3616, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, specifically: Section 361, Eligibility Requirements for Attendance at Department of Defense Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools; Section 364, Assistance to Local Education Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees; Section 551, One-Year Extension of Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities Relating to Personnel Management and Benefits; Section 3151, Termination of Worker and Community Transition Assistance. As you know, these provisions are within the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

While I do not intend to seek sequential referral of H.R. 3616, the Committee does hold an interest in preserving its future jurisdiction with respect to issues raised in the aforementioned provisions, and its jurisdictional prerogatives should the provisions of this bill or any Senate amendments thereto be considered in a conference with the Senate. We would expect to be appointed as conferees on these provisions should a conference with the Senate arise.

Again, I thank you for working with me in developing the amendments to H.R. 3616 and look forward to working with you on these issues in the future.

Sincerely,

BILL GOODLING, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, May 5, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight agrees to waive sequential jurisdiction over The Travel By Reservists On Carriers Under Contract With The General Services Administration Amendment to H.R. 3616 offered by Mr. Buyer of Indiana.

This waiver is not intended or designed to limit our jurisdiction over any future jurisdiction of related matters.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your consultation with the Government Reform and Oversight Committee to ensure that these provisions address the legislative goals of both Committees as well as the American Taxpayer.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Government Reform and Oversight agrees to waive jurisdiction over the following provisions in H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Title III—Operation and Maintenance

Sec. 368: Travel by Reservists on Carriers Under Contract with General Services Administration.

Title XI—Civilian Personnel Matters

Sec. 1101: Authority for Release to Coast Guard of Drug Test Results of Civil Service Mariners of the Military Sealift Command.

Sec. 1102: Limitations on Back Pay Awards.

Sec. 1103: Restoration of Annual Leave Accumulated by Civilian Employees at Installations in the Republic of Panama to be Closed Pursuant to the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977.

Sec. 1104: Repeal of Program Providing Preference for Employment of Military Spouses in Military Child Care Facilities.

Sec. 1105: Elimination of Retained Pay as a Basis for Determining Locality-Based Adjustments.

Sec. 1106: Observance of Certain Holidays at duty Posts Outside the United States.

Title XVIII—General Provisions

Sec. 2812: Outdoor Recreation development on Military Installations for Disabled Veterans, Military Dependents with Disabilities, and other Persons with Disabilities.

Title XXXV—Panama Canal Commission:

Sec. 3506: Sunset of United States Overseas Benefits Just Before Transfer.

Sec. 3507: Central Examining Office.

As you know, House Rule X, Establishment and Jurisdiction of Standing Committees, grants the Government Reform and Oversight Committee wide jurisdiction over government management issues including matters related to Federal civil service, procurement policy and property disposal. This committee also oversees legislation regarding holidays and celebrations. This waiver is not intended or designed to limit our jurisdiction over any future consideration of related matters.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your consultation with the Government Reform and Oversight Committee to ensure that these provisions address the legislative goals of both Committees as well as the American taxpayer.

I look forward to working with you on this and other issues throughout the 105th Congress.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1998.

HON. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 3616, legislation that was ordered reported by the Committee on National Security on May 6, 1998.

As reported, H.R. 3616 contains language within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. Specifically, section 2812 of the bill would treat volunteers who assist the Department of Defense in developing and conducting outdoor recreation programs for disabled veterans as federal employees for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The Judiciary Committee staff was consulted on this provision of the bill, and changes were made in H.R. 3616 to accommodate their concerns. For this reason, the Committee does not object to the terms of this provision, and will not request a sequential referral. However, this does not in any way waive this Committee's jurisdiction over those portions of the bill which fall within this Committee's jurisdiction, nor does it waive the Committee's jurisdiction

over any matters within its jurisdiction which might be included in H.R. 3916 during conference discussions with the Senate.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that on Wednesday, May 6, 1998, the Committee on National Security ordered favorably reported H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. The bill includes a number of provisions that fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations pursuant to Rule X(k) of the House of Representatives.

The specific provisions within our committee's jurisdiction are: (1) Section 233, Limitation on Funding for Cooperation Ballistic Missile Defense Programs; (2) Section 1021, Department of Defense Support for Counter-Drug Activities; (3) Section 1043, Training of Special Operation Forces with Friendly Foreign Forces; (4) Section 1201, Limitation of Funds for Peacekeeping in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; (5) Section 1202, Reports on the Mission of United States Forces in Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina; (6) Section 1203, Report on Military Capabilities on an Expanded NATO Alliance; (7) Section 1204, One-Year Extension of Counter-Proliferation Authorities for Support of United Nations Special Commission in Iraq; and (8) Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction With States of Former Soviet Union.

Pursuant to Chairman Solomon's announcement that the Committee on Rules will move expeditiously to consider a rule for H.R. 3616 and your desire to have the bill considered on the House floor next week, and in recognition that both of our staffs have been consulting on these provisions, the Committee on International Relations will not seek a sequential referral of the bill as a result of including these provisions, without waiving or ceding now or in the future this committee's jurisdiction over the provisions in question. I will seek to have conferees appointed for these provisions during any House-Senate conference committee.

I would appreciate your including this letter as a part of the report on H.R. 3616 and as part of the record during consideration of the bill by the House of Representatives.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 11, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for keeping me and my staff apprised of H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999. I have reviewed this bill and note several provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources. These provisions include:

Title V—Military Personnel Policy [as it affects the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Corps]

Section 601—Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 1999 [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Section 613—One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other bonuses and special pays [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Section 614—Aviation career incentive pay and aviation officer retention bonus [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Sections 631–633—Travel and Transportation Allowances [as they affect the NOAA Corps]

Section 652—Accounting of advance payments [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Section 653—Reimbursement of rental vehicle costs when motor vehicle transported at government expenses is late [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Section 701—Expansion of dependent eligibility under retiree dental program [as it affects the NOAA Corps]

Section 2812—Outdoor recreation development on military installations for disabled veterans, military dependents with disabilities and other persons with disabilities

Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum Reserves [Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 2; Oil Shale Reserve Numbered 2]

Because of the continued cooperation and consideration you have afforded me and my staff in developing these provisions, I will not seek a sequential referral of H.R. 3616 based on their inclusion in the bill. Of course, this waiver does not prejudice any future jurisdictional claims over these provisions or similar language. I also reserve the right to seek to have conferees named from the Committee on Resources on these provisions, should a conference on H.R. 3616 or a similar measure become necessary.

Once again, it has been a pleasure to work with you and Robert Rangel, Phil Grone, and Michael Higgins of your staff. I look forward to seeing HR. 3616 enacted soon.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

HON. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your information and cooperation regarding H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, and provisions that are within the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 3616 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over a number of provisions of the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, that every effort will be made to include any agreements worked out by staff of our two Committees in amendments as the bill is taken to the House Floor, and that a copy of this letter and of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report. In addition, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee reserves the right to be included as conferees on any matter within its jurisdiction should this legislation go to a House-Senate conference.

Pursuant to Rule X, clause 1(q), of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has jurisdiction over oil and other pollution of navigable waters as well as the Coast Guard. This includes provisions which amend or affect the Clean Water Act, the Ocean Dumping Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships, and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA).

Accordingly, our Committee has a jurisdictional interest in various provisions in H.R. 3616, including section 3201 which authorizes the Army Corps of Engineers to administer and execute the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program. Nonmilitary activities of the Corps are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and this additional program will impact the Corps' ability to carry out its existing missions.

The Committee has an interest in the following sections, as well as any other section in the reported version of the bill affecting Coast Guard pay or personnel matters:

531. Study of New Decorations for Injury or Death in Line of Duty.

551. One-Year Extension of Certain Force Drawdown Transition Authorities.

552. Leave Without Pay for Academy Cadets and Midshipmen.

601. Increase in Basic Pay for Fiscal Year 1999.

602. Basic Allowance for Housing Outside the United States.

613. One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Bonuses and Special Pays.

614. Aviation Career Incentive Pay and Aviation Officer Retention Bonuses.

641. Effective Date of Former Spouse Survivor Benefit Coverage.

653. Reimbursement of Rental Vehicle Costs.

701. Expansion of Dependent Eligibility Under Retiree Dental Program.

1101. Authority for release to Coast Guard of drug test results of civilian service mariners of the Military Sealift Command.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter. I look forward to continuing to work with you on H.R. 3616 and other matters of mutual interest to our two Committees

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1998.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of May 12, 1998 regarding H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation. I understand that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure would be successful in asserting its right to a sequential referral of H.R. 3616, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request such a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill.

Finally, it is my understanding that discussions among our staffs have led to an agreement on the issue of modifications to the role of the Federal Emergency Management Agency within the Chemical Emergency Preparedness Program. You have my assurance that I will support the amendment resulting from these discussions if offered on the House floor during consideration of H.R. 3616.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 5, 1998.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR FLOYD: I am advised that the Committee on National Security intends to order reported the National Defense Authorization Act for 1999, and that the measure will include two provisions which are also within the jurisdiction of the VA Committee. I am writing to you on behalf of the Committee to advise you that the Committee has no objection to House consideration of the bill even though the VA Committee has taken no action on these provisions.

The first of these provisions, section 556, would amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to offer higher educational assistance "kickers" to persons enlisting in the armed forces in the future who have a skill or specialty for which there is difficulty recruiting. The maximum amount of the kicker would be raised from \$700 a month to \$950 a month. These "kickers" are paid out of Defense funds and are in addition to the basic benefit which these enlistees would get under the Montgomery GI Bill.

The second provision, which will be offered as an amendment on behalf of Mr. Hefley and me, would transfer land adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery so that the cemetery can be expanded in the future. The land consists of a parcel presently occupied by the Navy Annex and vacant land along the present boundary between Arlington National Cemetery and Fort Myer. The transfer will be of lands already in the possession of the Defense Department at no cost to Arlington.

Sincerely,

BOB STUMP, *Chairman.*

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 1999 and the four following fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the cost estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 2(l)(3)(C) of House Rule XI.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 2(l)(3)(C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 403(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

MAY 12, 1998.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 3616, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

Summary: H.R. 3616 would authorize appropriations for 1999 for the military functions of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Energy (DOE). It also would prescribe personnel strengths for each active duty and selected reserve component of the U.S. armed forces. Assuming appropriation of the authorized amounts for 1999, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 3616 would result in additional discretionary spending from 1999 appropriations of \$266 billion over the 1999–2003 period. In addition, the bill contains provisions that would lower the costs of discretionary defense programs over the 2000–2003 period by about \$7.3 billion.

The bill contains provisions that would affect direct spending through land conveyances, the sale of vessels, changes to military retirement and survivor benefit programs, and other provisions. CBO does not have enough information to estimate the budgetary impact of certain land conveyances. We estimate that the direct spending from other provisions of H.R. 3616 would be less than \$500,000 annually or would be offset by the proceeds from asset

sales. Because it would affect direct spending, the bill would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures.

H.R. 3616 would require some airlines to extend federal government rates to reservists traveling to and from their inactive duty stations. This requirement may be a private-sector mandate as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA). However, the cost of this provision would be small, and well below the threshold established by UMRA. UMRA excludes from application of that act legislative provisions that are necessary for the national security. CBO has determined that all other provisions in H.R. 3616 either fit within this exclusion or do not contain inter-governmental mandates as defined by UMRA.

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 3616 is shown in Table 1, assuming that the bill will be enacted by October 1, 1998.

TABLE 1.—BUDGETARY IMPACT OF H.R. 3616 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION ACTION						
Spending Under Current Law for Defense Programs:						
Budget Authority ¹	270,854	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	269,125	91,079	33,955	15,117	6,586	3,047
Proposed Changes:						
Authorization Level	0	270,837	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	179,344	53,817	20,319	8,980	3,547
Spending Under H.R. 3616 for Defense Programs:						
Authorization Level ¹	270,854	270,837	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	269,125	270,423	87,772	35,436	15,566	6,594
DIRECT SPENDING						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
Estimated Outlays	0	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
ASSET SALES ³						
Estimated Budget Authority	0	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Estimated Outlays	0	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)

¹ The 1998 level is the amount appropriated for programs authorized by the bill.

² CBO does not have enough information to estimate the budgetary impact of certain land conveyances in H.R. 3616. Direct spending under other provisions of the bill is either less than \$500,000 annually or is limited to the proceeds from asset sales.

³ Under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, proceeds from a nonroutine asset sale may be counted for purposes of pay-as-you-go scorekeeping only if the sale would entail no net financial cost to the government.

⁴ CBO does not have enough information to estimate the budgetary impact of the asset sales that would be authorized by H.R. 3616.

Note.—Costs of the bill would fall under budget function 050 (national defense), except for certain items noted in the text.

Authorizations of Appropriations

The bill would authorize specific appropriations totaling \$271 billion in 1999 for military programs in DOD and DOE (see Table 2). These costs would fall within budget function 050 (national defense). The estimate assumes that the amounts authorized will be appropriated for 1999. Outlays are estimated based on historical spending patterns. In addition, H.R. 3616 would authorize specific appropriations for other budget functions:

TABLE 2.—SPECIFIC AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1999, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Military Personnel:					
Authorization Level	70,697	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	66,720	3,464	212	71	0
Operation and Maintenance:					
Authorization Level	92,880	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	70,274	17,195	3,027	1,068	436
Procurement:					
Authorization Level	49,052	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	11,551	13,845	12,264	6,317	2,544
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation:					
Authorization Level	36,228	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	18,909	13,274	2,705	689	236
Military Construction and Family Housing:					
Authorization Level	8,228	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	2,614	2,508	1,493	786	254
Atomic Energy Defense Activities:					
Authorization Level	11,897	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	7,860	3,245	621	57	57
Other Accounts:					
Authorization Level	1,786	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1,075	339	117	52	40
General Transfer Authority:					
Authorization Level	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	280	-60	-120	-60	-20
Total:					
Authorization Level	270,768	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	179,282	53,810	20,319	8,980	3,547

\$23 million for the Naval Petroleum Reserve (function 270).

\$91 million for the Maritime Administration (function 400).

\$71 million for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (function 700).

The bill also contains provisions that would affect various costs, mostly for personnel, that would be covered by the fiscal year 1999 authorization and by authorizations in future years. Table 3 contains estimates of these amounts. In addition to the costs covered by the 1999 authorizations in the bill, these provisions would lower estimated costs by \$7.3 billion over the 2000–2003 period. The following sections describe the estimated authorizations shown in Table 3 and provide information about CBO's cost estimates.

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 3616 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Endstrengths:					
Department of Defense:					
Estimated Authorization Level	-1,030	-1,065	-1,105	-1,140	-1,177
Estimated Outlays	-972	-1,056	-1,098	-1,135	-1,171
Coast Guard Reserve:					
Estimated Authorization Level	69	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	62	7	0	0	0
Grade Structure:					
Estimated Authorization Level	2	2	2	2	2
Estimated Outlays	2	2	2	2	2

TABLE 3.—ESTIMATED AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SELECTED PROVISIONS IN H.R. 3616 AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY—Continued
[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

Category	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Compensation and Benefits (DOD):					
Military Pay Raise in 1999:					
Estimated Authorization Level	186	248	254	261	269
Estimated Outlays	177	244	254	261	269
Expiring Bonuses and Allowances:					
Enlistment/reenlistment Bonuses (Active):					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	174	53	49	35
Estimated Outlays	0	165	59	49	36
Aviation and Nuclear Special Pay:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	90	34	34	26
Estimated Outlays	0	86	36	34	27
Various Bonuses (Reserve):					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	55	45	30	22
Estimated Outlays	0	52	46	31	22
Special Pay for Nurses:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	10	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	9	1	0	0
Honor Guard Details:					
Estimated Authorization Level	320	330	339	350	360
Estimated Outlays	304	329	339	350	360
Voluntary Separation/Early Retirement:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	160	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	155	5	0	0
Benefits for Involuntary Separations:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	40	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	38	2	0	0
Recruiting Incentives:					
Estimated Authorization Level	4	24	24	24	24
Estimated Outlays	4	24	24	24	24
Changes in Reenlistment Bonuses:					
Estimated Authorization Level	10	10	10	10	10
Estimated Outlays	10	10	10	10	10
Education Loan Repayment:					
Estimated Authorization Level	5	5	5	5	5
Estimated Outlays	5	5	5	5	5
Reserve Hostile Fire Pay:					
Estimated Authorization Level	3	3	3	3	3
Estimated Outlays	3	3	3	3	3
Reimbursement for Car Rental:					
Estimated Authorization Level	2	2	2	2	2
Estimated Outlays	2	2	2	2	2
Reduction in Acquisition Workforce:					
Estimated Authorization Level	-19	-672	-1,467	-2,074	-2,192
Estimated Outlays	-18	-653	-1,443	-2,056	-2,189
Dependents' Dental Premiums:					
Estimated Authorization Level	(¹)	-1	-2	-3	-4
Estimated Outlays	(¹)	-1	-2	-3	-4
Long-Term Charter of a Naval Vessel:					
Estimated Authorization Level	30	16	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	4	10	11	10	10
Worker and Community Transition Assistance:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	0	-20	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	0	-13	-6	-1
Separate Housing:					
Estimated Authorization Level	0	100	100	0	0
Estimated Outlays	0	17	52	62	40
Total Authorization of Appropriations:					
Estimated Authorization Level	-418	-469	-1,723	-2,447	-2,615
Estimated Outlays	-418	-552	-1,706	-2,356	-2,554

¹ Less than \$500,000.

Notes.—For every item in this table except one, the 1999 impacts are included in the amounts specifically authorized to be appropriated in the bill. Those amounts are shown in Table 2. Only the authorization of endstrength for the Coast Guard Reserve is additive to the amounts in Table 2.

This table does not include the costs of section 712, which would require that certain dependents of active-duty personnel be automatically enrolled in Tricare Prime. CBO estimates that those costs would be less than \$5 million annually.

Endstrength. The bill would authorize active and reserve endstrengths for 1999 and would lower the minimum endstrength authorization under permanent law. The authorized endstrengths for active-duty personnel and personnel in the Selected Reserve would total 1,406,720 and 878,094, respectively. The bill would specifically authorize appropriations of \$70.7 billion for military pay and allowances in 1999. Current law sets the minimum endstrength for active-duty personnel at 1,431,379, but the bill would lower that figure for future years to the level it would authorize for 1999, thus reducing future personnel costs by about \$1.1 billion annually.

Also the bill would authorize an endstrength of 8,000 in 1999 for the Coast Guard Reserve. This authorization would cost about \$69 million and would fall under budget function 400, transportation.

Grade Structure. Section 414 would change the grade structure of active duty personnel in support of the reserves. This change would not increase the overall endstrength, but would result in more promotions. The provision would cost about \$2 million a year.

Compensation and Benefits. H.R. 3616 contains several provisions that would affect military compensation and benefits.

Pay Raises. Section 601 would raise basic pay by 3.6 percent or \$1.3 billion in 1999. Because this pay raise would be 0.5 percent above current law, CBO estimates that the incremental costs would be \$186 million in 1999 and over \$200 million annually in subsequent years.

Expiring Bonuses and Allowances. Several sections would extend for one year DOD's authority to pay certain bonuses and allowances to current personnel. The authorities are scheduled to expire at the end of 1999, but in some cases renewing authorities for one year results in costs over several years because payments are made in installments. CBO estimates that payment of enlistment and reenlistment bonuses for active duty personnel would cost \$174 million in 2000. The cost of extending special payments for aviators and nuclear-qualified personnel would be \$90 million in 2000. Payment authorities for various bonuses for the Selected and Ready Reserve would total \$55 million in 2000. We estimate that authorities to make special payments to nurse officer candidates, registered nurses, and nurse anesthetists would cost \$10 million in 2000.

Honor Guard Details at Funerals of Veterans. Section 558 would require the secretary of a military department to provide, upon request, an honor guard detail for the funeral of any veteran. Costs associated with this provision would include additional pay, transportation, and per diem expenses for those participating in the honor guard detail. CBO estimates that honor guards would be requested for about 250,000 services. Costs for sending guard details averaging five members would total about \$320 million in 1999 and increasing amounts in subsequent years.

Voluntary Separation Benefits and Early Retirement. Section 551 would extend for one year DOD's authority to separate personnel by paying voluntary separation benefits and offering early retire-

ment. Because DOD has made relatively little use of the voluntary separation benefit in recent years, CBO estimates the cost of extending that authority would be less than \$10 million. However, recent experience indicates that early retirement incentives may be used more often. CBO estimates that DOD would spend about \$150 million in 2000 to cover the costs of extending an option to retire early.

Benefits for Involuntary Separations. Section 551 would also extend for one year transitional benefits for former military personnel who have left service involuntarily. These benefits include travel and transportation allowances, payments for storing household goods, and access to health care, commissaries and family housing. CBO estimates that costs for extending these benefits would total \$40 million in 2000.

Recruiting Incentives. Section 618 would increase the maximum enlistment bonus in the Army from \$4,000 to \$6,000 dollars for individuals who enlist for three years and score 50 or above on the Armed Forces Qualification Test. Based on current recruitment goals, CBO estimates that costs for enlistment bonuses would increase by \$4 million annually. In addition, the maximum benefit from each college fund would increase in 2000 from \$40,000 to \$50,000 under section 556, at an estimated cost to the military pay accounts of \$20 million a year.

Changes in Reenlistment Bonus Eligibility. The services extend reenlistment bonuses to personnel in specialties characterized by inadequate manning, low retention, and high replacement costs. The maximum bonus payment under current law is \$45,000, but no more than 10 percent of the bonuses can exceed \$20,000. Section 617 would remove the ten percent restriction and allow the services to extend large bonuses to more people. In addition, section 616 would allow the services to extend reenlistment bonuses to reserve members performing active guard and reserve duty. CBO estimates that extension of additional reenlistment bonuses would cost \$10 million a year.

Caps on Education Loan Repayment. The bill would increase the authorized caps on loans that DOD may repay for health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve and who have critical skills. The repayment caps would increase from \$3,000 per year and \$20,000 in total to \$10,000 and \$50,000, respectively. The provision would cost an estimated \$5 million a year.

Additional Hostile Fire Pay for Reservists. Section 619 would increase Hostile Fire Pay to a full month of coverage whenever reservists become eligible for payment. Under current law, reservists may collect the pay for only those days that they are assigned to dangerous duty. CBO estimates that section 619 would increase payments by about \$3 million annually.

Reimbursement for Car Rental. The bill would authorize DOD to reimburse service personnel for the cost of renting a car if DOD is shipping their vehicle and it fails to arrive on schedule. The provision would limit the reimbursement to \$30 a day for one week. CBO estimates the annual cost of the reimbursement to be \$2 million.

Currency Fluctuations and Overseas Housing. Under current law DOD advances housing allowances to certain military personnel

overseas. The individual reimburses the department over a period of months and bears the risk of currency fluctuations. Section 602 would shift that burden to the department by requiring DOD to adjust the amount it deducts from a member's pay as reimbursement. Because currency fluctuations are extremely difficult to estimate, spending could be either higher or lower than the amounts authorized for overseas housing. Therefore, this estimate does not include costs associated with currency fluctuations.

Reductions in Defense Acquisition Workforce. The bill would limit the size of the acquisition workforce and would require a reduction of 70,000 personnel over a three-year period. Because the number of military personnel is determined by endstrength requirements, CBO assumes that the provision would mainly affect civilian employees and that about half of the reduction would occur under current law. We estimate that further reducing the acquisition workforce would save \$19 million in 1999 and over \$2 billion a year once the reduction is fully accomplished in 2002 and thereafter.

Military Health Care Programs and Benefits. Title VII contains several provisions affecting health care programs and benefits, although only a few would have a budgetary impact.

Dependents' Dental Premiums. Under current law, participating dependents of active-duty personnel must pay part of the total premium for dental care coverage, but the amount is capped at \$20 per month per family. Section 721 would allow DOD to adjust the participants' premium for inflation. Under the bill DOD would not have to pay an increasing share of the family premium. CBO estimates that this provision would reduce DOD's costs by a negligible amount in 1999 but that savings would increase by about \$1 million annually thereafter.

Tricare Access Standards. Section 722 would require DOD to collect data on beneficiaries' access to primary care and to measure the performance of other Tricare providers against the standards established for the Tricare Prime program. Currently, DOD collects some information on access through a survey of beneficiaries, but that survey is limited to beneficiaries who use military treatment facilities (MTFs) as part of Tricare Prime. CBO estimates that the cost of this provision would be insignificant if DOD could expand its current survey to satisfy this provision. However, the costs would be substantial if DOD interprets this provision to require a system for collecting information from all providers at each encounter (for example, an office visit) rather than through surveys.

Automatic Enrollment and Reenrollment in Tricare Prime. Under current law, if dependents of active-duty personnel want to join Tricare Prime, they must enroll each year. Enrollees can choose either military or civilian primary care providers or they may be assigned to civilian providers if an MTF reaches its enrollment capacity. Section 712 would provide that such individuals who live within 40 miles of an MTF, a so-called catchment area, be automatically enrolled in Tricare Prime at the MTF. They would remain enrolled at the MTF until they elected to disenroll or became ineligible for coverage.

CBO estimates that this provision would raise DOD's health care costs less than \$5 million a year. Costs would increase if automatic

enrollment attracts beneficiaries who do not participate in DOD's health programs under current law. If all such beneficiaries were enrolled and began receiving care from the MTFs, then DOD's costs would increase by about \$90 million in 1999. Also, if automatic enrollment encourages current participants in Tricare Extra and Tricare Standard to get care from the MTFs instead, then DOD would incur more costs in the direct care system. However, only a small part of this population would be likely to change providers based solely on automatic enrollment, and because Tricare contractors would experience lower health costs from shifts to the MTFs, at least some of DOD's extra costs would be offset by adjustments to the price of the managed care contracts.

Authority to Provide Tricare Coverage. Under current law beneficiaries lose eligibility for Tricare once they are eligible for Medicare. The bill would allow DOD to extend Tricare eligibility through June 30, 1999, for certain beneficiaries who have become eligible for Medicare because of a disability but who have not enrolled in Medicare Part B. CBO estimates that DOD would spend about \$3 million in health care costs for these individuals, based on information from DOD on the number of affected beneficiaries. Information from DOD suggests that it has been willing to pay these expenses even though current law does not require it. Thus, assuming that DOD would continue to pay these costs under current law, this provision would have no net budgetary impact.

Long-Term Charter of Naval Vessels. Section 1015 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into long-term commitments to either lease newly built surface vessels or contract for services employing such vessels; in either case the contract may include an option for the Navy to purchase the vessel. Contracts under this section would have to be specifically authorized in subsequent legislation. Under current practices, a contract authorized under this section would probably be considered either a capital lease or a lease-purchase arrangement. As a result, the subsequent authorization would be scored with a large amount of budget authority in the first year. If the arrangement is a lease-purchase, the budget would record all outlays in the first year for contracts on existing vessels and over the expected construction period for contracts to acquire new vessels.

Section 1013 would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to charter through 2003 three vessels in support of submarine rescue, escort, and towing. The charter would be a capital lease that would cost about \$46 million through 2003. Because two charters would begin in 1999 and the third would begin in 2000, the estimated authorization is counted in those two years. The estimate is based on information provided by the Navy and the owner of the vessels.

Worker and Community Assistance. Section 3151 would terminate after fiscal year 2000 the worker transition assistance program. This program assists employees of the Department of Energy (DOE) with the costs of relocating to other facilities and former employees of DOE with the costs of finding new employment. DOE projects that under current law, worker assistance programs would decrease over the next two years and be completely eliminated by the end of fiscal year 2001. Based on this information, CBO estimates that savings would total \$20 million in 2001. Savings would

vary, however, depending on the extent of any restructuring of DOE and its use of the authority under current law.

Similarly, section 3151 would discontinue assistance to communities affected by restructuring DOE. CBO estimates that any savings from terminating DOE's community assistance programs would be offset by costs in other federal programs.

Separate Housing During Basic Training. The bill would require DOD to house male and female recruits in separate barracks during basic training. The cost of this provision would vary widely depending on whether new buildings are constructed or existing buildings are renovated. Information from the Navy, which conducts most of its training at one base, suggests one-time costs of \$1 million to \$2 million, assuming it can fulfill the requirement with slight modifications to existing structures. On the other hand, data from the Army and Air Force, which conduct basic training on many different bases, indicate costs of about \$150 million and \$50 million, respectively, because each may require construction of new barracks. To the extent that construction would be required, annual operating costs for those bases would marginally increase because of increased overhead and maintenance.

Direct spending and asset sales

H.R. 3616 contains several provisions that would affect direct spending and asset sales.

Land Conveyances. The bill contains several provisions that would convey land to nonfederal entities. In some cases the provisions would raise receipts of the federal government, but other provisions would lower them. CBO cannot estimate the aggregate budgetary impact because DOD has not assessed the market value of all the affected properties.

Section 2841 would grant an easement of 340 acres at Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, California to a local transportation agency for the construction of a freeway. The agency would pay the United States fair market value for the easement, thereby increasing receipts to the Treasury.

Section 2834 would authorize DOD to give about 300 acres to the town of New Windsor, New York. This property is excess to the needs of the Army and under current law all or part of it would probably be turned over to the General Services Administration (GSA) for disposal. Under GSA's procedures, properties can be sold to the public if other entities, including other federal agencies, do not acquire them, thus section 2834 could result in costs to the Treasury.

Section 2835 would sell about 5,000 acres to an Indiana Reuse Authority and section 2836 would convey about 1,000 acres to Hamilton County, Tennessee. In each case, payment would occur 10 years after the land was transferred. The delayed payment would represent loans by the United States under procedures established by the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. The budgetary impact would be the difference between the sale price and the subsidy cost. However, because DOD does not know the market value of the land, CBO cannot estimate the budgetary effects.

Sections 2835 and 2836 also would grant the Secretary of the Army authority to accept and spend reimbursements from local au-

thorities for administrative expenses incurred during the conveyances. Because receipts and spending would offset each other, this authority would have no net budgetary impact.

Other sections would either authorize DOD to give or sell parcels of property that GSA might sell under its disposal procedures. CBO estimates that these sections would not have a significant budgetary impact.

Naval Petroleum Reserve. Title XXXIV would direct DOE to dispose of certain lots within the Naval Petroleum Reserve Number 2 (NPR-2) in California. DOE also would be authorized to dispose of other NPR properties after oil and gas operations have been abandoned. Based on information provided by DOE, CBO estimates that selling the specified lots within NPR-2 would increase receipts by about \$300,000 sometime in the next two to three years. Receipts from the disposal of other properties are not expected to be significant over the 1999-2003 period.

Sale of Vessels. Title XXXVI would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to sell three vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet at fair market value. The Secretary would deposit all proceeds from the sales as offsetting collections into the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund, from which they would be available to the Maritime Administration without further appropriation to acquire and maintain other ships. Under current law, these ships would likely be sold under the agency's scrapping program. The proceeds would be treated the same under current law as they would under this provision. But because vessels sold under the authority provided in this bill may bring in more money than those sold under the existing program, additional offsetting collections could be slightly higher than under current law.

Other Provisions. The following provisions would have an insignificant budgetary impact:

Section 551 would extend the authority to require the retirement of certain senior officers who fail to receive promotions to the next higher grade.

Section 641 would require certain retirees to begin paying premiums under the Survivor Benefit Program the month following a court order.

Section 2812 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to accept donations of funds, property, or services in connection with the department's programs for public outdoor recreation at military sites. This provision would have no net budgetary effect because any new receipts would be offset by any new outlays.

Title XXXV would authorize the Panama Canal Commission (PCC) to solicit and accept donations of funds, property, and services from nonfederal sources for the purpose of carrying out promotional activities. This provision would have no net effect on direct spending because any new offsetting collections would be deposited into the PCC's revolving fund, from which they would be spent without further appropriation action.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. CBO does not have enough information to estimate the budgetary impact

of certain land conveyances. CBO estimates that the direct spending from other provisions of H.R. 3616 is either less than \$500,000 annually or would be offset by the proceeds from asset sales.

Estimated impact on State, local, and tribal governments: The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA) excludes from application of that act legislative provisions that are necessary for the national security. CBO has determined that the provisions in H.R. 3616 either fit within this exclusion or do not contain intergovernmental mandates as defined by UMRA.

Estimated impact on the private sector: One provision of H.R. 3616 could impose a new private-sector mandate. Section 368 of title III would require airlines and other common carriers under contract with the General Services Administration to provide transportation at the contracted federal government rate to reservists traveling to and from their inactive duty training station. To the extent that the contracted government rate is lower than available commercial rates, this provision would reduce carriers' revenues and income. About 700,000 reservists are required to participate in monthly drills and annual training. The annual cost of this provision would be well below the \$100 million threshold set by UMRA, since most reservists travel to their training bases by private automobile rather than by common carrier. Furthermore, once the General Services Administration renegotiates its service agreements with the carriers, this provision would become a standard condition of the contract that the carriers accept, and would therefore no longer constitute a private-sector mandate.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Cost: The estimates for defense programs were prepared by Valerie Barton (military retirement), Shawn Bishop (health programs), Kent Christensen (military construction and other defense), Jeannette Deshong (military and civilian personnel), Raymond Hall (procurement, RDT&E, stockpile sales, and atomic energy defense activities), and Dawn Sauter (operation and maintenance). Kathy Gramp prepared the estimates for the Naval Petroleum Reserve, and Deborah Reis prepared the estimate for programs of the Maritime Administration and the Panama Canal Commission.

Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Leo Lex. Impact on the Private Sector: R. William Thomas.

Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause 7(a) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee generally concurs with the estimates for budget authority and direct spending as contained in the report of the Congressional Budget Office. However, the committee notes that the Congressional Budget Office estimate fails to fully consider the restrictions on defense outlays imposed by section 1003. This provision would limit total outlays available to the Secretaries of Defense and Energy for national defense, function (050), programs to amounts consistent with the limitations imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. These limitations are in line with the fiscal year 1999 national defense estimates contained in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1998 (H. Con.

Res. 84). Furthermore, should the Congress appropriate funds as authorized by this bill, enforcement mechanisms contained in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, would preclude any increase in total defense outlays beyond those allowed by the statute.

INFLATION IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee concludes that the bill would have no significant inflationary impact.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 2(l)(3)(A) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

With respect to clause 2(l)(3)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

With respect to clause 2(l)(3)(D) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee has not received a report from the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight pertaining to the subject matter of H.R. 3616.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(l)(4) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee finds the authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104-4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

ROLLCALL VOTES

In accordance with clause 2(1)(2)(B) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, rollcall and voice votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 3616. The record of these votes is attached to this report.

The committee ordered H.R. 3616 reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 50-1, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 14**Date: 05/06/98****Eliminate Waiver on Certain
Conveyances****Offered By: Mr. Hunter**Voice Vote **Ayes** **Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman	X			Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan			
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy			
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Lewis	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley	X						
Mr. Gibbons	X						
Mr. Redmond							
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **45 Aye 4 Nay Present**

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL**

Amendment Number: 34

Date: 05/06/98

Gender-Integrated Training

Offered By: Mrs. Fowler

Voice Vote Ayes Nays

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen		X		Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. McHale		X	
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Lewis		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham		X		Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Ryun		X					
Mr. Pappas		X					
Mr. Riley		X					
Mr. Gibbons		X					
Mr. Redmond							
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total 23 Aye 30 Nay Present

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL**

Amendment Number: 19

Date: 05/06/98

Abortion Policy

Offered By: Ms. Harman

Voice Vote Ayes Nays

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence		X		Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump		X		Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon		X		Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley		X		Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton		X		Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer		X		Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman	X		
Mr. McHugh		X		Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent		X		Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. Everett		X		Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett		X		Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen			
Mr. Lewis		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts		X		Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Chambliss		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary		X		Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough				Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham				Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Ryun		X					
Mr. Pappas		X					
Mr. Riley		X					
Mr. Gibbons							
Mr. Redmond		X					
Ms. Granger		X					

Roll Call Vote Total 20 Aye 28 Nay Present

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment Number: 44**Date: 05/06/98****Commend Vietnam Conflict Allies,
Substitute to Amendment #10****Offered By: Mr. Buyer****Voice Vote Ayes Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton		X	
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt		X	
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz		X	
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett		X	
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans		X	
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor		X	
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie		X	
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan		X	
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood		X	
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman		X	
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. McHale		X	
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy		X	
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Blagojevich		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen			
Mr. Lewis	X			Mr. Snyder		X	
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd		X	
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney		X	
Mr. Scarborough				Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez		X	
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley	X						
Mr. Gibbons							
Mr. Redmond	X						
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total 26 Aye 23 Nay Present

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL**

Amendment Number: 10**Date: 05/06/98****Commend Vietnamese Commandos,
As Amended By Amendment #44****Offered By: Ms. Sanchez****Voice Vote Ayes Nays**

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt	X		
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Haman	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen			
Mr. Lewis	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley	X						
Mr. Gibbons							
Mr. Redmond							
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total 50 Aye Nay Present

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL**

Amendment Number: 48

Date: 05/06/98

Commend Vietnamese Commandos, Offered By: Ms. Sanchez

Modified

Voice Vote Ayes Nays

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt			
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon				Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan	X		
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood	X		
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. Everett			X	Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett			X	Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen			
Mr. Lewis		X		Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler			X	Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough			X	Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney	X		
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley	X						
Mr. Gibbons							
Mr. Redmond							
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total 43 Aye 1 Nay 4 Present

COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Motion to Close

Date: 05/06/98

Offered By: Mr. Weldon

Voice Vote Ayes Nays

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Siskiy	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt			
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen				Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan			
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood			
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman			
Mr. McHugh				Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy			
Mr. Everett				Mr. Blagojevich			
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon				Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Lewis	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner			
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith			
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney			
Mr. Scarborough				Mr. McIntyre			
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney			
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley							
Mr. Gibbons							
Mr. Redmond							
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total 35 Aye Nay Present

**COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
105TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL**

Final Passage of H.R. 3616

Date: 05/06/98

Offered By: Mr. Stump

Voice Vote Ayes Nays

Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present	Rep.	Aye	Nay	Present
Mr. Spence	X			Mr. Skelton	X		
Mr. Stump	X			Mr. Sisisky	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Spratt			
Mr. Kasich				Mr. Ortiz	X		
Mr. Bateman				Mr. Pickett	X		
Mr. Hansen	X			Mr. Evans	X		
Mr. Weldon	X			Mr. Taylor	X		
Mr. Hefley	X			Mr. Abercrombie	X		
Mr. Saxton	X			Mr. Meehan			
Mr. Buyer	X			Mr. Underwood			
Mrs. Fowler	X			Ms. Harman	X		
Mr. McHugh	X			Mr. McHale	X		
Mr. Talent	X			Mr. Kennedy	X		
Mr. Everett	X			Mr. Blagojevich	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Allen	X		
Mr. Lewis	X			Mr. Snyder	X		
Mr. Watts	X			Mr. Turner	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Mr. Boyd	X		
Mr. Hostettler	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Chambliss	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Hilleary	X			Mr. Maloney	X		
Mr. Scarborough	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. Rodriguez	X		
Mr. Graham	X			Ms. McKinney		X	
Mr. Ryun	X						
Mr. Pappas	X						
Mr. Riley	X						
Mr. Gibbons	X						
Mr. Redmond	X						
Ms. Granger	X						

Roll Call Vote Total **50 Aye** **1 Nay** **Present**

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 216 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

SEC. 216. MANAGEMENT OF NAVY MINE COUNTERMEASURES PROGRAMS.

(a) RESPONSIBILITY.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Director, Defense Research and Engineering shall have the primary responsibility for developing and testing naval mine countermeasures systems during fiscal years 1995 **[through 1999]** *through 2003*.

* * * * *

TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

Subtitle A—General Military Law

* * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL MILITARY POWERS

* * * * *

CHAPTER 2—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sec.
111. Executive department.

* * * * *

117. *Readiness reporting system: establishment; reporting to congressional committees.*

* * * * *

§ 113. Secretary of Defense

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(1) *The Secretary shall include in the annual report to Congress under subsection (c) the following:*

(1) *A comparison of the amounts provided in the defense budget for support and for mission activities for each of the preceding five years.*

(2) *A comparison of the number of military and civilian personnel, shown by major occupational category, assigned to support positions and to mission positions for each of the preceding five years.*

(3) An accounting, shown by service and by major occupational category, of the number of military and civilian personnel assigned to support positions during each of the preceding five years.

(4) A listing of the number of military and civilian personnel assigned to management headquarters and headquarters support activities as a percentage of military end-strength for each of the preceding 10 years.

* * * * *

§ 115a. Annual manpower requirements report

(a) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress[, not later than February 15 of each fiscal year,] an annual manpower requirements report. [The report shall be in writing and] *The report shall be submitted each year not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget for the next fiscal year is transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, shall be in writing, and shall contain the Secretary's recommendations for—*

(1) the annual active-duty end-strength level for each component of the armed forces for the next fiscal year; and

(2) the annual civilian personnel end-strength level for each component of the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year.

* * * * *

§ 117. Readiness reporting system: establishment; reporting to congressional committees

(a) *REQUIRED READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a comprehensive readiness reporting system for the Department of Defense. The readiness reporting system shall measure in an objective, accurate, and timely manner the capability of the armed forces to carry out—*

(1) the National Security Strategy prescribed by the President in the most recent annual national security strategy report under section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a);

(2) the defense planning guidance provided by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 113(g) of this title; and

(3) the National Military Strategy prescribed by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(b) *READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS.— In establishing the readiness reporting system, the Secretary shall ensure—*

(1) that the readiness reporting system is applied uniformly throughout the Department of Defense;

(2) that information in the readiness reporting system is continually updated, with any change in the overall readiness status of a unit, of an element of the training establishment, or an element of defense infrastructure that is required to be reported as part of the readiness reporting system shall be reported within 24 hours of the event necessitating the change in readiness status; and

(3) that sufficient resources are provided to establish and maintain the system so as to allow reporting of changes in readiness status as required by this section.

(c) *CAPABILITIES.*—The readiness reporting system shall have the capability to do the following:

(1) Measure the capability of units (both as elements of their respective armed force and as elements of joint forces) to conduct their assigned wartime missions.

(2) Measure the capability of training establishments to provide trained and ready forces for wartime missions.

(3) Measure the capability of defense installations and facilities and other elements of Department of Defense infrastructure, both in the United States and abroad, to provide appropriate support to forces in the conduct of their wartime missions.

(4) Measure critical warfighting deficiencies in unit capability, training establishments, and defense infrastructure.

(5) Measure the level of current risk based upon the readiness reporting system relative to the capability of forces to carry out their wartime missions.

(6) Measure such other factors relating to readiness as the Secretary prescribes.

(d) *PERIODIC JOINT READINESS REVIEW.*—The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall periodically, and not less frequently than monthly, conduct a joint readiness review. The Chairman shall incorporate into each such review the current information derived from the readiness reporting system and shall assess the capability of the armed forces to execute their wartime missions based upon their posture at the time of the review. The Chairman shall submit to the Secretary of Defense the results of each review, including the deficiencies in readiness identified during that review.

(e) *SUBMISSION TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.*—The Secretary shall each month submit to the congressional defense committees a report in writing containing the complete results of each review under subsection (d) during the preceding month, including the current information derived from the readiness reporting system. Each such report shall be submitted in unclassified form and may, as the Secretary determines necessary, also be submitted in classified form.

(f) *REGULATIONS.*—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. In those regulations, the Secretary shall prescribe the units that are subject to reporting in the readiness reporting system, what type of equipment is subject to such reporting, and the elements of the training establishment and of defense infrastructure that are subject to such reporting.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 3—GENERAL POWERS AND FUNCTIONS

Sec.

121. Regulations.

121a. Requirement of exemplary conduct by civilians in chain of command.

* * * * *

§ 121a. Requirement of exemplary conduct by civilians in chain of command

The President, as Commander in Chief, and the Secretary of Defense are required (in the same manner that commanding officers and others in authority in the Armed Forces are required)—

(1) to show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, and patriotism and to subordinate themselves to those ideals;

(2) to be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command;

(3) to guard against and to put an end to all dissolute and immoral practices and to correct, according to the laws and regulations of the armed forces, all persons who are guilty of them; and

(4) to take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs of the armed forces, to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of the officers and enlisted persons under their command or charge.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 4—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

* * * * *

§ 134. Under Secretary of Defense for Policy

(a) There is an Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. A person may not be appointed as Under Secretary within 10 years after relief from active duty as a commissioned officer of a regular component of an armed force.

(b)(1) The Under Secretary shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. *The Under Secretary shall have responsibility for overall supervision of activities of the Department of Defense relating to export controls.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 8—DEFENSE AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FIELD ACTIVITIES

* * * * *

§ 192. Defense Agencies and Department of Defense Field Activities: oversight by the Secretary of Defense

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR DEFENSE COMMISSARY AGENCY.—Notwithstanding the results of the periodic review required under subsection (c) with regard to the Defense Commissary Agency, the Secretary of Defense may not transfer to the Secretary of a military department the responsibility to manage and fund the provision of services and supplies provided by the Defense Commissary Agency unless the transfer of the management and funding responsibility is specifi-

ally authorized by a law enacted after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

CHAPTER 9—DEFENSE BUDGET MATTERS

Sec.

221. Future-years defense program: submission to Congress; consistency in budgeting.

* * * * *

223. Ballistic missile defense programs.

* * * * *

§223. Ballistic missile defense programs

(a) PROGRAM ELEMENTS SPECIFIED.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31), the amount requested for activities of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization shall be set forth in accordance with the following program elements:

- (1) The Patriot system.
- (2) The Navy Area system.
- (3) The Theater High-Altitude Area Defense system.
- (4) The Navy Theater Wide system.
- (5) The Medium Extended Air Defense System.
- (6) Joint Theater Missile Defense.
- (7) National Missile Defense.
- (8) Support Technologies.
- (9) Family of Systems Engineering and Integration.
- (10) Ballistic Missile Defense Technical Operations.
- (11) Threat and Countermeasures.
- (12) International Cooperative Programs.

(b) TREATMENT OF MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.—Amounts requested for Theater Missile Defense and National Missile Defense major defense acquisition programs shall be specified in individual, dedicated program elements, and amounts appropriated for those programs shall be available only for Ballistic Missile Defense activities.

(c) MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT.—The amount requested for each program element specified in subsection (a) shall include requests for the amounts necessary for the management and support of the programs, projects, and activities contained in that program element.

CHAPTER 20—HUMANITARIAN AND OTHER ASSISTANCE

Sec.

401. Humanitarian and civic assistance provided in conjunction with military operations.

* * * * *

406. Use of Cooperative Threat Reduction program funds: limitation.

* * * * *

§406. Use of Cooperative Threat Reduction program funds: limitation

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In carrying out Cooperative Threat Reduction programs during any fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may use funds appropriated for those programs only to the extent that those funds were appropriated for that fiscal year or for either of the 2 preceding fiscal years.

(b) *DEFINITION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS.*—In this section, the term “Cooperative Threat Reduction programs” means the following programs with respect to states of the former Soviet Union:

- (1) Programs to facilitate the elimination, and the safe and secure transportation and storage, of nuclear, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles.
- (2) Programs to facilitate the safe and secure storage of fissile materials derived from the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- (3) Programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, components, and technology and expertise related to such weapons.
- (4) Programs to expand military-to-military and defense contacts.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 23—MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES AND REPORTS

- Sec.
481. Race relations, gender discrimination, and hate group activity: annual survey and report.
[482. Quarterly reports: personnel and unit readiness.]

* * * * *

§482. Quarterly reports: personnel and unit readiness

[(a) QUARTERLY REPORTS REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the end of each calendar-year quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding military readiness. The report for a quarter shall contain the information required by subsections (b), (d), and (e).

[(b) READINESS PROBLEMS AND REMEDIAL ACTIONS.—Each report shall specifically describe—

- [(1) each readiness problem and deficiency identified using the assessments considered under subsection (c);
- [(2) planned remedial actions; and
- [(3) the key indicators and other relevant information related to each identified problem and deficiency.

[(c) CONSIDERATION OF READINESS ASSESSMENTS.—The information required under subsection (b) to be included in the report for a quarter shall be based on readiness assessments that are provided during that quarter—

- [(1) to any council, committee, or other body of the Department of Defense—
 - [(A) that has responsibility for readiness oversight; and
 - [(B) whose membership includes at least one civilian officer in the Office of the Secretary of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or higher;

[(2) by senior civilian and military officers of the military departments and the commanders of the unified and specified commands; and

[(3) as part of any regularly established process of periodic readiness reviews for the Department of Defense as a whole.

[(d) COMPREHENSIVE READINESS INDICATORS FOR ACTIVE COMPONENTS.—Each report shall also include information regarding each of the active components of the armed forces (and an evaluation of such information) with respect to each of the following readiness indicators:

[(1) PERSONNEL STRENGTH.—

[(A) Personnel status, including the extent to which members of the armed forces are serving in positions outside of their military occupational specialty, serving in grades other than the grades for which they are qualified, or both.

[(B) Historical data and projected trends in personnel strength and status.

[(2) PERSONNEL TURBULENCE.—

[(A) Recruit quality.

[(B) Borrowed manpower.

[(C) Personnel stability.

[(3) OTHER PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

[(A) Personnel morale.

[(B) Recruiting status.

[(4) TRAINING.—

[(A) Training unit readiness and proficiency.

[(B) Operations tempo.

[(C) Training funding.

[(D) Training commitments and deployments.

[(5) LOGISTICS—EQUIPMENT FILL.—

[(A) Deployed equipment.

[(B) Equipment availability.

[(C) Equipment that is not mission capable.

[(D) Age of equipment.

[(E) Condition of nonpacing items.

[(6) LOGISTICS—EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE.—

[(A) Maintenance backlog.

[(7) LOGISTICS—SUPPLY.—

[(A) Availability of ordnance and spares.

[(B) Status of prepositioned equipment.

[(e) UNIT READINESS INDICATORS.—Each report shall also include information regarding the readiness of each active component unit of the armed forces at the battalion, squadron, or an equivalent level (or a higher level) that received a readiness rating of C-3 (or below) for any month of the calendar-year quarter covered by the report. With respect to each such unit, the report shall separately provide the following information:

[(1) The unit designation and level of organization.

[(2) The overall readiness rating for the unit for the quarter and each month of the quarter.

[(3) The resource area or areas (personnel, equipment and supplies on hand, equipment condition, or training) that adversely affected the unit's readiness rating for the quarter.

[(4) The reasons why the unit received a readiness rating of C-3 (or below).

[(f) CLASSIFICATION OF REPORTS.—A report under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form. To the extent the Secretary of Defense determines necessary, the report may also be submitted in classified form.]

* * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * *

CHAPTER 32—OFFICER STRENGTH AND DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE

* * * * *

§ 526. Authorized strength: general and flag officers on active duty

(a) * * *

(b) LIMITED EXCLUSION FOR JOINT DUTY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) * * *

(2) This subsection shall cease to be effective on October 1, [1998] 2001.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 36—PROMOTION, SEPARATION, AND INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS ON THE ACTIVE-DUTY LIST

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—SELECTION BOARDS

* * * * *

§ 614. Notice of convening of selection boards

(a) * * *

(b) An officer eligible for consideration by a selection board convened under section 611(a) of this title may send a written communication to the board, to arrive not later than the date the board convenes, calling attention to any matter concerning himself that the officer considers important to [his case] *enhancing his case for selection for promotion*. The selection board shall give consideration to any timely communication under this subsection.

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER III—FAILURE OF SELECTION FOR PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT FOR YEARS OF SERVICE

* * * * *

§ 628. Special selection boards

[(a)(1) In the case of an officer who is eligible for promotion who the Secretary of the military department concerned determines was

not considered for selection for promotion by a selection board because of administrative error, the Secretary concerned, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, shall convene a special selection board under this subsection (composed in accordance with section 612 of this title or, in the case of a warrant officer, composed in accordance with section 573 of this title and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned) to determine whether such officer should be recommended for promotion.】

(a) PERSONS NOT CONSIDERED BY PROMOTION BOARDS DUE TO ADMINISTRATIVE ERROR.—(1) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines that because of administrative error a person who should have been considered for selection for promotion by a promotion board was not so considered, the Secretary shall convene a special selection board under this subsection to determine whether that person (whether or not then on active duty) should be recommended for promotion.

(2) A special selection board convened under paragraph (1) shall consider the record of 【the officer as his record】 *the person whose name was referred to it for consideration as that record would have appeared to the board that should have considered him.* That record shall be compared with a sampling of the records of those officers of the same competitive category who were recommended for promotion, and those officers who were not recommended for promotion, by the board that should have considered him.

(3) If a special selection board convened under paragraph (1) does not recommend for promotion 【an officer in a grade below the grade of colonel or, in the case of an officer of the Navy, captain whose name was referred to it for consideration, the officer】 *a person whose name was referred to it for consideration for selection for appointment to a grade other than a general officer or flag officer grade, the person shall be considered to have failed of selection for promotion.*

【(b)(1) In the case of an officer who is eligible for promotion who was considered for selection for promotion by a selection board but was not selected, the Secretary of the military department concerned, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may convene a special selection board under this subsection (composed in accordance with section 612 of this title or, in the case of a warrant officer, composed in accordance with section 573 of this title and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned) to determine whether such officer should be recommended for promotion if the Secretary concerned determines that—

【(A) the action of the board which considered the officer was contrary to law or involved material error of fact or material administrative error; or

【(B) the board did not have before it for its consideration material information.】

(b) PERSONS CONSIDERED BY PROMOTION BOARDS IN UNFAIR MANNER.—(1) If the Secretary of the military department concerned determines, in the case of a person who was considered for selection for promotion by a promotion board but was not selected, that there was material unfairness with respect to that person, the Secretary

may convene a special selection board under this subsection to determine whether that person (whether or not then on active duty) should be recommended for promotion. In order to determine that there was material unfairness, the Secretary must determine that—

(A) the action of the promotion board that considered the person was contrary to law or involved material error of fact or material administrative error; or

(B) the board did not have before it for its consideration material information.

(2) A special selection board convened under paragraph (1) shall consider the record of [the officer as his record] *the person whose name was referred to it for consideration as that record*, if corrected, would have appeared to the board that considered him. That record shall be compared with the records of a sampling of those officers of the same competitive category who were recommended for promotion, and those officers who were not recommended for promotion, by the board that considered him.

(3) If a special selection board convened under paragraph (1) does not recommend for promotion [an officer] *a person* whose name was referred to it for consideration, the [officer] *person* incurs no additional failure of selection for promotion.

(c) *REPORTS OF BOARDS.*—(1) Each special selection board convened under this section shall submit to the Secretary of the military department concerned a written report, signed by each member of the board, containing the name of each [officer] *person* it recommends for promotion and certifying that the board has carefully considered the record of each [officer] *person* whose name was referred to it.

(2) The provisions of sections 617(b) and 618 of this title apply to the report and proceedings of a special selection board convened under this section in the same manner as they apply to the report and proceedings of a selection board convened under section 611(a) of this title. *However, in the case of a board convened under this section to consider a warrant officer or former warrant officer, the provisions of sections 576(d) and 576(f) of this title (rather than the provisions of section 617(b) and 618 of this title) apply to the report and proceedings of the board in the same manner as they apply to the report and proceedings of a selection board convened under section 573 of this title.*

(d) *APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS SELECTED BY BOARDS.*—(1) If the report of a special selection board convened under this section, as approved by the President, recommends for promotion to the next higher grade [an officer] *a person* whose name was referred to it for consideration, [such officer] *that person* shall, as soon as practicable, be appointed to [the next higher grade] *that grade* in accordance with subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 624 of this title. *However, in the case of a board convened under this section to consider a warrant officer or former warrant officer, if the report of that board, as approved by the Secretary concerned, recommends that warrant officer or former warrant officer for promotion to the next higher grade, that person shall, as soon as practicable, be appointed to the next higher grade in accordance with provisions of section 578(c) of this title (rather than subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 624 of this title).*

(2) **[An officer who is promoted]** *A person who is appointed to the next higher grade as the result of the recommendation of a special selection board convened under this section shall, upon [such promotion] that appointment, have the same date of rank, the same effective date for the pay and allowances of that grade, and the same position on the active-duty list as he would have had if he had been recommended for promotion to that grade by the board which should have considered, or which did consider, him. In the case of a person who is not on the active-duty list when appointed to the next higher grade, placement of that person on the active-duty list pursuant to the preceding sentence shall be only for purposes of determination of eligibility of that person for consideration for promotion by any subsequent special selection board under this section.*

[(e) The provisions of section 613 of this title apply to members of special selection boards convened under this section.]

(e) DECEASED PERSONS.—If a person whose name is being considered for referral to a special selection board under this section dies before the completion of proceedings under this section with respect to that person, this section shall be applied to that person posthumously.

(f) CONVENING OF BOARDS.—A board convened under this section—

(1) shall be convened under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense;

(2) shall be composed in accordance with section 612 of this title or, in the case of board to consider a warrant officer or former warrant officer, in accordance with section 573 of this title and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

(3) shall be subject to the provisions of section 613 of this title.

(g) PROMOTION BOARD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “promotion board” means a selection board convened by the Secretary of a military department under section 573(a) or 611(a) of this title.

* * * * *

§633. Retirement for years of service: regular lieutenant colonels and commanders

Except an officer of the Navy designated for limited duty to whom section 5596(e) of this title applies and an officer of the Marine Corps designated for limited duty to whom section 5596(e) or section 6383 of this title applies and except as provided under section 637(b) of this title, each officer of the Regular Army, Regular Air Force, or Regular Marine Corps who holds the regular grade of lieutenant colonel, and each officer of the Regular Navy who holds the regular grade of commander, who is not on a list of officers recommended for promotion to the regular grade of colonel or captain, respectively, shall, if not earlier retired, be retired on the first day of the month after the month in which he completes 28 years of active commissioned service. During the period beginning on July 1, 1993, and ending on October 1, **[1999]** 2000, the preceding sentence shall not apply to an officer of the Navy designated for limited duty to whom section 6383 of this title applies.

§634. Retirement for years of service: regular colonels and Navy captains

Except as provided under section 637(b) of this title, each officer of the Regular Army, Regular Air Force, or Regular Marine Corps who holds the regular grade of colonel, and each officer of the Regular Navy who holds the regular grade of captain, who is not on a list of officers recommended for promotion to the regular grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half), respectively, shall, if not earlier retired, be retired on the first day of the month after the month in which he completes 30 years of active commissioned service. During the period beginning on July 1, 1993, and ending on October 1, [1999] 2000, the preceding sentence shall not apply to an officer of the Regular Navy designated for limited duty to whom section 6383(a)(4) of this title applies.

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—CONTINUATION ON ACTIVE DUTY AND SELECTIVE EARLY RETIREMENT

* * * * *

§638a. Modification to rules for continuation on active duty; enhanced authority for selective early retirement and early discharges

(a) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department, [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000*, to take any of the actions set forth in subsection (b) with respect to officers of an armed force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 39—ACTIVE DUTY

* * * * *

§691. Permanent end strength levels to support two major regional contingencies

(a) * * *

(b) Unless otherwise provided by law, the number of members of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) on active duty at the end of any fiscal year shall be not less than the following:

- (1) For the Army, [495,000] 484,800.
- (2) For the Navy, [390,802] 376,423.
- (3) For the Marine Corps, [174,000] 173,922.
- (4) For the Air Force, 371,577.

* * * * *

(e) For a fiscal year for which the active duty end strength authorized by law pursuant to section 115(a)(1)(A) of this title for any of the armed forces is identical to the number applicable to that armed force under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may re-

duce that number by not more than 1 percent [or, in the case of the Army, by not more than 1.5 percent].

* * * * *

CHAPTER 40—LEAVE

* * * * *

§ 702. Cadets and midshipmen

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c)(1) The Secretary concerned may place an academy cadet or midshipman on involuntary leave without pay if, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the Superintendent of the Academy at which the cadet or midshipman is admitted—

(A) has recommended that the cadet or midshipman be dismissed or discharged;

(B) has directed the cadet or midshipman return to the Academy to repeat an academic semester or year;

(C) has otherwise recommended to the Secretary for good cause that the cadet or midshipman be placed on involuntary leave without pay.

(2) In this subsection, the term “academy cadet or midshipman” means—

(A) a cadet of the United States Military Academy;

(B) a midshipman of the United States Naval Academy;

(C) a cadet of the United States Air Force Academy; or

(D) a cadet of the United States Coast Guard Academy.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 53—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

* * * * *

§ 1034. Protected communications; prohibition of retaliatory personnel actions

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) REPORTS ON INVESTIGATIONS.—(1) * * *

* * * * *

[(3) If, in the course of an investigation of an allegation under this section, the Inspector General determines that it is not possible to submit the report required by paragraph (1) within 90 days after the date of receipt of the allegation being investigated, the Inspector General shall provide to the Secretary of Defense (or to the Secretary of Transportation in the case of a member of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy) and to the member making the allegation a notice—

[(A) of that determination (including the reasons why the report may not be submitted within that time); and

[(B) of the time when the report will be submitted.]

[(4)] (3) The report on the results of the investigation shall contain a thorough review of the facts and circumstances relevant to

the allegation and the complaint or disclosure and shall include documents acquired during the course of the investigation, including summaries of interviews conducted. The report may include a recommendation as to the disposition of the complaint.

* * * * *

[(h) POST-DISPOSITION INTERVIEWS.—After disposition of any case under this section, the Inspector General shall, whenever possible, conduct an interview with the person making the allegation to determine the views of that person on the disposition of the matter.]

* * * * *

§ 1053. Reimbursement for financial institution charges incurred because of Government error in direct deposit of pay

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) In this section:

[(1) The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term “financial organization” in section 3332(a) of title 31.]

(1) The term “financial institution” means a bank, savings and loan association, or similar institution or a credit union chartered by the United States or a State.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 54—COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE BENEFITS

Sec.

1061. Survivors of certain Reserve and Guard members.

1062. Certain former spouses.

1063. Period for use of commissary stores: eligibility for members of the Ready Reserve.

1064. Use of commissary stores by certain members and former members.]

1063. Use of commissary stores: members of Ready Reserve with at least 50 creditable points.

1063a. Use of commissary stores and MWR retail facilities: members of National Guard serving in federally declared disaster.

1064. Use of commissary stores: persons qualified for retired pay under chapter 1223 but under age 60.

* * * * *

[§ 1063. Period for use of commissary stores: eligibility for members of the Ready Reserve]

§ 1063. Use of commissary stores: members of Ready Reserve with at least 50 creditable points

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS OF READY RESERVE.—[(1)] A member of the Ready Reserve who satisfactorily completes 50 or more points creditable under section 12732(a)(2) of this title in a calendar year shall be eligible to use commissary stores of the Department of Defense. The Secretary concerned shall authorize the member to have [12 days of eligibility] *24 days of eligibility* for any calendar year that the member qualifies for eligibility under this subsection.

[(2) Paragraph (1)] (b) *EFFECT OF COMPENSATION OR TYPE OF DUTY.*—Subsection (a) shall apply without regard to whether, during the calendar year, the member receives compensation for the duty or training performed by the member or performs active duty for training.

[(b) LIMITATION.—A member may not use commissary stores by reason of this section for more than 14 days in any period of 365 days.]

§ 1063a. Use of commissary stores and MWR retail facilities: members of National Guard serving in federally declared disaster

(a) *ELIGIBILITY OF MEMBERS.*—A member of the National Guard who, although not in Federal service, is called or ordered to duty in response to a federally declared disaster shall be permitted to use commissary stores and MWR retail facilities during the period of such duty on the same basis as members of the armed forces on active duty.

(b) *ELIGIBILITY OF DEPENDENTS.*—A dependent of a member of the National Guard who is permitted under subsection (a) to use commissary stores and MWR retail facilities shall be permitted to use such stores and facilities, during the same period as the member, on the same basis as dependents of members of the armed forces on active duty.

(c) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) *FEDERALLY DECLARED DISASTER.*—The term “federally declared disaster” means a disaster or other situation for which a Presidential declaration of major disaster is issued under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170).

(2) *MWR RETAIL FACILITIES.*—The term “MWR retail facilities” means exchange stores and other revenue-generating facilities operated by nonappropriated fund activities of the Department of Defense for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces.

[§ 1064. Use of commissary stores by certain members and former members]

§ 1064. Use of commissary stores: persons qualified for retired pay under chapter 1223 but under age 60

Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a person who would be eligible for retired pay under chapter 1223 of this title but for the fact that the person is under 60 years of age shall be authorized to use commissary stores of the Department of Defense [for 12 days each calendar year] for 24 days each calendar year.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 55—MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

Sec.

1071. Purpose of this chapter.

* * * * *

1095a. Medical care: members held as captives and their dependents.

- 1095b. *TRICARE program: contractor payment of certain claims.*
- 1096. Military-civilian health services partnership program.
- 1097. Contracts for medical care for retirees, dependents, and survivors: alternative delivery of health care.
- 1097a. *Enrollment in TRICARE Prime: procedures.*
- 1098. Incentives for participation in cost-effective health care plans.

* * * * *

§ 1076a. Dependents' dental program

- (a) * * *
- (b) PREMIUMS.—(1) * * *

(2) A member enrolled in a basic dental benefits plan shall pay a premium of not more than \$20 per month (*in 1993 dollars, as adjusted for inflation in each year thereafter*) for the member and the family of the member.

* * * * *

§ 1076c. Dental insurance plan: certain retirees and their surviving spouses and other dependents

- (a) * * *
- (b) PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR PLAN.—The following persons are eligible to enroll in the dental insurance plan established under subsection (a):

- (1) * * *
- * * * * *
- (4) *Eligible dependents of a member described in paragraph (1) or (2) who is not enrolled in the plan and who—*
 - (A) *is enrolled under section 1705 of title 38 to receive dental care from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;*
 - (B) *is enrolled in a dental plan that—*
 - (i) *is available to the member as a result of employment by the member that is separate from the military service of the member; and*
 - (ii) *is not available to dependents of the member as a result of such separate employment by the member;*
 - or*
 - (C) *is prevented by a medical or dental condition from being able to obtain benefits under the plan.*

- [(4)] (5) The unmarried surviving spouse and eligible child dependents of a deceased member—
 - (A) who died while in a status described in paragraph (1) or (2);
 - (B) who is described in section 1448(d)(1) of this title; or
 - (C) who died while on active duty for a period of more than 30 days and whose eligible dependents are not eligible, or no longer eligible, for dental benefits under section 1076a of this title pursuant to subsection (i)(2) of such section.

* * * * *

- (f) TERMINATION OF ENROLLMENT.—The Secretary shall terminate the enrollment of any enrollee, and any eligible dependents of the enrollee covered by the enrollment, in the dental insurance

plan established under subsection (a) upon the occurrence of the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) In the case of an enrollment under subsection [(b)(4)] (b)(5), remarriage of the surviving spouse.

* * * * *

§ 1095b. TRICARE program: contractor payment of certain claims

(a) *PAYMENT OF CLAIMS.*—(1) *The Secretary of Defense may authorize a contractor under the TRICARE program to pay a claim described in paragraph (2) before seeking to recover from a third-party payer the costs incurred by the contractor to provide health care services that are the basis of the claim to a beneficiary under such program.*

(2) *A claim under this paragraph is a claim—*

(A) *that is submitted to the contractor by a provider under the TRICARE program for payment for services for health care provided to a covered beneficiary; and*

(B) *that is identified by the contractor as a claim for which a third-party payer may be liable.*

(b) *RECOVERY FROM THIRD-PARTY PAYERS.*—*A contractor for the provision of health care services under the TRICARE program that pays a claim described in subsection (a)(2) shall have the right to collect from the third-party payer the costs incurred by such contractor on behalf of the covered beneficiary. The contractor shall have the same right to collect such costs under this subsection as the right of the United States to collect costs under section 1095 of this title.*

(c) *DEFINITION OF THIRD-PARTY PAYER.*—*In this section, the term “third-party payer” has the meaning given that term in section 1095(h) of this title, except that such term excludes primary medical insurers.*

* * * * *

§ 1097a. Enrollment in TRICARE Prime: procedures

(a) *AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT OF CERTAIN DEPENDENTS.*—*The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures under which dependents of members of the armed forces on active duty who reside in the catchment area of a military medical treatment facility shall be automatically enrolled in TRICARE Prime at the military medical treatment facility. The Secretary shall provide notice in writing to the member regarding such enrollment.*

(b) *AUTOMATIC CONTINUATION OF ENROLLMENT.*—*The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures under which enrollment of covered beneficiaries in TRICARE Prime shall automatically continue until such time as the covered beneficiary elects to disenroll or is no longer eligible for enrollment.*

(c) *OPTION FOR RETIREES TO DEDUCT FEE FROM PAY.*—*The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures under which a retired member of the armed forces may elect to have any fees payable by*

the member for enrollment in TRICARE Prime withheld from the retired pay of the member (if pay is available to the member).

(d) DEFINITION OF TRICARE PRIME.—In this section, the term “TRICARE Prime” means the managed care option of the TRICARE program known as TRICARE Prime.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 58—BENEFITS AND SERVICES FOR MEMBERS BEING SEPARATED OR RECENTLY SEPARATED

* * * * *

§ 1145. Health benefits

(a) TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE.—(1) For the applicable time period described in paragraph (2), a member of the armed forces who is involuntarily separated from active duty **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000* (and the dependents of the member), shall be entitled to receive—

(A) medical and dental care under section 1076 of this title in the same manner as a dependent described in subsection (a)(2) of such section; and

(B) health benefits contracted under the authority of section 1079(a) of this title and subject to the same rates and conditions as apply to persons covered under that section.

* * * * *

(c) HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN SEPARATED MEMBERS NOT OTHERWISE ELIGIBLE.—(1) Consistent with the authority of the Secretary concerned to designate certain classes of persons as eligible to receive health care at a military medical facility, the Secretary concerned should consider authorizing, on an individual basis in cases of hardship, the provision of that care for a member who is separated from the armed forces **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000*, and is ineligible for transitional health care under subsection (a) or does not obtain a conversion health policy (or a dependent of the member).

* * * * *

(e) COAST GUARD.—The provisions of this section shall apply to members of the Coast Guard (and their dependents) involuntarily separated from active duty **[during the five-year period beginning on October 1, 1994]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000*. The Secretary of Transportation shall implement this section for the Coast Guard.

* * * * *

§ 1146. Commissary and exchange benefits

The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to allow a member of the armed forces who is involuntarily separated from active duty **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000*, to continue to use commissary and exchange stores during the two-year period beginning on the date of

the involuntary separation of the member in the same manner as a member on active duty. The Secretary of Transportation shall implement this provision for Coast Guard members involuntarily separated **[during the five-year period beginning October 1, 1994]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on September 30, 2000.*

§ 1147. Use of military family housing

(a) **TRANSITION FOR INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED MEMBERS.**—(1) The Secretary of a military department may, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, permit individuals who are involuntarily separated **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000,* to continue for not more than 180 days after the date of such separation to reside (along with other members of the individual's household) in military family housing provided or leased by the Department of Defense to such individual as a member of the armed forces.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation may prescribe regulations to permit members of the Coast Guard who are involuntarily separated **[during the five-year period beginning October 1, 1994]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1994, and ending on September 30, 2000,* to continue for not more than 180 days after the date of such separation to reside (along with others of the member's household) in military family housing provided or leased by the Coast Guard to the individual as a member of the armed forces.

* * * * *

§ 1150. Affiliation with Guard and Reserve units: waiver of certain limitations

(a) **PREFERENCE FOR CERTAIN PERSONS.**—A person who is separated from the armed forces **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000,* and who applies to become a member of a National Guard or Reserve unit within one year after the date of such separation shall be given preference over other equally qualified applicants for existing or projected vacancies within the unit to which the member applies.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 59—SEPARATION

* * * * *

§ 1174a. Special separation benefits programs

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(h) **TERMINATION OF PROGRAM.**—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary concerned may not conduct a program pursuant to this section after September 30, **[1999]** *2000.*

(2) No member of the armed forces may be separated under a program established pursuant to this section after the date of the termination of that program.

§ 1175. Voluntary separation incentive

(a) Consistent with this section and the availability of appropriations for this purpose, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation may provide a financial incentive to members of the armed forces described in subsection (b) for voluntary appointment, enlistment, or transfer to a reserve component, requested and approved under subsection (c), for the period of time the member serves in a reserve component, *or for the period described in subsection (e)(1) if the member becomes ineligible for retention in an active or inactive status in a reserve component because of age, years of service, failure to select for promotion, or medical disqualification, so long as such ineligibility does not result from deliberate action on the part of the member with the intent to avoid retention in an active or inactive status in a reserve component.*

* * * * *

(d)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) After September 30, [1999] 2000, the Secretary may not approve a request.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 60—SEPARATION OF REGULAR OFFICERS FOR SUBSTANDARD PERFORMANCE OF DUTY OR FOR CERTAIN OTHER REASONS

- Sec.
 1181. Authority to establish procedures to consider the separation of officers for substandard performance of duty and for certain other reasons.
 1182. Boards of inquiry.
 [1183. Boards of review.]
 1184. Removal of officer: action by Secretary upon recommendation of board [of review].

* * * * *

§ 1182. Boards of inquiry

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) If a board of inquiry determines that the officer has failed to establish that he should be retained on active duty, [it shall send the record of its proceedings to a board of review convened under section 1183 of this title] *it shall report that determination to the Secretary concerned.*

* * * * *

[§ 1183. Boards of review

[(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall convene boards of review at such times as the Secretary may prescribe to review the cases of officers who a board of inquiry has determined have failed to establish that they should be retained on active duty. Each board of review shall be composed of not less than three officers having the qualifications prescribed by section 1187 of this title.

[(b) If, after reviewing the record of the case of any officer, a board of review determines that the officer has failed to establish that he should be retained on active duty, the board of review shall recommend to the Secretary concerned that the officer not be retained on active duty.

[(c)(1) If, after reviewing the record of the case of any officer, a board of review determines that the officer has established that he should be retained on active duty, the officer's case is closed.

[(2) An officer who is required to show cause for retention under subsection (a) of section 1181 of this title and who is determined under paragraph (1) to have established that he should be retained on active duty may not again be required to show cause for retention under such subsection within the one-year period beginning on the date of that determination.

[(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), an officer who is required to show cause for retention under subsection (b) of section 1181 of this title and who is determined under paragraph (1) to have established that he should be retained on active duty may again be required to show cause for retention at any time.

[(B) An officer who has been required to show cause for retention as a result of proceedings under subsection (b) of section 1181 of this title and who is thereafter retained on active duty may not again be required to show cause for retention on active duty under such subsection solely because of conduct which was the subject of the previous proceeding, unless the findings or recommendations of the board of inquiry or board of review that considered his case are determined to have been obtained by fraud or collusion.]

§ 1184. Removal of officer: action by Secretary upon recommendation of board [of review]

The Secretary of the military department concerned may remove an officer from active duty if the removal of such officer from active duty is recommended by a [board of review convened under section 1183 of this title] *board of inquiry convened under section 1182 of this title*.

§ 1185. Rights and procedures

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, each officer required under section 1181 of this title to show cause for retention on active duty—

(1) shall be notified in writing[, at least 30 days before the hearing of his case by a board of inquiry,] of the reasons for which he is being required to show cause for retention on active duty;

* * * * *

CHAPTER 69—RETIRED GRADE

* * * * *

§ 1370. Commissioned officers: general rule; exceptions

(a) RULE FOR RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE HELD SATISFACTORILY.—(1) * * *

(2)(A) In order to be eligible for voluntary retirement under any provision of this title in a grade above major or lieutenant commander, a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps must have served on active duty in that grade for not less than three years, except that the Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of a military department to reduce such period to a period not less than two years in the case of retirements effective **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 73—ANNUITIES BASED ON RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN

* * * * *

§ 1448. Application of Plan

(a) * * *

(b) **INSURABLE INTEREST AND FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE.—**

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) **FORMER SPOUSE COVERAGE BY PERSONS ALREADY PARTICIPATING IN PLAN.—**

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(C) **IRREVOCABILITY, EFFECTIVE DATE, ETC.—**An election under this paragraph may not be revoked except in accordance with section 1450(f) of this title. Such an election is effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is received by the Secretary concerned, *except that, in the case of an election made by a person described in section 1450(f)(3)(B) of this title, such an election is effective on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the court order or filing involved (in the same manner as provided under section 1450(f)(3)(D) of this title).* This paragraph does not provide the authority to change a designation previously made under subsection (e).

* * * * *

CHAPTER 75—DEATH BENEFITS

Sec. 1475. Death gratuity: death of members on active duty or inactive duty training and of certain other persons.

* * * * *

1491. *Honor guard details at funerals of veterans.*

* * * * *

§ 1481. Recovery, care, and disposition of remains: decedents covered

(a) The Secretary concerned may provide for the recovery, care, and disposition of the remains of the following persons:

(1) Any Regular of an armed force[, or member of an armed force without component,] under his jurisdiction who dies while on active duty.

* * * * *

(7) Any retired member of an armed force under his jurisdiction who becomes a patient in a [United States] hospital while he is on active duty [for a period of more than 30 days,] and who continues to be such a patient until the date of his death.

* * * * *

§ 1491. Honor guard details at funerals of veterans

(a) *AVAILABILITY.*—The Secretary of a military department shall, upon request, provide an honor guard detail (or ensure that an honor guard detail is provided) for the funeral of any veteran.

(b) *COMPOSITION OF HONOR GUARD DETAILS.*—The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that an honor guard detail for the funeral of a veteran consists of not less than three persons and (unless a bugler is part of the detail) has the capability to play a recorded version of Taps.

(c) *PERSONS FORMING HONOR GUARDS.*—An honor guard detail may consist of members of the armed forces or members of veterans organizations or other organizations approved for purposes of this section under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of a military department may provide transportation, or reimbursement for transportation, and expenses for a person who participates in an honor guard detail under this section and is not a member of the armed forces or an employee of the United States.

(d) *REGULATIONS.*—The Secretary of Defense shall by regulation establish a system for selection of units of the armed forces and other organizations to provide honor guard details. The system shall place an emphasis on balancing the funeral detail workload among the units and organizations providing honor guard details in an equitable manner as they are able to respond to requests for such details in terms of geographic proximity and available resources. The Secretary shall provide in such regulations that the armed force in which a veteran served shall not be considered to be a factor when selecting the military unit or other organization to provide an honor guard detail for the funeral of the veteran.

(e) *ANNUAL REPORT.*—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report not later than January 31 of each year beginning with 2001 and ending with 2005 on the experience of the Department of Defense under this section. Each such report shall provide data on the number of funerals supported under this section, cost for that support, shown by manpower and other cost factors, and the number and costs of funerals supported by each participating organization. The data in the report shall be presented in a standard format, regardless of military department or other organization.

(f) *VETERAN DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38.

CHAPTER 77—POSTHUMOUS COMMISSIONS AND WARRANTS

* * * * *

§ 1521. Posthumous commissions

(a) The President may issue, or have issued, an appropriate commission in the name of a member of the armed forces who, after September 8, 1939—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) was officially recommended for appointment or promotion to a commissioned grade and the recommendation for whose appointment or promotion was approved by the Secretary concerned (*whether before or after the member's death*) but was unable to accept the promotion or appointment because of death in line of duty.

(b) A commission issued under subsection (a) shall issue as of the date of the appointment, recommendation, or approval, as the case may be, and the member's name shall be carried on the records of the military or executive department concerned as if he had served in the grade, and branch if any, in which posthumously commissioned, from the date of the appointment, recommendation, or approval to the date of his death. *In the case of a member to whom subsection (a)(3) applies who dies before approval by the Secretary concerned of the appointment or promotion, the commission shall issue as of the date of death.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 79—CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

Sec.

1551. Correction of name after separation from service under an assumed name.

* * * * *

1555. *Professional staff.*

1556. *Ex parte communications prohibited.*

1557. *Timeliness standards for disposition of cases before Corrections Boards.*

* * * * *

§ 1555. Professional staff

(a) *The Secretary of each military department shall assign to the staff of the service review agency of that military department at least one attorney and at least one physician. Such assignments shall be made on a permanent, full-time basis and may be made from members of the armed forces or civilian employees.*

(b) *Personnel assigned pursuant to subsection (a)—*

(1) *shall work under the supervision of the director or executive director (as the case may be) of the service review agency; and*

(2) *shall be assigned duties as advisers to the director or executive director or other staff members on legal and medical matters, respectively, that are being considered by the agency.*

- (c) *In this section, the term “service review agency” means—*
- (1) *with respect to the Department of the Army, the Army Review Boards Agency;*
 - (2) *with respect to the Department of the Navy, the Board for Correction of Naval Records; and*
 - (3) *with respect to the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force Review Boards Agency.*

§ 1556. Ex parte communications prohibited

(a) *IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of each military department shall ensure that an applicant seeking corrective action by the Army Review Boards Agency, the Air Force Review Boards Agency, or the Board for Correction of Naval Records, as the case may be, is provided a copy of all correspondence and communications (including summaries of verbal communications) to or from the agency or board, or a member of the staff of the agency or board, with an entity or person outside the agency or board that pertain directly to the applicant’s case or have a material effect on the applicant’s case.*

- (b) *EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:*
- (1) *Classified information.*
 - (2) *Information the release of which is otherwise prohibited by law or regulation.*
 - (3) *Any record previously provided to the applicant or known to be possessed by the applicant.*
 - (4) *Any correspondence that is purely administrative in nature.*
 - (5) *Any military record that is (or may be) provided to the applicant by the Secretary of the military department or other source.*

§ 1557. Timeliness standards for disposition of cases before Corrections Boards

(a) *TEN-MONTH CLEARANCE PERCENTAGE.—Of the cases accepted for consideration by a Corrections Board during a period specified in the following table, the percentage on which final action must be completed within 10 months of receipt (other than for those cases considered suitable for administrative correction) is as follows:*

For cases accepted during—	The percentage on which final action must be completed within 10 months of receipt is—
<i>the period of fiscal years 2001 and 2002</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>the period of fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>the period of fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>the period of any fiscal year after fiscal year 2010</i>	<i>90.</i>

(b) *CLEARANCE DEADLINE FOR ALL CASES.—Effective October 1, 2002, final action on all cases accepted for consideration by a Corrections Board (other than those cases considered suitable for administrative correction) shall be completed within 18 months of receipt.*

(c) *WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may exclude an individual case from the timeliness standards prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) if the Secretary determines that the case warrants a longer period of consideration.*

The authority of the Secretary of a military department under this subsection may not be delegated.

(d) *REPORTS ON FAILURE TO MEET TIMELINESS STANDARDS.*—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report not later than June 1 following any fiscal year during which the Corrections Board of that Secretary’s military department was unable to meet the timeliness standards in subsections (a) and (b). The report shall specify the reasons why the standard could not be met and the corrective actions initiated to ensure compliance in the future. The report shall also specify the number of waivers granted under subsection (c) during that fiscal year.

(e) *CORRECTIONS BOARD DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “Corrections Board” means—

(1) with respect to the Department of the Army, the Army Board for Correction of Military Records;

(2) with respect to the Department of the Navy, the Board for Correction of Naval Records; and

(3) with respect to the Department of the Air Force, the Air Force Board for Correction of Military Records.

CHAPTER 81—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

* * * * *

§ 1594. Reimbursement for financial institution charges incurred because of Government error in direct deposit of pay

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) In this section:

[(1) The term “financial institution” has the meaning given the term “financial organization” in section 3332(a) of title 31.]

(1) *The term “financial institution” means a bank, savings and loan association, or similar institution or a credit union chartered by the United States or a State.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 87—DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER III—ACQUISITION CORPS

* * * * *

§ 1732. Selection criteria and procedures

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) **EXCEPTIONS.—(1)** * * *

* * * * *

(3) *The requirement of subsection (b)(1)(A) shall not apply to an employee who served in an Acquisition Corps in a position within*

grade GS-13 or above of the General Schedule and who is placed in another position which is in a grade lower than GS-13 of the General Schedule, or whose position is reduced in grade to a grade lower than GS-13 of the General Schedule, as a result of reduction-in-force procedures, the realignment or closure of a military installation, or another reason other than for cause.

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER V—GENERAL MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

- Sec. 1761. Management information system.
* * * * *
- 1765. Limitation on number of personnel.
* * * * *

§ 1765. Limitation on number of personnel

(a) *LIMITATION.*—Effective October 1, 2001, the number of defense acquisition personnel may not exceed the baseline number reduced by 70,000.

(b) *PHASED REDUCTION.*—The number of defense acquisition personnel—

(1) as of October 1, 1999, may not exceed the baseline number reduced by 25,000; and

(2) as of October 1, 2000, may not exceed the baseline number reduced by 50,000.

(c) *BASELINE NUMBER.*—For purposes of this section, the baseline number is the total number of defense acquisition personnel as of October 1, 1998.

(d) *DEFENSE ACQUISITION PERSONNEL DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “defense acquisition personnel” means military and civilian personnel (other than civilian personnel who are employed at a maintenance depot) who are assigned to, or employed in, acquisition organizations of the Department of Defense (as specified in Department of Defense Instruction numbered 5000.58 dated January 14, 1992).

CHAPTER 88—MILITARY FAMILY PROGRAMS AND MILITARY CHILD CARE

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—MILITARY CHILD CARE

* * * * *

§ 1792. Child care employees

(a) * * *

* * * * *

[(d) EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCE PROGRAM FOR MILITARY SPOUSES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a program under which qualified spouses of members of the armed forces shall be given a preference in hiring for the position of child care employee in a position paid from nonappropriated funds if the spouse is among persons determined to be best qualified for the position.

[(2) A spouse who is provided a preference under this subsection at a military child development center may not be precluded from obtaining another preference, in accordance with section 1784 of this title, in the same geographic area as the military child development center.]

[(e)] (d) COMPETITIVE SERVICE POSITION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “competitive service position” means a position in the competitive service, as defined in section 2102(a)(1) of title 5.

* * * * *

PART III—TRAINING AND EDUCATION

* * * * *

CHAPTER 101—TRAINING GENERALLY

* * * * *

§2011. Special operations forces: training with friendly foreign forces

(a) AUTHORITY TO PAY TRAINING EXPENSES.—Under regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (c), the commander of the special operations command established pursuant to section 167 of this title and the commander of any other unified or specified combatant command may pay, or authorize payment for, any of the following expenses:

- (1) Expenses of training special operations forces assigned to that command in conjunction with training, and training with, armed forces [and other security forces] of a friendly foreign country.

* * * * *

(b) PURPOSE OF TRAINING.—The [primary] purpose of the training for which payment may be made under subsection (a) shall be to train the special operations forces of the combatant command.

(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section. *The regulations shall require that training activities may be carried out under this section only with the prior approval of the Secretary of Defense.* The regulations shall establish accounting procedures to ensure that the expenditures pursuant to this section are appropriate.

* * * * *

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report regarding training during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under this section. Each report shall specify the following:

- (1) All countries in which that training was conducted.

* * * * *

- (5) *A summary of the expenditures under this section resulting from the training for which expenses were paid under this section.*

(6) A discussion of the unique military training benefit to United States special operations forces derived from the training activities for which expenses were paid under this section.

§2012. Support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside Department of Defense

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(j) *OVERSIGHT AND COST ACCOUNTING.*—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program to improve the oversight and cost accounting of training projects conducted in accordance with this section. The program shall include measures to accomplish the following:

(1) Ensure that each project that is proposed to be conducted in accordance with this section (regardless of whether additional funding from the Secretary of Defense is sought) is requested in writing, reviewed for full compliance with this section, and approved in advance of initiation by the Secretary of the military department concerned and, in the case of a project that seeks additional funding from the Secretary of Defense, by the Secretary of Defense.

(2) Ensure that each project that is conducted in accordance with this section is required to provide, within a specified period following completion of the project, an after-action report to the Secretary of Defense.

(3) Require that each application for a project to be conducted in accordance with this section include an analysis and certification that the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in the cost of training (as determined in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense).

(4) Determine the total program cost for each project, including both those costs that are borne by the military departments from their own accounts and those costs that are borne by defense-wide accounts.

(5) Provide for oversight of project execution to ensure that a training project under this section is carried out in accordance with the proposal for that project as approved.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 105—ARMED FORCES HEALTH PROFESSIONS FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER II—NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM

* * * * *

§2130a. Financial assistance: nurse officer candidates

(a) *BONUS AUTHORIZED.*—(1) A person described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, executes a written agreement in accordance with subsection (c) to accept an appointment as a nurse officer may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the

Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus of not more than \$5,000. The bonus shall be paid in periodic installments, as determined by the Secretary concerned at the time the agreement is accepted, except that the first installment may not exceed \$2,500.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 108—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCHOOLS

* * * * *

§2164. Department of Defense domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools

(a) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.**—(1) If the Secretary of Defense makes a determination that appropriate educational programs are not available through a local educational agency for dependents of members of the armed forces and dependents of civilian employees of the Federal Government residing on a military installation in the United States (including territories, commonwealths, and possessions of the United States), the Secretary may enter into arrangements to provide for the elementary or secondary education of the dependents of such members of the armed forces and, to the extent authorized in subsection (c), the dependents of such civilian employees.

(2) The Secretary may, at the discretion of the Secretary, permit dependents of members of the armed forces and, to the extent provided in subsection (c), dependents of civilian employees of the Federal Government residing in a territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States but not on a military installation, to enroll in an educational program provided by the Secretary pursuant to this subsection. *If a member of the armed forces is assigned to a remote location or is assigned to an unaccompanied tour of duty, a dependent of the member who resides, on or off a military installation, in a territory, commonwealth, or possession of the United States, as authorized by the member's orders, may be enrolled in an educational program provided by the Secretary under this subsection.*

* * * * *

(c) **ELIGIBILITY OF DEPENDENTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) * * *

(2)(A) * * *

[(B) A dependent referred to in subparagraph (A) may be enrolled in the program for more than five consecutive school years if the Secretary determines that, in the interest of the dependent's educational well-being, there is good cause to extend the enrollment for more than the five-year period described in such subparagraph. Any such extension may be made for only one school year at a time.]

(B) *At the discretion of the Secretary, a dependent referred to in subparagraph (A) may be enrolled in the program for more than five consecutive school years if the dependent is otherwise qualified for enrollment, space is available in the program, and the Secretary*

will be reimbursed for the services provided. Any such extension shall cover only one school year at a time.

* * * * *

**PART IV—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND
PROCUREMENT**

* * * * *

CHAPTER 131—PLANNING AND COORDINATION

- Sec.
2201. Apportionment of funds: authority for exemption; excepted expenses.
* * * * *
2212. *Obligations for contract services: reporting in budget object classes.*
* * * * *
2223. *Information technology: additional responsibilities of Chief Information Officers.*
* * * * *

§2212. Obligations for contract services: reporting in budget object classes

(a) *LIMITATION ON REPORTING IN MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES OBJECT CLASS.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that, in reporting to the Office of Management and Budget (pursuant to OMB Circular A-11 (relating to preparation and submission of budget estimates)) obligations of the Department of Defense for any period of time for contract services, no more than 15 percent of the total amount of obligations so reported is reported in the miscellaneous services object class.*

(b) *DEFINITION OF REPORTING CATEGORIES FOR ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES.—In carrying out section 1105(g) of title 31 for the Department of Defense (and in determining what services are to be reported to the Office of Management and Budget in the advisory and assistance services object class), the Secretary of Defense shall apply to the terms used for the definition of “advisory and assistance services” in paragraph (2)(A) of that section the following meanings:*

(1) *MANAGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES.—The term “management and professional support services” (used in clause (i) of section 1105(g)(2)(A) of title 31) means services that provide engineering or technical support, assistance, advice, or training for the efficient and effective management and operation of organizations, activities, or systems. Those services—*

(A) are closely related to the basic responsibilities and mission of the using organization; and

(B) include efforts that support or contribute to improved organization or program management, logistics management, project monitoring and reporting, data collection, budgeting, accounting, auditing, and administrative or technical support for conferences and training programs.

(2) *STUDIES, ANALYSES, AND EVALUATIONS.—The term “studies, analyses, and evaluations” (used in clause (ii) of section*

1105(g)(1)(A) of title 31) means services that provide organized, analytic assessments to understand or evaluate complex issues to improve policy development, decisionmaking, management, or administration and that result in documents containing data or leading to conclusions or recommendations. Those services may include databases, models, methodologies, and related software created in support of a study, analysis, or evaluation.

(3) ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SERVICES.—The term “engineering and technical services” (used in clause (iii) of section 1105(g)(1)(A) of title 31) means services that take the form of advice, assistance, training, or hands-on training necessary to maintain and operate fielded weapon systems, equipment, and components (including software when applicable) at design or required levels of effectiveness.

(c) PROPER CLASSIFICATION OF ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES.—Before the submission to the Office of Management and Budget of the proposed Department of Defense budget for inclusion in the President’s budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), shall review all Department of Defense services expected to be performed as contract services during the fiscal year for which that budget is to be submitted in order to ensure that those services that are advisory and assistance services (as defined in accordance with subsection (b)) are in fact properly classified, in accordance with that subsection, in the advisory and assistance services object class.

(d) INFORMATION ON SERVICE CONTRACTS.—In carrying out the annual review under subsection (c) of Department of Defense services expected to be performed as contract services during the next fiscal year, the Secretary (acting through the Under Secretary (Comptroller)) shall conduct an assessment of the total non-Federal effort that resulted from the performance of all contracts for such services during the preceding fiscal year and the total non-Federal effort that resulted, or that is expected to result, from the performance of all contracts for such services during the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year. The assessment shall include determination of the following for each such year:

(1) The amount expended or expected to be expended for non-Federal contract services, shown for the Department of Defense as a whole and displayed by contract services object class for each DOD organization.

(2) The amount expended or expected to be expended for contract services competed under OMB Circular A-76 or a similar process, shown for the Department of Defense as a whole and displayed by contract services object class for each DOD organization.

(3) The number of private sector workyears performed or expected to be performed in connection with the performance of non-Federal contract services, shown for the Department of Defense as a whole and displayed by contract services object class for each DOD organization.

(4) Any other information that the Secretary (acting through the Under Secretary) determines to be relevant and of value.

(e) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—The Secretary shall submit to Congress each year, not later than 30 days after the date on which the budget for the next fiscal year is submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, a report containing the information derived from the assessment under subsection (d).

(f) *ASSESSMENT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.*—(1) The Comptroller General shall conduct a review of the report of the Secretary of Defense under subsection (e) each year and shall—

(A) assess the methodology used by the Secretary in obtaining the information submitted to Congress in that report; and

(B) assess the information submitted to Congress in that report.

(2) Not later than 120 days after the date on which the Secretary submits to Congress the report required under subsection (e) for any year, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the Comptroller General's report containing the results of the review for that year under paragraph (1).

(g) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) The term “contract services” means all services that are reported to the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to OMB Circular A-11 (relating to preparation and submission of budget estimates) in budget object classes that are designated in the Object Class 25 series.

(2) The term “advisory and assistance services object class” means those contract services constituting the budget object class that is denominated “Advisory and Assistance Service and designated (as the date of the enactment of this section) as Object Class 25.1 (or any similar object class established after the date of the enactment of this section for the reporting of obligations for advisory and assistance contract services).

(3) The term “miscellaneous services object class” means those contract services constituting the budget object class that is denominated “Other Services (services not otherwise specified in the 25 series)” and designated (as the date of the enactment of this section) as Object Class 25.2 (or any similar object class established after the date of the enactment of this section for the reporting of obligations for miscellaneous or unspecified contract services).

(4) The term “DOD organization” means—

(A) the Office of the Secretary of Defense;

(B) each military department;

(C) the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the unified and specified commands;

(D) each Defense Agency; and

(E) each Department of Defense Field Activity.

(5) The term “private sector workyear” means an amount of labor equivalent to the total number of hours of labor that an individual employed on a full-time equivalent basis by the Federal Government performs in a given year.

* * * * *

§ 2223. Information technology: additional responsibilities of Chief Information Officers

(a) *ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES.*—In addition to the responsibilities provided for in chapter 35 of title 44 and in section 5125 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1425)—

(1) the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, with respect to the elements of the Department of Defense other than the military departments, shall—

(A) review and provide recommendations to the Secretary of Defense on Defense budget requests for information technology and national security systems;

(B) ensure the interoperability of information technology and national security systems throughout the Department of Defense; and

(C) ensure that information technology and national security systems standards that will apply throughout the Department of Defense are prescribed; and

(2) the Chief Information Officer of each military department, with respect to the military department concerned, shall—

(A) review budget requests for all information technology and national security systems;

(B) ensure that information technology and national security systems are in compliance with standards of the Government and the Department of Defense;

(C) ensure that information technology and national security systems are interoperable with other relevant information technology and national security systems of the Government and the Department of Defense;

(D) provide for the elimination of duplicate information technology and national security systems within and between the military departments and Defense Agencies; and

(E) coordinate with the Joint Staff with respect to information technology and national security systems.

(b) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section:

(1) The term “Chief Information Officer” means the senior official designated by the Secretary of Defense or a Secretary of a military department pursuant to section 3506 of title 44.

(2) The term “information technology” has the meaning given that term by section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

(3) The term “national security system” has the meaning given that term by section 5142 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1452).

* * * * *

CHAPTER 146—CONTRACTING FOR PERFORMANCE OF CIVILIAN COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL TYPE FUNCTIONS

* * * * *

§ 2460. Definition of depot-level maintenance and repair

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In this chapter, the term “depot-level maintenance and repair” means (except as provided in subsection (b)) ma-

terial maintenance or repair requiring the overhaul, upgrading, or rebuilding of parts, assemblies, or subassemblies, and the testing and reclamation of equipment as necessary, regardless of the source of funds for the maintenance or repair *or the location at which the maintenance or repair is performed*. The term includes (1) all aspects of software maintenance classified by the Department of Defense as of July 1, 1995, as depot-level maintenance and repair, and (2) interim contractor support or contractor logistics support (or any similar contractor support), to the extent that such support is for the performance of services described in the preceding sentence.

* * * * *

§2461. Commercial or industrial type functions: required studies and reports before conversion to contractor performance

[(a) REQUIRED NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—A commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that on October 1, 1980, was being performed by Department of Defense civilian employees may not be converted to performance by a private contractor unless the Secretary of Defense provides to Congress in a timely manner—

[(1) notification of any decision to study such function for possible performance by a private contractor and the anticipated length and cost of the study;

[(2) a detailed summary of a comparison of the cost of performance of such function by Department of Defense civilian employees and by private contractor which demonstrates that the performance of such function by a private contractor will result in a cost savings to the Government over the life of the contract and a certification that the entire cost comparison is available;

[(3) a certification that the Government calculation for the cost of performance of such function by Department of Defense civilian employees is based on an estimate of the most efficient and cost effective organization for performance of such function by Department of Defense civilian employees; and

[(4) a report, to be submitted with the certification required by paragraph (3), showing—

[(A) the potential economic effect on employees affected, and the potential economic effect on the local community and Federal Government if more than 75 employees are involved, of contracting for performance of such function;

[(B) the effect of contracting for performance of such function on the military mission of such function; and

[(C) the amount of the bid accepted for the performance of such function by the private contractor whose bid is accepted and the cost of performance of such function by Department of Defense civilian employees, together with costs and expenditures which the Government will incur because of the contract.

[(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION TO CONVERT.—If, after completion of the studies required for completion of the

certification and report required by paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a), a decision is made to convert the function to contractor performance, the Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of such decision. The notification shall include the timetable for completing conversion of the function to contractor performance.】

(a) REPORTING AND STUDY REQUIREMENTS AS PRECONDITION TO CHANGE IN PERFORMANCE.—A commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that, as of October 1, 1980, was being performed by Department of Defense civilian employees may not be changed to performance by a private contractor or changed to procurement through a private contractor until the Secretary of Defense fully complies with the reporting and study requirements specified in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) NOTIFICATION AND ELEMENTS OF STUDY.—(1) Before commencing to study a commercial or industrial type function described in subsection (a) for possible change to performance by a private contractor or possible change to procurement through a private contractor, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) The function to be studied for possible change.

(B) The location at which the function is performed by Department of Defense civilian employees.

(C) The number of civilian employee positions potentially affected.

(D) The anticipated length and cost of the study.

(E) A certification that the performance of the commercial or industrial type function by civilian employees of the Department of Defense is not precluded due to any constraint or limitation in term of man years, end strengths, full-time equivalent positions, or maximum number of employees.

(2) The responsibility of the Secretary of Defense to submit the report required under paragraph (1) may be delegated only to senior acquisition executives or higher officials for the military departments and the Defense Agencies.

(3) The study of a commercial or industrial type function for possible change in performance shall include the following:

(A) A comparison of the cost of performance of the function by Department of Defense civilian employees and by private contractor to demonstrate whether change to performance by a private contractor or change to procurement through a private contractor will result in savings to the Government over the life of the contract, including in the comparison—

(i) the amount estimated by the Secretary of Defense (based on bids received) to be the amount of a contract for performance of the function by a private contractor;

(ii) the cost to the Government of Department of Defense civilian employees performing the function; and

(iii) the costs and expenditures which the Government would incur (in addition to the amount of the contract) because of the award of such a contract.

(B) An examination of the potential economic effect of performance of the function by a private contractor—

(i) on employees who would be affected by such a change in performance; and

(ii) on the local community and the Government, if more than 75 employees perform the function.

(C) An examination of the effect of performance of the function by a private contractor on the military mission of the function.

(4) If the commercial or industrial type function at issue involves a working-capital fund in the Department of Defense and the study concerns the possible procurement by a requisitioning agency of services or supplies from a private contractor instead of the working-capital fund, in lieu of the comparison required by paragraph (3), the study shall include a comparison of the sources of the services or supplies to determine which source is more cost-effective for the requisitioning agency.

(5) An individual or entity at a facility where a commercial or industrial type function is studied for possible change in performance may raise an objection to the study on the grounds that the report required under paragraph (1) as a precondition for the study does not contain the certification required by subparagraph (E) of such paragraph. The objection may be raised at any time during the course of the study, shall be in writing, and shall be submitted to the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary determines that the certification was omitted, the commercial or industrial type function covered by the study may not be the subject of request for proposal or award of a contract until a certification is made that fully complies with paragraph (1)(E) and the other requirements of this section are satisfied.

(c) NOTIFICATION OF DECISION.—(1) If, as a result of the completion of a study under subsection (b)(3), a decision is made to change the commercial or industrial type function that was the subject of the study to performance by a private contractor or to procurement through a private contractor, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing that decision. The report shall—

(A) indicate that the study under subsection (b)(3) has been completed;

(B) certify that the Government calculation for the cost of performance of the function by Department of Defense civilian employees is based on an estimate of the most efficient and cost effective organization for performance of the function by Department of Defense civilian employees;

(C) certify that the comparison required by subsection (b)(3)(A) (or alternatively by subsection (b)(4)) as part of the study demonstrates that the performance of the function by a private contractor or procurement of the function through a private contractor will result in savings to the Government over the life of the contract;

(D) certify that the entire comparison is available for examination; and

(E) contain a timetable for completing change of the function to contractor performance.

(2) The actual change of the function to contractor performance may not begin until after the submission of the report required by this subsection.

(e) WAIVER FOR THE PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS AND SERVICES OF THE BLIND AND OTHER SEVERELY HANDICAPPED PERSONS.—Subsections (a) through (c) shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that—

(1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 47); or

(2) is planned to be ~~converted~~ *changed* to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped persons in accordance with that Act.

(f) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—(1) A commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that on October 1, 1980, was being performed by Department of Defense civilian employees may not be ~~converted~~ *changed* to performance by a private contractor to circumvent a civilian personnel ceiling.

(2) In no case may a commercial or industrial type function being performed by Department of Defense personnel be modified, reorganized, divided, or in any way changed for the purpose of exempting from the requirements of subsection (a) the ~~conversion~~ *change* of all or any part of such function to performance by a private contractor.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY DURING WAR OR EMERGENCY.—The provisions of this section shall not apply during war or during a period of national emergency declared by the President or Congress.

~~[(c)]~~ (h) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than February 1 of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a written report describing the extent to which commercial and industrial type functions were performed by Department of Defense contractors during the preceding fiscal year. The Secretary shall include in each such report an estimate of the percentage of commercial and industrial type functions of the Department of Defense that will be performed by Department of Defense civilian employees, and the percentage of such functions that will be performed by private contractors, during the fiscal year during which the report is submitted.

* * * * *

§ 2464. Core logistics capabilities

(a) NECESSITY FOR CORE LOGISTICS CAPABILITIES.—(1) * * *

* * * * *

(5)(A) The commercial items covered by paragraph (3) are commercial items that have been sold or leased in substantial quantities to the general public and are purchased without modification in the same form that they are sold in the commercial marketplace, or with minor modifications to meet Federal Government requirements. *The determination of whether a modification is minor shall be based on a comparison of only the critical systems of the version sold in the commercial marketplace and the version purchased by the Government, and a modification may not be considered to be minor unless at least 90 percent of the total content by component value remains identical.*

(B) *In this paragraph, the term “substantial quantities” means, with respect to determining whether an item is a commercial item,*

that purchases and leases of the item to the general public constitute the majority of all transactions involving the item at the time the exception under paragraph (3) is proposed to be exercised.

* * * * *

(c) *RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.*—The requirement under subsection (a) that the Department of Defense maintain a core logistics capability that is Government-owned and Government-operated is not satisfied when a core logistics workload is converted to contractor performance even though the actual performance of the workload will be carried out in a Government-owned, Government-operated facility of the Department of Defense as a subcontractor of the private contractor. Nothing in section 2474 of this title or section 337 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2717) authorizes the use of subcontracts as a means to provide workloads to Government-owned, Government-operated facilities of the Department of Defense in order to satisfy paragraph (4) of subsection (a).

* * * * *

§ 2473. Procurements from the small arms production industrial base

(a) **[AUTHORITY] REQUIREMENT TO LIMIT PROCUREMENTS TO CERTAIN SOURCES.**—[To the extent that the Secretary of Defense determines necessary to preserve the small arms production industrial base, the Secretary may] *In order to preserve the small arms production industrial base, the Secretary of Defense shall require that any procurement of property or services described in subsection (b) for the Department of Defense be made only from a firm in the small arms production industrial base.*

(b) **COVERED PROPERTY AND SERVICES.**—Subsection (a) applies to the following:

(1) *Small arms end items.*

[(1)] (2) *Repair parts for small arms, if those parts are manufactured under a contract with the Department of Defense to produce the end item.*

[(2)] (3) *Modifications of parts to improve small arms used by the armed forces.*

(4) *Repair parts consisting of barrels, receivers, and bolts for small arms, whether or not the small arms are in production under a contract with the Department of Defense at the time of production of such repair parts.*

* * * * *

(d) *RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROVISIONS.*—(1) *If a procurement under subsection (a) is a procurement of a commercial item, the Secretary may, notwithstanding section 2306(b)(1)(B) of this title, require the submission of certified cost or pricing data under section 2306(a) of this title.*

(2) *Subsection (a) is a requirement for purposes of section 2304(c)(5) of this title.*

* * * * *

**CHAPTER 147—COMMISSARIES AND EXCHANGES AND
OTHER MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ACTI-
VITIES**

Sec.

2482. Commissary stores: operation.

* * * * *

2491. Overseas commissary and exchange stores: access and purchase restrictions.

* * * * *

§ 2491. Overseas commissary and exchange stores: access and purchase restrictions

(a) *GENERAL AUTHORITY.*—The Secretary of Defense may establish restrictions on the ability of eligible patrons of commissary and exchange stores located outside of the United States to purchase certain merchandise items (or the quantity of certain merchandise items) otherwise included within an authorized merchandise category if the Secretary determines that such restrictions are necessary to prevent the resale of such merchandise in violation of host nation laws or treaty obligations of the United States. In establishing a quantity or other restriction, the Secretary shall ensure that the restriction is consistent with the purpose of the overseas commissary and exchange system to provide reasonable access for eligible patrons to purchase merchandise items made in the United States.

(b) *CONTROLLED ITEM LISTS.*—For each location outside the United States that is served by the commissary system or the exchange system, the Secretary of Defense may maintain a list of controlled merchandise items, except that, after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, the Secretary may not change the list to add a merchandise item unless, before making the change, the Secretary submits to Congress a notice of the proposed addition and the reasons for the addition of the item.

(c) *SPECIAL RULES FOR KOREA.*—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not prohibit a dependent who resides in Korea, is at least 21 years of age, and is otherwise eligible to use the commissary and exchange system, from purchasing alcoholic beverages through the commissary and exchange system. Quantity restrictions on the purchase of alcoholic beverages may be imposed, and any such restriction may be enforced through the use of an issued ration control device, but a dependent may not be required to sign for any purchase. A quantity restriction on malt beverages may not restrict purchases to fewer than eight cases, of 24-units per case, per month. Daily or weekly restrictions on malt beverage purchases may not be imposed. The purchase of malt beverages may be recorded on a ration control device, but eligible patrons may not be required to sign for any purchase.

(2) A dependent residing in Korea who is at least 18 years of age and otherwise eligible to use the commissary and exchange system may purchase tobacco products on the same basis as other eligible patrons of the commissary and exchange system.

(3) Eligible patrons of the commissary and exchange system who are traveling through a military air terminal in Korea shall be authorized to the purchase sundry items, including tobacco products, on a temporary basis during the normal operating hours of com-

missary and exchange stores operated in connection with the terminal.

(4) In applying restrictions to dependents of members of the armed forces, the Secretary of Defense may not differentiate between a dependent whose movement to Korea was authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of title 37 and other dependents residing in Korea.

(d) *REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.*—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress an annual report describing the host nation laws and the treaty obligations of the United States, and the conditions within host nations, that necessitate the use of quantity or other restrictions on purchases in commissary and exchange stores located outside the United States.

CHAPTER 148—NATIONAL DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE, DEFENSE REINVESTMENT, AND DEFENSE CONVERSION

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IV—MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY AND DUAL-USE ASSISTANCE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

* * * * *

§ 2525. Manufacturing Technology Program

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) *COMPETITION AND COST SHARING.*—(1)(A) Competitive procedures shall be used for awarding all grants and entering into all contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions under the program.

(B) For each grant awarded and each contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction entered into on a cost-share basis under the program, the ratio of contract recipient cost to Government cost shall be determined by competitive procedures. For a project for which the Government receives an offer from only one offeror, the contracting officer shall negotiate the ratio of contract recipient cost to Government cost that represents the best value to the Government.

(2)(A) A grant may not be awarded under the program, and a contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction may not be entered into under the program, on any basis other than a cost-sharing basis unless the Secretary of Defense determines that the grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction, as the case may be, is for a program that—

[(A)] (i) is not likely to have any immediate and direct commercial application;

[(B)] (ii) is of sufficiently high risk to discourage cost sharing by non-Federal Government sources; or

[(C)] (iii) will be carried out by an institution of higher education.

(B) For any grant awarded or contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction entered into on a basis other than a cost-sharing basis because of a determination made under subparagraph (A), the

transaction file for the project concerned must document the rationale for the determination.

(C) The Secretary of Defense may delegate the authority to make determinations under subparagraph (A) only to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology or a service acquisition executive, as appropriate.

(3) [At least] As a goal, at least 25 percent of the funds available for the program each fiscal year [shall] should be used for awarding grants and entering into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions on a cost-share basis under which the ratio of recipient cost to Government cost is two to one. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments and upon recommendation of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, shall establish annual objectives to meet such goal.

[(4) If the requirement of paragraph (3) cannot be met by July 15 of a fiscal year, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology may waive the requirement and obligate the balance of the funds available for the program for that fiscal year on a cost-share basis under which the ratio of recipient cost to Government cost is less than two to one. Before implementing any such waiver, the Under Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives the reasons for the waiver.]

(e) FIVE-YEAR PLAN.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a five-year plan for the program which establishes—

(A) the overall manufacturing technology goals, milestones, priorities, and investment strategy for the program; [and]

(B) for each of the five fiscal years covered by the plan, the objectives of, and funding for the program by, each military department and each Defense Agency participating in the program[.]; and

(C) the extent of cost sharing in the manufacturing technology program by companies in the private sector, weapons system program offices and other defense program offices, Federal agencies other than the Department of Defense, nonprofit institutions and universities, and other sources.

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS TECHNOLOGY BASE POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

* * * * *

§2534. Miscellaneous limitations on the procurement of goods other than United States goods

(a) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PROCUREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense may procure any of the following items only if the manufacturer of the item satisfies the requirements of subsection (b):

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(6) AMMUNITION.—Ammunition or ammunition components.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 157—TRANSPORTATION

* * * * *

§ 2634. Motor vehicles: transportation or storage for members on change of permanent station or extended deployment

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(g) If a motor vehicle of a member (or a dependent of the member) that is transported at the expense of the United States under this section does not arrive at the authorized destination of the vehicle by the designated delivery date, the Secretary concerned shall reimburse the member for expenses incurred after that date to rent a motor vehicle for the member's use, or for the use of the dependent for whom the delayed vehicle was transported. However, the amount reimbursed shall not exceed \$30 per day, and the rental period for which reimbursement may be provided shall expire after seven days or on the date on which the delayed vehicle finally arrives at the authorized destination (whichever occurs first).

[(g)] (h) In this section:

(1) The term "change of permanent station" means the transfer or assignment of a member of the armed forces from a permanent station inside the continental United States to a permanent station outside the continental United States or from a permanent station outside the continental United States to another permanent station. It also includes an authorized change in home port of a vessel, or a transfer or assignment between two permanent stations in the continental United States when the member cannot, because of injury or the conditions of the order, drive the motor vehicle between the permanent duty stations.

(2) The term "continental United States" does not include Alaska.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 159—REAL PROPERTY; RELATED PERSONAL PROPERTY; AND LEASE OF NONEXCESS PROPERTY

Sec.

2661. Miscellaneous administrative provisions relating to real property.

* * * * *

[2691. Restoration of land used by permit or lease from other agencies.]

2691. Restoration of land used by permit or lease.

* * * * *

[§ 2691. Restoration of land used by permit or lease from other agencies]

§ 2691. Restoration of land used by permit or lease

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) As a condition of any lease, permit, license, or other grant of access entered into by the Secretary of a military department with

another Federal agency authorizing the other agency to use lands under the control of the Secretary, the Secretary may require the other agency to agree to remove any improvements and to take any other action necessary in the judgment of the Secretary to restore the land used by the agency to the condition the land was in before its use by the agency. In lieu of performing the work itself, the Federal agency may elect, with the consent of the Secretary, to reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the military department to perform the removal and restoration work.

* * * * *

**CHAPTER 169—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING**

* * * * *

**SUBCHAPTER IV—ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR
ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY HOUSING**

* * * * *

§ 2871. Definitions

In this subchapter:

(1) The term “ancillary supporting facilities” means facilities related to military housing units, including *facilities to provide or support elementary or secondary education*, child care centers, day care centers, tot lots, community centers, housing offices, dining facilities, unit offices, and other similar facilities for the support of military housing.

* * * * *

Subtitle B—Army

* * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * *

CHAPTER 367—RETIREMENT FOR LENGTH OF SERVICE

* * * * *

§ 3911. Twenty years or more: regular or reserve commissioned officers

(a) * * *

(b) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Army, **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000**, to reduce the requirement under subsection (a) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary of the Army) of not less than eight years.

* * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * *

CHAPTER 401—TRAINING GENERALLY

Sec.

4301. Members of Army: detail as students, observers, and investigators at educational institutions, industrial plants, and hospitals.

* * * * *

4319. *Recruit basic training: separate platoons and separate housing for male and female recruits.*

4320. *Recruit basic training: privacy.*

* * * * *

§4319. Recruit basic training: separate platoons and separate housing for male and female recruits

(a) *SEPARATE PLATOONS.*—The Secretary of the Army shall require that during basic training—

(1) male recruits shall be assigned to platoons consisting only of male recruits; and

(2) female recruits shall be assigned to platoons consisting only of female recruits.

(b) *SEPARATE HOUSING FACILITIES.*—The Secretary of the Army shall require that during basic training male and female recruits be housed in separate barracks or other troop housing facilities.

(c) *INTERIM AUTHORITY FOR HOUSING RECRUITS ON SEPARATE FLOORS.*—(1) If the Secretary of the Army determines that it is not feasible, during some or all of the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 1, 2001, to comply with subsection (b) at any particular installation at which basic training is conducted because facilities at that installation are insufficient for such purpose, the Secretary may grant a waiver of subsection (b) with respect to that installation. Any such waiver may not be in effect after October 1, 2001, and may only be in effect while the facilities at that installation are insufficient for the purposes of compliance with subsection (b).

(2) If the Secretary grants a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to an installation, the Secretary shall require that male and female recruits in basic training at that installation during any period that the waiver is in effect not be housed on the same floor of a barracks or other troop housing facility.

(d) *BASIC TRAINING DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “basic training” means the initial entry training program of the Army that constitutes the basic training of new recruits.

§4320. Recruit basic training: privacy

The Secretary of the Army shall require that access by drill sergeants and other training personnel to a barracks floor on which recruits are housed during basic training shall be limited after the end of the training day, other than in the case of an emergency or other exigent circumstance, to drill sergeants and other training personnel who are of the same sex as the recruits housed on that floor.

* * * * *

Subtitle C—Navy and Marine Corps

* * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION

* * * * *

CHAPTER 503—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Sec.

5011. Organization.

* * * * *

5026. Consultation with Commandant of the Marine Corps regarding Marine Corps aviation.

* * * * *

§5026. Consultation with Commandant of the Marine Corps regarding Marine Corps aviation

The Secretary of the Navy shall require that the views of the Commandant of the Marine Corps be obtained before a milestone decision or other major decision is made by an element of the Department of the Navy outside the Marine Corps in a procurement matter, a research, development, test, and evaluation matter, or a depot-level maintenance matter that concerns Marine Corps aviation.

* * * * *

PART III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

601. Officer Procurement Programs 6901

602. Training Generally 6931

* * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL

* * * * *

CHAPTER 571—VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT

* * * * *

§ 6323. Officers: 20 years

(a)(1) * * *

(2) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Navy, [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] during the period through September 30, 2000, to reduce the requirement under paragraph (1) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary) of not less than eight years.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 573—INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT, SEPARATION, AND FURLOUGH

* * * * *

§6383. Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps; officers designated for limited duty; retirement for length of service or failures of selection for promotion; discharge for failures of selection for promotion; reversion to prior status; retired grade; retired pay

(a) MANDATORY RETIREMENT.—(1) * * *

* * * * *

(5) Paragraphs (2) through (4) shall be effective only during the period beginning on July 1, 1993, and ending on October 1, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

(k) SELECTIVE RETENTION BOARDS FOR LDOS.—Under such regulations as he may prescribe, whenever the needs of the service require, the Secretary of the Navy may defer the retirement under subsection (a) or (b) or the discharge under subsection (b) or (d) of any officer designated for limited duty upon recommendation of a board of officers convened under section 611(b) of this title and with the consent of the officer concerned. An officer whose retirement is deferred under this subsection and who is not subsequently promoted may not be continued on active duty beyond 20 years active commissioned service, if in the grade of lieutenant or captain, beyond 24 years active commissioned service, if in the grade of lieutenant commander or major, or beyond 28 years active commissioned service, if in the grade of lieutenant colonel, or beyond age 62, whichever is earlier. During the period beginning on July 1, 1993, and ending on October 1, [1999] 2000, an officer of the Navy in the grade of commander or captain whose retirement is deferred under this subsection and who is not subsequently promoted may not be continued on active duty beyond age 62 or, if earlier, 28 years of active commissioned service if in the grade of commander or 30 years of active commissioned service if in the grade of captain.

* * * * *

PART III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Chap.	Sec.
601. Officer Procurement Programs	6901
602. <i>Training Generally</i>	6931

* * * * *

CHAPTER 602—TRAINING GENERALLY

- Sec.
6931. *Recruit basic training: separate small units and separate housing for male and female recruits.*
6932. *Recruit basic training: privacy.*

§6931. Recruit basic training: separate small units and separate housing for male and female recruits

(a) SEPARATE SMALL UNIT ORGANIZATION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require that during basic training—

(1) male recruits in the Navy shall be assigned to divisions, and male recruits in the Marine Corps shall be assigned to platoons, consisting only of male recruits; and

(2) female recruits in the Navy shall be assigned to divisions, and female recruits in the Marine Corps shall be assigned to platoons, consisting only of female recruits.

(b) SEPARATE HOUSING.—The Secretary of the Navy shall require that during basic training male and female recruits be housed in separate barracks or other troop housing facilities.

(c) INTERIM AUTHORITY FOR HOUSING RECRUITS ON SEPARATE FLOORS.—(1) If the Secretary of the Navy determines that it is not feasible, during some or all of the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 1, 2001, to comply with subsection (b) at any particular installation at which basic training is conducted because facilities at that installation are insufficient for that purpose, the Secretary may grant a waiver of subsection (b) with respect to that installation. Any such waiver may not be in effect after October 1, 2001, and may only be in effect while the facilities at that installation are insufficient for the purposes of compliance with subsection (b).

(2) If the Secretary grants a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to an installation, the Secretary shall require that male and female recruits in basic training at that installation during any period that the waiver is in effect not be housed on the same floor of a barracks or other troop housing facility.

(d) BASIC TRAINING DEFINED.—In this section, the term “basic training” means the initial entry training programs of the Navy and Marine Corps that constitute the basic training of new recruits.

§ 6932. Recruit basic training: privacy

The Secretary of the Navy shall require that access by recruit division commanders and other training personnel to a barracks floor on which Navy recruits are housed during basic training shall be limited after the end of the training day, other than in the case of an emergency or other exigent circumstance, to recruit division commanders and other training personnel who are of the same sex as the recruits housed on that floor.

* * * * *

PART IV—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

* * * * *

**CHAPTER 631—SECRETARY OF THE NAVY:
MISCELLANEOUS POWERS AND DUTIES**

Sec.
7204. Schools near naval activities: financial aid.

* * * * *

7233. Auxiliary vessels: authority for long-term charter contracts.

* * * * *

§ 7233. Auxiliary vessels: authority for long-term charter contracts

(a) *AUTHORIZED CONTRACTS.*—After September 30, 1998, the Secretary of the Navy, subject to subsection (b), may enter into a contract for the long-term lease or charter of a newly built surface vessel, under which the contractor agrees to provide a crew for the vessel for the term of the long-term lease or charter, for any of the following:

- (1) The combat logistics force of the Navy.
- (2) The strategic sealift program of the Navy.
- (3) Other auxiliary support vessels for the Department of Defense.

(b) *CONTRACTS REQUIRED TO BE AUTHORIZED BY LAW.*—A contract may be entered into under this section with respect to specific vessels only if the Secretary is specifically authorized by law to enter into such a contract with respect to those vessels.

(c) *FUNDS FOR CONTRACT PAYMENTS.*—The Secretary may make payments for contracts entered into under this section using funds available for obligation during the fiscal year for which the payments are required to be made. Any such contract shall provide that the United States will not be required to make a payment under the contract (other than a termination payment, if required) before October 1, 2000.

(d) *TERM OF CONTRACT.*—In this section, the term “long-term lease or charter” means a lease, charter, service contract, or conditional sale agreement with respect to a vessel the term of which (including any option period) is for a period of 20 years or more.

(e) *OPTION TO BUY.*—A contract entered into under the authority of this section may contain options for the United States to purchase one or more of the vessels covered by the contract at any time during, or at the end of, the contract period (including any option period) upon payment of an amount not in excess of the unamortized portion of the cost of the vessels plus amounts incurred in connection with the termination of the financing arrangements associated with the vessels.

(f) *DOMESTIC CONSTRUCTION.*—The Secretary shall require in any contract entered into under this section that each vessel to which the contract applies—

- (1) shall have been constructed in a shipyard within the United States; and
- (2) upon delivery, shall be documented under the laws of the United States.

(g) *VESSEL CREWING.*—The Secretary shall require in any contract entered into under this section that the crew of any vessel to which the contract applies be comprised of private sector commercial mariners.

(h) *DOMESTIC CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN LEASES OF VESSELS.*—(1) Notwithstanding section 2400 or 2401a of this title or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract for the lease or charter of a vessel described in paragraph (2) for a contract period in excess of 17 months (inclusive of any option periods) unless the vessel is constructed in a shipyard in the United States.

- (2) Paragraph (1) applies to vessels of the following types:

- (A) Auxiliary support vessel.
- (B) Strategic sealift vessel.
- (C) Tank vessel.
- (D) Combat logistics force vessel.

(i) *CONTINGENT WAIVER OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.*—A contract authorized by this section may be entered into without regard to section 2401 or 2401a of this title if the Secretary of Defense makes the following findings with respect to that contract:

(1) The need for the vessels or services to be provided under the contract is expected to remain substantially unchanged during the contemplated contract or option period.

(2) There is a reasonable expectation that throughout the contemplated contract or option period the Secretary of the Navy (or, if the contract is for services to be provided to, and funded by, another military department, the Secretary of that military department) will request funding for the contract at the level required to avoid contract cancellation.

(3) The use of such contract or the exercise of such option is in the interest of the national defense.

(j) *SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR TERMINATION LIABILITY.*—If a contract entered into under this section is terminated, the costs of such termination may be paid from—

(1) amounts originally made available for performance of the contract;

(2) amounts currently available for operation and maintenance of the type of vessels or services concerned and not otherwise obligated; or

(3) funds appropriated for those costs.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 643—CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Sec.

7472. Physical examination: employees engaged in hazardous occupations.

* * * * *

7479. Civil service mariners of Military Sealift Command: release of drug test results to Coast Guard.

* * * * *

§ 7479. Civil service mariners of Military Sealift Command: release of drug test results to Coast Guard

(a) *RELEASE OF DRUG TEST RESULTS TO COAST GUARD.*—The Secretary of the Navy may release to the Commandant of the Coast Guard the results of a drug test of any employee of the Department of the Navy who is employed in any capacity on board a vessel of the Military Sealift Command. Any such release shall be in accordance with the standards and procedures applicable to the disclosure and reporting to the Coast Guard of drug tests results and drug test records of individuals employed on vessels documented under the laws of the United States.

(b) *WAIVER.*—The results of a drug test of an employee may be released under subsection (a) without the prior written consent of the

employee that is otherwise required under section 503(e) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1987 (5 U.S.C. 7301 note).

* * * * *

Subtitle D—Air Force

* * * * *

PART I—ORGANIZATION

* * * * *

CHAPTER 807—THE AIR FORCE

* * * * *

§ 8069. Air Force nurses: Chief and assistant chief; appointment; grade

(a) POSITIONS OF CHIEF AND ASSISTANT CHIEF.—There are a Chief and assistant chief of the Air Force Nurse Corps.

Section 8069(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out “, but not for more than three years, and may not be reappointed to the same position” in the last sentence.

(b) CHIEF.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall appoint the Chief from the officers of the Regular Air Force designated as Air Force nurses whose regular grade is above lieutenant colonel and who are recommended by the Surgeon General. An appointee who holds a lower regular grade shall be appointed in the regular grade of brigadier general. The Chief serves during the pleasure of the Secretary[, but not for more than three years, and may not be reappointed to the same position].

* * * * *

CHAPTER 867—RETIREMENT FOR LENGTH OF SERVICE

* * * * *

§ 8911. Twenty years or more: regular or reserve commissioned officers

(a) * * *

(b) The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the Air Force, [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period through September 30, 2000*, to reduce the requirement under subsection (a) for at least 10 years of active service as a commissioned officer to a period (determined by the Secretary of the Air Force) of not less than eight years.

* * * * *

PART III—TRAINING

* * * * *

CHAPTER 901—TRAINING GENERALLY

Sec.

9301. Members of Air Force: detail as students, observers, and investigators at educational institutions, industrial plants, and hospitals.

* * * * *

9319. *Recruit basic training: separate flights and separate housing for male and female recruits.*

9320. *Recruit basic training: privacy.*

* * * * *

§ 9319. Recruit basic training: separate flights and separate housing for male and female recruits

(a) *SEPARATE FLIGHTS.*—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require that during basic training—

(1) male recruits shall be assigned to flights consisting only of male recruits; and

(2) female recruits shall be assigned to flights consisting only of female recruits.

(b) *SEPARATE HOUSING.*—The Secretary of the Air Force shall require that during basic training male and female recruits be housed in separate dormitories or other troop housing facilities.

(c) *INTERIM AUTHORITY FOR HOUSING RECRUITS ON SEPARATE FLOORS.*—(1) If the Secretary of the Air Force determines that it is not feasible, during some or all of the period beginning on April 15, 1999, and ending on October 1, 2001, to comply with subsection (b) at any particular installation at which basic training is conducted because facilities at that installation are insufficient for such purpose, the Secretary may grant a waiver of subsection (b) with respect to that installation. Any such waiver may not be in effect after October 1, 2001, and may only be in effect while the facilities at that installation are insufficient for the purposes of compliance with subsection (b).

(2) If the Secretary grants a waiver under paragraph (1) with respect to an installation, the Secretary shall require that male and female recruits in basic training at that installation during any period that the waiver is in effect not be housed on the same floor of a dormitory or other troop housing facility.

(d) *BASIC TRAINING DEFINED.*—In this section, the term “basic training” means the initial entry training program of the Air Force that constitutes the basic training of new recruits.

§ 9320. Recruit basic training: privacy

The Secretary of the Air Force shall require that access by drill sergeants and other training personnel to a dormitory floor on which recruits are housed during basic training shall be limited after the end of the training day, other than in the case of an emergency or other exigent circumstance, to drill sergeants and other training personnel who are of the same sex as the recruits housed on that floor.

* * * * *

**PART IV—SERVICE, SUPPLY, AND
PROCUREMENT**

* * * * *

CHAPTER 939—SALE OF SERVICEABLE MATERIAL

- Sec.
9621. Subsistence and other supplies: members of armed forces; veterans; executive or military departments and employees; prices.
9622. Rations: commissioned officers in field.
[9623. Tobacco: enlisted members of Air Force.]

* * * * *

[§ 9623. Tobacco: enlisted members of Air Force

[The Air Force shall sell not more than 16 ounces of tobacco a month to an enlisted member of the Air Force on active duty who requests it.]

* * * * *

Subtitle E—Reserve Components

* * * * *

PART II—PERSONNEL GENERALLY

* * * * *

**CHAPTER 1201—AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS AND
DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE**

* * * * *

**§ 12011. Authorized strengths: reserve officers on active duty
or on full-time National Guard duty for administration
of the reserves or the National Guard**

(a) The number of reserve officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps who may be on active duty or full-time National Guard duty in each of the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel, and of the Navy who may be on active duty in each of the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, as of the end of any fiscal year for duty described in subclauses (B) and (C) of section 523(b)(1) of this title or full-time National Guard duty (other than for training) under section 502(f) of title 32 may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

[Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or Lieutenant Commander	3,219	1,071	643	140
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	1,524	520	672	90
Colonel or Navy Captain	412	188	274	30]

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Army</i>	<i>Navy</i>	<i>Air Force</i>	<i>Marine Corps</i>
<i>Major or Lieutenant Commander</i>	<i>3,219</i>	<i>1,071</i>	<i>776</i>	<i>140</i>
<i>Lieutenant Colonel or Commander</i>	<i>1,524</i>	<i>520</i>	<i>672</i>	<i>90</i>
<i>Colonel or Navy Captain</i>	<i>438</i>	<i>188</i>	<i>274</i>	<i>30</i>

* * * * *

§ 12012. Authorized strengths: senior enlisted members on active duty or on full-time National Guard duty for administration of the reserves or the National Guard

(a) The number of enlisted members in pay grades E-8 and E-9 who may be on active duty (other than for training) or on full-time National Guard duty under the authority of section 502(f) of title 32 (other than for training) as of the end of any fiscal year in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components or the National Guard may not exceed the number for that grade and armed force in the following table:

Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9	603	202	366	20
E-8	2,585	429	890	94】

<i>Grade</i>	<i>Army</i>	<i>Navy</i>	<i>Air Force</i>	<i>Marine Corps</i>
<i>E-9</i>	<i>623</i>	<i>202</i>	<i>388</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>E-8</i>	<i>2,585</i>	<i>429</i>	<i>979</i>	<i>94</i>

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1205—APPOINTMENT OF RESERVE OFFICERS

* * * * *

§ 12205. Commissioned officers: appointment; educational requirement

(a) * * *

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) The appointment to or recognition in a higher grade of any person who was appointed to, or federally recognized in, the grade of captain or, in the case of the Navy, lieutenant before October 1, 1995, or in the case of an officer commissioned through the Army Officer Candidate School, October 1, 2000.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1215—MISCELLANEOUS PROHIBITIONS AND PENALTIES

- Sec.
- 12551. Prohibition of use of Air Force Reserve AGR personnel for Air Force base security functions.
- 12552. *Funeral honor guard functions: prohibition of treatment as drill or training.*

* * * * *

§ 12552. Funeral honor guard functions: prohibition of treatment as drill or training

Performance by a Reserve of honor guard functions at the funeral of a veteran may not be considered to be a period of drill or training otherwise required.

CHAPTER 1217—MISCELLANEOUS RIGHTS AND BENEFITS

- Sec.
- 12601. Compensation: Reserve on active duty accepting from any person.
- 12602. Members of Army National Guard of United States and Air National Guard of United States: credit for service as members of National Guard.
- 12603. *Travel: use of carriers under contract with General Services Administration.*

* * * * *

§ 12603. Travel: use of carriers under contract with General Services Administration

A member of a reserve component who requires transportation in order to perform inactive duty training may use a carrier under contract with the General Services Administration to provide the transportation. The transportation shall be provided by the carrier in the same manner as transportation is provided to members of the armed forces and civilian employees who are traveling at Government expense, except that the Reserve is responsible for the cost of the travel at the contract rate. The Secretary concerned may require the Reserve to use a Government approved travel card to ensure that the transportation is procured for the purpose of performing inactive duty training.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1223—RETIRED PAY FOR NON-REGULAR SERVICE

* * * * *

§ 12731. Age and service requirements

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) In the case of a person who completes the service requirements of subsection (a)(2) during the period beginning on October 5, 1994, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, the provisions of subsection (a)(3) shall be applied by substituting “the last six years” for “the last eight years”.

§ 12731a. Temporary special retirement qualification authority

(a) RETIREMENT WITH AT LEAST 15 YEARS OF SERVICE.—For the purposes of section 12731 of this title, the Secretary concerned may—

(1) during the period described in subsection (b), determine to treat a member of the Selected Reserve of a reserve component of the armed force under the jurisdiction of that Secretary as having met the service requirements of subsection (a)(2) of that section and provide the member with the notification required by subsection (d) of that section if the member—

(A) * * *

(B) after that date and before October 1, [1999] 2000, completes 15 years of service computed under that section; and

* * * * *

(b) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—The period referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the period beginning on October 23, 1992, and ending on October 1, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

PART III—PROMOTION AND RETENTION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1405—PROMOTIONS

* * * * *

§ 14301. Eligibility for consideration for promotion: general rules

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(g) *A reserve component brigadier general of the Army or the Air Force who is in an inactive status is eligible (notwithstanding subsection (a)) for consideration for promotion to major general by a promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title if the officer—*

(1) has been in an inactive status for less than one year as of the date of the convening of the promotion board; and

(2) had continuously served for at least one year on the reserve active status list or the active duty list (or a combination of both) immediately before the officer's most recent transfer to an inactive status.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1409—CONTINUATION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST AND SELECTIVE EARLY REMOVAL

* * * * *

§ 14705. Selective early retirement: reserve general and flag officers of the Navy and Marine Corps

(a) * * *

[(b) BOARDS.—If the Secretary of the Navy determines that consideration for early retirement under this section is necessary, the Secretary shall convene a board under section 14101(b) of this title to recommend an appropriate number of officers for early retirement.**]**

(b) BOARDS.—(1) If the Secretary of the Navy determines that consideration of officers for early retirement under this section is necessary, the Secretary shall convene a continuation board under section 14101(b) of this title to recommend an appropriate number of officers for early retirement.

(2) In the case of such a board convened to consider officers in the grade of rear admiral or major general—

(A) the Secretary may appoint the board without regard to section 14102(b) of this title; and

(B) each member of the board must be serving in a grade higher than the grade of rear admiral or major general.

* * * * *

PART IV—TRAINING FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1606—EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE

* * * * *

§ 16133. Time limitation for use of entitlement

(a) * * *

(b)(1) In the case of a person—

(A) * * *

(B) who, on or after the date on which such person became entitled to educational assistance under this chapter ceases to be a member of the Selected Reserve during the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, by reason of the inactivation of the person's unit of assignment or by reason of involuntarily ceasing to be designated as a member of the Selected Reserve pursuant to section 10143(a) of this title,

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1609—EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAMS

* * * * *

§ 16302. Education loan repayment program: health professions officers serving in Selected Reserve with wartime critical medical skill shortages

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c)(1) * * *

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the amount of a loan that may be repaid under this section on behalf of any person may not exceed **[\$3,000]** *\$10,000* for each year of service described in paragraph (1).

(3) The total amount that may be repaid on behalf of any person under this section may not exceed **[\$20,000]** *\$50,000*.

(d) The authority provided in this section shall apply only in the case of a person first appointed as a commissioned officer before October 1, **[1999]** *2000*.

* * * * *

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * *

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

* * * * *

Subtitle D—Other Ballistic Missile Defense Provisions

[SEC. 251. BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAM ELEMENTS.

[(a) ELEMENTS SPECIFIED.—In the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Defense budget for any fiscal year after fiscal year 1996 (as submitted with the budget of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), the amount requested for activities of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization shall be set forth in accordance with the following program elements:

[(1) The Patriot system.

[(2) The Navy Lower Tier (Area) system.

[(3) The Theater High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system.

[(4) The Navy Upper Tier (Theater Wide) system.

[(5) The Corps Surface-to-Air Missile (SAM) system.

[(6) Other Theater Missile Defense Activities.

[(7) National Missile Defense.

[(8) Follow-On and Support Technologies.

[(b) TREATMENT OF CORE THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS.—Amounts requested for core theater missile defense programs specified in section 234 shall be specified in individual, dedicated program elements, and amounts appropriated for such programs shall be available only for activities covered by those program elements.

[(c) BM/C³I PROGRAMS.—Amounts requested for programs, projects, and activities involving battle management, command, control, communications, and intelligence (BM/C³I) shall be included in the “Other Theater Missile Defense Activities” program element or the “National Missile Defense” program element, as determined on the basis of the primary objectives involved.

[(d) MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT.—Each program element shall include requests for the amounts necessary for the management and support of the programs, projects, and activities contained in that program element.]

* * * * *

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

* * * * *

Subtitle C—Environmental Provisions

* * * * *

SEC. 335. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR UNIFORM FUNDING OF MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) PERIOD OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The demonstration project shall terminate [not later than September 30, 1998] *on September 30, 1999.*

* * * * *

(e) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress an interim report on the implementation of this section.

(2) Not later than December 31, 1998, the Secretary shall submit to Congress [a final report on the results] *an additional report on the progress* of the demonstration project. The report shall include a comparison of—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

**DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATIONS**

* * * * *

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * *

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances Generally

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

* * * * *

**SEC. 2858. LAND CONVEYANCE, INDIANA ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT,
CHARLESTOWN, INDIANA.**

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) The Secretary may also convey to the State, without consideration, another parcel of real property at the Indiana Army Ammunition Plant consisting of approximately 2,000 acres of additional riverfront property in order to connect the parcel conveyed under paragraph (2) with the parcels of Charlestown State Park conveyed to the State under paragraph (1) and title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

* * * * *

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1998**

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS**

* * * * *

**TITLE III—OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE**

* * * * *

Subtitle F—Other Matters

* * * * *

SEC. 392. PROGRAM TO INVESTIGATE FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a specific coordinated program for the investigation of evidence of fraud, waste, and abuse within the Department of Defense, particularly fraud, waste, and abuse regarding finance and accounting matters *and any fraud, waste, and abuse occurring in connection with overpayments made to vendors by the Department of Defense, including overpayments identified under section 354 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104-106; 10 U.S.C. 2461 note).*

* * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

* * * * *

Subtitle F—Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues

* * * * *

SEC. 562. DUTIES.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) REPORTS.—(1) Not later than [April] *October 15, 1998*, the commission shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives a report setting forth a strategic plan for the work of the commission and the activities and initial findings of the commission.

(2) Not later than [September 16, 1998] *March 15, 1999*, the commission shall submit a final report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on National Security of the House of Representatives. The final report shall set forth the activities, findings, and recommendations of the commission, including any recommendations for congressional action and administrative action that the commission considers appropriate. The report shall specifically set forth the views of the Secretaries of the military departments regarding the matters described in subparagraphs (O) and (P) of subsection (b)(2).

* * * * *

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

* * * * *

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

* * * * *

SEC. 602. REFORM OF BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) TRANSITIONAL ENTITLEMENT TO ALLOWANCE.—

(1) ENLISTED MEMBERS.—

(A) * * *

(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED RESERVE MEMBERS.—Unless entitled to basic pay under section 204 of title 37, United States Code, an enlisted member of a reserve component (as defined in section 101(24) of such title) may receive, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101(5) of such title), rations in kind, or a part thereof, when the member's instruction or duty periods (as described in section 206(a) of such title) total at least eight hours in a calendar day. The Secretary concerned may provide an enlisted member who could be provided rations in kind under the preceding sentence with a commutation when rations in kind are not available..

* * * * *

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

* * * * *

[SEC. 615. INCREASE IN AVIATION CAREER INCENTIVE PAY.

[(a) AMOUNTS.—The table in subsection (b)(1) of section 301a of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

[(1) by inserting at the end of phase I of the table the following:

["Over 14 840";

and

[(2) by striking out phase II of the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

["PHASE II

"Years of service as an officer:	"Monthly rate
"Over 22	\$585
"Over 23	495
"Over 24	385
"Over 25	250".

[(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such subsection is further amended in the matter after the table by striking out "18 years" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "22 years".

[(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on January 1, 1999, and

shall apply with respect to months beginning on or after that date.]

* * * * *

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * *

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * *

Subtitle C—Defense Base Closure and Realignment

* * * * *

SEC. 2826. PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN CONVEYANCES OF PROPERTY AT NAVAL STATION, LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

[(e) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) The President may waive the prohibitions contained in this section with respect to a conveyance of property described in subsection (a) to COSCO if the President determines that—

[(A) appropriate action has been taken to address any increased national security risk identified in the reports required by subsection (d); and

[(B) the conveyance would not adversely affect national security or significantly increase the counter-intelligence burden on the intelligence community.

[(2) Any waiver under paragraph (1) shall take effect 30 days after the date on which the President notifies the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the President's determination to use the waiver authority provided under this subsection.]

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

* * * * *

**Subtitle C—Program Authorizations,
Restrictions, and Limitations**

* * * * *

**SEC. 3132. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION
PROJECTS.**

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(g) PROHIBITION ON LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary of Energy may not guarantee any loan made by a private sector entity to a contractor to pay for any costs (including costs described in subsection (a)(3)) borne by the contractor to carry out a contract entered into under this section.

SEC. 3133. INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP.

(a) FUNDING PROHIBITION.—No funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Energy [for fiscal year 1998] for any fiscal year may be obligated or expended to conduct any activities associated with international cooperative stockpile stewardship.

* * * * *

**SECTION 1518 OF THE ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT
HOME ACT OF 1991**

[SEC. 1518. INSPECTION BY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall—

[(1) conduct, not later than three years after the effective date specified in section 1541(a) (and at six-year intervals thereafter), an inspection of the Retirement Home and the records of the Retirement Home;

[(2) cause the Inspector Generals of the military departments to conduct an inspection of the Retirement Home and its records at six-year intervals alternating with the inspections by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense so that each home is inspected every three years; and

[(3) submit to the Retirement Home Board, the Secretary of Defense, and Congress a report describing the results of the inspection and containing such recommendations as the Inspector General considers appropriate.]

SEC. 1518. INSPECTION OF RETIREMENT HOME.

(a) PERIODIC INSPECTION.—The Inspector Generals of the military departments shall conduct, at three-year intervals, an inspection of the Retirement Home and the records of the Retirement Home. Each

inspection under this subsection shall be performed by a single Inspector General on an alternating basis.

(b) REPORT.—The Inspector General of a military department who performs an inspection of the Retirement Home under subsection (a) shall submit to the Retirement Home Board, the Secretary of Defense, and Congress a report describing the results of the inspection and containing such recommendations as the Inspector General considers appropriate.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1993**

* * * * *

**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZA-
TIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

* * * * *

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL
SECURITY PROGRAMS**

* * * * *

Subtitle E—Defense Nuclear Workers

[SEC. 3161. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES WORK FORCE RESTRUCTURING PLAN.

[(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon determination that a change in the workforce at a defense nuclear facility is necessary, the Secretary of Energy (hereinafter in this subtitle referred to as the “Secretary”) shall develop a plan for restructuring the work force for the defense nuclear facility that takes into account—

[(1) the reconfiguration of the defense nuclear facility; and

[(2) the plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile that is the most recently prepared plan at the time of the development of the plan referred to in this subsection.

[(b) CONSULTATION.—(1) In developing a plan referred to in subsection (a) and any updates of the plan under subsection (e), the Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Labor, appropriate representatives of local and national collective-bargaining units of individuals employed at Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities, appropriate representatives of departments and agencies of State and local governments, appropriate representatives of State and local institutions of higher education, and appropriate representatives of community groups in communities affected by the restructuring plan.

[(2) The Secretary shall determine appropriate representatives of the units, governments, institutions, and groups referred to in paragraph (1).

[(c) OBJECTIVES.—In preparing the plan required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall be guided by the following objectives:

[(1) Changes in the work force at a Department of Energy defense nuclear facility—

[(A) should be accomplished so as to minimize social and economic impacts;

[(B) should be made only after the provision of notice of such changes not later than 120 days before the commencement of such changes to such employees and the communities in which such facilities are located; and

[(C) should be accomplished, when possible, through the use of retraining, early retirement, attrition, and other options that minimize layoffs.

[(2) Employees whose employment in positions at such facilities is terminated shall, to the extent practicable, receive preference in any hiring of the Department of Energy (consistent with applicable employment seniority plans or practices of the Department of Energy and with section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1682)).

[(3) Employees shall, to the extent practicable, be retrained for work in environmental restoration and waste management activities at such facilities or other facilities of the Department of Energy.

[(4) The Department of Energy should provide relocation assistance to employees who are transferred to other Department of Energy facilities as a result of the plan.

[(5) The Department of Energy should assist terminated employees in obtaining appropriate retraining, education, and re-employment assistance (including employment placement assistance).

[(6) The Department of Energy should provide local impact assistance to communities that are affected by the restructuring plan and coordinate the provision of such assistance with—

[(A) programs carried out by the Department of Labor pursuant to the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.);

[(B) programs carried out pursuant to the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 (Part D of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2391 note); and

[(C) programs carried out by the Department of Commerce pursuant to title IX of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3241 et seq.).

[(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall, subject to the availability of appropriations for such purpose, work on an ongoing basis with representatives of the Department of Labor, work force bargaining units, and States and local communities in carrying out a plan required under subsection (a).

[(e) PLAN UPDATES.—Not later than one year after issuing a plan referred to in subsection (a) and on an annual basis thereafter, the Secretary shall issue an update of the plan. Each updated plan under this subsection shall—

[(1) be guided by the objectives referred to in subsection (c), taking into account any changes in the function or mission of the Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities and any

other changes in circumstances that the Secretary determines to be relevant;

[(2) contain an evaluation by the Secretary of the implementation of the plan during the year preceding the report; and

[(3) contain such other information and provide for such other matters as the Secretary determines to be relevant.

[(f) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a plan referred to in subsection (a) with respect to a defense nuclear facility within 90 days after the date on which a notice of changes described in subsection (c)(1)(B) is provided to employees of the facility, or 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

[(2) The Secretary shall submit to Congress any updates of the plan under subsection (e) immediately upon completion of any such update.]

* * * * *

DIVISION D—DEFENSE CONVERSION, REINVESTMENT, AND TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

* * * * *

TITLE XLIV—PERSONNEL ADJUSTMENT, EDUCATION, AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—Active Forces Transition Enhancements

* * * * *

SEC. 4403. TEMPORARY EARLY RETIREMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(i) ACTIVE FORCE DRAWDOWN PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the active force drawdown period is the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on October 1, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

Subtitle B—Guard and Reserve Transition Initiatives

SEC. 4411. FORCE REDUCTION TRANSITION PERIOD DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “force reduction transition period” means the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

SEC. 4416. FORCE REDUCTION PERIOD RETIREMENTS.

(a) * * *

(b) TEMPORARY SPECIAL AUTHORITY.—During the period referred to in subsection (c), the Secretary concerned may grant a member

of the Selected Reserve under the age of 60 years the annual payments provided for under this section if—

(1) as of October 1, [1999] 2000, that member has completed at least 20 years of service computed under section 1332 of title 10, United States Code, or after that date and before October 1, 1995, such member completes 20 years of service computed under that section;

* * * * *

Subtitle F—Job Training and Employment and Educational Opportunities

* * * * *

SEC. 4463. PROGRAM OF EDUCATIONAL LEAVE RELATING TO CONTINUING PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) EXPIRATION.—The authority to grant a leave of absence under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

SECTION 3015 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 3015. Amount of basic educational assistance

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) In the case of an individual who has a skill or specialty designated by the Secretary concerned as a skill or specialty in which there is a critical shortage of personnel or for which it is difficult to recruit, the Secretary concerned, pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may, *at the time the individual first becomes a member of the Armed Forces*, increase the rate of the basic educational assistance allowance applicable to such individual to such rate in excess of the rate prescribed under subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate, but the amount of any such increase may not exceed [\$400 per month, in the case of an individual who first became a member of the Armed Forces before November 29, 1989, or \$700 per month, in the case of an individual who first became a member of the Armed Forces on or after that date] \$950 per month.

* * * * *

TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

CHAPTER 1—DEFINITIONS

* * * * *

§ 101. Definitions

In addition to the definitions in sections 1–5 of title 1, the following definitions apply in this title:

(1) * * *

(2) The term “possessions” includes [the Canal Zone,] Guam, American Samoa, and the guano islands.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 5—SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

* * * * *

§ 301a. Incentive pay: aviation career

(a)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) To be entitled to continuous monthly incentive pay, an officer must perform the prescribed operational flying duties (including flight training but excluding proficiency flying) for 8 of the first 12, and 12 of the first 18 years of the aviation service of the officer. However, if an officer performs the prescribed operational flying duties (including flight training but excluding proficiency flying) for at least 10 but less than 12 of the first 18 years of the aviation service of the officer, the officer will be entitled to continuous monthly incentive pay for the first [22 years of the officer’s service as an officer] 22 years of aviation service of the officer. Entitlement to continuous monthly incentive pay ceases for an officer (other than a warrant officer) upon completion of [25 years of service as an officer (as computed under section 205 of this title)] 25 years of aviation service, but such an officer in a pay grade below pay grade O–7 remains entitled to monthly incentive pay under subsection (b)(1) for the performance of operational flying duty.

* * * * *

(6) In this section:

(A) The term “aviation service” means service performed by an officer (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer) while holding an aeronautical rating or designation or while in training to receive an aeronautical rating or designation.

[(A)] (B) The term “operational flying duty” means flying performed under competent orders by rated or designated members while serving in assignments in which basic flying skills normally are maintained in the performance of assigned duties as determined by the Secretary concerned, and flying performed by members in training that leads to the award of an aeronautical rating or designation.

[(B)] (C) The term “proficiency flying duty” means flying performed under competent orders by rated or designated members while serving in assignments in which such skills would normally not be maintained in the performance of assigned duties.

[(C)] (D) The term “officer” includes an individual enlisted, and designated, as an aviation cadet under section 6911 of title 10.

[(b) A member who satisfies the requirements described in subsection (a) is entitled to monthly incentive pay as follows:

[(1) For a member who is qualified under subsection (a):

[PHASE I

Years of aviation service (including flight training) as an officer:	<i>Monthly rate</i>
2 or less	\$125
Over 2	156
Over 3	188
Over 4	206
Over 6	650

[PHASE II

Years of service as an officer:	<i>Monthly rate</i>
Over 18	\$585
Over 20	495
Over 22	385
Over 25	250

An officer is entitled to the rates in phase I of this table until he has completed 22 years of service as an officer, after which his entitlement is as prescribed by the rates in phase II, if he has completed at least 6 years of aviation service as an officer. However, if he has over 22 years of service as an officer, but not at least 6 years of aviation service as an officer, he continues to be subject to the rates set forth in phase I of the table that apply to an officer who has less than 6 years of aviation service as an officer. An officer in a pay grade above O-6 is entitled, until he completes 25 years of service as an officer, to be paid at the rates set forth in this table, except that an officer in pay grade O-7 may not be paid at a rate greater than \$200 a month, and an officer in pay grade O-8, or above, may not be paid at a rate greater than \$206 a month.]

(b)(1) A member who satisfies the requirements described in subsection (a) is entitled to monthly incentive pay as follows:

Years of aviation service (including flight training) as an officer:	<i>Monthly rate</i>
2 or less	\$125
Over 2	\$156
Over 3	\$188
Over 4	\$206
Over 6	\$650
Over 14	\$840
Over 22	\$585
Over 23	\$495
Over 24	\$385
Over 25	\$250

(2) An officer in a pay grade above O-6 is entitled, until the officer completes 25 years of aviation service, to be paid at the rates set forth in the table in paragraph (1), except that—

(A) an officer in pay grade O-7 may not be paid at a rate greater than \$200 a month; and

(B) an officer in pay grade O-8 or above may not be paid at a rate greater than \$206 a month.

(3) For a warrant officer with over 22, 23, 24, or 25 years of aviation service who is qualified under subsection (a), the rate pre-

scribed in the table in paragraph (1) for officers with over 14 years of aviation service shall continue to apply to the warrant officer.

* * * * *

(d) Under regulations prescribed by the President and to the extent provided for by appropriations, when a member of a reserve component of a uniformed service, or of the National Guard, who is entitled to compensation under section 206 of this title, performs, under orders, duty described in subsection (a) for members entitled to basic pay, he is entitled to an increase in compensation equal to $\frac{1}{30}$ of the monthly incentive pay authorized by [subsection (b)(1) or (2), as the case may be, for the performance of that duty by a member of corresponding years of aviation or officer service, as appropriate.] *subsection (b) for the performance of that duty by a member with corresponding years of aviation service* who is entitled to basic pay. Such member is entitled to the increase for as long as he is qualified for it, for each regular period of instruction, or period of appropriate duty, at which he is engaged for at least two hours, including that performed on a Sunday or holiday, or for the performance of such other equivalent training, instruction, duty or appropriate duties, as the Secretary may prescribe under section 206(a) of this title. This subsection does not apply to a member who is entitled to basic pay under section 204 of this title.

* * * * *

§ 301b. Special pay: aviation career officers extending period of active duty

(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—An aviation officer described in subsection (b) who, during the period beginning on January 1, 1989, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, executes a written agreement to remain on active duty in aviation service for at least one year may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid a retention bonus as provided in this section.

(b) COVERED OFFICERS.—An aviation officer referred to in subsection (a) is an officer of a uniformed service who—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(5) has completed at least six but less than 13 years of [active duty] *aviation service*; and

* * * * *

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

[(1) The term “aviation service” means the service performed by an officer holding an aeronautical rating or designation (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer).]

(1) The term “aviation service” means service performed by an officer (except a flight surgeon or other medical officer) while holding an aeronautical rating or designation or while in training to receive an aeronautical rating or designation.

* * * * *

§ 302d. Special pay: accession bonus for registered nurses

(a) ACCESSION BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) A person who is a registered nurse and who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, executes a written agreement described in subsection (c) to accept a commission as an officer and remain on active duty for a period of not less than four years may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid an accession bonus in an amount determined by the Secretary concerned.

* * * * *

§ 302e. Special pay: nurse anesthetists

(a) SPECIAL PAY AUTHORIZED.—(1) An officer described in subsection (b)(1) who, during the period beginning on November 29, 1989, and ending on September 30, [1999] 2000, executes a written agreement to remain on active duty for a period of one year or more may, upon the acceptance of the agreement by the Secretary concerned, be paid incentive special pay in an amount not to exceed \$15,000 for any 12-month period.

* * * * *

§ 302g. Special pay: Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT AUTHORITY.—No agreement under this section may be entered into after September 30, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

§ 304. Special pay: diving duty

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, a member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay is entitled to special pay, in the amount set forth in subsection (b), for periods during which the member—

- (1) is assigned by orders to the duty of diving; *or*
- (2) is required to maintain proficiency as a diver [by frequent and regular dives; and].
- [(3) actually performs diving duty.]

* * * * *

§ 308. Special pay: reenlistment bonus

(a)(1) A member of a uniformed service who—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

[(D) reenlists or voluntarily extends his enlistment in a regular component of the service concerned for a period of at least three years;]

(D) reenlists or voluntarily extends the member's enlistment for a period of at least three years in a regular component, or

in a reserve component if the member is performing active Guard and Reserve duty (as defined in section 101(d)(6) of title 10), of the service concerned;
 may be paid a bonus as provided in paragraph (2).

* * * * *

(b) [(1)] Bonus payments authorized under this section may be paid in either a lump sum or in installments. If the bonus is paid in installments, the initial payment shall be not less than 50 percent of the total bonus amount.

[(2) Of the bonuses paid under this section to members of a uniformed service during a fiscal year, not more than 10 percent may exceed \$20,000.]

* * * * *

(g) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any reenlistment, or voluntary extension of an active-duty reenlistment, in the armed forces entered into after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308a. Special pay: enlistment bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) No bonus shall be paid under this section with respect to any enlistment or extension of an initial period of active duty in the armed forces made after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308b. Special pay: reenlistment bonus for members of the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after September 30, [1999] 2000, reenlists or voluntarily extends his enlistment in a reserve component.

§ 308c. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any enlisted member who, after September 30, [1999] 2000, enlists in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of an armed force.

§ 308d. Special pay: enlisted members of the Selected Reserve assigned to certain high priority units

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) Additional compensation may not be paid under this section for inactive duty performed after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308e. Special pay: bonus for reserve affiliation agreement

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for a reserve obligation agreement entered into after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308f. Special pay: bonus for enlistment in the Army

(a) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, a person—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

may be paid a bonus in an amount prescribed by the Secretary of the Army not to exceed [\$4,000] \$6,000. The bonus may be paid in a lump sum or in equal periodic installments, as determined by the Secretary of the Army.

* * * * *

(c) No bonus may be paid under this section with respect to an enlistment in the Army after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308h. Special pay: bonus for reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of enlistment in elements of the Ready Reserve other than the Selected Reserve

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(g) A bonus may not be paid under this section to any person for a reenlistment, enlistment, or voluntary extension of an enlistment after September 30, [1999] 2000.

§ 308i. Special pay: prior service enlistment bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No bonus may be paid under this section to any person for an enlistment after September 30, [1999] 2000.

* * * * *

§ 310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger

(a) * * *

(b)(1) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

(2) A member of a reserve component who is eligible for special pay under this section for a month shall receive the full amount authorized in subsection (a) for that month regardless of the number of days during that month on which the member satisfies the eligibility criteria specified in such subsection.

* * * * *

§ 312. Special pay: nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active duty

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before September 30, [1999] 2000, execute the required written agreement to remain in active service.

* * * * *

§ 312b. Special pay: nuclear career accession bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) The provisions of this section shall be effective only in the case of officers who, on or before September 30, [1999] 2000, have been accepted for training for duty in connection with the supervision, operation, and maintenance of naval nuclear propulsion plants.

§ 312c. Special pay: nuclear career annual incentive bonus

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d) For the purposes of this section, a “nuclear service year” is any fiscal year beginning before October 1, [1999] 2000.

CHAPTER 7—ALLOWANCES

Sec.

401. Definitions.

* * * * *

[411c. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with leave from certain stations in foreign countries.]

411c. *Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with rest and recuperative leave from certain stations in foreign countries.*

* * * * *

§ 402. Basic allowance for subsistence

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) *SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED RESERVE MEMBERS.— Unless entitled to basic pay under section 204 of this title, an enlisted member of a reserve component may receive, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, rations in kind, or a part thereof, when the member’s instruction or duty periods, as described in section 206(a) of this title, total at least eight hours in a calendar day. The Secretary concerned may provide an enlisted member who could be provided rations in kind under the preceding sentence with a commutation when rations in kind are not available.*

[(e)] (f) **POLICIES ON USE OF DINING AND MESSING FACILITIES.—** The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries concerned, shall prescribe policies regarding use of dining and field messing facilities of the uniformed services.

[(f)] (g) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section. Before prescribing the regulations, the Secretary shall consult with each Secretary concerned.

(2) The regulations shall include the specific rates of basic allowance for subsistence required by subsection (b).

§ 403. Basic allowance for housing

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3)(A) *In the case of a member of the uniformed services authorized to receive an allowance under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned may make a lump-sum payment to the member for required deposits and advance rent, and for expenses relating thereto, that are—*

- (i) *incurred by the member in occupying private housing outside of the United States; and*
- (ii) *authorized or approved under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned.*

(B) *Expenses for which a member may be reimbursed under this paragraph may include losses relating to housing that are sustained by the member as a result of fluctuations in the relative value of the currencies of the United States and the foreign country in which the housing is located.*

(C) *The Secretary concerned shall recoup the full amount of any deposit or advance rent payments made by the Secretary under subparagraph (A), including any gain resulting from currency fluctuations between the time of payment and the time of recoupment.*

* * * * *

§ 404. Travel and transportation allowances: general

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c)(1) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned and as provided in paragraph (2), a member who—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(C) *is involuntarily separated from active duty [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000,*

* * * * *

(f)(1) The travel and transportation allowances authorized under this section for a member who is separated from the service or released from active duty may be paid or provided only for travel actually performed.

(2)(A) * * *

(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to a member—

(i) * * *

* * * * *

(v) who is involuntarily separated from active duty [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000.*

* * * * *

§ 405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska

(a) * * *

* * * * *

[(c)(1) In the case of a member of the uniformed services authorized to receive a per diem allowance under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may make a lump-sum payment for nonrecurring expenses—

[(A) incurred by the member in occupying private housing outside of the United States; and

[(B) authorized or approved under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

[(2) Nonrecurring expenses for which a member may be reimbursed under paragraph (1) may include losses sustained by the member on the refund of a rental deposit (or other deposit made by the member to secure housing) as a result of fluctuations in the relative value of the currencies of the United States and the foreign country in which such housing is located.

[(3) The Secretary concerned shall recoup the full amount of a refunded deposit referred to in paragraph (2) that was paid by the United States, including any gain resulting from a fluctuation in currency values referred to in that paragraph.

[(4) Expenses for which payments are made under this subsection may not be considered for purposes of determining the per diem allowance of the member under subsection (a).]

* * * * *

§ 405a. Travel and transportation allowances: departure allowances

(a) * * *

(b)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, each member whose dependents are covered by subsection (a) is entitled to have one motor vehicle that is owned by the member (or a dependent of the member) and is for the personal use of the member or his dependents transported at the expense of the United States to a designated place for the use of the dependents. When the dependents are permitted to rejoin the member, the vehicle may be transported at the expense of the United States to his permanent duty station.

(2) *If a motor vehicle of a member (or a dependent of the member) that is transported at the expense of the United States under paragraph (1) does not arrive at the authorized destination of the vehicle by the designated delivery date, the Secretary concerned shall reim-*

burse the member for expenses incurred after that date to rent a motor vehicle for the dependent's use. However, the amount reimbursed shall not exceed \$30 per day, and the rental period for which reimbursement may be provided shall expire after seven days or on the date on which the delayed vehicle finally arrives at the authorized destination (whichever occurs first).

§ 406. Travel and transportation allowances: dependents; baggage and household effects

(a)(1) * * *

(2)(A) * * *

(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to a member—

(i) * * *

* * * * *

(v) who is involuntarily separated from active duty [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000.*

(b)(1)(A) * * *

* * * * *

(D) In connection with the change of temporary or permanent station of a member in a pay grade below pay grade O-6, the Secretary concerned may authorize a higher weight allowance than the weight allowance determined under subparagraph (C) for the member if the Secretary concerned determines that the application of the weight allowance determined under such subparagraph would result in significant hardship to the member or the dependents of the member. An increase in weight allowance under this subparagraph may not result in a weight allowance exceeding the weight allowance specified in subparagraph (C) for pay grades O-6 to O-10, *unless the additional weight allowance in excess of such maximum is intended to permit the shipping of consumables that cannot be reasonably obtained at the new station of the member.* The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subparagraph.

* * * * *

(g)(1) Under uniform regulations prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, a member who—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(C) is involuntarily separated from active duty [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000,*

is, not later than one year from the date he is so retired, placed on that list, involuntarily separated, discharged, or released, except as prescribed in regulations by the Secretaries concerned, entitled to transportation for his dependents, baggage, and household effects to the home selected under section 404(c) of this title, and to a per diem for his dependents. In addition, baggage and household effects may be shipped to a location other than the home selected by the member.

(h)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) If a motor vehicle of a member (or a dependent of the member) that is transported at the expense of the United States under this subsection does not arrive at the authorized destination of the vehicle by the designated delivery date, the Secretary concerned shall reimburse the member for expenses incurred after that date to rent a motor vehicle for the dependent's use. However, the amount reimbursed shall not exceed \$30 per day, and the rental period for which reimbursement may be provided shall expire after seven days or on the date on which the delayed vehicle finally arrives at the authorized destination (whichever occurs first).

* * * * *

[§411c. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with leave from certain stations in foreign countries]

§411c. Travel and transportation allowances: travel performed in connection with rest and recuperative leave from certain stations in foreign countries

(a) * * *

[(b) The transportation authorized by this section is limited to transportation of the member, and of each dependent of the member, for one round-trip during any tour of at least 24, but less than 36, consecutive months or two round-trips during any tour of at least 36 consecutive months.]

(b) When the transportation authorized by subsection (a) is provided by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary may use Government or commercial carriers. The Secretary concerned may limit the amount of payments made to members under subsection (a).

* * * * *

§430. Travel and transportation: dependent children of members stationed overseas

(a) * * *

(b)(1) A member described in subsection (a) may be paid a transportation allowance for each unmarried dependent child, who is under 23 years of age and is attending a school in the continental United States for the purpose of obtaining a secondary or undergraduate college education, of one annual trip between the school being attended and the member's duty station outside the continental United States and return. The allowance authorized by this section may be transportation in kind or reimbursement therefor, as prescribed by the Secretaries concerned. However, the transportation authorized by this section may not be paid a member for a child attending a school in the continental United States for the purpose of obtaining a secondary education if the child is eligible to attend a secondary school for dependents that is located at or in the vicinity of the duty station of the member and is operated under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.).

(2) *At the option of the member, in lieu of the transportation of baggage of a dependent child under paragraph (1) from the dependent's school in the continental United States, the Secretary concerned may pay or reimburse the member for costs incurred to store the baggage at or in the vicinity of the school during the dependent's annual trip between the school and the member's duty station. The amount of the payment or reimbursement may not exceed the cost that the Government would incur to transport the baggage.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 10—PAYMENTS TO MISSING PERSONS

* * * * *

§ 554. Travel and transportation: dependents; household and personal effects; trailers; additional movements; motor vehicles; sale of bulky items; claims for proceeds; appropriation chargeable

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(i) If a motor vehicle of a member (or a dependent of the member) that is transported at the expense of the United States under this section does not arrive at the authorized destination of the vehicle by the designated delivery date, the Secretary concerned shall reimburse the dependent for expenses incurred after that date to rent a motor vehicle for the dependent's use. However, the amount reimbursed shall not exceed \$30 per day, and the rental period for which reimbursement may be provided shall expire after seven days or on the date on which the delayed vehicle finally arrives at the authorized destination (whichever occurs first).

- [(i)] *(j) This section does not amend or repeal—*
 - (1) sections 2575, 2733, 4712, 6522, or 9712 of title 10;
 - (2) section 507 of title 14; or
 - (3) chapter 171 of title 28.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 19—ADMINISTRATION

§ 1006. Advance payments

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e)(1) As far as practicable, regulations for the administration of subsections (a)–(d) shall be uniform for all of the uniformed services.

(2) Obligations and expenditures incurred for an advance payment under this section may not be included in any determination of amounts available for obligation or expenditure except in the fiscal year in which the advance payment is ultimately earned and such obligations and expenditures shall be accounted for only in such fiscal year.

* * * * *

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1991**

* * * * *

**DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF
DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS**

* * * * *

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL

PART A—PERSONNEL READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

* * * * *

**SEC. 503. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES RELATING
TO MEMBERS INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED**

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) STORAGE OF HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department shall exercise the authority provided by section 406 of title 37, United States Code, to provide nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects for a period not longer than one year in the case of individuals who are involuntarily separated **[during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990]** *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000.*

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term “involuntarily separated” has the meaning given that term in section 1141 of title 10, United States Code.

* * * * *

**TITLE X—DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG
ACTIVITIES**

* * * * *

SEC. 1004. ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

(a) SUPPORT TO OTHER AGENCIES.—During fiscal years 1991 through **[1999]** *2000*, the Secretary of Defense may provide support for the counter-drug activities of any other department or agency of the Federal Government or of any State, local, or foreign law enforcement agency for any of the purposes set forth in subsection (b) if such support is requested—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(b) TYPES OF SUPPORT.—The purposes for which the Secretary may provide support under subsection (a) are the following:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) The establishment (including unspecified minor construction) and operation of bases of operations or training facilities for the purpose of facilitating counter-drug activities within or

outside the United States conducted by the Department of Defense or a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, or a foreign law enforcement agency in the case of counter-drug activities outside the United States.

* * * * *

(h) UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, shall apply with respect to any unspecified minor military construction project carried out using the authority provided under this section.

* * * * *

TITLE XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * *

PART C—GUARD AND RESERVE INITIATIVE

* * * * *

[SEC. 1438. TACTICAL AIRLIFT MISSION

[(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall assign the tactical airlift mission of the Air Force to the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard of the United States.

[(b) REQUIREMENT FOR TRANSFER PLAN.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall develop a plan for the transfer of all tactical airlift transport aircraft to the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard of the United States at the earliest practical date and shall complete the transfer in accordance with such plan not later than September 30, 1992.

[(c) DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a copy of the plan referred to in subsection (b) not later than June 1, 1991.

[(d) The Secretary of the Air Force may waive subsection (a) for any fiscal year if, not later than May 1 of the year in which that fiscal year begins, the Secretary certifies to the congressional defense committees that—

[(1) the requirements for tactical airlift capability of the commanders of the unified commands during that fiscal year require continued operation of tactical airlift aircraft by active duty Air Force units; and

[(2) the budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for that fiscal year and the multiyear defense program submitted to Congress in connection with that budget pursuant to section 114a of title 10, United States Code, propose sufficient funding to procure tactical airlift aircraft of the type required by the commanders of the unified commands for active Air Force tactical airlift squadrons.]

* * * * *

SECTION 1407 OF THE DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION ACT OF 1978

SCHOOL SYSTEM FOR DEPENDENTS IN OVERSEAS AREAS

Sec. 1407. (a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) CONTINUATION OF ENROLLMENT FOR CERTAIN DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES INVOLUNTARILY SEPARATED.—(1) A member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty on September 30, 1990, who is involuntarily separated [during the nine-year period beginning on October 1, 1990] *during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on September 30, 2000*, and who has a dependent described in paragraph (2) who is enrolled in a school of the defense dependents' education system (or a school for which tuition is provided under subsection (b)) on the date of that separation shall be eligible to enroll or continue the enrollment of that dependent at that school (or another school serving the same community) for the final year of secondary education of that dependent in the same manner as if the member were still on active duty.

(2) A dependent referred to in paragraph (1) is a dependent who on the date of the separation of the member has completed the eleventh grade and is likely to complete secondary education within the one-year period beginning on that date.

* * * * *

SECTION 114 OF TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE

§ 114. Honor guard functions at funerals for veterans

[(a)] Subject to such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, the performance of honor guard functions by members of the National Guard at funerals for veterans of the armed forces may be treated by the Secretary concerned as a Federal function for which appropriated funds may be used. Any such performance of honor guard functions at such a funeral may not be considered to be a period of drill or training otherwise required.

[(b)] This section does not authorize additional appropriations for any fiscal year. Any expense of the National Guard that is incurred by reason of this section shall be paid from appropriations otherwise available for the National Guard.]

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

* * * * *

**TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**

* * * * *

Subtitle B—Force Structure Review

* * * * *

**SEC. 1053. DISPOSAL OF TRACT OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA.**

(a) DISPOSAL AUTHORIZED.—Notwithstanding title II the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481 et seq.), title VIII of such Act (40 U.S.C. 531 et seq.), section 501 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411), or any other provision of law relating to the management and disposal of real property by the United States, the Armed Forces Retirement Home Board may convey[, by sale or otherwise,] all right, title, and interest of the United States in a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 49 acres located in Washington, District of Columbia, east of North Capitol Street, and recorded as District Parcel 121/19. *The conveyance of the real property shall be made by sale to the highest bidder, except that the purchase price may not be less than the fair market value of the parcel.*

(b) MANNER, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS OF DISPOSAL.—The Armed Forces Retirement Home Board may determine—

(1) the manner for [the disposal] *the sale* of the real property under subsection (a); and

* * * * *

**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZA-
TIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

* * * * *

**TITLE XXXV—PANAMA CANAL
COMMISSION**

* * * * *

**Subtitle B—Amendments to Panama Canal
Act of 1979**

* * * * *

SEC. 3548. CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) * * *

(b) CROSS REFERENCES IN PANAMA CANAL ACT.—

(1) * * *
(3) Section 1341(f) (22 U.S.C. 3751(f)) is amended by striking out “[section] sections 1302(c)” and inserting in lieu thereof “[section] sections 1302(b)”.

* * * * *

TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

PART III—EMPLOYEES

* * * * *

Subpart D—Pay and Allowances

* * * * *

CHAPTER 53—PAY RATES AND SYSTEMS

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—PAY COMPARABILITY SYSTEM

* * * * *

§ 5302. Definitions

For the purpose of this subchapter—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(8) the term “rates of pay under the General Schedule”, “rates of pay for the General Schedule”, or “scheduled rates of basic pay” means—

(A) the rates of basic pay set forth in the General Schedule; and

(B) in the case of an employee receiving a retained rate of basic pay under section 5363 (*except a rate retained under subsection (a)(2) of that section*), the rate of basic pay payable under such section; and

* * * * *

CHAPTER 55—PAY ADMINISTRATION

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER IX—SEVERANCE PAY AND BACK PAY

* * * * *

§ 5596. Back pay due to unjustified personnel action

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) *The pay, allowances, or differentials granted under this section for the period for which an unjustified or unwarranted personnel action was in effect shall not exceed that authorized by the applicable law, rule, regulations, or collective bargaining agreement under which the unjustified or unwarranted personnel action is found, except that in no case may pay, allowances, or differentials be granted under this section for a period beginning more than 6 years before the date of the filing of a timely appeal or, absent such filing, the date of the administrative determination.*

[(4)] (5) For the purpose of this subsection, “grievance” and “collective bargaining agreement” have the meanings set forth in section 7103 of this title and (with respect to members of the Foreign Service) in sections 1101 and 1002 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, “unfair labor practice” means an unfair labor practice described in section 7116 of this title and (with respect to members of the Foreign Service) in section 1015 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, and “personnel action” includes the omission or failure to take an action or confer a benefit.

* * * * *

Subpart E—Attendance and Leave

CHAPTER 61—HOURS OF WORK

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

* * * * *

§6103. Holidays

(a) * * *

(b) For the purpose of statutes relating to pay and leave of employees, with respect to a legal public holiday and any other day declared to be a holiday by Federal statute or Executive order, the following rules apply:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) *Instead of a holiday that is designated under subsection (a) to occur on a Monday, for an employee at a duty post outside the United States whose basic workweek is other than Monday through Friday, and for whom Monday is a regularly scheduled workday, the legal public holiday is the first workday of the workweek in which the Monday designated for the observance of such holiday under subsection (a) occurs.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 63—LEAVE

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER I—ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

* * * * *

§ 6304. Annual leave; accumulation

(a) Except as provided by subsections (b), (d), (e), (f), and (g) of this section, annual leave provided by section 6303 of this title, which is not used by an employee, accumulates for use in succeeding years until it totals not more than 30 days at the beginning of the first full bi-weekly pay period, or corresponding period for an employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods, occurring in a year.

* * * * *

(d)(1) Annual leave which is lost by operation of this section because of—

* * * * *

(3)(A) For the purpose of this subsection, the closure of, and any realignment with respect to, an installation of the Department of Defense pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101-510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) during any period, *the closure of an installation of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Panama in accordance with the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977*, and the closure of any other installation of the Department of Defense, during the period beginning on October 1, 1992, and ending on December 31, 1997, shall be deemed to create an exigency of the public business and any leave that is lost by an employee of such installation by operation of this section (regardless of whether such leave was scheduled) shall be restored to the employee and shall be credited and available in accordance with paragraph (2).

* * * * *

Subpart F—Labor-Management and Employee Relations

* * * * *

CHAPTER 71—LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

* * * * *

SUBCHAPTER III—GRIEVANCES, APPEALS, AND REVIEW

§ 7121. Grievance procedures

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(h) *Settlements and awards under this chapter shall be subject to the limitations in section 5596(b)(4) of this title.*

* * * * *



**SECTION 1505 OF THE WEAPONS OF MASS
DESTRUCTION CONTROL ACT OF 1992**

SEC. 1505. INTERNATIONAL NONPROLIFERATION INITIATIVE.

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(f) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance under this section terminates at the close of fiscal year **[1998]** 1999.

**SECTION 580 OF THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

[MORATORIUM ON USE OF ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

[SEC. 580. (a) UNITED STATES MORATORIUM.—For a period of one year beginning three years after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States shall not use antipersonnel landmines except along internationally recognized national borders or in demilitarized zones within a perimeter marked area that is monitored by military personnel and protected by adequate means to ensure the exclusion of civilians.

[(b) DEFINITION AND EXEMPTIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

[(1) ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINE.—The term “antipersonnel landmine” means any munition placed under, on, or near the ground or other surface area, delivered by artillery, rocket, mortar, or similar means, or dropped from an aircraft and which is designed, constructed or adapted to be detonated or exploded by the presence, proximity, or contact of a person.

[(2) EXEMPTIONS.—The term “antipersonnel landmine” does not include command detonated Claymore munitions.]

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1998**

* * * * *

**DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
AUTHORIZATIONS**

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998”.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

* * * * *

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section

2104(a)(1), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alabama	Redstone Arsenal	\$27,000,000
* * *	* * *	*
New York	Fort Drum	【\$24,400,000】
		<i>\$24,900,000</i>
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	\$17,700,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	【\$25,000,000】
		<i>\$28,500,000</i>
* * *	* * *	*
	Total	【\$598,750,000】
		<i>\$602,750,000</i>

* * * * *

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1997, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of 【\$2,010,466,000】 *\$2,013,966,000* as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2101(a), 【\$435,350,000】 *\$438,850,000*.

* * * * *

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(8) 【\$8,500,000】 *\$9,000,000* (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for the construction of an aerial gunnery range at Fort Drum, New York).

* * * * *

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

* * * * *

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED GUARD AND RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1997, for the costs of ac-

quisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

- (1) For the Department of the Army—
 - (A) * * *
 - (B) for the Army Reserve, **[\$66,267,000]** *\$53,553,000*.

* * * * *

[SEC. 2603. ARMY RESERVE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT, CAMP WILLIAMS, UTAH.

[With regard to the military construction project for the Army Reserve concerning construction of a reserve center and organizational maintenance shop at Camp Williams, Utah, to be carried out using funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2601(a)(1)(B), the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement with the State of Utah under which the State agrees to provide financial or in-kind contributions toward land acquisition, site preparation, and relocation costs in connection with the project.]

* * * * *

SECTION 816 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

SEC. 816. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT ON PURCHASE OF FIRE, SECURITY, POLICE, PUBLIC WORKS, AND UTILITY SERVICES FROM LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.

(a) * * *

(b) EVALUATION OF PROJECT.—Not later than December 31 of each of the years 1997 [and 1998] *through 2000*, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report evaluating the results of the project and making any recommendations the Secretary considers appropriate, including recommendations on whether the purchase authorities used in conducting the project could be used to provide similar services at other locations.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

* * * * *

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SECTION 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995”.

* * * * *

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2405(a)(1), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

Agency	Installation or location	Amount
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction	Anniston Army Depot, Alabama	\$5,000,000
	Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas	【\$134,000,000】
		<i>\$154,400,000</i>
	Tooele Army Depot, Utah	\$4,000,000
	Umatilla Army Depot, Oregon	【\$187,000,000】
		<i>\$193,377,000</i>
* *	* * * *	*
* *	* * * *	*

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1990 AND 1991

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE

This division may be cited as the “Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991”.

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

PART A—FISCAL YEAR 1990

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS

(a) **INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

* * * * * * *

DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES OFFICE

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, \$1,600,000.

* * * * * * *

Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia, **[\$330,000,000]**
\$351,354,000.

* * * * *

**SEC. 2405. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGEN-
CIES**

(a) * * *

(b) **LIMITATION OF TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**—
Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of
title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations author-
ized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section
2401 may not exceed—

(1) * * *

(2) **[\$321,500,000]** \$342,854,000 (the balance of the amount
authorized under section 2401(a) for the construction of a med-
ical facility at Portsmouth Naval Hospital, Virginia); and

* * * * *

THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 15, 1960

AN ACT To promote effectual planning, development, maintenance, and coordina-
tion of wildlife, fish, and game conservation and rehabilitation in military reserva-
tions.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the
United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sikes Act”.

**TITLE I—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS ON MILITARY
INSTALLATIONS**

* * * * *

[SEC. 103.]

SEC. 103. PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC OUTDOOR RECREATION.

(a) *PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.*—The Secretary of Defense is also au-
thorized to carry out a program for the development, enhancement,
operation, and maintenance of public outdoor recreation resources
at military installations in accordance with an integrated natural
resources management plan mutually agreed upon by the Secretary
of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with
the appropriate State agency designated by the State in which the
installations are located.

(b) *ACCESS FOR DISABLED VETERANS, MILITARY DEPENDENTS
WITH DISABILITIES, AND OTHER PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.*—(1)
*In developing facilities and conducting programs for public outdoor
recreation at military installations, consistent with the primary
military mission of the installations, the Secretary of Defense shall
ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that outdoor recreation
opportunities (including fishing, hunting, trapping, wildlife view-
ing, boating, and camping) made available to the public also pro-
vide equal access for persons described in paragraph (2) when topo-
graphic, vegetative, and water resources allow equal access without
substantial modification to the natural environment.*

(2) *Persons referred to in paragraph (1) are disabled veterans, military dependents with disabilities, and other persons with disabilities.*

(3) *The Secretary of Defense shall carry out this subsection in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, national service, military, and veterans organizations, and sporting organizations in the private sector that participate in outdoor recreation projects for persons described in paragraph (2).*

(c) *ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS.—In connection with the facilities and programs for public outdoor recreation at military installations, in particular the requirement under subsection (b) to provide equal access for persons described in paragraph (2) of such subsection, the Secretary of Defense may accept—*

- (1) *the voluntary services of individuals and organizations;*
- and
- (2) *donations of money or property, whether real, personal, mixed, tangible, or intangible.*

(d) *TREATMENT OF VOLUNTEERS.—A volunteer under subsection (c) shall not be considered to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits, except that—*

- (1) *for the purposes of the tort claims provisions of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, the volunteer shall be considered to be a Federal employee; and*
- (2) *for the purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries, the volunteer shall be considered to be an employee, as defined in section 8101(1)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of such subchapter shall apply.*

* * * * *

SECTION 319 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

[SEC. 319. PROHIBITION ON JOINT USE OF GRAY ARMY AIRFIELD WITH CIVIL AVIATION

[The Secretary of the Army may not enter into an agreement to allow joint use of the Robert Gray Army Airfield at Fort Hood, Texas, with civil aviation.]

SECTION 3110 OF THE USEC PRIVATIZATION ACT

SEC. 3110. EMPLOYEE PROTECTIONS.

(a) **CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.—(1)** * * *

* * * * *

(5) **In the event of a plant closing or mass layoff (as such terms are defined in section 2101(a) (2) and (3) of title 29, United States Code) at either of the gaseous diffusion plants, the Secretary of Energy shall treat any adversely affected employee of an operating contractor at either plant who was an employee at such plant on**

July 1, 1993, as a Department of Energy employee for purposes of sections 3161 and 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (42 U.S.C. 7274h–7274i). *With respect to such section 3161, the Secretary shall, on and after the effective date of the repeal of such section, provide assistance to any such employee in accordance with the terms of such section as in effect on the day before the effective date of its repeal.*

* * * * *

PANAMA CANAL ACT OF 1979

* * * * *

TITLE I—ADMINISTRATION AND REGULATIONS

CHAPTER 1—PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

* * * * *

SPECIFIC POWERS OF COMMISSION

SEC. 1102b. (a) * * *

* * * * *

(f)(1) The Commission may seek and accept donations of funds, property, and services from individuals, foundations, corporations, and other private and public entities for the purpose of carrying out its promotional activities.

(2) The Commission shall establish written guidelines setting forth the criteria to be used in determining whether the acceptance of funds, property, or services authorized by paragraph (1) would reflect unfavorably upon the ability of the Commission (or any employee of the Commission) to carry out its responsibilities or official duties in a fair and objective manner or would compromise the integrity or the appearance of the integrity of its programs or of any official in those programs.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 2—EMPLOYEES

Subchapter I—Panama Canal Commission Personnel

* * * * *

APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION; DUTIES

SEC. 1202. (a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) In the case of an individual who is an officer or employee of the Commission on [the day before the date of the enactment of the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997] November 17, 1997, and who has not had a break in service with the Commission since that date, the rate of basic pay for that officer or employee [on or after that date] may not be less than the rate in effect for that officer or employee on [the day before that date of enactment] that date except—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

【COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCE

【SEC. 1206. Effective beginning October 1, 1984, each officer and employee of the Commission who is a citizen of the United States and was employed by the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government on September 30, 1979, or who is an individual of any nationality recruited outside the Republic of Panama after September 30, 1979, may be paid an allowance to offset any increased cost of living which may result from the termination of the eligibility of the officer or employee and his dependents to use military postal services, sales stores, and exchanges. The amount of the allowance may be determined by the Commission.

【EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL BENEFITS

【SEC. 1207. (a) The Commission shall provide by regulation for round-trip transportation between the Republic of Panama and the United States or, in the case of an employee described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, between the Republic of Panama and the country in which such employee is recruited, for undergraduate college education for dependents of employees of the Commission who—

【(1) are United States citizens who were employed by the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government on September 30, 1979, or

【(2) are recruited outside the Republic of Panama after that date.

【(b) The regulations prescribed by the Commission under this section shall—

【(1) provide eligibility requirements which must be met by such dependents to qualify for transportation under this section, including a requirement that all eligible dependents must be under 23 years of age; and

【(2) limit the transportation provided to two round trips during any one-year period.]

* * * * *

Subchapter II—Wage and Employment Practices

* * * * *

PANAMA CANAL EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM; MERIT AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 1212. (a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Panama Canal Act Amendments of 1996 (subtitle B of title XXXV of Public Law 104-201; 110 Stat. 2860), or **【the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997】** *the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997 (subtitle B of title XXXV of Public Law 105-85; 110*

Stat. 2062), or the Panama Canal Commission Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, this subchapter, as in effect on September 22, 1996, shall continue to apply to an Executive agency or the Smithsonian Institution to the extent of an election under paragraph (1) by the head of the agency or the Institution, respectively.

* * * * *

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION REMUNERATION

SEC. 1217. [(a) In addition to basic pay, additional compensation may be paid, in such amounts as the head of the agency concerned determines, as an overseas recruitment or retention differential to any individual who—

[(1) before October 1, 1979, was employed by the Panama Canal Company, by the Canal Zone Government, or by any other agency in the area then known as the Canal Zone;

[(2) is an employee who was recruited on or after October 1, 1979, outside of the Republic of Panama for placement in the Republic of Panama; or

[(3) is a medical doctor employed by the Department of Defense in the Republic of Panama or by the Commission; if, in the judgment of the head of the agency concerned, the recruitment or retention of the individual is essential.]

* * * * *

[CENTRAL EXAMINING OFFICE

[SEC. 1223. The Commission shall establish a Central Examining Office. The purpose of the office shall be to implement the provisions of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977 and related agreements with respect to recruitment, examination, determination of qualification standards, and similar matters relating to employment of the Commission.]

* * * * *

APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 1224. The following provisions of title 5, United States Code, apply to the Panama Canal Commission:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

[(11) Chapter 59 (relating to allowances).]

* * * * *

Subchapter III—Conditions of Employment and Placement

TRANSFERRED OR REEMPLOYED EMPLOYEES

SEC. 1231. (a)(1) * * *

(2) The terms and conditions of employment referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection are the following:

[(A) rates of basic pay;

[(B) tropical differential;]

* * * * *

[(F) leave and travel;
[(G) transportation and repatriation benefits;
[(H) group health and life insurance;]

* * * * *

CHAPTER 3—FUNDS AND ACCOUNTS

* * * * *

Subchapter II—Accounting Policies and Audits

* * * * *

AUDITS

SEC. 1313. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to [subsection (d)] subsection (c), financial transactions of the Commission shall be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “Comptroller General”). In conducting any such audit, the appropriate representatives of the Comptroller General shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and other papers, items, or property in use by the Commission and necessary to facilitate such audit, and such representative shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. Any such audit shall first be conducted with respect to the fiscal year in which this Act becomes effective. An audit performed under this section is subject to the requirements of paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 9105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) Subject to [subsection (d)] subsection (c), the Comptroller General shall, not later than six months after the end of each fiscal year, submit to the Congress a report of the audit conducted pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to such fiscal year. Such report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(d) In addition to auditing the financial statements of the Commission, the Comptroller General (or the independent auditor if one is employed pursuant to [subsection (d)] subsection (c)) shall, in accordance with standards for an examination of a financial forecast established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, examine and report on the Commission’s financial forecast that it will be in a position to meet its financial liabilities on December 31, 1999.

Subchapter III—Interagency Accounts

INTERAGENCY SERVICES; REIMBURSEMENTS

SEC. 1321. (a) * * *

* * * * *

[(e) The appropriations or funds of the Commission, or of any other department or agency of the United States conducting oper-

ations in the Republic of Panama, shall be available to defray the cost of—

[(1) health care services provided by medical facilities licensed and approved by the Republic of Panama (and not operated by the United States) to elderly or disabled persons who were eligible to receive such services before the effective date of this Act, less amounts payable by such persons, and

[(2) educational services provided by schools in the Republic of Panama or the United States, which are not operated by the United States, to employees of the Commission who are citizens of the United States, to other Commission employees when determined by the Commission to be necessary for their recruitment or retention, and to other persons who were receiving such services at the expense of the Canal Zone Government before the effective date of this Act.

Notwithstanding the provisions relating to the availability of adequate schools contained in section 5924(4)(A) of title 5, United States Code, the Commission shall by regulation determine the extent to which costs of educational services may be defrayed under this subsection.]

* * * * *

CHAPTER 4—CLAIMS FOR INJURIES TO PERSONS OR PROPERTY

* * * * *

Subchapter II—Vessel Damage

INJURIES IN LOCKS OF CANAL

SEC. 1411. (a) Subject to section 1419(b) of this Act and to subsection (b) of this section, the Commission shall promptly adjust and pay damages for injuries to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels, which may arise by reason of their passage through the locks of the Panama Canal when the injury was proximately caused by negligence or fault on the part of an officer or employee of the United States acting within the scope of his employment and in the line of his duties in connection with the operation of the Canal. If the negligence or fault of the vessel, master, crew, or passengers proximately contributed to the injury, the award of damages shall be diminished in proportion to the negligence to fault attributable to the vessel, master, crew, or passengers. Damages may not be allowed and paid for injuries to any protrusion beyond any portion of the hull of a vessel, whether it is permanent or temporary in character. A vessel is considered to be passing through the locks of the Canal, under the control of officers or employees of the United States, from the time the first towing line is made fast on board before entrance into the locks and until the towing lines are cast off upon, or immediately prior to, departure from the lock chamber. No payment for damages on a claim may be made under this section unless the claim is filed with the Commission within one year after the date of the injury or [the

date of the enactment of the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997] by November 18, 1998, whichever is later.

* * * * *

INJURIES OUTSIDE LOCKS

SEC. 1412. [The Commission] *Subject to section 1419(b) of this Act, the Commission shall promptly adjust and pay damages for injuries to vessels, or to the cargo, crew, or passengers of vessels which may arise by reason of their presence in the Panama Canal, or waters adjacent thereto, other than the locks, when the injury was proximately caused by negligence or fault on the part of an officer or employee of the United States acting within the scope of his employment and in the line of his duties in connection with the operation of the Canal. If the negligence or fault of the vessel, master, crew, or passengers proximately contributed to the injury, the award of damages shall be diminished in proportion to the negligence or fault attributable to the vessel, master, crew, or passengers. In the case of a vessel which is required by or pursuant to regulations prescribed pursuant to section 1801 of this Act to have a Panama Canal pilot on duty aboard, damages may not be adjusted and paid for injuries to the vessel, or its cargo, crew, or passengers, incurred while the vessel was underway and in motion, unless at the time the injuries were incurred the navigation or movement of the vessel was under the control of a Panama Canal pilot. No payment for damages on a claim may be made under this section unless the claim is filed with the Commission within one year after the date of the injury or [the date of the enactment of the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997] by November 18, 1998, whichever is later.*

* * * * *

ACTIONS ON CLAIMS

SEC. 1416. [A claimant] *Subject to section 1419(b) of this Act, a claimant for damages pursuant to section 1411(a) or 1412 of this Act who considers himself aggrieved by the findings, determination, or award of the Commission in reference to his claim may bring an action on the claim against the Commission in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. Subject to the provisions of this chapter and of applicable regulations issued pursuant to section 1801 of this Act relative to navigation of the Panama Canal and adjacent waters, such actions shall proceed and be heard by the court without a jury according to the principles of law and rules of practice obtaining generally in like cases between a private party and a department or agency of the United States. Any judgment obtained against the Commission in an action under this subchapter may be paid out of money allotted for the maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal. An action for damages cognizable under this section shall not otherwise lie against the United States or the Commission, nor in any other court, than as provided in this section; nor may it lie against any officer or employee of the United States or of the Commission. Any action on a claim under this section shall be barred unless the ac-*

tion is brought within 180 days after the date on which the Commission mails to the claimant written notification of the Commission's final determination with respect to the claim or the date of the enactment of the Panama Canal Transition Facilitation Act of 1997, whichever is later. Attorneys appointed by the Commission shall represent the Commission in any action arising under this subchapter.

* * * * *

INSURANCE

SEC. 1419. (a) The Commission is authorized to purchase insurance to protect the Commission against major and unpredictable revenue losses or expenses arising from catastrophic marine accidents or other unpredictable events.

(b) *The Commission may not consider or pay any claim under section 1411 or 1412 of this Act, nor may an action for damages lie thereon, unless the claimant is covered by one or more valid policies of insurance totalling at least \$1,000,000 against the injuries specified in those sections. The Commission's liability on any such claim shall be limited to damages in excess of all amounts recovered or recoverable by the claimant from its insurers. The Commission may not consider or pay any claim by an insurer or subrogee of a claimant under section 1411 or 1412 of this Act.*

* * * * *

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

CHAPTER 1—PROCUREMENT

* * * * *

PANAMA CANAL BOARD OF CONTRACT APPEALS

SEC. 3102. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commission, **[shall]** *may* establish a board of contract appeals, to be known as the Panama Canal Board of Contract Appeals, in accordance with section 8 of the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 607). Except as otherwise provided by this section, the Panama Canal Board of Contract Appeals (in this section referred to as the "Board") shall be subject to the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 (41 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) in the same manner as any other agency board of contract appeals established under that Act.

* * * * *

(3) *Compensation for members of the Board of Contract Appeals shall be established by the Commission's supervisory board, except that such compensation may not be reduced during a member's term of office from the level established at the time of the appointment.*

* * * * *

(e) COMMENCEMENT.—The Board shall begin to function as soon as it has been established and has prescribed procedures under subsection (d)**[, but not later than January 1, 1999]**.

* * * * *

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF LANE EVANS, MARTIN T. MEEHAN,
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, JANE HARMAN, THOMAS H.
ALLEN, LORETTA SANCHEZ AND CYNTHIA MCKINNEY

We strongly disagree with the Committee's inclusion of legislation to repeal the Antipersonnel (AP) Landmine moratorium. We believe this move sends the wrong signal to the international community at an important time in the movement to ban these weapons.

Congressional leadership has gone far to spur worldwide action to end the horrific toll mines exact on innocent men, women, and children. The passage and extension of legislation to ban US exports of AP landmines as well as the successful enactment of the landmine moratorium legislation sent strong signals to the nations of the world that there was serious support in the United States for aggressive measures to tackle this problem.

Despite the strong leadership shown by the Congress on this issue, the Clinton Administrations decided not sign the Ottawa Treaty to ban these weapons. We were troubled by this decision, which we believe was strongly at odds with past Administration commitments to tackle the problems caused by the proliferation of AP mines abroad. However, the President has made a commitment for our nation to eventually sign the treaty. The President has also made commitments to stop our use of AP mines by 2003, and to ban the use of AP mines in Korea by 2006 if alternatives to AP mines can be developed. While we believes these steps could be taken much sooner, we believe the underlying commitment to our nation joining the Ottawa treaty must not be undermined. The repeal of the AP landmine moratorium would do just that.

While our nation stands on the sidelines, over 120 nations have agreed to sign the Ottawa treaty to ban AP landmine. Over 120 nations that believe that their militaries can live without these weapons. And over 120 nations that do not have near the strength of our military or our technological expertise. Yet, these nations, whose militaries have more to supposedly lose by banning these weapon than to gain are moving ahead.

We believe that the Committee and DOD most examine more closely how the employment of our own landmines can negatively affect our own soldiers. Too often, our own mine use, even including the deployment of "technically advanced" self-destruct/self deactivating mines, hurt our own forces. A recent computer war game at the National Training Center showed that the highest cause of friendly fire casualties among our own soldiers were scatterable, self destruct/self-deactivating landmine. And a number or retired generals, including two commanders of US forces in Korea and General John Galvin, the highly respected former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, support a ban because of these problems.

These factors make it clear that there are legitimate and serious concerns about the "blowback" effect of these weapons.

We would also hope that the Committee and the Department of Defense would make a significant commitment to funding research into alternatives to landmines. Currently, little funding is budgeted to pursue alternatives. And a specific commitment to seek alternatives to anti-tank mine packages containing AP mines has been hard to confirm. This neither indicates a serious commitment to finding a solution nor a serious belief on the part of our military that the loss of AP landmines will actually hurt our servicemen and women. A substantial allocation of resources to address technological advances or doctrinal changes would go far in helping our nation achieve the President's goal of signing the Ottawa Treaty in the near future. At this time, that commitment is sorely lacking.

In conclusion, we regret that the committee has taken action to repeal the AP mine moratorium. We hope that Committee members will consider the ramifications of this action to our own service personnel as well as to the prestige of U.S. leadership abroad as we continue consideration of the FY1999 Department of Defense Authorization Act.

LANE EVANS.
MARTY MEEHAN.
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.
JANE HARMAN.
TOM ALLEN.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

CIRCULAR A-76

I am deeply concerned with the Department of Defense's continuing utilization of the A-76 process in its quest to mete out savings and increase productivity. While I recognize that the Department can no longer conduct business the way it had during the Cold War, it seems shortsighted and thankless to potentially lay-off thousands of government employees who have served for so long. Although, the A-76 process at least provides a chance for Government employees to compete, we must recognize that this is an inglorious method to show our gratitude for all their years of service.

An additional concern is that the Department of Defense is relying too heavily on A-76, privatization and other outsourcing initiatives to provide sorely needed savings for their programs. I remain skeptical over the estimates that DOD claims they will reap from these processes.

Finally, I am concerned that the retirement benefit packages of federal employees is penalized severely for early retirement. Currently, there is no provision to protect the full receipt of benefits if the employee is displaced by a private sector worker as a result of A-76. The devastating inequity of A-76 is that a federal worker who is 2 to 3 years away from retirement will lose out on a full pension through no fault of their own. In conclusion, it is my hope that the Department will seriously review the process to protect its loyal employees and the retirement benefits that they were promised.

ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF TILLIE FOWLER, JANE HARMAN,
MARTIN T. MEEHAN, LANE EVANS, NEIL ABERCROMBIE,
LORETTA SANCHEZ, CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, PATRICK J.
KENNEDY, JAMES H. MALONEY AND CYNTHIA A.
MCKINNEY

We are disappointed that the Committee has opted to prejudice the work of its own Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues by directing our Armed Services to segregate basic training by gender. In our view, such a requirement is, at minimum, premature and, notwithstanding the arguments of the provision's proponents, may affect unit cohesion and readiness, and will not address serious problems of sexual misconduct and harassment confronting the Services.

The provision is premature: Last year, Congress enacted as part of the FY98 National Defense Authorization Act a provision establishing the aforementioned independent commission to study a comprehensive range of issues related to the effectiveness of the military's basic training. These issues specifically included the rationale, validity and effects of gender-integrated and gender-segregated training. The commission was tasked—at a cost of \$2.2 million—with developing objective standards to evaluate gender-integrated and gender-segregated training, as well as other factors affecting attrition, morale, and unit readiness. Among other things, it will compare the experiences of other nations and look at how military training compares with industry standards and concepts.

To underscore the importance given to the commission's work, last year's law specifically states that "after receipt of the report of the commission . . . Congress shall consider the report and, based upon the results of the review (and such other matters as Congress considers appropriate), consider whether to require by law that the Secretaries of the military departments conduct basic training on a gender-segregated or gender-integrated basis."

Unfortunately, rather than waiting for our commission's findings, so as to afford Congress the opportunity to act on what may well be a full range of recommendations designed to improve basic training, the Committee has elected, with its approval of section 521 of the bill, to require the Army, Navy and Air Force to train men and women separately.

This change is based on the recommendations of a panel, chaired last year by former Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker, which focused on a much narrower set of concerns related to basic training. Moreover, we would observe that a General Accounting Office review of the Kassebaum Baker study raised serious questions about that panel's conclusions because the panel did not: (1) systematically collect the same information from all groups; (2) document information generated in each of the interviews and focus groups;

and (3) explain how what was heard led to the panel's conclusions and recommendations.

Most notably, the recommendations of the Kassebaum Baker panel are at variance with all previous studies of basic training, including those of similarly independent panels of experts and laymen. This, alone, does not undermine the value of the Kassebaum Baker panel, but it does raise important questions. We believe the best way to address these questions is to let the commission mandated by Congress undertake one of the most important aspects of its charter—to review basic training in light of the broader goals of operational readiness, unit cohesiveness, and the physical conditioning and military socialization of recruits.

The provision may affect unit cohesion and readiness and will not address problems of sexual misconduct and harassment: Proponents of the provision included in the Committee's bill believe re-segregating basic training will help solve a very serious problem—sexual misconduct and harassment in the military services. However, the most serious problems have occurred in Advanced Individual Training (AIT), which the provision does not even address.

Most importantly, we note that the Army, Navy and Air Force strongly oppose Section 521. In their words, the best way to train soldiers, sailors and airmen is to “train the way we fight.” For Army, Navy, and Air Force recruits, that means in integrated units.

If the provisions of H.R. 3616 as reported by the HNSC are enacted, we would ask, where will male and female recruits learn how to work together? We note that the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Donald L. Pilling, testified in March to the Military Personnel Subcommittee that 40% of the basic trainees report directly to the fleet. If male and female recruits do not learn how to live and work together during basic training, are the confined quarters aboard ships the next-best place? We don't think so.

Finally, according to Gen. Norman Lezy, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, section 521 would require the Army alone to spend \$159 million in fiscal year 2000 for additional barracks—whether to meet the provision's interim requirement to house male and female troops on separate floors, or to meet its longer term requirement that separate barracks must be built for men and women by the end of fiscal year 2001. We find it deeply troubling that the Committee would opt for such an expensive course of action when other construction priorities have already been identified.

Two year's ago, the Defense Science Board's Quality of Life Task Force found that 64 percent of the Department's family housing units are unsuitable. Other areas of our military infrastructure also cry out for replacement and renovation. We should be working to meet these real needs with our scarce military construction resources instead of requiring the Army to build additional barracks space to replace barracks that are currently adequate.

The success of our volunteer military requires us to recruit from the widest and most talented pool available—and that pool necessarily includes women. Section 521 presumes that the individuals recruited from that pool cannot be trained together. In reality, leadership and accountability are the principal keys to resolving

sexual harassment and misconduct problems in the military and in training troops prepared for tomorrow's conflicts.

We thus deeply regret the Committee's action on such a consequential issue.

TILLIE FOWLER.
MARTY MEEHAN.
NEIL ABERCROMBIE.
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.
JIM MALONEY.
JANE HARMAN
LANE EVANS.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.
CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS ON FY 99 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
BILL, HR 3616

We regret the Committee's rejection once again this year of an amendment to repeal the ban on abortions at military hospitals overseas. The amendment would have reinstated a policy—in effect from 1973 until 1988, and again from 1993 to 1996—that permits servicewomen and female dependents to use their own funds to obtain abortion services at overseas U.S. hospitals.

We believe the ban on abortions at U.S. military hospitals overseas is fundamentally unfair to our women in uniform and to the dependents of our service members. Military men and women and their families stationed abroad already make many sacrifices. We should be able to guarantee them the same constitutional right they would have here in the United States, where women have the ability to obtain this service under *Roe v. Wade*. This is what the amendment would have done—no more.

The amendment specified that no federal funds would be used to provide this service, and health care professionals objecting to performing this procedure on moral grounds or as a matter of conscience would not be compelled to do so.

Barring women from obtaining this service at our hospitals overseas places their health in unnecessary danger. Medical facilities in many foreign nations do not provide the same standards of care as hospitals in the United States. Some countries do not allow the procedure altogether. But, by denying our women in uniform and military dependents the ability to obtain this medical procedure in military hospitals, this Committee forces them either to risk an unsafe or illegal procedure or delay it until they can return to the United States.

Many national health care associations, public health organizations and civil rights groups are opposed to the current policy of denying abortions at U.S. military hospitals abroad. They include:

- American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
- American Association of University Women
- American Civil Liberties Union
- American Medical Women's Association
- American Public Health Association
- Center for Reproductive Law & Policy
- National Abortion Federation
- National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League
- National Council of Jewish Women
- National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association
- National Organization for Women
- NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund
- National Partnership for Women and Families
- Planned Parenthood Federation of America

By its action, rejecting the amendment to overturn the current ban, this Committee is sacrificing the constitutional rights and the health care of female service members and female dependents to a policy with no military merit. Indeed, there is no justifiable basis for this restriction on those who serve our country.

JANE HARMAN.
MARTY MEEHAN.
LORETTA SANCHEZ.
JIM MALONEY.
TILLIE FOWLER.
PATRICK J. KENNEDY.
LANE EVANS.
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ.
CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JAMES M. TALENT

I write to express my disappointment that the Committee mark included 27 F/A-18E/Fs Super Hornets rather than the 30 aircraft as requested by the Navy for FY 1999. I am confident, however, especially given the outstanding success of this program, that these three aircraft will be restored as we progress through the legislative process.

Over the winter, a handful of print articles attempted to make the case that "wing drop" was a major problem for the E/F. This phenomenon, inherent in swept-wing, high-performance fighter aircraft, occurred at a limited number of known points in the flight envelop. It was caused by an imbalance in lift generated across one wing relative to the other. Software modifications eliminated most, but not all, of this undesirable flight characteristic.

From last fall through early April, the Navy's flight test team at Patuxent River Naval Air Station, Maryland, followed a systematic, structured test plan that developed a final software/hardware fix to wing drop. During testing as far back as mid December, the Navy was able to report that over a two day period involving 421 attempts to actually induce wing drop with hardware applications in place, test pilots noted only two incidents.

During testimony before the House National Security Committee earlier this spring, Secretary Cohen stated that he would not release FY 1998 funding until he was satisfied that wing drop was solved. Leading up to the Secretary's own review, the Navy's solution to wing drop was scrutinized by (1) the Overarching Integrated Product Test Team chaired by George Schneiter in his capacity as Director, Strategic and Tactical Systems; (2) Phil Coyle III, OSD's Director of Operational Testing and Evaluation; (3) John Douglass, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Acquisition; (4) Admiral Jay Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations; (5) John Dalton, Secretary of the Navy; (6) Jacques Gansler, Under Secretary for Acquisition; and (7) Dr. John Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

On April 3, Secretary Cohen endorsed the Test Team's solution for wing drop, and on April 15 released funds for the 20 Super Hornets authorized and funded in FY 1998. Despite the attention paid the issue, the solution to wing drop is nothing more than a piece of sheet stainless steel with thousands of little holes drilled in it to energize airflow over that portion of the wing. The production solution, a simple bolt-on composite panel, simply replaces the old one, and involves no hydraulics, electronics, nor structural modifications.

Having said this, it is important to note the significance of the Navy's request for 30 aircraft. This issue must be, from the warfighter's perspective, the program's key operational milestone. Specifically the FY 1999 Navy request procures the first Super Hornets destined for operational use in fleet operations, currently

scheduled for deployment aboard *Harry S. Truman* (CVN-75) in the spring of 2002. These aircraft are meant to replace two aging squadrons of 1970s-vintage F-14A Tomcats. Not merely a question of replacing Tomcats with Super Hornets, in 2002 the average age of these A-model F-14s will exceed 21 years.

There are a number of very good reasons why Secretary Dalton and Admiral Johnson identify the Super Hornet as the Navy's top priority, and why the Navy's leadership has done so for three consecutive years. The E/F's operational capabilities are well known. The CNO has summed up the matter quite well: The Super Hornet "will dominate every known and anticipated threat for the next 20 years." More than any other single weapons program, the Super Hornet, or acquisition costs. Rather, the issue is one of how best to economically procure E/Fs consistent with QDR recommendations and deploy them to the fleet. Given the outstanding success of the program and the close scrutiny—and endorsement—it has received from the Department, we should authorize the Service to begin negotiations towards a multi-year contract—and the approximately two-thirds of a billion dollars this action will save. One need only look at the difficulties involved in other multi-year contract negotiations to understand that we should support this action now.

JIM TALENT.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF PATRICK KENNEDY

The defense authorization bill as reported out by the House National Security Committee contains a number of significant measures, ranging from substantive quality of life to research and development investment, that will serve to further our national security objectives. While I was proud to vote in support of the legislation, there remain a number of provisions with which I have serious concern.

I am pleased that the committee understands the importance of undersea warfare as a priority for our future defense and has worked to ensure a strong focus on anti-submarine warfare (ASW). However, I would like to express my disappointment that the committee did not include report language for the conversion of four Trident ballistic-missile submarines (SSBNs) to platforms for the launch of conventional guided missiles against land targets (SSGNs). In December 1997, the National Defense Panel (NDP) outlined the kinds of actions that should be taken to transform the nation's military forces to meet challenges of the future. With respect to "Sea Forces" the NDP recommended a "Move toward small-signature ships capable of providing sustained long-range, precision fire power." The Panel also stated that "the Navy should look closely at * * * converting one or more of the four Trident SSBNs coming out of strategic service to alternative missions." I respectfully request that the committee agree with these recommendations based on the merit in converting these very capable submarines, with at least twenty years of life remaining, into stealthy, versatile platforms for reconnaissance and surveillance, covert precision strike, covert insertion and recovery of Special Forces, as well as traditional SSN missions.

These converted Trident submarines would be ideal for Joint Force operations and experimentation across the spectrum of joint littoral warfare. These large submarines offer the space to test new concepts without compromising their military effectiveness; concepts such as: dense-packed strike/fire support munitions, modular payloads, UAVs, UUVs, Special Forces vehicles, offboard sensors, etc. The first two conversions would replace U.S.S. *Polk* and U.S.S. *Kamehameha* which now provide unique operational capabilities to the Special Forces and are scheduled for inactivation in 1999 and 2001, respectively.

As you may know, the Navy is in the early stages of developing a Trident submarine conversion program. The Secretary of Defense is developing a program to convert two or more Trident SSBNs to a Strike/Special Forces configuration, including a plan to accommodate any strategic arms control restrictions. Design work should begin in FY00 in order to minimize the gap in Special Forces capabilities created by the inactivation of U.S.S. *Polk* and U.S.S. *Kamehameha*. The Secretary of Defense shall report the status of this ef-

fort to the Congressional Defense Committees by December 15, 1998.

In addition, I would like to express my disappointment that the committee sought to gender-segregate basic training within the military services. Our committee heard time and time again that military leaders find it important to their mission to be able to train as they fight. We should seek to try and fix the system rather than dismantle it. I regret that we have not allowed our leaders in the services adequate time to resolve the problems as they sought to do. The committee has undermined the study currently underway on this issue by moving forward with actions to gender-segregate during basic training.

Finally, I would like to express my disappointment that the committee did not address the issue of sexual orientation and service in the military. Theoretically, current policy permits gay and lesbians to serve in the military as long as they do not disclose their sexual orientation nor engage in homosexual activity. I remain steadfast in my belief that servicemembers should be assessed on their ability to perform the duties their country asks of them. If anything, the instances of sexual misconduct and harassment at Aberdeen are indicative that our military has many more pressing concerns than the presence of patriotic gays and lesbians among its ranks. Although we are not yet there, I believe we will someday have a military which recognizes and values the contributions of all serving in uniform regardless of sexual orientation.

PATRICK J. KENNEDY.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF ROSCOE G. BARTLETT

Last year when the Army experienced a sex scandal that reached from its basic training posts at Fort Leonard Wood and Fort Jackson into the ranks of AIT at Aberdeen Proving Grounds many of us on the committee were concerned that the Army method of training its soldiers in an integrated fashion during basic training was a prescription for disaster. Except for a brief experiment from 1977-82, the United States Army had conducted gender separate training for its 200 year history. Then without any study or concern for cost, the Clinton administration changed this policy which had served us well for so long.

The recent incidents at Fort Leonard Wood and Fort Jackson have proven that mixed-gender training is not in women's, men's or the country's best interests. It was during this time that we witnessed widespread abuses of power by Drill Sergeants, a rampage of consensual sex between recruits and a system of rewards for recruits who succumbed to the sexual desires of their male drill instructors.

After learning of these problems, I visited the training bases of each of the services and determined without a doubt that the method used by the Marine Corps (separating recruits by sex and requiring same-sex drill instructors) is the only way to eliminate the attraction and distractions associated with sex during this critical period of basic training. I then introduced legislation to require the other Services to adopt the Marines' method into their basic training. This legislation received 121 cosponsors and had a great deal of outside support. Unfortunately, however, attempts to include this legislation in last year's authorization bill were not successful. Instead, we opted for a Congressional Commission to study the issue.

Fortunately, Secretary of Defense William Cohen also appointed a commission to study this issue and their results were delivered last December. Cohen's commission, which was headed by former Senator Nancy Kassabaum and made up of members from varied backgrounds unanimously endorsed the heart of my legislation, requiring separate training at the platoon, division and flight level as well as separate barracks for male and female recruits.

I applaud Chairman Steve Buyer for holding a hearing on the Kassabaum Commission's report and for taking the necessary step of including their recommendations in the Personnel Subcommittee's mark. At the time of this writing, the Navy is experiencing a sex scandal similar to that of Leonard Wood and Aberdeen. Recruits Division Commanders are being accused of having consensual sex with recruits, having improper sexual harassment, fraternization and socialization with recruits and even one recruit is claiming to have been impregnated by an RDC.

We need to stop worshipping at the alter of political correctness and do what is right for our country. If the services are unwilling to take the necessary steps, the Congress has the Constitutional responsibility to do so. The House must ensure that this provision is maintained in Conference.

ROSCOE BARTLETT.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF TOM ALLEN, PAUL McHALE, MIKE PAPPAS, JIM SAXTON AND GENE TAYLOR

We disagree with the Committee's actions regarding the DD-21 land attack destroyer. The hearing record of this Committee is replete with testimony from the Navy, the senior civilian and military leadership at the Pentagon, and outside experts, that warns of the effects of continued low shipbuilding rates on the fleet and the industrial base. Members of the Committee, on a bipartisan basis, have expressed concerns about the ability of our armed forces to carry out their mission in the future if the Navy is not sufficiently able to recapitalize and modernize.

We are concerned that the Committee has chosen, for the second year in a row, to cut funding for a promising ship program that would incorporate new technologies, innovative designs and warfighting concepts into a platform that would ensure the superiority of our sea-based forces into the 21st Century. The Committee's means of expressing its dissatisfaction with the Navy's progress in developing new program concepts risks the Navy's ability to meet new warfighting requirements of the next century.

Last year, the Committee's action to eliminate funding for the Maritime Fire Support Demonstrator (MFSD, also known as Arsenal Ship) ultimately led to its cancellation, which Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition John Douglass recently called "the dumbest, stupidest mistake we've made in a long time." Acknowledging the MFSD's role as a technology test bed and natural transition to the next-generation land attack destroyer, Secretary Douglass noted that its cancellation has slowed competition in the DD-21 program, even though the lessons learned from MFSD have been integral to industry DD-21 designs.

As a justification for its \$25 million cut in the \$84 million DD-21 request, the Committee's report language cites the potential for delay in the program created by the Navy's review of competition in the concept phase. Thus, it appears that the Committee's undercutting of the MFSD a year ago created the conditions that provided a rationalization for undercutting the DD-21 this year. The Committee, while offering rhetorical support for increased shipbuilding rates and a modernized fleet, has taken actions that do the opposite.

Shipbuilding programs are unlike any other within military procurement. Because of the long period of time between concept and construction, decisions regarding ship programs are not based on the current environment, but on the situation five, ten or twenty years hence. What Congress does on DD-21 today is not a FY1999 decision, but really a FY2004 decision, the year the first ship is to go into production.

The delay endorsed by the Committee could have a major impact in FY2004 on the surface combatant industrial base, as production

of the DDG-51 AEGIS Destroyer is slated to end the year before. It could also greatly affect the size and capability of our naval forces, if older frigates and destroyers planned for retirement are not replaced with technologically advanced surface ships. In this light, we feel the Committee needs to take the long view into account.

The out-year effect is no less of a concern for the warfighter. The United States Marine Corps has adopted a 21st century warfighting concept called Operational Maneuver from the Sea (OMFTS), which places unprecedented emphasis on the littorals and will demand greater cohesiveness between naval warfare and maneuver warfare. The over-the-horizon operations that result from OMFTS will place increased importance on Naval Surface Fire Support, as Marine forces are most vulnerable in the initial stages of an amphibious landing. The ability of a Marine Lance Corporal to call in massive, precision strikes from off-shore will be vital to ensuring mission success and the survival of the Marine force.

The Navy has not possessed effective surface fire support capability since the decommissioning of the last remaining active battleships earlier this decade. The Navy has identified a requirement for a new combatant emphasizing capabilities to conduct land attacks and provide fire support to ground combat forces. This combatant has been identified as the DD-21 maritime fire support ship.

The DD-21 will perform multiple missions in support of theater, joint and maneuver force commanders. The design parameters proposed by the Navy call for dramatically reduced life-cycle cost and manning requirements, made possible by new technologies and a revolutionary acquisition approach representing close government-industry cooperation. Complementing the DDG-51, today's most advanced surface combatant, the DD-21 will have significant warfighting capabilities, especially in the littoral environment, with operating cost and personnel reductions of 70 percent, as well as the capability of extended deployments up to 36 months. As the Navy moves toward new modes of operations and combat, based on linked networks rather than steel platforms, the DD-21 will serve as a key node in such a network-centric force, with interoperable C⁴I, signature reduction, enhanced firepower, robust self-defense, speed and endurance.

As the Committee was in the process of crafting the FY99 bill, the Navy and DOD were engaged in a decision-making process regarding the question of competition in the DD-21 program. These decisions were being made in an environment of dramatic industry consolidation, forced by reductions in the military budget and encouraged by DOD policy. Competition in the classic sense may be problematic given the realities of the shipbuilding industrial base.

Even with this in mind, DOD had not altered its acquisition plan for the DD-21 by the date the Committee met to mark up the bill, meaning that the plan already in place was the operative one. We believe the Committee should have authorized \$84 million in FY99, the funding level required under the current plan. If indeed the acquisition plan is altered at a later date, Congress still has the opportunity in the next few months to evaluate the DD-21 budget be-

fore the conference on the FY99 defense authorization bill is concluded.

While we disagree with the Committee's action on the DD-21 program, we look forward to working with Members of the Committee to find an outcome in conference that does not result in a delay for the program.

TOM ALLEN.
PAUL MCHALE.
MICHAEL PAPPAS.
JIM SAXTON.
GENE TAYLOR.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF LORETTA SANCHEZ, LANE EVANS,
VIC SNYDER, JANE HARMAN, ADAM SMITH, AND CYNTHIA
MCKINNEY

We are pleased that the Committee approved an amendment this year to recognize and honor the former South Vietnamese Commandos for their heroism, sacrifice and service in connection with United States armed forces during the Vietnam War.

This legislation officially recognizes these heroic men who fought side by side with American soldiers in Vietnam. We would like the record to show that the State of California American Legion strongly endorses this amendment and requests that the letter from the Department Commander Frank Larson be included in the record.

In Commander Larson's letter dated May 1, 1998, he states,

Ms. Sanchez: I'm sure if history were unfolded for all to see it would show that the South Vietnamese commandos, who aided the United States government in covert actions against the North Vietnamese, were responsible for saving many American lives. To that end, the same recognition due our soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen involved in the Vietnamese Conflict should be afforded to the former South Vietnamese commandos, who so gallantly served and endured.

Today, the members of this Committee had an opportunity to properly honor these brave men and we are proud that the committee unanimously voted to recognize them.

LORETTA SANCHEZ.
CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.
LANE EVANS.
ADAM SMITH.
JANE HARMAN.
VIC SNYDER.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF JIM RYUN, DUNCAN HUNTER, JOEL HEFLEY, JIM SAXTON, ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, RON LEWIS, J.C. WATTS, JR., JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, VAN HILLEARY, AND MICHAEL PAPPAS

There have been recent disturbing reports regarding the transfer of sensitive missile technology to the People's Republic of China. In 1996, after the failed launch of the Chinese-made Long March missile, engineers from two United States aerospace firms traveled to China to lend their expertise to Great Wall Industries, the manufacturer of the missile. The technology that these companies turned over to China while analyzing the rocket launch failure is, in essence, missile guidance technology and is applicable to the development of strategic missiles. A May 1997 classified Department of Defense report determined that this transfer damaged national security.

Next month, President Clinton will visit Beijing. During this visit, he is expected to announce a new U.S.-China space cooperation agreement, and possibly discuss lifting Tiananmen Square-related sanctions on the transfer of military technology. The reported purpose of this agreement is to increase the sharing of commercial satellite and space technology. We are concerned, however, that this technology will be used for the development of China's strategic missile program.

A recent Central Intelligence Agency report stated that China has 13 CSS-4 nuclear missiles aimed at the United States. Several years ago, a Chinese official indicated to an American general that China would be willing to launch nuclear missiles against the United States. As long as China remains a communist country, transfers technology to regimes such as Iran and Pakistan, and refuses to join the Missile Technology Control Regime, the United States should not share any commercial technology which could aid the development of China's strategic missile program.

Additionally, it is troubling that while the Administration seeks to increase technology transfers to the People's Republic of China, it continues to block or veto any attempt to construct a National Missile Defense system. We find it reprehensible that the President seeks to advance the military capabilities of a foreign communist country while refusing to provide the resources necessary to defend the American people.

As members of the National Security Committee, we believe that the committee should seek ways to limit the transfer of sensitive missile technology, to include eliminating preferential treatment of Hong Kong, currently a backdoor for sensitive dual use technology to China, and continue to pursue a National Missile Defense system.

JIM RYUN.
DUNCAN HUNTER.
JOEL HEFLEY.
JIM SAXTON.
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT.
RON LEWIS.
J.C. WATTS, Jr.
JOHN H. HOSTETTLER.
VAN HILLEARY.
MICHAEL PAPPAS.

DISSENTING VIEWS OF CYNTHIA MCKINNEY

While I recognize the hard work of my colleagues on the committee and the sincerest efforts to oversee the Pentagon in order to provide for the common defense, I could not support reporting the bill out of committee. Aside from the budgetary implications, I believe our national security depends equally on our domestic programs and our foreign policy and its constructive initiatives.

It appears that the Committee was successful in producing a budget in line with last year's balanced budget agreement. However, this authorization is only part of the defense spending. The Congress just passed the Supplemental Emergency Appropriation which provided for additional spending for our forces in Bosnia and the Persian Gulf. As well, the emergency appropriation bill became vehicle by which a new ballistic missile system was paid for. This additional spending of \$2.9 billion not only falls out of the budget agreement, but important domestic programs were cut to pay for it. I am deeply disturbed that this might become our practice for supporting our military activities. Clearly, the Committee and the Congress must ensure that we are more prepared to deal with these small scale engagements which seem to be the norm in this post-Cold War era. Therefore, it becomes evermore necessary for us to leave behind the military structure and its devices which we depended on to win the Cold War.

The committee's recommendations still reflect a Cold War era mentality by finding ways to finance a too-large military force structure; an overly aggressive, and in many cases misguided, weapons modernization program; and overly programmed requirements to maintain short-term readiness, rather than planning successfully to pay for our involvement in peacekeeping and humanitarian ventures. I believe the budget should be realigned to plan for our involvement in the kinds of conflicts and dangers we see emerging in the post-Cold War era: conflicts that require smaller scale peacekeeping, humanitarian relief, conflict prevention, and activities arising from the irresponsible proliferation and potential use of weapons of mass destruction.

We will be shortchanging our national security if we continue to shortchange our investment in the domestic programs that make for real national security—a healthy, well educated, properly housed citizenry. We will also continue to shortchange the effectiveness of our armed forces if we fail to make the investments in education and health that are required by the technological demands of the modern military.

Above all, I believe the committee's recommendation deters, rather than enhances, the evolution of a foreign policy that would protect human rights and the growth of democracy. The committee must strive to meet its obligations to support humanitarian operations with a properly trained and equipped military.

I believe investing in democracy building and protection of human rights, along with nation building, economic development, and conflict prevention and peacekeeping operations are wise investments in building a world that is secure and one that will minimize the need for us to continue to deploy our brave men and women in uniform to foreign shores.

Unfortunately, I believe that the committee's recommendations still remain out of line with the many facets of our nation's national security interests. We no longer live in the Cold War era.

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY.

