AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

106TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
106–244

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS
[To accompany H.R. 2561]

JULY 20, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
57–992 WASHINGTON : 1999

CONTENTS

	Page
Bill Totals	1
Committee Budget Review Process	4
Introduction	4
Basis for Committee Recommendations	5
The President's Fiscal Year 2000–2005 Defense Program	5
Neglect of Traditional Appropriations and Acquisition Program Practices	8
"Lessons Learned" from Recent Military Operations	10
Shortages of Low-Density, High Demand Assets	13
United States Air Force—At a Crossroads?	13
Air Force Modernization Issues	16
F–22	17
F–22 Concerns	17
Potential Alternatives	19
Major Committee Recommendations	20
Air Force Program Reprioritization	20
Ensuring "Lessons Learned" Are Incorporated into FY 2001–2006 Defense Planning	21
Ensuring Appropriations Process Integrity	22
Multiyear Procurement	22
Addressing High Priority Shortfalls	22
Ensuring a Quality Ready Force	23
Modernization Programs	23
Reforms/Program Reductions	24
Tactical Reconnaissance	25
Information Assurance	26
Preparedness Against WMD Terrorist Attacks	26
Committee Recommendations by Major Category	28
Active Military Personnel	28
Guard and Reserve	28
Operation and Maintenance	28
Procurement	28
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	29
Forces to be Supported	29
Department of the Army	29
Department of the Navy	30
Department of the Air Force	31
Title I, Military Personnel	33
Programs and Activities Funded by Military Personnel Appropriations	33
Summary of Military Personnel Recommendations for FY2000	33
Overall Active End Strength	34
Overall Selected Reserve End Strength	34
Adjustments to Military Personnel Account	35
Overview	35
End Strength Adjustments	35

Page

Title I, Military Personnel—Continued
Adjustments to Military Personnel Account—Continued
Pay and Retirement Reform 35
Basic Allowance for Housing 36
Aviation Continuation Pay 36
Unfunded Requirements 36
JROTC Leadership Training 36
Quality of Life Study 37
Guard and Reserve Forces 37
Full-Time Support Strengths 38
Guard and Reserve Full-Time End Strengths 38
Military Personnel, Army 38
Military Personnel, Navy 40
AOE–1 Replenishment Ships 42
Military Personnel, Marine Corps 42
Marine Corps Security Guards Detachments 44
Military Personnel, Air Force 44
Reserve Personnel, Army 46
Reserve Personnel, Navy 48
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps 50
Reserve Personnel, Air Force 52
Test Support Mission 54
National Guard Personnel, Army 54
Army National Guard Workyear Requirements 56
National Guard Personnel, Air Force 56
Title II, Operation and Maintenance 59
Operation and Maintenance Overview 62
Rotational Training Initiatives 63
Real Property Maintenance 63
Base Operations Support 64
Depot Maintenance 64
Spares and War Reserve Materiel 65
Force Protection Initiatives 65
Soldier Support Initiatives 66
Operating Tempo Funding 66
Recruiting and Advertising 66
Small Business Advertising 67
Guard and Reserve Unfunded Requirements 67
Army Training Area Environmental Management 67
Headquarters and Administrative Expenses 67
Consultants and Advisory Services 68
Communications Services 68
Security Programs 68
Defense Finance and Accounting Service 69
Acquisition Contracting and Travel 69
Operation and Maintenance Budget Execution Data 69
Operation and Maintenance Reprogrammings 69
A–76 Studies 70
Urban Warfare 71
Controlled Humidity Preservation Program 71
Operation and Maintenance, Army 71
Logistics and Technology Project 74
Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated (GOCO) Facilities 75
Humanitarian Airlift Aircraft 75
National Training Center Heliport Security 75

Page

Title II, Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Operation and Maintenance, Army—Continued
Memorial Events 75
General Purpose Tents 76
Abrams Integrated Management Program 76
Information Technology Programs 76
Operation and Maintenance, Navy 76
Oceanographic Research 81
Naval Weapons Station Concorde 81
Portable Firefighting Equipment 82
Vieques Range Complex, Puerto Rico 82
Naval Air Station (NAS) LeMoore 82
Navy Electricity and Electronics Training Series 83
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps 83
Blount Island 85
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force 85
Interim Contractor Support 89
Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program 90
McClellan Air Force Base 90
Enterprise Integration Program 90
REMIS 90
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide 90
Performance Measures 92
DLA–Warstoppers 93
Defense Acquisition University 93
Family Therapy Program 93
Defense Finance and Accounting Service 93
Information Technology Programs 93
DLA–Security Locks 93
DLA–Improved Cargo Methods 94
DTRA–Treaty Implementation 94
Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)-Management Support 94
JCS–J–MEANS 94
OSD–C4ISR 94
OSD–Near East/South Asia Center for Security Studies 94
OSD–Middle East Regional Security Issues 95
OSD–Energy Savings Performance Contracts 95
OSD–Job Placement Program 95
OSD–Youth Development and Leadership Program 95
OSD–Youth Development Initiative 95
OSD–Management and Contract Support 95
WHS–Emergency Notification 95
JCS Mobility Enhancements 95
National Curation Pilot Project 96
Information Systems Security Education 96
Improved General Purpose Tents 96
Department of Defense Education Activity 97
Pine Bluff Arsenal Sustainment Training and Technical Assistance Program 97
Legacy 97
Classified Program 97
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve 99
Operation and Maintenace, Navy Reserve 99
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve 99
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve 103

Page

Title II, Operation and Maintenance—Continued
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard 105
Army National Guard Center 107
Armed Forces Reserve Center 107
National Guard Bureau Nationwide Fiber Optics Network 107
National Guard Distance Learning 107
NGB Project Management System 107
Repair of UH–1 Engines 108
Moffett Field and March Air Reserve Base 108
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard 108
National Guard State Partnership Program 111
C–130 Operations 111
159th Air National Guard Fighter Group 111
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund 111
Budget Justification and Budget Execution Materials 111
Kosovo Base Camp Construction 112
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces 112
Environmental Restoration, Army 112
Rocky Mountain Arsenal 113
Environmental Remediation Contracts 113
Environmental Restoration, Navy 113
Environmental Restoration, Air Force 113
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide 113
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites 114
Camp Croft 114
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant 114
Newmark 114
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid 115
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction 115
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense 116
Title III, Procurement 117
Estimates and Appropriations Summary 117
Special Interest Items 119
Classified Programs 119
Rangeless Training 119
Foreign Comparative Test New Starts 119
Air Force Interim Contractor Support 119
Reprogramming Procedures 120
Army Procurement Issues 120
Unfunded Requirements List 120
Aircraft Procurement, Army 121
Apache A Model Readiness 122
Missile Procurement, Army 124
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army 126
Procurement of Ammunition, Army 128
Program Manager for Ammunition 128
Self-Destruct Fuzes 129
Other Procurement, Army 132
Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles 134
Information Technology Programs 134
Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (TUAV) 134
Aircraft Procurement, Navy 142
V–22 Aircraft 143
KC–130J Aircraft 143
Joint Primary Aircraft Training System 144

Page

Title III, Procurement—Continued
Aircraft Procurement, Navy—Continued
EA–6B Aircraft 144
Consolidated Automated Support System 145
Advanced Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance System (ATARS) 146
Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance Pod System-Completely Digital (TARPS-CD) 146
Rescissions 147
Weapons Procurement, Navy 149
JSOW 149
Rescissions 149
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 151
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 153
Post Delivery Test and Trials 153
Rescissions 153
Other Procurement, Navy 155
Pollution Control Equipment 156
Rescissions 157
Procurement, Marine Corps 163
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 167
F–22 168
F–15 168
F–16 169
C–130J 169
E–8C 170
C–135 Modifications 170
F–15 Modifications 171
T–38 Modifications 171
Missile Procurement, Air Force 176
Minuteman III Guidance Replacement Program 176
JSOW 177
Titan 177
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 180
Other Procurement, Air Force 182
Procurement, Defense-Wide 187
Electronic Commerce Resource Centers 187
Information Technology Programs 188
Classified Programs 188
National Guard and Reserve Equipment 191
Fire Fighting 191
Support to Non-Profit Agencies 192
Defense Production Act Purchases 194
Information Technology 194
Year 2000 (Y2K) Computer Problem 195
Year 2000 (Y2K) Lessons Learned 195
Inadequate Information Technology Oversight 196
Defense Joint Accounting System 197
Information Technology Oversight-Committee Recommendations 197
Financial Management Regulations 198
Standard Procurement System 199
Armor Officer Distance Learning 199
Power Projection C4 Infrastructure 199
Supercomputing Work 199
Electricity and Electronics Training Series 199
IMDS/REMIS 199

Page

Title III, Procurement—Continued
Information Technology—Continued
DIMHRS 199
National Guard Bureau Nationwide Fiber Optics Network 200
National Guard Distance Learning 200
Maintenance Automated Identification Technology 200
Global Combat Support System—Army 200
Ammunition Automated Identification Technology 201
National Guard Distance Learning-Courseware 201
Joint Systems Education and Training Systems Development 201
Service Information Infrastructure Shortfalls 201
Share in Savings 201
Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation 203
Estimates and Appropriation Summary 203
Special Interest Items 205
Classified Programs 205
Technical Data 205
Experimentation 205
Information Assurance as Part of Independent Operational Testing 205
Special Termination Cost Clause 206
Joint Mission Planning System 206
Utilization of Small Business 206
Anti-Tank Weapons Master Plan 208
Tactical Radios 208
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army 208
Hunter Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) 212
Basic Research 213
Defense Research Sciences 213
Applied Research 213
Ballistics Technology 213
Human Factor Engineering Technology 213
Environmental Quality Technology 213
Advanced Technology Development 214
Medical Advanced Technology 214
Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology 214
Line-Of-Sight Technology Demonstration 214
Joint Tactical Radio 214
Artillery Systems-Demonstration and Validation 215
Operational Systems Development 215
Force XXI, Warfighting Rapid Acquisition Program 215
Other Missile Improvement Programs 216
Aircraft Modifications/Product Improvement Program 216
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy 221
Joint Experimentation 226
Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology 228
Intercooled Recuperative Gas Turbine Engine 228
JSOW 228
Aerial Targets 229
Bone Marrow Registry 229
Shared Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP) 229
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force 236
Consolidation and Elimination of Small Programs 236
AF/National Program Consolidation 236
Air Force Science and Technology 236
Wright Patterson Landing Gear Facility 236

Page

Title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation—Continued
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force—Continued
Aerospace Propulsion Subsystems Integration 241
Advanced Computing Technology 241
Crew Systems and Personnel Protection Technology 241
Joint Strike Fighter 242
B–2 242
Milstar 243
SBIRS High 243
Development Planning 244
F–16 Squadrons 244
F–15 Squadrons 245
Spacelift Range System 245
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 252
Basic Research 255
Chemical and Biological Defense Program 255
Applied Research 255
Historically Black Colleges and Universities 255
Extensible Information Systems 255
Biological Warfare Defense 256
Advanced Technology Development 256
Chemical and Biological Defense Program—Advanced Development 256
Verification Technology Demonstration 257
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations 257
Ballistic Missile Defense 258
National Missile Defense Site Selection 259
Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) 260
Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) 260
Russian American Observational Satellite (RAMOS) 261
Space-Based Laser 261
Sensor and Guidance Technology 261
Discoverer II 262
Physical Security Equipment 262
Coalition Warfare 262
Technical Studies, Support and Analysis 263
Strategic Environmental Research Program 263
Defense Imagery and Mapping Agency Program 263
Tri-Service Directed Energy Center 263
Special Operations Tactical Systems Development 263
Information Technology Program 264
Developmental, Test and Evaluation, Defense 269
Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program 269
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 271
Title V. Revolving and Management Funds 273
Defense Working Capital Funds 273
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Services 273
National Defense Sealift Fund 273
Large Medium Speed Roll-On/Roll-Off (LMSR) Ships 273
Maritime Prepositioning Force Enhancement Conversion 274
National Defense Features 274
DOD Requirements for Commercial Tanker Ships 275
Massachusetts Maritime Academy Training Ship 275
Sealift Ship Leases 275
Title VI. Other Department of Defense Programs 277
Defense Health Program 277

Page

Title VI. Other Department of Defense Programs—Continued
Defense Health Program—Continued
Peer Reviewed Research 278
Tricare Contracts and Pharmacy Costs 278
Custodial Care 278
Fatigue Management 279
Joint Diabetes Project 279
Cervical Cancer Testing 279
Gulf War Illness 280
Computer Based Modeling in Health Care 280
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army 280
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense 283
Forward Operating Locations 283
Fingerprint Operations 284
C–26 Aircraft Photo Reconnaissance Upgrade 285
Drug Testing 285
A–10 Logistical and Demilitarization Support 285
Office of the Inspector General 285
Title VII. Related Agencies 287
National Foreign Intelligence Program 287
Introduction 287
Classified Annex 287
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund 287
Intelligence Community Management Account 288
Payment to Kaho'Olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund 288
National Security Education Trust Fund 288
Title VIII. General Provisions 289
Definition of Program, Project and Activity 289
Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles 289
B–52 Force Structure 290
National Missile Defense 290
Aggressor Squadrons 290
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations 291
Medium Extended Air Defense System 291
Military Recruitment Financial Penalties 291
House of Representatives Reporting Requirements 291
Changes in the Application of Existing Law 291
Appropriations Language 292
General Provisions 294
Appropriations Not Authorized by Law 297
Transfer of Funds 299
Rescissions 300
Compliance With Clause 3 of Rule XIII (Ramseyer Rule) 300
Constitutional Authority 301
Comparison with the Budget Resolution 301
Five-Year Outlay Projections 302
Financial Assistance to State and Local Governments 302
Additional Views 314

106TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–244

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

JULY 20, 1999.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. LEWIS of California, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2561]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000.

BILL TOTALS

Appropriations for most military functions of the Department of Defense are provided for in the accompanying bill for the fiscal year 2000. This bill does not provide appropriations for military construction, military family housing, civil defense, or nuclear warheads, for which requirements are considered in connection with other appropriations bills.

The President's fiscal year 2000 budget request for activities funded in the Department of Defense Appropriations Bill totals $263,265,959,000 in new budget (obligational) authority. The amounts recommended by the Committee in the accompanying bill total $266,061,503,000 in net new budget authority. This is $2,795,544,000 above the budget estimate; $15,540,955,000 above the sums made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1999 in the fiscal year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act; and, in terms of the total authority available to the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2000, $1,283,432,000 above the sums made

available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1999, when fiscal year 1999 supplemental appropriations are included.[1]

[1] These figures include $16,095,949,000 in fiscal year 1999 emergency defense funding included in Public Law 105–277, Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999, and Public Law 106–31, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1999; and $1,838,426,000 in Fiscal Year 2000 emergency defense funding also included in Public Law 106–31.

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	70,607,566	73,723,293	72,011,977	+1,404,411	-1,711,316
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	84,042,814	91,268,249	93,686,750	+9,643,936	+2,418,501
(By transfer)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	.....	.....
Title III - Procurement	48,590,420	51,851,538	53,031,397	+4,440,977	+1,179,859
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	36,756,650	34,375,219	37,169,446	+412,796	+2,794,227
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	802,866	512,044	820,044	+17,178	+308,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	11,797,668	12,932,601	12,883,961	+1,086,293	-48,640
Title VII - Related agencies	358,623	381,515	376,515	+17,892	-5,000
Title VIII - General provisions	-2,436,059	-128,500	-1,318,587	+1,117,472	-1,190,087
DoD-wide savings	.....	-1,650,000	.....	.....	+1,650,000
Total, Department of Defense	250,520,548	263,265,959	268,661,503	+18,140,955	+5,395,544
Scorekeeping adjustments	.....	.....	-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000
Total funds provided in this Act	250,520,548	263,265,959	266,061,503	+15,540,955	+2,795,544
Funds provided in Supplemental Acts	16,095,949	.....	1,838,426	-14,257,523	+1,838,426
Total funding available for DoD	266,616,497	263,265,959	267,899,929	+1,283,432	+4,633,970

These figures include $16,095,949,000 in FY 1999 emergency defense funding included in P.L. 105-277, Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Appropriations for FY 1999, and P.L. 106-31, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1999; and $1,838,426,000 in FY 2000 emergency defense funding also included in P.L. 106-31.

COMMITTEE BUDGET REVIEW PROCESS

During its review of the fiscal year 2000 budget, the Subcommittee on Defense held a total of 17 hearings during the period of February 1999 to March 1999. Testimony received by the Subcommittee totaled 1,394 pages of transcript. Approximately half of the hearings were held in open session. Executive (closed) sessions were held only when the security classification of the material to be discussed presented no alternative.

INTRODUCTION

The Committee's consideration of the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill comes as America's armed forces, and the plans and budgets intended to support them and U.S. security demands in the future, confront a series of difficult and interrelated challenges.

As evidenced by Operation Allied Force and other recent military and humanitarian relief operations, the U.S. Armed Forces are still without question the finest in the world. The overall quality and skill of America's soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines remains unsurpassed. And U.S. training, equipment, and technology are, when considered in their entirety, still superior to those of any potential adversary, as well as our allies. Even so, the immediate and long-term challenges confronting the Department of Defense (DoD), the military services, and policymakers in the executive and legislative branches remain difficult and complex.

The international environment remains uncertain and potentially explosive. Recent trends and developments involving Russia, China, India and Pakistan are assuredly not optimistic, while prospects for other regional threats—including those which have dominated recent U.S. military planning, North Korea, Iraq, and Iran—remain both unclear and unsettling. Meanwhile, political instability persists in many regions, as does the growing threat posed by the proliferation of technology. Transnational issues such as ethnic conflicts, terrorism, the international drug trade and increasingly, "information age" threats continue to loom. And now, the United States, on the heels of a mission in Bosnia which nears four years in duration, faces an even more difficult and more protracted commitment to the Balkans in the wake of the Kosovo conflict.

Against this backdrop, the U.S. military—now having been drawn down to the lowest force levels since the end of World War II—has been and will doubtless continue to be engaged globally. Yet, even before the recent hostilities involving Kosovo and Iraq, a combination of overseas commitments, new missions, shrinking force structure, aging equipment, and insufficient and, in some instances, misprioritized budgets joined to bring the current and future readiness of the U.S. military into question. These problems have created a punishing pace of operational tempo and a decline in overall quality of life for servicemembers and their families, which when combined with the effects of a strong economy, have created a serious military manpower crisis. Within the past year, for the first time in over two decades the U.S. Army, Navy and Air Force have failed by significant margins to meet recruiting goals, while these services' retention rates for experienced personnel in

critical specialty areas (such as Air Force pilots) have reached dangerously low levels. In the meantime, serious readiness and weapons modernization shortfalls persist. Recognizing these problems, both Congress and now the Administration have proposed significant increases in defense spending above previously planned levels.

BASIS FOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee strongly believes that, in many ways, this year is a potential watershed for future defense planning, budgets, and programs. It is significant that there now appears to be a general consensus between the Administration and the Congress that the U.S. military's operational, budgetary and programmatic needs call for a steady and sustained increase in defense spending. Yet events of just the past eight months—notably, the strengths and weaknesses displayed during the conduct of Operations Desert Fox and Allied Force; the deployment of U.S. forces in support of the Kosovo Stabilization Force (KFOR); and the ongoing domestic debate over future government spending—combine to reinforce serious questions regarding the prospects for and adequacy of proposed defense budgets, be it the President's or Congressional alternatives.

Therefore, the Committee has endeavored to not only consider the details of the Department's proposed fiscal year 2000 budget request, but has also attempted to measure that budget and the new fiscal years 2000–2005 Future Years' Defense Plan (FYDP) against a number of factors. These include the international challenges cited above; the need to not only plan for current DoD needs but those likely to be confronted in 2010, 2020 and beyond; and the already well-documented and articulated manpower, readiness and modernization needs of the DoD generally and the services specifically.

The Committee also gave careful consideration to three additional areas in developing its recommendations:

(a) The overall Federal budget debate and the strengths and weaknesses of the Administration's defense budgets in that context;

(b) Neglect by certain DoD agencies of law, regulation and practices concerning the use of appropriated funds, including the initiation of new programs and diversion of funds provided for one purpose to another without the required congressional notification or approval—events which the Committee views as most troubling given the constitutional imperative that appropriated funds be put to the uses specifically delineated by the Congress; and

(c) The actual experience derived from the recent combat operations involving Iraq and Yugoslavia; the degree to which the Future Years' Defense Plan and the individual services' budgets address a series of longstanding needs of the regional commanders-in-chief (CINCs) and our forces in the field; and whether the nation's current national security strategy (which calls for the U.S. military to carry out and win two, near-simultaneous "major theater wars") can reasonably expect to be supported given current defense planning and programming.

THE PRESIDENT'S FISCAL YEAR 2000–2005 DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Committee finds, with some qualification, that the fiscal year 2000 budget and the overall fiscal years 2000–2005 defense

program announced by the President this February is a more realistic attempt to match "military means to goals" than previous budget submissions. This new budget program calls for overall increases in previously planned defense spending levels of approximately $112 billion over the period 2000–2005. Of this amount, a significant portion (nearly $35 billion) is targeted specifically at improving military pay and benefits, including repeal of the military retirement program changes adopted in 1986. Other significant increases are programmed for readiness and operation and maintenance funding generally, as well as critical weapons modernization programs.

Despite these noteworthy proposals, the Committee remains deeply troubled about whether this budget program can in fact meet both immediate and longer-term national security challenges. Three specific problems come to mind:

The FY 2000–2005 Defense Budget Is Linked To Large Increases in Overall Discretionary Spending: The President's new fiscal year 2000–2005 defense program proposes steady and sustained growth in defense discretionary spending, from roughly $272 billion in FY 1999 (not including enacted emergency supplemental appropriations) to about $330 billion annually in FY 2005. The Committee believes such growth is justified, especially with numerous peacekeeping commitments and the need to reinvigorate weapons modernization accounts. However, the Committee also believes that it is a fair question to consider whether a defense program whose very viability hinges on such growth is in fact realistic. The defense budget cannot be viewed in insolation from the overall budget dynamic, involving spending levels for discretionary and entitlement programs, potential changes in the the tax code, and estimates of the government surplus.

Such questions about long-term budget levels are particularly important to the DoD. Unlike most federal agencies, the DoD develops a multi-year budget program with some degree of fidelity, essential for an agency with hundreds of major equipment procurement and developmental efforts. Given the current uncertainty about the future budgetary environment, the Committee views with some caution any long-term revitalization plan for the DoD which has at its core an assumption of very robust outyear defense spending levels. This is especially important in light of plans being developed by each of the military services to make long-term commitments to major production programs which tend to "squeeze" other items in the budget to unacceptable levels.

New, "Unbudgeted" Defense Budget Commitments Are Already Apparent: Since the budget was presented to the Congress in February, two new developments have arisen which will require major revisions to the existing DoD budget plan. The first involves Congressional action on military pay and benefits, as expressed through both House- and Senate-passed versions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. The President's budget proposes a sizable increase over previously programmed amounts for military compensation. Both the House and Senate, most notably through increasing the size of the proposed fiscal year 2000 military pay raise (from 4.4 to 4.8 percent), but also through other initiatives, have now voted for authorization changes which

pose considerable unbudgeted outyear costs for the DoD—perhaps more than $10 billion through fiscal year 2005.

Long-term, unbudgeted costs of continued contingency deployments are also escalating, especially those resulting from NATO missions in the Balkans. The Committee observes the current DoD budget plan was premised on a gradual drawdown of U.S. forces in Bosnia, with no funds budgeted after fiscal year 2001 for any Balkan peacekeeping force or for continued sanctions enforcement around Iraq. Until late last year, the average cost of these two missions had appeared to stabilize at between $1.5–2.0 billion per year. Realistically, one must assume there will be costs of some greater magnitude from 2001–2005 stemming from continued U.S. deployments associated with Bosnia and Iraq; and now, these unbudgeted costs will be compounded by those resulting from Operation Joint Guardian, the U.S. participation in KFOR. Using conservative planning factors, the Committee believes these could result in up to $25 billion in unbudgeted, unprogrammed costs over the FYDP.

The Committee believes it it essential that these issues be kept in plain view as the Congress develops its defense spending recommendations for fiscal year 2000 and beyond. They clearly cast a long shadow over DoD's overall Future Year's Defense Program, and the viability of planned modernization budgets in particular since personnel and readiness programs must continue to receive top budget priority.

"Creative Accounting" In The Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Request.—Of immediate relevance to the Committee's consideration of the fiscal year 2000 defense appropriations request is what senior Department officials have publicly conceded is a FY 2000–2005 program built largely on optimistic economic assumptions and, for fiscal year 2000, "one-time initiatives" which the Committee can most charitably describe as "creative accounting". The most obvious and blatant of these are the budget proposals to offset nearly $5 billion in new fiscal year 2000 programmatic increases with a like amount of budget authority "offsets"—a $3.1 billion reduction from a "one-time" proposal to incrementally fund the fiscal year 2000 Military Construction program (that is, providing only half the required budget authority needed to actually complete proposed military construction projects); and an unspecified cut of $1.65 billion (in the form of a proposed, non-program specific general reduction) embedded in the budget request for the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill.

The Committee finds small solace in the refrain of many senior Administration officials that its fiscal year 2000 defense budget "has a $12 billion increase" over previous plans, much of which is for critical personnel and readiness needs—when its budget really only pays for slightly more than half of those increases.

In essence, the Department's FY 2000 budget tries to have it both ways: it proposes needed increases in key programs, but "offsets" this growth with "cuts" having no substance.

The Committee will not subscribe to such a "quick fix" mentality. In both this bill, and the Military Construction bill reported by the Committee, it has rejected these proposals out of hand. Rather, to meet DoD's unfunded requirements, finance congressional initia-

tives and backfill for the budget's creative accounting, the Committee proposes an increase over the total fiscal year 2000 defense spending level by the President, combined with a wide range of program reductions, rescissions of previously appropriated funds and other initiatives. This approach is not only justified on the merits, but is a direct consequence of the Administration's having sent up a fiscal year 2000 budget submission which itself was "oversubscribed" by $4.75 billion.

NEGLECT OF TRADITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AND ACQUISITION PROGRAM PRACTICES

Adding to the difficulties confronting the Committee in its consideration of the fiscal year 2000 budget request are serious budgeting and funding execution issues regarding appropriations for defense acquisition programs. These are occuring with increasing frequency in both the budget requests submitted by the Department of Defense as well as in the execution of program funding once appropriations have been provided by the Congress. Throughout this report there will be more specific descriptions of these and related issues. Of particular concern is the failure of certain DoD entities to comply with many existing procedures governing the expenditure of appropriated funds.

One of the highest duties of the Congress is to exercise the mandate in Clause 7, Section 9, Article I of the Constitution of the United States that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law." In terms of appropriations provided to the Department of Defense, this mandate has evolved over time as a result of statute, appropriations law, court rulings, and executive branch regulations; decades of appropriations implementation and resulting "practices and rules"; and what the Committee regards as an ongoing discussion with the DoD and its component departments and agencies over budget rules and appropriate procedures regarding the use of appropriated funds.

The Committee's perspective is one of ensuring that funds made available in appropriations acts are in fact put to the use intended by the elected members of Congress, under the terms and conditions the Congress and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees place on the funding in question. This is a responsibility the Constitution clearly intended for the Congress—the so-called power of the purse—and therefore, the Committee does not take issues regarding the use of appropriated funds lightly. However, given the sheer size, complexity, and dynamism of both the real world and the funding environments that the Department of Defense and the U.S. military operates, the Committee is sensitive to and has in fact actively engaged the Department on countless occasions to ensure that the DoD has the funding flexibility it needs to respond rapidly to emerging circumstances. The Committee notes that unless specific restrictions have been enacted into law, in most instances the most restrictive rules require the DoD, in accordance with certain pre-established thresholds, to provide the Committee with prior notification or, through the reprogramming process, to seek the Committee's prior approval for contemplated funding shifts. All the Committee demands is that these well-estab-

lished procedures—many enshrined in statute or appropriations law, not just custom or practice—be followed.

Regrettably, in recent years the Committee has observed a steady erosion of departmental compliance with these standards, prompting the Committee to actively address these problems in recent appropriations acts and accompanying Committee reports. The Committee further observes these abuses have generally been most numerous and blatant with respect to defense acquisition programs—and of late, those managed by the acquisition communities within the Department of the Air Force, the Department of the Army, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

For example, with respect to the Air Force, despite recent Committee direction and, in several instances, new appropriations law, the Committee finds that both in execution of funds provided in appropriations acts and in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission the Air Force acquisition community continues to ignore and violate a wide range of appropriations practices and acquisition rules. Details on these specific instances can be found elsewhere in this report, but a short summary of such Air Force abuses includes:

(a) In its fiscal year 2000 budget the Air Force continues to blithely ignore specific Committee direction and law intended to ensure that funds appropriated for one purpose—for example, weapons procurement—are in fact used for that purpose and not for other efforts, such as research and development, by:

(1) Requesting hundreds of millions of dollars in various procurement programs, when in fact the intended use is to support operation and maintenance funding needs (in violation of DoD policy);

(2) Requesting substantial procurement funds for a program (the F–22 fighter) when in fact the use of the funds is for development (in violation of specific Congressional direction), and

(3) Requesting substantial development funds for a program (the MILSTAR satellite), when the intent is to use the funds for procurement (in violation of a provision of law);

(b) Violation of both new start program regulations and law, as well as standard reprogramming procedures, by using fiscal year 1999 funds to begin a new start, several hundred-million dollar production program which the Congress never formally approved (the C–5 avionics modernization program)—and did so by diverting funds specifically provided by the Congress for another program; and

(c) Initiation of a new Special Access Program without prior Congressional notification as required by law.

Regarding the Army, it has in several instances ignored specific Committee or House-Senate conference report direction on major programs, to include:

(a) Entering into a new multi-year production contract for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles, despite specific Committee direction to defer such action until it first identified and then formally submitted to the Congress, an approved plan to fix significant technical and safety problems plaguing thousands of vehicles already delivered and in service;

(b) Negotiating a multi-year production contract for the TOW Improved Target Acquisition System (ITAS) despite both fiscal year

1999 Committee and appropriations conference committee direction explicitly denying approval of the ITAS multi-year contract; and

(c) In conjunction with OSD, explicitly ignoring fiscal year 1999 conference committee direction and using Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration funds for the Line-of-Sight Tank (LOSAT) program.

Regarding OSD acquisition officials, in addition to the example involving LOSAT cited above, the Committee is little short of amazed when it comes to their actions on the Medium Altitude Air Defense (MEADS) program. This program was specifically terminated in the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1999 Defense Appropriations Act. Internal DoD financial management documents issued this spring noted this action and correctly stated that: *"This item has been denied by the Congress and is not subject to reprogramming"* (emphasis added). Nonetheless, the Committee has since learned that officials in the OSD acquisition structure as well as in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, an OSD acquisition organization, directed the use of over $2 million of funds specifically provided for another program to continue MEADS-related activities, and actually announced the winner of the MEADS contract competition. All for a program explicitly terminated in the fiscal year 1999 appropriations process.

The Committee believes these and similar instances raise fundamental questions regarding DoD program oversight and compliance with existing law and regulations. The Committee is also compelled to note such actions contribute to the Committee's uncertainty regarding the adequacy of the Department's proposed defense budget and program planning. The extent of such problems gives the Committee little confidence that the military service or defense agency in question is requesting appropriations for its major acquisition programs based on solid cost estimates, testing and production milestones, and firm estimates and commitments to funding requirements. In this sense, such actions are extremely corrosive to sensible program management, defense planning and budgeting. And it severely weakens the working relationship between the executive branch—charged with proposing, then managing, programs if funded—and the legislative branch, which in providing funding must have confidence that the budget and program proposals underlying the funding requests in question are accurate and executable.

The Committee could speculate as to the reason behind this growing trend—for example, the pressure to deal with weapons modernization demands following more than a decade of inflation-adjusted cuts in funding—but to do so is to justify these practices. While sympathetic to budget pressures, and aware of the desire of the acquisition community to exercise as much control and flexibility over its programs as possible, in keeping with its constitutional duties the Committee simply cannot excuse violations of appropriations and acquisition law, regulation and practice.

"LESSONS LEARNED" FROM RECENT MILITARY OPERATIONS

The combat operations over Iraq and Yugoslavia (Operations Desert Fox and Allied Force, respectively) and their immediate aftermath have already been instructive in terms of "lessons

learned"—not only for DoD, the Joint Staff, the services, and the regional commands, but also for others in the executive branch and Congress. These missions have confirmed the wisdom of prudent investments over the years in so-called "force multipliers". These include such programs as advanced reconnaissance and intelligence collection; improved command, control and communications; selective "platform" upgrades, such as night attack capability for tactical strike assets, or conventional, all-weather precision weapons delivery capability for the heavy bomber force; and a new generation of precision-guided munitions.

Yet these technological improvements are only one aspect of the many factors essential to battlefield success. While much attention is being directed at the new capabilities brought to bear in these operations, the Committee insists that without the less-glamorous "basics"—such as effective logistics systems; solid training; and most importantly, keeping a highly motivated and quality force—our technological advances mean little.

Accordingly, the Committee not only acknowledges the exemplary performance of the U.S. forces deployed in direct support of these operations, but all those who helped prepare, train, and equip those forces. This provides a vivid reminder to Congress and the senior leadership in the executive branch of the shared responsibility to work in concert with the senior military leadership of the Department and the forces in the field to fashion a defense program which balances these competing prerogatives.

In keeping with this obligation, then, while laudatory of the performance of U.S. forces in these recent engagements, the Committee must register its deep concern over a number of issues which these recent operations have highlighted.

Current Force Structure and Current Commitments Are Not In Balance.—It is now all too apparent that the military services are not yet properly reconfigured from their old "Cold War" orientation, or are simply undermanned or underequipped in certain key categories, to meet the Nation's emerging global commitments at an acceptable level of risk. In the immediate aftermath of the Yugoslav campaign, the Chiefs of Staff of Army and Air Force, in different yet equally compelling ways, have brought this issue into sharp focus. The new Army Chief of Staff has pronounced publicly that, without new and innovative thinking in his service—including a fundamental restructuring of the Army's heavy and light units—his service risks losing strategic and tactical relevance. The Air Force Chief of Staff declares that the immediate well-being of his service—stretched by years of unanticipated operations, unprecedented rates of "peacetime" operational tempo, declining readiness indicators, personnel turbulence and shortages, and now, two major air campaigns within the past eight months—makes a lengthy "stand-down", including a significant reprieve from overseas deployments, essential if he is to properly reconstitute his force.

This Committee recognizes these are complex issues, with each Service facing its own unique challenges. But it is clear the strategy, roles and missions, and force structure assumptions underpinning the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) two years ago—which now form the basis of current DoD planning—must be revisited. This is a considerable undertaking, made more difficult by the un-

certain world situation, the budget environment and many difficult resource allocation issues in each service. Nevertheless, the Committee expresses its conviction that, in light of the additional commitments incurred by U.S. forces since the QDR was conducted, as well as the serious personnel and readiness problems that have emerged over the past few years, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the senior leadership of each of the military services, and ultimately, the President and the Congress must deal with these issues head on, as soon as possible.

Fundamental Problems Persist In Matching Resource Allocations To Operational Requirements.—For years, the Committee has expressed deep concern that the DoD's annual budget submissions have consistently failed to adequately address certain critical warfighting needs. This disconnect was illustrated during the early stages of Operation Allied Force, when the Air Force had to submit an urgent reprogramming request, and then an emergency supplemental budget request for the Conventional Air-Launched Cruise Missile (the Air Force's only long-range, all weather conventionally armed stand-off weapon), because inventories had been drawn down to unacceptable levels. The Committee notes this problem would have been far worse had not the Congress in the mid-1990's provided funding for 250 CALCMs, which had not been budgeted by the Air Force or the DoD. Had this not occurred, CALCM would not have even been available for Operations Desert Fox or Allied Force.

The Committee also notes that many of the innovations which were used to great effect in Operation Allied Force—such as the use of B–2 and B–1 bombers in a conventional bombing role—are available now only because of congressional actions to both initiate and accelerate many of the upgrades required for these missions. For example, the initial deployment of a precision-guided conventional weapon on the B–2—which served as a clear precursor to its subsequently being equipped with the highly effective JDAM munition—was the so-called "GATS–GAM" interim weapon, a congressional initiative.

These examples, unfortunately, are symptomatic of many recent budget decisions. The Committee has stated its view repeatedly that many programs with strong warfighting applications ofttimes are given short shrift in annual service budget submissions. The reasons for this vary, but are usually found in either budget pressures, service parochialism, and the aversion of many of the services' acquisition hierarchies to upgrade existing systems (as opposed to developing a new system from scratch). The Committee has also observed that these problems are especially acute when the capability or system in question has a "joint" or "national" character, and is needed by multiple services or joint warfighting commands. Regrettably, even when such capabilities are of great utility to forces in the field, they often involve missions or capabilities—such as logistics, transportation, intelligence collection and reconnaissance, and electronic combat—which the military services often fail to consider on a par with what each considers its core requirements.

SHORTAGES OF LOW-DENSITY, HIGH-DEMAND ASSETS

The Committee is especially troubled as many of these deficiencies, including shortages in so-called "low-density, high-demand" assets, have been well known for some time. These include, but are not limited to: electronic warfare aircraft and specialized jamming equipment; tactical intelligence collection and dissemination assets (ranging from collection assets such as the U–2, RIVET JOINT, AWACS and JSTARS aircraft and tactical UAVs; interoperable, secure communications and command and control, to include new data links and data fusion capability); and tactical airlift, aerial refueling capability and other transportation and logistics support platforms and equipment. The Committee has consistently supported additions over DoD budget requests for such programs over the years. Nevertheless, continued shortages in these and many other categories clearly posed operational constraints during Operations Desert Fox and Allied Force. This not only impeded the regional commands charged with prosecuting the air campaigns, but also other regional commanders who were confronted with the physical diversion of assets from their areas of responsibility and other unexpected resource shortfalls.

The Committee's concern about these problems is not new, and it has demonstrated it will not shy from taking actions to ensure that our forces in the field are not at risk or caught short. In this regard, the recently-enacted emergency supplemental appropriations act which provided funding for the conduct of Operation Allied Force (Public Law 106–31) created a new appropriations account, the "Operational Rapid Response Transfer Fund", that was expressly intended to provide a funding source to meet immediate shortfalls and needs identified by the regional CINCs. The Committee understands the Department will soon make use of the $300,000,000 provided by the Congress in this fund to address some of these most urgent problems, such as those plaguing the limited inventory of Navy EA–6B jamming aircraft. The Committee commends the senior leadership of the Department for expeditiously following through on the Congress' intent in this regard.

However, it is clear much more must be done. As with the questions raised earlier in this report about the proper size and organization of each of the military services, a continued failure by the DoD generally—and the military services and defense agencies specifically—to consistently link operational needs to decisions about resource allocations and defense program development carries with it serious implications for the ability of the U.S. military to carry out the current national security strategy. This is not just a theoretical discussion, nor one which the Committee believes can be deferred. The Committee bill, across all services and defense agencies, is intended to bring these questions to the forefront—and in the instance of one of the military services—the United States Air Force—the Committee believes these problems are now so acute that it must take a series of immediate and forceful steps.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE—AT A CROSSROADS?

The air campaigns against Iraq and Yugoslavia, which on the whole featured an exemplary level of professionalism, technical so-

phistication and skill, were conducted and supported in large measure by the men and women of the United States Air Force. To them, and their colleagues in the other branches of the military and defense agencies who also played important roles in these operations, the Committee expresses its gratitude and respect for their service and bravery.

In the Committee's view, this performance on the part of the Air Force is all the more remarkable in light of the serious problems which, over the past few years, have increasingly beset this service as it struggles with the twin dilemmas of redefining its role in the post Cold War era while being called to carry out an increasing number of missions with fewer people. Among the most serious of these problems:

—For the first time since 1979, the Air Force will miss its recruiting goals for new enlistees—by nearly 2,600 individuals. This is especially noteworthy given the Air Force's success since the transition to an all-volunteer force in attracting many more potential recruits than it actually requires.

—The Air Force also is coping with serious retention problems, particularly in the midyear grades, with acute shortages in a large number of specialty career fields ranging from air traffic controllers to security police. Of considerable concern is that the Air Force is already suffering from a steep shortage of pilots, with an existing deficit of over 1,100 that is projected to approach 2,000 within the next three years.

—Overall Air Force readiness—as measured by the mission capable rates of aircraft and other key systems—has steadily declined in each of the past eight years, with an overall rating of less than 75 percent (an eleven percent decline since 1991) prior to the onset of Operation Allied Force.

—In the past three years a major aviation spare parts shortfall has arisen in the Air Force (as well as the Navy), due largely to faulty estimates which failed to accurately reflect the effects of increased operational tempo on aging equipment. Despite the appropriation of roughly $2 billion over budgeted amounts for spare parts over the past three years, continued operational demands and the time required to procure the necessary parts and perform required maintenance make it likely that Air Force operational readiness rates and equipment availability will remain low for the foreseeable future.

—Despite the proposed increases in the President's budget submission, major funding shortfalls persist across nearly all Air Force mission and functional areas. In February 1999 the Air Force Chief of Staff submitted to Congress an "unfunded priority list" for fiscal year 2000 alone of over $2.3 billion. The following month, in response to a request from the House Armed Services Committee, senior Air Force officials provided a detailed unfunded shortfall list covering the period of the current Future Years Defense Plan (fiscal years 2000–2005). After adjusting this list (removing from it fiscal years 1999 and 2000 needs tied to the contingency operations involving Iraq and Kosovo, most of which were dealt with in the emergency supplemental appropriations act enacted in late May), the Air Force still documents unfunded needs totaling *over $14 billion* (emphasis added).

All of these problems were present prior to the air campaigns against Iraq and Yugoslavia, which senior Air Force officials freely admit stretched existing Air Force personnel and assets to the limit. For example, during Operation Allied Force, the Air Force was compelled to implement the so-called "stop-loss" program, whereby individuals whose terms of service were due to expire were formally notified that they could be kept on active duty for an indefinite period owing to operational needs. At the time stop-loss was invoked, the Air Force indicated nearly 34,000 servicemembers in critical specialty areas could have their tours of duty involuntarily extended as a result of Operation Allied Force and the Air Force's other global missions.

Air Force operational assets were also clearly taxed by Operations Desert Fox and Allied Force. The most acute problems occurred in certain categories—such as reconnaissance, airlift, and aerial refueling—where the Air Force carries a disproportionate share of, if not the only, capability within the U.S. armed forces to support major military operations. The Air Force itself describes its unique capabilities as "Global Reach, Global Power". One may then ask, can the Air Force today or in the future deliver on this motto's promise? These weaknesses give the Committee doubts about the U.S. military's ability to carry out the "near-simultaneous, two major theater war" capability that the national military strategy is premised upon. Of even greater concern is the fact that the six-year Air Force budget program demonstrably falls short of meeting both existing and projected requirements in these critical areas.

Now, following Operation Allied Force, the Air Force Chief of Staff has made clear his view that the Air Force must conduct a "stand-down" of at least several months duration, to reconstitute its forces and give its officers and airmen a chance to recover from the operational tempo which is the root cause of many of the Air Force's personnel and readiness problems. The Committee has been advised that this standdown, as envisioned by the Air Force, would be of sufficient scope and length that many current operational requirements being carried out by the Air Force would either have to be transferred to the other services or left unaddressed.

The Committee believes such candor on the part of senior Air Force leadership—clearly at variance from the typical "can do" attitude which the military services often take to an extreme—deserves both respect and careful consideration. It says much about the current state in which the Air Force finds itself.

The Committee recognizes many of these problems are not of the Air Force's making, nor could they have been forecast. Many stem from a series of decisions and events which began in 1989–91, starting with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the resulting dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union, the Persian Gulf War, and the acceleration of a major defense build-down in response to these events and federal budget pressures. The Committee is well aware of the difficulties these changes posed for all the military services, and the Air Force in particular.

Moreover, the operational employment of U.S. forces has changed markedly in recent years. The Air Force and its sister services not only continue to carry existing regional commitments and their potential warfighting demands, but now find themselves regularly de-

ployed on a large scale on what had just a few years ago been called "non-traditional missions", such as peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and humanitarian relief operations. Each of the services—not just the Air Force—have and will continue to struggle with these new missions.

With 20/20 hindsight, the Committee believes that the Air Force's recognition of the scale of its modernization dilemma may have inadvertently contributed to many of the personnel and readiness problems it now confronts. The Committee remembers vividly how just two years ago the then-Chief of Staff of the Air Force explained to the Committee how his service had consciously decided to give up force structure and manning levels in order to free up additional resources for modernization. Now, that gamble, and others taken by this Service, have come home to roost, leading to what the Committee believes is an Air Force personnel and readiness crisis, even while the Air Force still confronts a modernization crisis of considerable size and scope.

AIR FORCE MODERNIZATION ISSUES

It is indisputable that the Air Force has many unmet needs in modernization, many of which were on clear display during Operation Allied Force.

There is a requirement for at least five additional Joint STARS surveillance aircraft beyond those currently funded or budgeted—yet after this year, the Air Force budget provides none.

At least 20 percent of the KC–135 aerial refueling fleet—which uses 1950's and 1960's vintage airframes—has yet to be modernized with improved engines and other equipment which will not only extend its service life but greatly increase its operational flexibility and availability. The Air Force budget fails to request even one tanker conversion in its budget until fiscal year 2002.

The Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Transportation Command, declares a need for at least 150 C–130J tactical airlift aircraft—yet the Air Force budget fails to buy any until fiscal year 2002 and active duty units are not scheduled to receive any new C–130's until 2006.

Due to fiscal constraints the Air Force has restructured the next-generation of early warning satellites used for detection of ballistic missile launches, the Space-Based Infrared System-High and -Low. In so doing, at least in the case of SBIRS-High, the Air Force has taken a fully funded, well-crafted acquisition program and within less than nine months, restructured it into a higher risk program, with a two year slip in fielding, excessive concurrency between development and production—and in the process generated an unfunded shortfall of nearly $100 million in its fiscal year 2000 budget.

These are just a few examples where the Committee believes the Air Force acquisition program and budget priorities are inconsistent with actual need. Programs relied upon by forces in the field, and in some instances the National Command Authority, are not funded adequately or deferred. Other efforts, which may have some intrinsic merit but are really nothing more than expensive demonstration projects, receive increased budget allocations. Meanwhile, as described earlier in this report, the Air Force acquisition

community seems at times to be completely oblivious to the legal and DoD policies in place governing the proper use of appropriated funds.

F–22

The centerpiece of the Air Force's modernization program for at least the past decade, along with the C–17 transport aircraft, has been its next generation air superiority fighter, the F–22. The F–22 was originally conceived in the early 1980's to counter a projected threat driven by the expectation that the then-Soviet Union would couple the sheer size of its force structure with significant technological advances in fighter and air-to-air technology. Following the demise of the Soviet Union and the huge downsizing of the now Russian military, the Air Force has continued development of the F–22 based largely on what it states is its desire to guarantee air superiority over any potential adversary for the foreseeable future. The original F–22 inventory objective of 750 aircraft has since been revised downwards, to a figure of 339 today, enough to equip three wings plus expected attrition reserve requirements.

As currently configured, there is little doubt that the F–22, if it meets its performance specifications, would far outclass any single fighter known to be under development. Even with the change in the threat environment, little of the F–22's high performance characteristics have changed in the past decade. The Air Force would concede that both development and production of the F–22 is indeed a challenging task, for that is the purpose of the program—to develop a fighter so capable that it will guarantee U.S. forces air superiority for decades once it is fielded.

However, the ambitious technical goals of the F–22, which include a series of new production processes as well as the most advanced avionics and electronics ever fielded on a U.S. aircraft, have led to a series of delays in the F–22 development program. Juxtaposed with the Air Force's desired fielding schedule, this has led to a program whose recent history has been marked by continual cost growth and whose current acquisition profile would, even if examined in isolation, raise serious questions about the overall affordability and feasibility of this program.

Given these factors, and the magnitude of other Air Force problems in personnel, readiness and modernization, the Committee decided to make the F–22 a focus of its deliberations. The following sections cites the key points which it took into consideration when making its recommendations.

F–22 CONCERNS

F–22 has been experiencing technical problems.—The F–22 has experienced several technical problems including: manufacturing problems with titanium castings; delamination of longerons; structural weaknesses in aft fuselage; anomalies in brakes, inertial reference system and environmental control system; nagging fuel leaks; problems with engine low pressure turbine blades, high pressure turbine blades, and engine combustors; and problems with excessive engine vibration. The Air Force reports that there are 97 issues limiting aircraft operations and 68 issues limiting ground maintenance. There are already indications that further flight test-

ing in fiscal year 1999 will be curtailed while the Air Force labors to correct these technical problems. While the Committee recognizes that the sophisticated technology intended for use in the F–22 makes such technical problems likely, it also must consider that the successful resolution of these problems will further both delay schedules and drive up costs.

Affordability of the F–22 is questionable.—Based on Air Force acquisition reports, the F–22—even without further cost growth—is projected to cost three times as much as the aircraft it replaces (the F–15). The unit cost of the six F–22's proposed to be procured with fiscal year 2000 funds is $300 million per plane compared to a $55 million per plane cost for the F–15. To finance such an expensive program, DoD's modernization plan requires unprecedented levels of spending on tactical aircraft over the next 20 years. In fact, DoD's tactical aircraft modernization plan requires twice the historical percentage of procurement dollars to buy roughly half the number of aircraft.

The Air Force has not demonstrated it can control F–22 costs.—Ten years ago, the Committee recommended termination of the F–22 (then called the Advanced Tactical Fighter) based in part on concerns over cost growth and unrealistic budgeting. Then, the Air Force told the Committee that F–22 development would cost $14 billion, a $900 million increase from the estimate provided six months earlier. Since then, the program has experienced a decade of cost growth with the current estimate for F–22 development now exceeding $23 billion. In the last six months alone, the development cost increased another $700 million and the production cost of just the first 6 aircraft increased $300 million.

The Committee notes, that without any further cost growth, the F–22 program is budgeted for more than $23 billion over the next six years alone, and has a "total cost to complete" of $40 billion assuming the Air Force's current schedule, cost estimates, and inventory objective of 339 remain static. Independent cost estimates developed within the Pentagon, the Congressional Budget Office, and the General Accounting Office all indicate that the Air Force production cost estimates are excessively optimistic. For example, the Cost Analysis Improvement Group within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, responsible for developing independent cost estimates for the Secretary, believes the F–22's total production costs are understated by at least $9 billion.

The current F–22 acquisition plan has a high potential for even further cost growth.—The F–22 is a technically challenging program combining stealth, advanced sensors and avionics, and the ability to cruise at supersonic speeds. The Air Force will not finish basic testing of these capabilities for another four years. To date, the program has completed only five percent of the required testing. The advanced sensors and avionics (perhaps the highest risk elements of the program) have not been tested on the F–22 at all. Yet this year's budget proposes production funding for six aircraft.

Overall, the Air Force's acquisition strategy requires the purchase of over $13 billion worth of aircraft before completion of basic operational testing. The unit cost of these initial aircraft increased 40 percent over the last 2 years, and any problems found during the next four years of testing will simply add to these costs.

U.S. has overwhelming numerical advantage of advanced fighters without F–22.—Current threat projections for 2010 indicate that the United States will have a 5 to 1 numerical advantage of advanced fighters against our most challenging adversaries without the F–22. Against what could be considered the most likely medium term adversaries used in Air Force planning scenarios, the United States enjoys a numeric advantage of 26 of our advanced fighters for every one belonging to our adversaries.

POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVES

The Committee also examined potential alternatives to the current F–22 program, and makes the following findings.

F–15 economic service life extends beyond 2015.—The Air Force has justified the need for the F–22 in part as a replacement for aging F–15 aircraft. However, service life data from the Air Force indicates that the F–15 can exceed 16,000 flying hours without major structural changes. The average age of the F–15 inventory is expected to be only 8000 flying hours by 2015.

F–15 can be improved to provide greatly enhanced combat capability.—F–15 combat capabilities can be improved substantially with upgraded radars, jammers, and helmet mounted targeting systems. The most cost effective upgrade may be a new datalink which allows aircraft to share target information. Air Force testimony to the Committee this year described the so-called "Link 16" datalink as "the most significant increase in fighter avionics since the introduction of the on-board radar." Tests with this $200,000 per aircraft upgrade to the F–15 have demonstrated a five-fold increase in air combat kill ratios.

(The Committee fails to understand why the Air Force has neglected to budget for this modestly priced upgrade for all its combat coded F–15s, while it chooses to request $150 million in fiscal year 2000 to redesign F–22 parts that have already become obsolete. The Committee notes that while this upgrade makes the F–15 five times more effective in the air combat mission, the Air Force only requires the F–22 to be twice as effective as the F–15.)

JSF has robust air-to-air capabilities and will be available in fiscal year 2007.—The Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), in development to produce a lower cost, yet highly capable replacement for Navy F/A–18's, Marine Corps F/A–18's and AV–8B's, and Air Force F–16's is scheduled to begin production deliveries in 2007. This program will be badly needed in this timeframe to begin replacing these aircraft types, which comprise the vast majority of the U.S. tactical fighter force, as their age and usage rates make a replacement in this timeframe essential, While incorporating advanced technology similar to that being developed for the F–22, the much higher inventory objective (over 2,800 aircraft) plus the lack of any other alternatives at present to deal with the block obsolescence issue make the JSF, in the Committee's view, one of the DoD's highest acquisition priorities.

Like the F–22, the Joint Strike Fighter combines stealth and advanced avionics to provide a robust air-to-air capability. Unlike the F–22, the JSF is being designed to be an affordable joint aircraft with far superior air-to-ground capabilities.

U.S. has other advantages in the area of air dominance.—While not minimizing the potential advantages which accrue to the side with a high technology air superiority aircraft, the Committee believes that the achievement of air dominance in the information age is more than one-on-one dogfights. Eight years ago, during Operation Desert Storm, 200 Iraqi aircraft were destroyed or captured on the ground whereas only 35 were destroyed in air-to-air combat. Since then, the U.S. has immensely improved its ability to achieve battlefield information dominance and to prosecute ground targets with precision guided weapons. The U.S. ability to damage runways, destroy aircraft fuel and repair infrastructure, and disrupt enemy command and control is improving markedly with the continued introduction of precision stand-off weapons into the bomber and tactical fighter inventory. This will severely limit any adversary's ability to get fighters airborne to mount serious challenges to U.S. fighters.

Should enemy fighters get airborne, absent a complete change in U.S. training and readiness priorities, they will likely confront a U.S. force possessing large numbers of highly maintained advanced fighters operated by better trained pilots with superior situational awareness. Despite current inventory problems (due largely to limited numbers of the total number of specialized platforms), there is no question the United States enjoys tremendous advantages in surveillance (AWACS, JSTARS), jamming (EA–6B, EC–130), command, control and communications, intelligence (RC–135s, EP–3s, UAVs, satellites), tactics, training, maintenance, and long-range precision weapons. It is vitally important that sufficient resources be invested in these systems as well—something the Committee believes is not being done.

MAJOR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AIR FORCE PROGRAM REPRIORITIZATION

As outlined earlier in this report, the Air Force is currently facing critical problems in terms of personnel, overall readiness, and funding for many essential warfighting needs, including many that give U.S. forces significant operational advantages over any adversary. The Committee believes the case for addressing these shortfalls as soon as possible is compelling. At the same time, the Committee is not convinced that the F–22 program as currently constituted can continue as planned, especially considering the other difficulties confronting the Air Force and the DoD generally.

Therefore, the Committee believes that unless and until the Air Force and the Department of Defense can clearly demonstrate how they intend to meet these competing demands, continued F–22 production is not justified at this time. The Committee thus recommends an F–22 "production pause" until these issues can be resolved. To implement this recommendation, the Committee specifically denies the $1.8 billion F–22 production funding requested for fiscal year 2000. The Secretary of the Air Force is further directed to take all necessary actions to cease production of aircraft funded in fiscal year 1999 and use all available procurement funds provided in that year to finance activities needed to ensure an orderly pause in the production program.

The Committee does approve the budgeted amount of $1.2 billion for F–22 development. These funds are provided in expectation that they will be used to complete the buy of nine F–22 development aircraft previously purchased. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to use these funds to take all necessary actions to restructure the ongoing F–22 development program into an affordable demonstration program tailored to reduce the risk of the Joint Strike Fighter. The Committee's expectation is that nine F–22 test aircraft currently funded will be more than sufficient to satisfy the requirements of this tailored demonstration program. The Committee therefore directs that none of the funds provided for the F–22 can be used to acquire more than nine flying test aircraft without written prior notification to the congressional defense committees. The Committee further reminds the Air Force that section 8090 of the Committee bill prohibits the use of research and development funding for procurement of aircraft for operational use.

Regarding other major Air Force issues, the Committee recommands significant increases over the budget request for a variety of programs such as: Air Force personnel recruiting and retention incentives (including $300 million over the budget for the aviation continuation pay program, targeted at retaining mid-grade pilots); spare parts and war reserve shortages; quality of life upgrades at Air Force facilities; and weapons modernization enhancements. The latter includes additions over the budget request for new production F–15 and F–16 fighters, and upgrades for these aircraft. The Committee also has provided funds over the budget request for bomber modernization, to accelerate upgrades to the existing inventory of B–52, B–1 and B–2 bombers, and has also increased funding for precision guided weapons. The Committee also proposes adding funding for a variety of Air Force reconnaissance assets including one additional Joint STARS aircraft, additional Predator unmanned aerial vehicles, and upgrades to existing RC–135 RIVET JOINT and U–2 surveillance platforms. The Committee also provides sizable increases in funding for the KC–135 tanker and RIVET JOINT engine upgrade programs. Finally, the Committee also adds $100 million to the Joint Strike Fighter program for risk reduction efforts. Additional details on these and other Air Force program adjustments can be found elsewhere in this report.

ENSURING "LESSONS LEARNED" ARE INCORPORATED INTO FY 2001–2006 DEFENSE PLANNING

The Committee commends the Secretary of Defense for his establishment of an "After-Action Review Board" to assess Operation Allied Force, jointly chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, with representation from the services and the Joint Staff. The Committee expects that this group will examine issues associated with the actual conduct of Operation Allied Force, which as the first offensive military operation in NATO's history clearly evidenced the various problems, be they political, strategic, or tactical, associated with coalition warfare on this scale.

However, the Committee also believes that this group, which is meeting while the Department is also developing its detailed fiscal year 2001–2006 defense plan, must also seek to address the force

structure, organizational, and resource allocation cited earlier in this report. The Committee, therefore, recommends a new general provision (Section 8129), which following after the lead of a similar congressionally-mandated review following the Persian Gulf War, is intended to build on the Secretary's initiative by directing that he formally assess the conduct of Operation Allied Force, as well as that of Operation Desert Fox in December 1998. The Committee believes it imperative the Secretary use these reviews to determine deficiencies in existing U.S. capabilities; report on his findings to both the President and Congress; and to the degree possible, incorporate these findings into the defense planning guidance and the fiscal year 2001 budget submission. Under this section, the Secretary is to report his initial findings to the President and the Congress not later than October 15, 1999, and will submit his final report with the submission of the fiscal year 2001 budget request.

ENSURING APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS INTEGRITY

The Committee recommends a number of initiatives to ensure that appropriated funds will not be diverted to programs without the required congressional notification or approval. To address the agency problems cited earlier in this report, the Committee recommends several adjustments to Section 8005 of the Committee bill, which provides the Secretary of Defense with the authority to transfer funds and propose reprogramming of funds. In the instance of problems encountered with specific acquisition programs, the Committee has also proposed several general provisions which realign and limit certain funding, as well as a number of appropriations adjustments described elsewhere in this report.

MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT

The Defense Department proposed a number of new multiyear procurement initiatives in the fiscal year 2000 budget. As described earlier in this report, the Committee is concerned that defense acquisition budgets will not materialize as forecast. As a result, the Committee believes it unwise to commit at this stage to any additional new multiyear procurements. If such contracts are initiated and subsequently broken for lack of funds, there would be severe cost penalties and program disruption. On the other hand, those programs not subject to multiyear contracts could suffer disproportionate reductions as an even larger share of defense procurement funding could be locked into long-term contracts.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that no funds or authority be provided to initiate new multiyear contracts in fiscal year 2000. Section 8008 of the Committee bill, which in past years has provided multiyear contracting authority, has been modified to prohibit new multiyear contracts. This action has no effect on on-gong multiyear contracts begun in prior years with prior appropriations, except in those instances where authority is sought to expand such contracts beyond their original timeframes.

ADDRESSING HIGH PRIORITY SHORTFALLS

The Committee bill recommends additions to the budget request of over $3.6 billion to address unbudgeted shortfalls identified by

the military Service Chiefs in personnel, acquisition and readiness-related programs. In total, the Committee recommends additions to the budget request that encompass nearly 44 percent of the non-contingency operation-related unbudgeted shortfalls identified by the military Service Chiefs. The Committee has also recommended increases over the budget request and fiscal year 1999 enacted levels for intelligence programs. Specific details are cited throughout the report and the classified annex.

ENSURING A QUALITY READY FORCE

Personnel Issues.—The Committee fully funded the 4.4 percent military pay raise in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill (Public Law 106–31). The Committee recommends an additional $165,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 to increase the pay raise to 4.8 percent. The Committee has fully funded and in some cases adds funds over the budget request for other pay compensation and bonus programs.

Military Medical Programs.—The Committee recommends fully funding the Defense Health Program and has provided a net increase of over $480,000,000 above the budget request for a variety of health care efforts.

Training/OPTEMPO.—For the Active duty forces, the Committee has added $112,100,000 to fund various shortfalls at the rotational training centers and $55,600,000 for operating tempo deficiencies in both the active and Guard and Reserve components identified by the Service Chiefs.

Spare Parts/War Reserve Material Shortfalls.—The Committee has added $453,000,000 to fund shortfalls in the active and Reserve components' stocks of spare and repair parts, to maintain near-term readiness and ensure sustainability of U.S. forces.

Equipment Repair/Maintenance.—The Committee has added $297,900,000 for depot level maintenance of active and Reserve component weapons systems and support equipment.

Real Property Maintenance.—The Committee has added a total of $854,000,000 for real property maintenance, targeted at quality-of-life related needs at defense installations.

Force Protection.—The Committee has added $41,400,000 for force protection initiatives identified by the military services as unfunded priorities. In addition, the Committee recommends that five percent of the additional $400,000,000 provided to the active components for base operations support be directed toward installation security and force protection costs.

Soldier Support Equipment.—The Committee has added $88,000,000 to fund purchases of additional soldier support equipment such as cold weather clothing, body armor and initial issue equipment for both the active and Reserve components.

MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS

The fiscal year 2000 budget request proposes an increase of $4,440,977,000 over fiscal year 1999 levels for modernization programs. While this increase is welcomed by the Committee, persistent shortfalls still exist. The Committee has included many recommendations throughout this bill which address these shortfalls identified from the testimony of Defense Department witnesses as

well as shortfall lists provided to the Committee by the Department. In total, the bill recommends a net increase to the budget request of over $1,179,859,000 for procurement programs.

The most significant recommendations include:

Missile Defense.—The Committee recommends total funding of $3,899,543,000 for the Ballistic Missile Defense Program. This total includes $761,555,000 for national missile defense and $1,116,432,000 for theater systems. The Committee has provided $527,871,000 for the Theater High Altitude Air Defense (THAAD) program, a reduction of $83,755,000 to the budget request due to the delay in entering the engineering and manufacturing development phase. A total of $419,768,000 in new appropriations is proposed for the Navy Theater-Wide (Upper Tier) program, an increase of $90,000,000 above the budget request.

Major Weapon Programs.—The Committee recommends fully funding the budget request for the Army's Crusader next generation artillery system, the Navy's AV–8B and F/A–18 E/F aircraft, the carrier replacement program, and DDG–51 and LPD–17 ships. The Committee has also funded the number of C–17 aircraft requested by the Air Force.

The Committee has added funds over the budget request to procure additional aircraft such as UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters for the Army, JPATS trainer aircraft for the Navy and Air Force, V–22 and KC–130Js for the Marine Corps, and F–15, F–16 and JSTARS aircraft for the Air Force. The Committee has also added funds over the request for Apache modifications, Bradley fighting vehicle industrial base sustainment, KC–135 tanker re-engining, continued upgrades to the B–2 bomber fleet and additional AMRAAM missiles.

Mission Essential Shortfalls.—The Committee has included additional funding for less glamorous, yet mission essential items which are critical for the capabilities of deployed troops. The Committee recommends increases over the budget request for such items as: tactical radios ($40,000,000), afloat protection systems ($24,400,000), enhancements to the EA–6B electronic warfare aircraft fleet ($111,000,000), ammunition for all services ($202,954,000), communication and electronics infrastructure equipment ($135,200,000) and tracked vehicle modification kits ($60,500,000).

Guard and Reserve Components.—The Committee continues its support of the Guard and Reserve in the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill with recommended increases of approximately $616,000,000 over the budget request for selected personnel and operation and maintenance programs. With respect to modernization programs, the Committee has provided $2,485,300,000 in accounts throughout the bill for procurement of National Guard and Reserve Equipment. This is an increase of $796,400,000 above the budget request for aircraft, tactical vehicles, miscellaneous equipment and upgrades to miscellaneous equipment for the guard and reserve components of the total force.

REFORMS/PROGRAM REDUCTIONS

The following table shows selected programs in the budget request which the Committee has eliminated or reduced funding

based on their having a relatively low priority, program duplication, unaffordability, or where the requested funding is excessive due to fact-of-life changes or when compared to previously enacted levels.

Program	*Reduction*
F–22 Production Pause	–$1,852,075,000
Revised Fiscal Year 1999 Inflation Estimates	–452,100,000
Chemical Demilitarization Program	–388,000,000
Military end-strength underexecution	–212,300,000
Headquarters and Administrative Expenses	–179,000,000
Discoverer II	–108,481,000
Javelin Missile	–98,000,000
THAAD	–83,755,000
T–38 Upgrade	–77,000,000
JSOW	–68,000,000
GPS Satellites	–67,498,000
SADARM Procurement	–54,546,000
Standard Missile	– 43,600,000
Maneuver Control System	–42,049,000
SHF Terminals	–31,950,000

TACTICAL RECONNAISSANCE

During Operation Allied Force and the subsequent deployment of NATO peace keeping troops in the Balkans region, the Committee believes the Department of Defense learned at least two important lessons with respect to tactical reconnaissance: it is extremely valuable and there are not enough assets. It was clear to many of the commanders that the RIVET JOINT and unmanned aerial vehicle assets became the best "eyes and ears" tactical intelligence monitoring available in theater. The problem is that there are a limited number of these assets and staffing is extremely lean.

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles proved their worth during Operation Allied Force. The vehicles could fly at altitudes and in areas that could not and should not be attempted by manned aircraft. The vehicles were vulnerable to enemy fire but managed to provide valuable intelligence that was used to target future strikes and monitor troop movements.

The RIVET JOINT, U–2 and special Navy manned reconnaissance aircraft were also effective during Operation Allied Force. These aircraft were a lucrative source of intelligence and logged in excess of 700 sorties over Kosovo and surrounding areas. Due to their effectiveness, these assets were popular with local commanders. However, the numbers of these aircraft are incredibly limited which puts tremendous pressure on aircrews.

Despite the obvious benefits of these reconnaissance assets and the fact that they are major providers of intelligence for force protection, target acquisition, troop movements, and battle damage assessment, the Department's fiscal year 2000 budget does not include adequate funding for its tactical reconnaissance requirements. Therefore, the Committee has included a total of $270,100,000 above the budget request to fund a variety of upgrades for tactical reconnaissance assets.

The following is a list of the additional major items for which funding is provided by the Committee:

	Amount
Predator Unmanned Aerial Vehicle	+$20,000,000
Global Hawk Unmanned Aerial Vehicle	+25,000,000

	Amount
RIVET JOINT	+102,200,000
U–2	+36,000,000
Joint SIGINT Avionics Family	+17,400,000

The Committee believes that these funds will provide significant tactical reconnaissance capability for future operations. The Department should ensure that the benefits from these increases are not shortchanged in future budget requests and that needed enhancements and aircraft replacements are fully funded.

INFORMATION ASSURANCE

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is vulnerable to unauthorized entries into its information infrastructure that could endanger U.S. troops or compromise U.S. security. There have been many instances in the past few years in which individuals outside of the Department of Defense have gained unauthorized access to the Defense Information Infrastructure. This is a serious threat to the protection of vital data. The DoD must have confidence that unauthorized persons have not altered critical information.

Therefore, throughout this report, the Committee recommends increases of over $500,000,000 to the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request, for critical technology developments and system upgrades that will provide information superiority and information assurance. As a part of this overall funding level, the Committee recommends providing an additional $150,000,000 for the Deputy Secretary of Defense to use in support of these efforts in section 8114 of the Committee bill. These funds are available for transfer by the Deputy Secretary to those agencies and organizations that require additional funds for specific projects, programs and activities that support information assurance and computer security. The Committee anticipates these funds will only be used as part of an overall Department of Defense Information Assurance Plan and not simply divided proportionately among the Services.

The Committee therefore has included language which prohibits the transfer of any portion of the additional $150,000,000 until the Deputy Secretary has submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a proposed funding allocation and plan, with specific goals, targeted at meeting DoD's needs in information superiority and information assurance.

PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WMD TERRORIST ATTACKS

Section 8113 of the Committee bill provides an additional $50,000,000 above the budget request to enhance efforts underway within the Department to develop a domestic emergency response capability against potential terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction. These funds are to be allocated as follows:

RAID Team Training/Equipment.—To complete the training and outfitting of Rapid Assessment Initial Detection (RAID) teams funded in FY 1999 and in this bill, including procurement of unified command suites and mobile analytical laboratory systems.

Appropriation	*Amount*
National Guard Personnel, Army	$4,240,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,060,000

Appropriation	*Amount*
Operation and Maintenance, Army	10,930,000
Other Procurement, Army	12,180,000

Military Support Detachment RAID (Light) Team.—To provide the training and preliminary equipment issue to field an initial operating capability for one traditional drilling Military Support Detachment RAID (Light) team.

	Amount
National Guard Personnel, Army	$70,000
National Guard Personnel, Air Force	20,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army	1,180,000

Additional Training/Exercises/Coordination Activities.—To enhance the training, organization, and support of DOD forces to prepare for and respond to WMD terrorism, and to enhance interoperability and connectivity between local, state, and federal interagency WMD response forces.

	Amount
Reserve Personnel, Army	$2,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	12,320,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	6,000,000

Of the funds provided for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard, the bill provides: $3,000,000 only to establish a cost effective counter terrorism training program at the Memorial Tunnel facility which has been outfitted by the Federal Highway Administration to study the effects of fire and smoke mitigation in enclosed spaces; $2,000,000 to develop a structured undergraduate research program to address the shortage of laboratory personnel skilled in the study of organisms and chemicals necessary to defend against biological and chemical weapons; $3,500,000 to enhance the Army National Guard's distance learning capabilities by implementing and expanding the Virtual Readiness University concept, enhancing the security of the Guardnet 21 backbone, and other related initiatives.

The Committee believes the National Guard's Distance Learning Network provides a ready-made and cost-effective infrastructure to deliver WMD training courses across the country to local, state, and federal WMD response forces. The Committee recommends that the National Guard Bureau and the Department of Justice establish a collaborative training program to make expanded use of the National Guard Distance Learning Network, and other training and education resources of the National Guard and Department of Justice, to train civilian and military personnel.

Of the funds provided for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, the bill provides $3,000,000 (PE 273610A) to continue consequence management and related training activities through the National Terrorism Preparedness Institute at the Southeastern Public Safety Institute. In addition, funds are provided to study the mass psychological trauma and impact of a WMD terrorism attack on civilians and on the military, and to identify appropriate response strategies.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS BY MAJOR CATEGORY

ACTIVE MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Committee recommends a total of $62,132,237,000 for active military personnel, a reduction of $1,526,243,000 below the budget request. The Committee has reduced the active and reserve military personnel accounts by $1,838,426,000 to reflect action taken in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) which provided advance funding for the fiscal year 2000 pay and retirement reform initiatives proposed by the President. The Committee also includes additional funds to pay for the cost of the pay raise increase from 4.4 percent to 4.8 percent, as proposed in the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. The Committee agrees with the authorized end strength as requested in the President's budget, and has included funds to provide for additional personnel costs for the Navy and Marine Corps.

GUARD AND RESERVE

The Committee recommends a total of $9,899,740,000, a decrease of $165,073,000 below the budget request for Guard and Reserve personnel. The Committee agrees with the authorized end strength as requested in the President's budget for Selected Reserve, and has included funds to provide for additional personnel costs for the Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard. The Committee has also included funds for the proposed pay raise to 4.8 percent.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Operation and maintenance appropriation provides for the readiness of U.S. Forces as well as the maintenance of facilities and equipment, the infrastructure that supports the combat forces and the quality of life service members and their families.

The Committee recommends $93,686,750,000, a net increase of $2,418,501,000 above the fiscal year 2000 budget request. This increase in driven primarily by the need to address shortfalls in funding for rotational training centers, spare and repair part stocks, depot-level maintenance, support equipment, and the infrastructure of U.S. military bases. The Committee also recommends reductions from the budget request as the result of fact of life changes and management actions the Department should undertake to streamline activities.

PROCUREMENT

The Committee recommends $53,031,397,000 in obligational authority for programs funded in Title III of the bill, Procurement, a net increase of $1,179,859,000 over the fiscal year 2000 budget request. Major programs funded in the bill include the following:

$207,140,000 for 19 UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters.

$774,536,000 for Apache Longbow modifications.

$296,472,000 for 2200 Hellfire missiles.

$307,677,000 for 2682 Javelin anti-tank missiles.

$138,134,000 for 47 MLRS launcher systems.

$392,762,000 for Bradley fighting vehicle industrial base sustainment.

$422,996,000 for the Abrams Tank upgrade program.
$260,444,000 for 12 AV–8B strike aircraft.
$2,691,989,000 for 36 F/A–18E/F fighter aircraft.
$856,392,000 for 11 V–22 aircraft.
$284,493,000 for 17 CH–60S helicopters.
$325,476,000 for 15 T–45 Trainer aircraft.
$576,257,000 for 8 KC–130J airlift aircraft.
$361,202,000 for P–3 aircraft modifications.
$437,488,000 for 12 Trident II ballistic missiles.
$155,267,000 for 91 Standard missiles.
$751,540,000 for the aircraft carrier replacement program.
$748,497,000 for the New Attack Submarine.
$2,681,653,000 for 3 DDG–51 Destroyers.
$1,508,338,000 for 2 LPD–17 ships.
$439,966,000 for 1 ADC(X) ship.
$440,000,000 for 8 F–15 aircraft.
$350,610,000 for 15 F–16 aircraft.
$2,671,047,000 for 15 C–17 aircraft.
$468,465,000 for 2 JSTARS aircraft.
$321,818,000 for F–15 modifications.
$295,536,000 for F–16 modifications.
$552,988,000 for C–135 modifications.
$190,279,000 for AMRAAM missiles.
$300,898,000 for 32 Patriot PAC–3 missiles.
$2,044,331,000 for ammunition for all services.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The Committee recommends $37,169,446,000 for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation. Major programs funded in the bill include:
$282,937,000 for the Crusader artillery system.
$427,069,000 for the Comanche helicopter.
$190,931,000 for cooperative engagement capability.
$251,456,000 for new submarine design.
$111,580,000 for ship self defense.
$308,634,000 for the Airborne Laser program.
$576,612,000 for the Joint Strike Fighter.
$1,222,232,000 for F–22 development.
$344,165,000 for B–2 development.
$322,803,000 for the evolved expendable launch vehicle program.
$527,871,000 for Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD).
$419,768,000 for Navy Theater Wide Missile Defense.
$761,555,000 for National Missile Defense.

FORCES TO BE SUPPORTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The fiscal year 2000 budget is designed to support active Army forces of 10 divisions, 3 armored cavalry regiments, and reserve forces of 8 divisions, 3 separate brigades, and 15 enhanced National Guard brigades (6 enhanced brigades will be aligned under 2 AC/ARNG integrated division headquarters). These forces provide the minimum force necessary to meet enduring defense needs and execute the National Military Strategy.

A summary of the major active forces follows:

	Fiscal year—		
	1998	1999	2000
Divisions:			
Airborne	1	1	1
Air Assault	1	1	1
Light	2	(−) 1/1	[1] 2
Infantry	0	0	0
Mechanized	4	4	4
Armored	2	2	2
Total	10	10	10
Non-division Combat units:			
Armored cavalry regiments:	3	3	3
Separate brigades	0	0	[1] 1
Total	3	3	4
Active duty military personnel, end strength (thousands)	495	480	480

[1] Separate brigade is aligned to one of the light divisions.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The fiscal year 2000 budget supports battle forces totaling 316 ships at the end of fiscal year 2000, a decrease of 1 ship from fiscal year 1999. Forces in fiscal year 2000 include 18 strategic submarines, 11 aircraft carriers, 245 other battle force ships, 1,852 Navy/Marine Corps tactical/ASW aircraft, 645 Undergraduate Training aircraft, 454 Fleet Air Training aircraft, 238 Fleet Air Support aircraft, 442 Reserve aircraft, and 450 aircraft in the pipeline.

A summary of the major forces follows:

	Fiscal year—		
	1998	1999	2000
Strategic Forces	18	18	18
Submarines	18	18	18
Other	0	0	0
SLBM Launchers	432	432	432
General Purpose	271	256	256
Aircraft Carriers	11	11	11
Surface Combatants	107	106	108
Submarines (Attack)	65	57	56
Amphibious Warfare Ships	38	37	37
Combat Logistics Ships	39	34	34
Other	11	11	11
Support Forces	25	25	25
Mobile Logistics Ships	3	2	2
Support Ships	22	23	23
Mobilization Category A	18	18	16
Aircraft Carriers	1	1	1
Surface Combatants	10	10	8
Amphibious Warfare Ships	2	2	2
Mine Warfare	5	5	5

	Fiscal year—		
	1998	1999	2000
Total Ships, Battle Force	333	317	316
Total Local Defense/Misc Forces	162	161	167
Auxiliaries/Sea Lift Forces	139	138	143
Surface Combatant Ships	2	1	0
Coastal Defense	13	12	13
Mobilization Category B	6	8	10
Surface Combatants	0	0	0
Mine Warfare Ships	8	10	11
Support Ships	0	0	0
Naval Aircraft:			
Primary Authorized (Plus-Pipe)	4,204	4,128	4,168
Authorized Pipeline	476	456	450
Tactical/ASW Aircraft	1,873	1,871	1,852
Fleet Air Training	489	469	454
Fleet Air Support	247	242	238
Training (Undergraduate)	675	648	645
Reserve	444	442	442
Naval Personnel:			
Active	560,036	544,896	543,929
Navy	386,894	372,696	371,781
Marine Corps	173,142	172,200	172,148
Reserve:			
Navy	94,294	90,843	90,288
SELRES	78,158	75,253	75,278
TARS	16,136	15,590	15,010

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The fiscal year 2000 Air Force budget is designed to support a total active inventory force structure of 49 fighter and attack squadrons, 6 Air National Guard air defense interceptor squadrons and 8 bomber squadrons, including B–2s, B–52s, and B–1s. The Minuteman and Peacekeeper ICBM forces will consist of 700 active launchers.

A summary of the major forces follows:

	1998	1999	2000
USAF fighter and attack (Active)	51	51	49
USAF fighter and attack (ANG and AFRC	36	35	35
Air defense interceptor (ANG)	10	6	6
Strategic bomber (Active)	8	9	8
Strategic bomber (ANG and AFRC)	3	3	3
ICBM launchers/silos	700	700	700
ICBM missile boosters	580	580	550
USAF airlift squadrons (Active):			
Strategic airlift	13	13	11
Tactical airlift	9	9	9
Total Airlift	22	22	20
Total Active Inventory	6,242	6,207	6,187

	FY 1998 (Actual)	FY 1999 Col FY 00 PB	FY 2000
Active Duty	367,470	365,882	360,877
Reserve Component	180,066	181,233	180,386
Air National Guard	108,096	106,991	106,678

	FY 1998 (Actual)	FY 1999 Col FY 00 PB	FY 2000
Air Force Reserve	71,970	74,242	73,708

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS

The President's fiscal year 2000 budget request has made military personnel its first priority to improve retention and recruiting through a more equitable compensation package. The budget request proposed increasing the military personnel accounts by over $3,100,000,000 from the fiscal year 1999 enacted levels, and by more than $36,000,000,000 over the Five Year Defense Plan. These personnel initiatives include enhanced pay raises, reform of the basic pay tables, legislation to repeal the Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986, new legislative initiatives designed to improve recruiting and retention in specific skill areas or critical military skills, and increased funding for enlistment bonuses and education benefits to help the Services' meet their accession goals.

The Committee, in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31), provided $1,838,426,000 in advance funds to support the President's fiscal year 2000 request for a 4.4 percent pay raise, pay table reform and retirement reform. In addition to the funds provided in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental, the Committee recommends including $164,510,000 for an increase of 0.4 percent in the military's pay raise to 4.8 percent, as proposed by the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. The Committee also includes $367,200,000 for increases to enlistment, reenlistment and aviation bonuses to improve recruiting and retention in the Department, $103,800,000 for recruiting, advertising and recruiter support programs, and $225,000,000 for the acceleration of the Basic Allowance for Housing reform.

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Fiscal year 1999	$70,607,566,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	73,723,293,000
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	72,011,977,000
Change from budget request	−1,711,316,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $72,011,977,000 for the Military Personnel accounts. The recommendation is an increase of $1,404,411,000 above the $70,607,566,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1999. These military personnel budget total comparisons include appropriations for the active, reserve, and National Guard accounts. The following tables include a summary of the recommendations by appropriation account. Explanations of changes from the budget request appear later in this section.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2000 MILITARY PERSONNEL RECOMMENDATION

[In thousands of dollars]

Account	Budget	Recommendation	Change from budget
Military Personnel:			
Army	$22,006,632	$21,475,732	−$530,900
Navy	17,207,481	16,737,072	−470,409
Marine Corps	6,544,682	6,353,622	−191,060
Air Force	17,899,685	17,565,811	−333,874
Subtotal, Active	63,658,480	62,132,237	−1,526,243
Reserve Personnel:			
Army	2,270,964	2,235,055	−35,909
Navy	1,446,339	1,425,210	−21,129
Marine Corps	409,189	403,822	−5,367
Air Force	881,170	872,978	−8,192
National Guard Personnel:			
Army	3,570,639	3,486,427	−84,212
Air Force	1,486,512	1,456,248	−30,264
Subtotal, Guard and Reserve	10,064,813	9,879,740	−185,073
Total, Title I	73,723,293	72,011,977	−1,711,316

The fiscal year 2000 budget request includes a decrease of 5,631 end strength for the active forces and a decrease of 11,744 end strength for the selected reserve over fiscal year 1999 authorized levels.

The Committee recommends the following levels highlighted in the tables below.

OVERALL ACTIVE END STRENGTH

Fiscal year 1999 estimate	1,390,437
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,384,806
Fiscal year 2000 House authorization	1,385,432
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	1,385,512
Compared with Fiscal year 1999	−4,925
Compared with Fiscal year 2000 budget request	+706

OVERALL SELECTED RESERVE END STRENGTH

Fiscal year 1999 estimate	877,042
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	865,298
Fiscal year 2000 House authorization	865,298
Fiscal year 2000 recommendation	865,373
Compared with Fiscal year 1999	−11,669
Compared with Fiscal year 2000 budget request	+75

	FY 1999 estimate	Budget request	Fiscal year 2000		
			House authorization	Recommendation	Change from request
Active Forces (end strength):					
Army	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000	.....
Navy	372,355	371,781	372,037	372,037	+256
Marine Corps	172,200	172,148	172,518	172,518	+370
Air Force	365,882	360,877	360,877	360,957	+80
Total, Active Force	1,390,437	1,384,806	1,385,432	1,385,512	+706

	FY 1999 estimate	Budget request	Fiscal year 2000		
			House authorization	Recommendation	Change from request
Guard and Reserve (end strength):					
Army Reserve	208,000	205,000	205,000	205,000	.....
Navy Reserve	90,843	90,288	90,288	90,288	.....
Marine Corps Reserve	39,966	39,624	39,624	39,624	.....
Air Force Reserve	74,242	73,708	73,708	73,764	+56
Army National Guard	357,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	.....
Air National Guard	106,991	106,678	106,678	106,697	+19
Total, Guard and Reserve	877,042	865,298	865,298	865,373	+75

ADJUSTMENTS TO MILITARY PERSONNEL ACCOUNT

OVERVIEW

END STRENGTH ADJUSTMENTS

The Committee recommends an understrength reduction of $212,300,000 to the budget request, as a result of a General Accounting Office review of the 1999 military personnel end strength levels. The General Accounting office has been examining the costs for military pay and allowances to determine if the fiscal year 2000 requirements are correct. They have concluded, based on May 1999 end strength projections, that the active components will begin fiscal year 2000 with approximately 12,000 fewer military personnel on-board than budgeted. In addition, actual data shows active military personnel on-board, by grade mix, is different than was requested in last year's budget request. This means the fiscal year 2000 pay and allowances requirements for personnel are incorrect and the budgets are overstated. The Committee will continue to monitor the Services end strength levels as more current data becomes available.

PAY AND RETIREMENT REFORM

The Committee included funds in support of the President's budget request for a 4.4 percent increase in basic pay, pay table reform, and the repeal of the 1986 Military Retirement Reform Act in the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31), and, therefore, recommends a reduction of $1,838,426,000 in the active and reserve military personnel accounts for fiscal year 2000 for these pay and compensation initiatives.

Subsequent to the Supplemental appropriations bill, however, the House-passed Defense Authorization bill recommended language to enhance the percentage pay raise for military personnel, effective January 1, 2000, and revised the budget's legislative proposal concerning the proposed repeal of the Redux retirement system. The Committee recommends an additional $164,510,000 to cover the cost of the increased pay raise, and recommends a reduction of $392,000,000 to the military personnel accounts for modifications to the Redux retirement system consistent with the House-passed authorization bill.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING

The Committee recommends an increase over the request of $225,000,000 for the reform of the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) program. In 1998, the services began phasing in the Basic Allowance for Housing program, which will replace two separate allowances, the Variable Housing Allowance and Basic Allowance for Quarters. The transition from the old housing allowance system to the new Basic Allowance for Housing was to be phased in over six years and was required to be cost neutral. The intent of BAH is to provide service members compensation that is based on comparable civilian costs of housing, and reduce their out-of-pocket housing expenses. The Committee recommends the additional funds to complete the transition phase of BAH reform, as recommended by the House-passed Defense Authorization bill, in order to protect service members from any further erosion of their housing benefits.

AVIATION CONTINUATION PAY

The Committee recommends an increase of $300,000,000 over the budget request to provide additional funds for the pilot Aviation Continuation Pay (ACP) bonus. The Committee is concerned about the high personnel tempo and operations tempo that aviation officers and enlisted crew members are undergoing, and understands that the Air Force is experiencing major retention problems in these career fields, as well as other critical skill areas. Prior to 1995, one in 14 pilots separated after 14 years of service. Today, one in four pilots separate prior to retirement. In addition, the Air Force is currently operating with approximately 1,100 less pilots, or at 92 percent of their manning requirements, and have projected over 1,600 pilot shortages by fiscal year 2003. The Committee believes that an increase in this bonus will allow the Air Force to implement an ACP program which offers bonuses to those eligible pilots who would otherwise separate from the military. The Committee also supports the budget request which establishes a new Career Enlisted Flyer Incentive Pay, designed to reverse declining retention of enlisted crew members.

UNFUNDED REQUIREMENTS

The Committee recommends an increase over the budget request of $592,200,000 for additional active duty and reserve component pays and allowances to enhance recruiting, retention and quality of life initiatives for military personnel, as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Enlistment Bonuses	$39,200
Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	28,000
Aviation Continuation Pay	300,000
Basic Allowance for Housing	225,000
Total	592,200

JROTC LEADERSHIP TRAINING

The Committee recommends an increase of $34,800,000 over the budget request in the services' personnel and operations and main-

tenance accounts to expand the number of JROTC programs during fiscal year 2000.

The Committee is impressed with the proposal of the George C. Marshall Foundation to develop, deliver, and evaluate a school-based community service program to develop ethical leadership and problem-solving abilities of JROTC students. The Committee commends this proposal to the Department for consideration.

QUALITY OF LIFE STUDY

The Committee is encouraged by the Department's decision to proceed with a service-wide quality of life survey similar to the model developed by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and reported in GAO Report NSIAD–99–197. The Committee expects that the Department's survey will take into account the factors GAO identified as having negative effects on unit morale and readiness, such as the availability of parts and equipment to perform daily job functions, the frequency of deployments, and other factors related to the work environment. In addition, the Committee supports a limited annual quality of life survey with consistent questions to develop longitudinal data on this issue. The Department may also consider the use of focus groups and the involvement of impartial entities to provide independent review and analysis. A report on the findings of the survey shall be submitted to the Committee by February 1, 2000.

GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES

The Committee recognizes that Guard and Reserve Forces are an essential part of the total force having played an important role in recent peacetime operations such as assistance to South American countries after Hurricane Mitch, and their continued work under the Enhanced New Horizons Exercises, Operations Desert Thunder/Fox in Southwest Asia, Operations Joint Guard/Forge in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and most recently the conflict in Kosovo. Many of the skills needed for response to a crisis reside in the Reserve components, guaranteeing the increased use of Reservists in military operations other than war. The Committee's recommendation for fiscal year 2000 continues its support of the Guard and Reserve and recommends an increase of $611,906,000 over the budget request for the operation and maintenance accounts. In addition to the $1,688,900,000 requested in the budget, and fully funded for Guard and Reserve equipment, the Committee has recommended $796,400,000 throughout the bill for additional aircraft, tactical vehicles, and various miscellaneous equipment and upgrades to existing equipment for the Guard and Reserve components. The following table summarizes the Guard and Reserve funding issues:

[In thousands of dollars]

Operation and Maintenance	+$611,900
Modernization	+796,400
Total	+1,408,306

FULL-TIME SUPPORT STRENGTHS

There are four categories of full-time support in the Guard and Reserve components: civilian technicians, active Guard and Reserve (AGR), non-technician civilians, and active component personnel.

Full-time support personnel organize, recruit, train, maintain and administer the Reserve components. Civilian (Military) technicians directly support units, and are very important to help units maintain readiness and meet the wartime mission of the Army and Air Force.

Full-time support end strength in all categories totaled 90,086 in fiscal year 1999. The fiscal year 2000 budget request is 113,827 end strength. The following table summarizes Guard and Reserve full-time support end strengths:

GUARD AND RESERVE FULL-TIME END STRENGTHS

	FY 1999 estimate	Budget estimate	House authorization	Recommendation	Change from request
Army Reserve:					
AGR	12,804	12,804	12,804	12,804	.....
Technicians	6,474	6,474	6,474	6,474	.....
Navy Reserve TAR	15,618	15,010	15,010	15,010	.....
Marine Corps Reserve	2,362	2,272	2,272	2,272	.....
Air Force Reserve:					
AGR	991	1,078	1,078	1,134	+56
Technicians	9,761	9,785	9,785	9,785	.....
Army National Guard:					
AGR	21,763	21,807	22,563	21,807	.....
Technicians	24,761	23,161	23,161	23,161	.....
Air National Guard:					
AGR	10,930	11,091	11,025	11,096	+5
Technicians	22,750	22,589	22,589	22,596	+7
Total:					
AGR/TAR	64,468	64,062	64,752	64,123	+61
Technicians	63,746	62,009	62,009	62,016	+7

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$20,841,687,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	22,006,632,000
Committee recommendation	21,475,732,000
Change from budget request	−530,900,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $21,475,732,000 for Military Personnel, Army. The recommendation is an increase of $634,045,000 above the $20,841,687,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

[IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS]

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
50	MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY			
100	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER			
150	BASIC PAY	3,628,563	3,628,563	---
200	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,163,712	1,163,712	---
350	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	619,968	619,968	---
400	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	149,286	149,286	---
450	INCENTIVE PAYS	77,071	77,071	---
500	SPECIAL PAYS	203,815	203,815	---
550	ALLOWANCES	86,756	86,756	---
600	SEPARATION PAY	87,929	87,929	---
650	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	275,798	275,798	---
700	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	6,292,898	6,292,898	---
750	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
800	BASIC PAY	7,774,659	7,774,659	---
850	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,493,248	2,493,248	---
1000	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,298,062	1,298,062	---
1050	INCENTIVE PAYS	69,232	69,232	---
1100	SPECIAL PAYS	374,543	423,543	+49,000
1150	ALLOWANCES	506,601	506,601	---
1200	SEPARATION PAY	270,039	270,039	---
1250	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	586,232	586,232	---
1300	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	13,372,616	13,421,616	+49,000
1350	ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS			
1400	ACADEMY CADETS	39,646	39,646	---
1500	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
1550	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	826,782	826,782	---
1600	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	459,889	459,889	---
1650	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	1,286,671	1,286,671	---
1700	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL			
1750	ACCESSION TRAVEL	129,429	129,429	---
1800	TRAINING TRAVEL	47,289	47,289	---
1850	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	136,305	136,305	---
1900	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	575,093	575,093	---
1950	SEPARATION TRAVEL	162,933	162,933	---
2000	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	6,409	6,409	---
2050	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	28,752	28,752	---
2100	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	10,605	10,605	---
2200	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	1,096,815	1,096,815	---
2250	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS			
2300	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	795	795	---
2350	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	487	487	---
2400	DEATH GRATUITIES	2,856	2,856	---
2450	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	102,292	102,292	---
2500	SURVIVOR BENEFITS	7,883	7,883	---
2600	ADOPTION EXPENSES	252	252	---
2700	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	114,565	114,565	---
2750	LESS REIMBURSABLES	-196,579	-196,579	---
2755	LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31	---	-559,533	-559,533
2770	PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-15,000	-15,000
2790	4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE	---	49,533	+49,533
2800	RETIREMENT REFORM	---	-127,500	-127,500
2805	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	72,600	+72,600
2840	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	22,006,632	21,475,732	-530,900

The adjustments to the budget activities for Military Personnel, Army are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:		
1100	Special Pays/Enlistment Bonuses	25,000
1100	Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonus	24,000
Other Adjustments:		
2755	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−559,533
2770	Personnel Underexecution	−15,000
2790	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	49,533
2800	Retirement Reform	−127,500
2805	Basic Allowance for Housing	72,600

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$16,570,754,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	17,207,481,000
Committee recommendation	16,737,072,000
Change from budget request	−470,409,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $16,737,072,000 for Military Personnel, Navy. The recommendation is an increase of $166,318,000 above the $16,570,754,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
2850 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY			
2900 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER			
2950 BASIC PAY	2,519,847	2,519,847	---
3000 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	809,915	809,915	---
3150 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	557,691	557,691	---
3200 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	102,631	102,631	---
3250 INCENTIVE PAYS	152,274	152,274	---
3300 SPECIAL PAYS	221,949	221,949	---
3350 ALLOWANCES	51,472	51,472	---
3400 SEPARATION PAY	50,517	50,517	---
3450 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	191,297	191,297	---
3500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	4,657,593	4,657,593	---
3550 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
3600 BASIC PAY	6,177,863	6,177,863	---
3650 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,976,919	1,976,919	---
3800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,428,369	1,428,369	---
3850 INCENTIVE PAYS	94,723	94,723	---
3900 SPECIAL PAYS	578,254	578,254	---
3950 ALLOWANCES	373,344	373,344	---
4000 SEPARATION PAY	123,654	123,654	---
4050 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	467,633	467,633	---
4100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	11,220,759	11,220,759	---
4150 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MIDSHIPMEN			
4200 MIDSHIPMEN	38,518	38,518	---
4300 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
4350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	538,334	538,334	---
4400 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	265,304	265,304	---
4450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	803,638	803,638	---
4500 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL			
4550 ACCESSION TRAVEL	56,062	56,062	---
4600 TRAINING TRAVEL	60,220	60,220	---
4650 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	141,795	141,795	---
4700 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	230,389	230,389	---
4750 SEPARATION TRAVEL	101,158	101,158	---
4800 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	19,620	19,620	---
4850 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	13,357	13,357	---
4900 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	5,556	5,556	---
4950 OTHER	4,710	4,710	---
5000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	632,867	632,867	---
5050 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS			
5100 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	839	839	---
5150 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	100	100	---
5200 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,806	1,806	---
5250 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	63,992	63,992	---
5300 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	3,173	3,173	---
5350 EDUCATION BENEFITS	9,341	9,341	---
5400 ADOPTION EXPENSES	272	272	---
5500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	79,523	79,523	---
5550 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-225,417	-225,417	---
5555 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31	---	-436,773	-436,773
5580 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-51,300	-51,300
5595 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE	---	37,464	+37,464
5605 RETIREMENT REFORM	---	-96,400	-96,400
5610 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	71,600	+71,600
5615 AOE-1 REPLENISHMENT SHIPS	---	5,000	+5,000
5640 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	17,207,481	16,737,072	-470,409

The adjustments to the budget activities for Military Personnel, Navy are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
5555	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−436,773
5580	Personnel Underexecution	−51,300
5595	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	37,464
5605	Retirement Reform	−96,400
5610	Basic Allowance for Housing	71,600
5615	AOE–1 Replenishment Ships	5,000

AOE–1 REPLENISHMENT SHIPS

The Committee recommends an increase over the budget request of $5,000,000 in "Military Personnel, Navy" to provide additional manpower costs for the required end strength associated with the decision not to implement the fiscal year 2000 decommissionings of the AOE–1 class of ships.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$6,263,387,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	6,544,682,000
Committee recommendation	6,353,622,000
Change from budget request	−191,060,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,353,622,000 for Military Personnel, Marine Corps. The recommendation is an increase of $90,235,000 above the $6,263,387,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
5650 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS			
5700 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER			
5750 BASIC PAY	811,861	811,861	---
5800 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	260,434	260,434	---
5950 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	145,075	145,075	---
6000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	34,253	34,253	---
6050 INCENTIVE PAYS	39,638	39,638	---
6100 SPECIAL PAYS	1,572	1,572	---
6150 ALLOWANCES	17,183	17,183	---
6200 SEPARATION PAY	13,925	13,925	---
6250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	61,402	61,402	---
6300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,385,343	1,385,343	---
6350 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
6400 BASIC PAY	2,738,038	2,738,038	---
6450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	876,634	876,634	---
6600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	410,051	410,051	---
6650 INCENTIVE PAYS	9,960	9,960	---
6700 SPECIAL PAYS	82,846	82,846	---
6750 ALLOWANCES	147,334	147,334	---
6800 SEPARATION PAY	58,998	58,998	---
6850 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	209,367	209,367	---
6900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	4,533,228	4,533,228	---
6950 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
7000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	249,032	249,032	---
7050 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	136,522	136,522	---
7100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	385,554	385,554	---
7150 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL			
7200 ACCESSION TRAVEL	28,409	28,409	---
7250 TRAINING TRAVEL	6,819	6,819	---
7300 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	63,604	63,604	---
7350 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	83,189	83,189	---
7400 SEPARATION TRAVEL	45,199	45,199	---
7450 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	994	994	---
7500 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	4,158	4,158	---
7550 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	5,565	5,565	---
7600 OTHER	1,698	1,698	---
7650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	239,635	239,635	---
7700 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS			
7750 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	880	880	---
7800 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	14	14	---
7850 DEATH GRATUITIES	996	996	---
7900 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	27,917	27,917	---
7950 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	1,200	1,200	---
8000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	959	959	---
8050 ADOPTION EXPENSES	46	46	---
8150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	32,012	32,012	---
8200 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-31,090	-31,090	---
8205 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31	---	-177,980	-177,980
8240 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE	---	15,520	+15,520
8242 INCREASE IN MARINE SECURITY GUARDS	---	6,600	+6,600
8250 RETIREMENT REFORM	---	-38,700	-38,700
8255 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	19,500	+19,500
8260 MARINE CORPS EXECUTION REPRICING	---	-16,000	-16,000
8290 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	6,544,682	6,353,622	-191,060

The adjustments to the budget activities for Military Personnel, Marine Corps are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
8205	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−177,980
8240	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	15,520
8242	Marine Corps Security Guards	6,600
8250	Retirement Reform	−38,700
8255	Basic Allowance for Housing	19,500
8260	Marine Corps Execution Repricing	−16,000

MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARD DETACHMENTS

The Committee recommends an increase over the budget request of $6,600,000 in "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", and $4,100,000 in "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps" to provide additional personnel and sufficient operational support costs associated with increasing the number of embassies guarded by Marine Security Guard Detachments.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$17,211,987,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	17,899,685,000
Committee recommendation	17,565,811,000
Change from budget request	−333,874,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $17,565,811,000 for Military Personnel, Air Force. The recommendation is an increase of $353,824,000 above the $17,211,987,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
8300	MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE			
8350	ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER			
8400	BASIC PAY	3,407,110	3,407,110	---
8450	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,093,419	1,093,419	---
8600	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	618,694	618,694	---
8650	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	136,599	136,599	---
8700	INCENTIVE PAYS	178,002	178,002	---
8750	SPECIAL PAYS	186,448	186,448	---
8800	ALLOWANCES	48,713	48,713	---
8850	SEPARATION PAY	118,845	118,845	---
8900	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	258,272	258,272	---
8950	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	6,046,102	6,046,102	---
9000	ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
9050	BASIC PAY	6,024,073	6,024,073	---
9100	RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,931,774	1,931,774	---
9250	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,157,649	1,157,649	---
9300	INCENTIVE PAYS	38,135	38,135	---
9350	SPECIAL PAYS	241,882	241,882	---
9400	ALLOWANCES	341,848	341,848	---
9450	SEPARATION PAY	70,251	70,251	---
9500	SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	460,840	460,840	---
9550	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	10,266,452	10,266,452	---
9600	ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS			
9650	ACADEMY CADETS	38,269	38,269	---
9750	ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL			
9800	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	687,956	687,956	---
9850	SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	108,685	108,685	---
9900	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	796,641	796,641	---
9950	ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL			
10000	ACCESSION TRAVEL	55,680	55,680	---
10050	TRAINING TRAVEL	57,596	57,596	---
10100	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	145,410	145,410	---
10150	ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	455,330	455,330	---
10200	SEPARATION TRAVEL	105,980	105,980	---
10250	TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	26,450	26,450	---
10300	NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	23,662	23,662	---
10350	TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	37,431	37,431	---
10400	OTHER	2,859	2,859	---
10450	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	910,398	910,398	---
10500	ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS			
10550	APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	100	100	---
10600	INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	595	595	---
10650	DEATH GRATUITIES	1,506	1,506	---
10700	UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	42,474	42,474	---
10750	SURVIVOR BENEFITS	4,155	4,155	---
10800	EDUCATION BENEFITS	4,646	4,646	---
10850	ADOPTION EXPENSES	800	800	---
10920	OTHER	50	50	---
10950	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	54,326	54,326	---
11000	LESS REIMBURSABLES	-212,503	-212,503	---
11005	LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31	---	-471,892	-471,892
11020	PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-146,000	-146,000
11040	4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE	---	40,518	+40,518
11070	RETIREMENT REFORM	---	-105,800	-105,800
11080	BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	61,300	+61,300
11090	AVIATION CONTINUATION PAY	---	300,000	+300,000
11100	TERA REPHASING	---	-12,000	-12,000
11140	TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	17,899,685	17,565,811	-333,874

The adjustments to the budget activities for Military Personnel, Air Force are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
11005	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−471,892
11020	Personnel Underexecution	−146,000
11040	4.8% Pay Increase	40,518
11070	Retirement Reform	−105,800
11080	Basic Allowance for Housing	61,300
11090	Aviation Continuation Pay	300,000
11100	TERA Rephasing	−12,000

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$2,167,052,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,270,964,000
Committee recommendation	2,235,055,000
Change from budget request	−35,909,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,235,055,000 for Reserve Personnel, Army. The recommendation is an increase of $68,003,000 above the $2,167,052,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
11150 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY			
11200 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
11250 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	927,080	927,080	---
11300 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	20,495	20,495	---
11350 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	112,579	112,579	---
11400 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	8,551	8,551	---
11500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,068,705	1,068,705	---
11550 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
11600 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	10,011	10,011	---
11650 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	89,586	89,586	---
11700 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	96,636	96,636	---
11750 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	879,417	881,617	+2,200
11800 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	25,761	25,761	---
11850 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	42,592	42,592	---
11900 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.....	24,516	24,516	---
11950 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	33,740	33,740	---
12000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	1,202,259	1,204,459	+2,200
12005 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-40,574	-40,574
12030 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	4,765	+4,765
12045 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	2,400	+2,400
12050 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-4,700	-4,700
12090 TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	2,270,964	2,235,055	-35,909

The adjustments to the budget activities for Reserve Personnel, Army are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
11750 Administration and Support/Enlistment Bonuses	2,200
Other Adjustments:	
12005 Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−40,574
12030 4.8% Pay Raise Increase	4,765
12045 JROTC Program	2,400
12050 Retirement Reform	−4,700

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,426,663,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,446,339,000
Committee recommendation	1,425,210,000
Change from budget request	−21,129,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,425,210,000 for Reserve Personnel, Navy. The recommendation is a decrease of $1,453,000 below the $1,426,663,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
12100 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY			
12150 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
12200 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	585,998	585,998	---
12350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	585,998	585,998	---
12400 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
12450 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	3,352	3,352	---
12500 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	6,291	6,291	---
12550 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	33,906	33,906	---
12600 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	768,903	777,903	+9,000
12650 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	3,756	3,756	---
12700 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	23,571	23,571	---
12750 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.....	16,522	16,522	---
12800 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	4,040	4,040	---
12850 TOTAL BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	860,341	869,341	+9,000
12855 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-29,833	-29,833
12895 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	3,004	+3,004
12899 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	1,400	+1,400
12910 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-4,700	-4,700
12940 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	1,446,339	1,425,210	-21,129

The adjustments to the budget activities for Reserve Personnel, Navy are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
12600 Administration and Support/Enlistment Bonuses	5,000
12600 Administration and Support/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	4,000
Other Adjustments:	
12855 Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−29,833
12895 4.8% Pay Raise Increase	3,004
12899 JROTC Program	1,400
12910 Retirement Reform	−4,700

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$406,616,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	409,189,000
Committee recommendation	403,822,000
Change from budget request	−5,367,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $403,822,000 for Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps. The recommendation is a decrease of $2,794,000 below the $406,616,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
12950 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS			
13000 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
13050 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	148,044	148,044	---
13100 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	15,822	15,822	---
13150 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	60,698	60,698	---
13200 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	311	311	---
13300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	224,875	224,875	---
13350 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
13400 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	2,073	2,073	---
13450 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	9,131	9,131	---
13500 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	20,593	20,593	---
13550 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	123,120	123,120	---
13600 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	16,157	16,157	---
13650 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	3,403	3,403	---
13700 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	9,837	9,837	---
13750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	184,314	184,314	---
13755 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-7,820	-7,820
13780 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	2,600	+2,600
13790 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	853	+853
13795 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-1,000	-1,000
13840 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	409,189	403,822	-5,367

The adjustments to the budget activities for Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
13755	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−7,820
13780	JROTC Program	2,600
13790	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	853
13795	Retirement Reform	−1,000

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$852,324,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	881,170,000
Committee recommendation	872,978,000
Change from budget request	−8,192,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $872,978,000 for Reserve Personnel, Air Force. The recommendation is an increase of $20,654,000 above the $852,342,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
13850 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE			
13900 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
13950 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	430,956	430,956	---
14000 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	79,061	79,061	---
14050 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	11,313	11,313	---
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	521,330	521,330	---
14200 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
14250 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	1,600	1,600	---
14300 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	66,283	66,283	---
14350 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	130,000	130,000	---
14400 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	95,994	95,994	---
14450 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	6,517	6,517	---
14500 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	35,289	35,289	---
14550 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP.....	24,157	24,157	---
14600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	359,840	359,840	---
14605 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-13,143	-13,143
14620 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	1,751	+1,751
14626 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	1,900	+1,900
14630 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-1,000	-1,000
14635 TRANSFER OF TEST SUPPORT MISSION/AGR'S.....	---	2,300	+2,300
14690 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	881,170	872,978	-8,192

The adjustments to the budget activities for Reserve Personnel, Air Force are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
14605	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−13,143
14620	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	1,751
14626	JROTC Program	1,900
14630	Retirement Reform	−1,000
14635	Transfer of Test Support Mission/AGR's	2,300

TEST SUPPORT MISSION

The Committee recommends an increase over the budget request of $2,300,000 in "Reserve Personnel, Air Force" to provide additional personnel costs required for the proposed transfer of the Functional Check Flight mission and two Test Support missions to the Air Force Reserve Command from the active Air Force.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$3,489,987,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,570,639,000
Committee recommendation	3,486,427,000
Change from budget request	−84,212,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,486,427,000 for National Guard Personnel, Army. The recommendation is a decrease of $3,560,000 below the $3,489,987,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
14700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY			
14750 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
14800 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	1,556,109	1,556,109	---
14850 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	195,613	195,613	---
14900 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	11,739	11,739	---
15000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,763,461	1,763,461	---
15050 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
15100 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	166,882	166,882	---
15150 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	89,814	89,814	---
15200 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	1,493,797	1,500,797	+7,000
15250 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	56,685	56,685	---
15350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	1,807,178	1,814,178	+7,000
15355 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-70,416	-70,416
15370 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	7,704	+7,704
15395 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-8,500	-8,500
15400 REDUCTION IN WORKYEARS/AT.....	---	-20,000	-20,000
15445 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	3,570,639	3,486,427	-84,212

The adjustments to the budget activities for National Guard Personnel, Army are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:		
15200	Administration and Support/Enlistment Bonuses	7,000
Other Adjustments:		
15355	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−70,416
15370	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	7,704
15395	Retirement Reform	−8,500
15400	Workyear Reduction/Annual Training	−20,000

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD WORKYEAR REQUIREMENTS

The Committee recommends a reduction from the budget request of $20,000,000 due to a General Accounting Office (GAO) review of the Army National Guard's military personnel budget request. The GAO reports that the Guard has overstated the number of average workyears of military personnel that is budgeted in fiscal year 2000 because of overstated participation rates for annual training and the variance in costs of the different pay groups. In addition, the GAO reports that last year the Army Guard moved approximately $86,000,000 of annual training funds (budget activity one) to pay for schools and special training costs (budget activity two) without the Department's knowledge and without congressional approval. The Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense report to the Committee, by February 1, 2000, on its efforts to ensure the Army Guard's accounting procedures for determining annual training and schools and special training costs are properly coded, and that the Army Guard follow the Department's financial management regulations in the future.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,377,109,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,486,512,000
Committee recommendation	1,456,248,000
Change from budget request	−30,264,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,456,248,000 for National Guard Personnel, Air Force. The recommendation is an increase of $79,139,000 above the $1,377,109,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
15450 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE			
15500 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING			
15550 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	616,338	616,338	---
15600 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	28,707	28,707	---
15650 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	1,823	1,823	---
15750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	646,868	646,868	---
15800 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT			
15850 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	104,054	104,054	---
15900 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	67,705	67,705	---
15950 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	655,209	655,209	---
16000 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	12,676	12,676	---
16100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	839,644	839,644	---
16105 LESS PAY INCREASE PROVIDED IN P.L. 106-31.....	---	-30,462	-30,462
16130 4.8% PAY RAISE INCREASE.....	---	3,398	+3,398
16140 RETIREMENT REFORM.....	---	-3,700	-3,700
16145 C-130 PERSONNEL.....	---	500	+500
16200 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	1,486,512	1,456,248	-30,264

The adjustments to the budget activities for National Guard Personnel, Air Force are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Other Adjustments:		
16105	Pay Increase Provided in P.L. 106–31	−30,462
16130	4.8% Pay Raise Increase	3,398
16140	Retirement Reform	−3,700
16145	C–130 Personnel	500

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The fiscal year 2000 budget request for Operation and maintenance is $91,268,249,000 in new budget authority, which is an increase of $7,225,435,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The request also includes a $150,000,000 cash transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund.

The accompanying bill recommends $93,686,750,000 for fiscal year 2000, which is an increase of $2,418,501,000 above the budget request. In addition, the Committee recommends that $150,000,000 be transferred from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund, as proposed in the budget request.

These appropriations finance the costs of operating and maintaining the Armed Forces, including the reserve components and related support activities of the Department of Defense (DoD), except military personnel costs. Included are pay for civilians, services for maintenance of equipment and facilities, fuel, supplies, and spare parts for weapons and equipment. Financial requirements are influenced by many factors, including force levels such as the number of aircraft squadrons, Army and Marine Corps divisions, installations, military personnel strength and deployments, rates of operational activity, and the quantity and complexity of equipment such as aircraft, ships, missiles and tanks in operation.

The table below summarizes the Committee's recommendations.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
50000	RECAPITULATION			
50050	O & M, ARMY	18,610,994	19,629,019	+1,018,025
50100	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
50120	TRANSFER TO PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND	---	---	---
50150	O & M, NAVY	22,188,715	23,029,584	+840,869
50200	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
50220	TRANSFER TO PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND	---	---	---
50250	O & M, MARINE CORPS	2,558,929	2,822,004	+263,075
50270	TRANSFER TO PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND	---	---	---
50300	O & M, AIR FORCE	20,313,203	21,641,099	+1,327,896
50350	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
50370	TRANSFER TO PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND	---	---	---
50400	O & M, DEFENSEWIDE	11,419,233	11,401,733	-17,500
50470	TRANSFER TO PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND	---	---	---
50500	O & M, ARMY RESERVE	1,369,213	1,513,076	+143,863
50550	O & M, NAVY RESERVE	917,647	969,478	+51,831
50600	O & M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	123,266	143,911	+20,645
50650	O & M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,728,437	1,788,091	+59,654
50700	O & M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	2,903,549	3,103,642	+200,093
50750	O & M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,099,618	3,239,438	+139,820

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
50790	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND.....	2,387,600	1,812,600	-575,000
50800	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES...	7,621	7,621	---
50850	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY.....	378,170	378,170	---
50900	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY.....	284,000	284,000	---
50950	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE.....	376,800	376,800	---
51000	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	25,370	25,370	---
51050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	199,214	209,214	+10,000
51200	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID.....	55,800	55,800	---
51300	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION.....	475,500	456,100	-19,400
51350	PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND.....	---	---	---
51360	TRANSFER.....	---	---	---
51450	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE.....	1,845,370	800,000	-1,045,370
51500	COMBATING TERRORISM ACTIVITIES TRANSFER FUND.....	---	---	---
51600	GRAND TOTAL, O & M.....	91,268,249	93,686,750	+2,418,501
51650	TRANSFERS.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	---
51700	TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE, O & M.....	91,418,249	93,836,750	+2,418,501

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OVERVIEW

Despite increases proposed by the administration in the fiscal year 2000 budget request, the Committee notes that there are substantial unfunded requirements in the Operation and Maintenance accounts that are critical to maintaining the readiness of U.S. armed forces, enhancing the sustainability of such forces when they are deployed, and improving the condition of the supporting infrastructure. As in past years, the Committee requested that the Military Services identify their top unfunded priorities for consideration during the Committee's deliberations on the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations bill. Once again, the Military Services have identified significant shortfalls in the Operation and Maintenance accounts. In the Committee's view, these shortfalls pose a serious risk to both the near term readiness of U.S. forces as well as the ability of these forces to sustain combat operations. These shortfalls are evident in a number of areas financed by the Operation and Maintenance accounts including: funding for the rotational training centers; funding for stocks of spare and repair parts necessary to ensure that equipment is mission capable and can be sustained once deployed; depot-level maintenance of weapons systems and support equipment; and, basic troop support gear such as cold weather clothing and body armor. These shortfalls are also apparent in the funding required to maintain the condition of U.S. military bases which, despite increases in the budget request, is perennially underfunded. To correct these deficiencies, the Committee recommends increased funding above the budget request in a number of areas including those areas of need cited above.

The Committee notes that an additional $2,250,000,000 was provided in the fiscal year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31) for critical, readiness-related shortfalls identified by the military Services including: spare parts, depot maintenance, readiness related training and base operations support. These increases, outlined below, have had a direct impact on certain recommendations made by the Committee in its deliberations on the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations bill. For instance, the Committee recommendation for additional spare parts for the Services is biased toward improving stocks of war reserve materials because a large percentage of the Department's immediate needs were met in Public Law 106–31, the Supplemental Appropriations Act.

The following listing indicates those readiness categories and funding addressed earlier this year in Public Law 106–31.

Spare Parts Requirements	$1,124,900,000
Depot Maintenance	742,500,000
Readiness Training and OPTEMPO	200,200,000
Base Operations Support	182,400,000

The Committee also notes that there are areas in the Operation and Maintenance accounts where savings can be achieved to free up resources both for readiness needs, and to make resources available for more robust modernization programs. Given the need to correct deficiencies in the Operation and Maintenance accounts in order to enhance near-term readiness and sustainability as well as

weapons modernization, the Committee believes it is imperative for the Department of Defense to use its Operation and Maintenance funding as efficiently as possible. Therefore, the Committee recommends certain reductions based on fact-of-life considerations, as well as management actions that the Department should undertake to streamline activities funded in the Operation and Maintenance accounts.

ROTATIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVES

The Committee recommends an increase of $112,100,000 above the budget request to address shortages of equipment and parts and to improve the state of infrastructure at each of the Military Service's rotational training centers. Consistent with the recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee in the report accompanying the fiscal year 2000 National Defense Authorization bill, the Committee finds that the rotational training centers are a key to maintaining the readiness of U.S. forces, and that the equipment, facilities and ranges at these centers are in urgent need of upgrades and repairs. To address these shortfalls, the Committee recommends additional funding over the budget request, to be distributed as follows:

Army	$42,100,000
Navy	2,000,000
Marine Corps	25,700,000
Air Force	42,300,000

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

The Committee recognizes that the Administration, for the first time, requested funding for the Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense account. While the Committee recommends including funding in this account, as discussed elsewhere in this report, the Committee recommends returning the funds included in the budget request to the Services' Operation and Maintenance accounts. The Committee notes that a substantial portion of the funding included in the budget request for Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense is not related to quality of life enhancing projects such as dormitories, barracks and related facilities. Similarly, the Committee notes that the funding proposed in the budget request was derived primarily by transferring funds which would have otherwise been included in the Services' Operation and Maintenance accounts.

Despite the administration's change in approach to real property maintenance (RPM) funding, the budget materials acknowledge that the central problem of RPM, a persistent and growing backlog, continues unabated. The budget estimates indicate that the RPM backlog is at least $9,600,000,000 and growing. The Committee notes with interest that the budget materials have not even included an estimate of the backlog of Army RPM for the past two years. (The last available data indicate that the backlog for this one service alone was $5,900,000,000.) To improve the information in the budget request, the Committee directs that the Department of Defense include estimates of the backlog of real property maintenance for the Army as well as all other Services and Defense-wide components in the fiscal year 2001 budget request, and all subsequent budget requests.

In order to reduce the backlog of real property maintenance requirements, the Committee recommends an increase totaling $854,000,000 above the budget request. Of this amount, $800,000,000 for the Active components is provided in the Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense account as described elsewhere in this report. Funding over the budget request for the Guard and Reserve components totals $54,000,000 and is provided to each component's respective Operation and Maintenance account. The additional funding over the budget request is distributed as follows:

Army	$182,600,000
Navy	285,200,000
Marine Corps	62,100,000
Air Force	259,600,000
Defense-wide	10,500,000
Army Reserve	10,000,000
Navy Reserve	10,000,000
Marine Corps Reserve	4,000,000
Air Force Reserve	10,000,000
Army National Guard	10,000,000
Air National Guard	10,000,000

BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT

The Committee recommends increases above the budget request totaling $439,800,000 to meet unfunded requirements associated with base operations support, broken out by component in the table below. The Services continue to suffer from significant unfunded priorities in their base operations support accounts. The Committee recognizes that unfunded requirements in this area have an indirect yet corrosive effect on the readiness of U.S. forces, as the Services have and will continue to shift funding from readiness related activities, such as training and equipment maintenance, to meet "must pay" bills related to base operations. Due to continuing concerns about installation security and force protection, the Committee expects the Department of Defense to allocate not less than 5 percent of the increases over the budget request for the active military services for base operations support to programs and costs associated with installation security and force protection.

Army	$154,600,000
Navy	91,200,000
Marine Corps	10,000,000
Air Force	144,200,000
Army Reserve	10,000,000
Navy Reserve	10,000,000
Air Force Reserve	10,000,000
Air National Guard	9,800,000

DEPOT MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends an increase of $297,900,000 above the budget request to meet unfunded depot-level equipment maintenance requirements. The Committee notes that the Department of Defense has an unfunded backlog of depot-level maintenance of over $1,100,000,000, with an additional $200,000,000 in unfunded ship maintenance availabilities. As it has noted in previous years, the Committee observes the fiscal year 2000 budget request once again provides for depot maintenance funding at significantly less than 100 percent of the Services' requirements. In order to reduce backlogs, and improve the availability of weapons systems and re-

lated equipment, the Committee recommends increases over the budget request, to be distributed as outlined below. Further detail on the distribution of this funding is found in the tables accompanying the description of each Service's Operation and Maintenance account.

The following list indicates the additions over the budget request.

Army	$35,600,000
Navy	125,100,000
Marine Corps	20,000,000
Air Force	68,800,000
Army Reserve	3,400,000
Air Force Reserve	15,000,000
Army National Guard	10,000,000
Air National Guard	20,000,000

SPARES AND WAR RESERVE MATERIEL

The Committee recommends an increase of $453,000,000 above the budget request to meet unfunded requirements for the acquisition of spare and repair parts for both peacetime operations as well as war reserve requirements. The Services have significant unfunded requirements as regards to the acquisition of critical inventory, including unit readiness spares and war reserve sustainment spares for the Army; aviation spares for the Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Air National Guard; readiness spares kits and bare base kits for the Air Force; war reserve material procured by the Defense Logistics Agency; and various peacetime operating stocks in support of Marine Corps Reserve and Air National Guard requirements. The availability of this material has a direct bearing on the Services' ability to prosecute the two MRC scenario postulated in the National Security Strategy.

To address these shortfalls, the Committee recommends increases over the budget request as outlined below. In addition, the Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than January 31, 2000, which delineates the amounts that the each Service plans to spend on peacetime operating stocks and war reserve materials. The Committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 28, 2000, that identifies the components of both the peacetime operating stocks and war reserve materials that will be allocated to improve the readiness of Apache helicopters.

The following list indicates the additions over the budget request.

Army	$213,500,000
Navy	85,000,000
Marine Corps	25,000,000
Air Force	115,000,000
Defense-wide	3,000,000
Marine Corps Reserve	1,500,000
Air National Guard	10,000,000

FORCE PROTECTION INITIATIVES

The Committee recommends an increase of $41,400,000 above the budget request for force protection to meet unfunded priorities identified by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. This increased funding is distributed as outlined

below. In addition to these amounts, as described elsewhere in this report the Committee has directed that not less than 5 percent of the additional funding provided above the budget request for base operations support for the active duty military services be directed toward enhanced facilities security and force protection requirements.

Navy	$36,400,000
Air Force	5,000,000

SOLDIER SUPPORT INITIATIVES

The Committee recommends an increase of $88,000,000 above the budget request in several Operation and Maintenance accounts for additional soldier support equipment. The Committee notes that there continues to be a substantial backlog of this type of equipment, which is essential to sustain troops in the field and enhance combat readiness. Items to be procured with these extra funds include extended cold weather clothing, body armor, equipment harnesses and other initial issue gear, and other personnel support equipment items. The funds added above the budget request are outlined below:

Army	$26,000,000
Marine Corps	35,000,000
Marine Corps Reserve	13,000,000
Army National Guard	14,000,000

OPERATING TEMPO FUNDING

The Committee recommends an increase of $55,600,000 above the budget request for training operations. Based on unfunded training needs identified by the Service Chiefs, and the recommendations in the House report accompanying the fiscal year 2000 National Defense Authorization bill, the Committee recommends that this increased funding be distributed as shown below. In addition, the Committee notes the additional funds provided for the Air National Guard are for the purpose of increased flying hours in support of F–16 training activities.

Marine Corps	$10,600,000
Army Reserve	20,000,000
Army National Guard	10,000,000
Air National Guard	15,000,000

RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING

The Committee recognizes that the military Services' recruiting efforts to enlist high quality recruits is continuing to be difficult and recommends an increase of $103,800,000 over the budget request to support the Department's efforts in achieving their recruiting objectives.

The Committee understands the Army is currently developing two new test accession programs, the GED+ and the College First Program. These programs while designed to expand recruiting markets to all qualified applicants, and increase opportunities for youths to serve in the Army, are also expected to increase minority representation in the military. Of the funds provided, the Committee has included $33,000,000 for the Army for recruiting and

advertising, which will allow for the implementation of these two new test programs.

SMALL BUSINESS ADVERTISING

The Committee understands that there are many qualified minority-owned businesses, women-owned businesses, and small businesses that design and place advertising and advertising campaigns, which can assist the Department in its recruiting efforts using print, electronic, and the radio media. The Committee believes these firms can provide valuable new insights and expertise to servicewide recruiting programs. The Committee expects the Department to increase the use of these qualified businesses in the initiation, design and placement of its advertising in the print, radio and electronic media.

GUARD AND RESERVE UNFUNDED REQUIREMENTS

The Committee recommends an increase of $356,600,000 over the budget request for additional Guard and Reserve Operation and maintenance requirements described by the Service's as readiness priorities, as follows:

Base Operations Support	$39,800,000
Real Property Maintenance Backlog	54,000,000
Depot Maintenance	48,400,000
Optempo/Flying Hours	45,000,000
Spares	11,500,000
Recruiting and Recruiter Support	51,500,000
Military (civilian) technicians shortfall	48,000,000
Information Management/Operations	31,400,000
Initial Issue/ECWCS	27,000,000

ARMY TRAINING AREA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends providing $32,000,000 over the budget request, in Operation and Maintenance, Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard accounts, as outlined in the Army's unfunded requirements list, to conduct preventive maintenance on training grounds to ensure continued realistic training and to protect the environment. This funding is distributed as follows:

Army	$24,736,000
Army Reserve	1,000,000
Army National Guard	6,264,000

HEADQUARTERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee recommends a reduction of $179,000,000 below the budget request for headquarters and administrative activities. Despite past attempts to streamline the management of DoD activities, the Committee notes that the budget request once again reflects headquarters activities which cost in excess of $3,000,000,000 in total and which are manned by over 40,000 personnel. In addition, the Committee agrees with the assessment found in the House report accompanying the fiscal year 2000 National Defense Authorization bill that these figures substantially understate the true funding and manning levels of headquarters

and administrative activities. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following reductions from the budget request:

Army	−$64,000,000
Navy	−35,000,000
Air Force	−20,000,000
Defense-wide	−60,000,000

CONSULTANTS AND ADVISORY SERVICES

The Committee recommends a reduction of $40,000,000 below the budget request for consulting and advisory services. Despite numerous unfunded requirements which contribute directly to the readiness of U.S. forces, or which represent must pay bills, as noted elsewhere in this report, the Department continues to request substantial amounts for studies which do not contribute directly to solving these fundamental problems. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following reductions from the budget request:

Army	−$10,000,000
Navy	−10,000,000
Air Force	−10,000,000
Defense-wide	−10,000,000

COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

The Committee recommends a reduction of $81,150,000 below the budget request for communications services. The Committee notes that the budget request includes alarmingly high levels of both price and program growth. For instance, on prices, the budget request reflects growth of over 16 percent in some cases, as compared to the general purchase rate of inflation of 1.5 percent. Therefore, the Committee recommends the following reductions from the budget request:

Army	−$36,000,000
Navy	−23,000,000
Marine Corps	−150,000
Air Force	−22,000,000

SECURITY PROGRAMS

The Committee recommends a decrease of $24,067,000 below the budget request for security programs of the Department of Defense. The budget request reflects substantial growth for security programs, notably work performed by the Defense Security Service and certain arms control programs. A review performed by the House Appropriations Surveys and Investigations staff indicates that this growth can be reduced and effect neither the work of the Defense Security Service, nor U.S. treaty compliance obligations. Accordingly, the Committee recommends the following reductions from the budget request:

Army	−$9,867,000
Navy	−6,900,000
Air Force	−7,300,000

DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE

The Committee recommends a reduction of $30,000,000 below the budget request for the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. The Committee notes that, on balance, the budget portrays program growth in the Services' Operation and Maintenance accounts, and is convinced that DFAS can further increase the efficiency of its operations. The Committee therefore recommends this reduction be distributed as follows:

Army	−$9,300,000
Navy	−9,300,000
Marine Corps	−2,000,000
Air Force	−9,400,000

ACQUISITION CONTRACTING AND TRAVEL

The Committee recommends a reduction of $17,531,000 from the budget request for acquisition personnel travel and contracting expenses, to be distributed as follows:

Army	−$3,350,000
Air Force	−4,181,000
Defense-Wide	−10,000,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET EXECUTION DATA

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to continue to provide the congressional defense committees with quarterly budget execution data. Such data should be provided not later than forty-five days past the close of each quarter of the fiscal year, and should be provided for each O–1 budget activity, activity group, and subactivity for each of the active, defense-wide, reserve and National Guard components. For each O–1 budget activity, activity group and subactivity, these reports should include: the budget request and actual obligations; the DoD distribution of unallocated congressional adjustments to the budget request; all adjustments made by DoD during the process of rebaselining the O&M accounts; all adjustments resulting from below threshold reprogrammings; and all adjustments resulting from prior approval reprogramming requests.

In addition, the Committee requires that the Department of Defense provide semiannual written notifications to the congressional defense committees which summarize Operation and Maintenance budget execution to include the effect of rebaselining procedures, other below threshold reprogrammings, and prior approval reprogrammings. The Committee further directs that the Department of Defense provide the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations written notification 30 days prior to executing procedures to rebaseline the Operation and Maintenance accounts.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE REPROGRAMMINGS

The Committee directs that proposed transfers of funds between O–1 budget activities in excess of $15,000,000 be subject to normal, prior approval reprogramming procedures. Items for which funds have been specifically provided in any appropriation in this report using phrases "only for" or "only to" are Congressional interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD form

1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD form 1414 at the stated amount, or a revised amount if changed during conference or if otherwise specifically addressed in the conference report. In addition, due to continuing concerns about force readiness and the diversion of Operation and maintenance funds, the Committee directs the Department of Defense to provide written notification to the congressional defense committees for the cumulative value of any and all transfers in excess of $15,000,000 from the following budget activities and subactivity group categories:

Operation and maintenance, Army

Land Forces: Divisions, Corps combat forces, Corps support forces, Echelon above corps forces, Land forces operations support; Land Forces Readiness: Land forces depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Navy

Air Operations: Mission and other flight operations, Fleet air training, Aircraft depot maintenance; Ship Operations: Mission and other ship operations, Ship operational support and training, Intermediate maintenance, Ship depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps

Expeditionary Forces: Operational forces, depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Air Operations: Primary combat forces, Primary combat weapons, Air operations training, Depot maintenance; Mobility Operations: Airlift operations, Depot maintenance, Payments to the transportation business area; Basic Skills and Advanced Training: Depot maintenance; Logistics Operations: Depot maintenance.

Further, the Department should follow prior approval reprogramming procedures for transfers in excess of $15,000,000 out of the following budget subactivities.

Operation and maintenance, Army

Depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Navy

Aircraft depot maintenance, Ship depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps

Depot maintenance.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Air Operations: Depot maintenance; Mobility Operations: Depot maintenance; Basic Skills and Advanced Training; Depot maintenance; and Logistics Operations: Depot maintenance.

A–76 STUDIES

The Committee harbors serious concerns about the current DoD outsourcing and privatization effort. While the Committee recognizes the need to reduce DoD infrastructure costs, the cost savings benefits from the current outsourcing and privatization effort are, at best, debatable. Despite end-strength savings, there is no clear

evidence that this effort is reducing the cost of support functions within DoD with high cost contractors simply replacing government employees. In addition, the current privatization effort appears to have created serious oversight problems for DoD especially in those cases where DoD has contracted for financial management and other routine administrative functions. DoD appears to be moving toward a situation in which contractors are overseeing and paying one another with little DoD oversight or supervision. As a result of this developing situation, the Committee recommends a reduction of $100,000,000 from the budget request as described in a new general provision, Section 8109. In addition, the Committee directs that DoD undertake a comprehensive review of A–76 studies as described in a new general provision, Section 8110.

URBAN WARFARE

The Department of Defense has recently placed increased emphasis on the importance of urban warfare. For example, the Committee is aware that the Army has recently begun efforts to acquire weapons systems that would have special application to an urban environment, and has developed an urban training area within the Joint Readiness Training Center. Nevertheless, the Committee is persuaded that efforts in this area must be substantially expanded in order to improve the readiness of U.S. forces for possible conflicts centered in urban environments. Consequently, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2000, that provides the following: an inventory of Department of Defense assets dedicated to urban warfare and associated training, including equipment and training areas; a description of the training programs specific to urban warfare; and an assessment of the readiness of U.S. forces in the conduct of urban warfare. This report shall also provide an assessment of shortfalls in equipment, personnel and facilities necessary to enhance the posture of U.S. forces in this area.

CONTROLLED HUMIDITY PRESERVATION PROGRAM

The Committee believes that the Controlled Humidity Preservation (CHP) Program will enhance the condition of Department of Defense equipment such as weapons systems and associated support equipment by minimizing maintenance requirements associated with moisture-induced corrosion. Accordingly, the Committee requires that the Secretary of Defense submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2000, that outlines measures taken by each of the military Services to expand the application of the CHP Program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$17,185,623,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	18,610,994,000
Committee recommendation	19,629,019,000
Change from budget request	1,018,025,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $19,629,019,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army. The recommendation is an

increase of $2,443,396,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

[IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS]

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
150 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
200 LAND FORCES			
250 DIVISIONS	1,151,351	1,185,351	+34,000
300 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	342,122	342,122	---
350 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	341,220	341,220	---
400 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	476,924	476,924	---
450 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	928,628	970,728	+42,100
500 LAND FORCES READINESS			
550 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,090,532	1,114,516	+23,984
600 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	465,195	465,195	---
650 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	645,714	681,514	+35,800
700 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
750 BASE SUPPORT	2,658,717	2,679,517	+20,800
800 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	490,964	490,964	---
850 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	126,563	122,563	-4,000
900 UNIFIED COMMANDS	78,490	78,490	---
950 MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	77,921	77,921	---
1045 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	8,874,341	9,027,025	+152,684
1050 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
1100 MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
1200 STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	326,228	326,228	---
1250 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	134,797	134,797	---
1300 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	69,947	69,947	---
1325 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	29,069	29,069	---
1350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	560,041	560,041	---
1400 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
1450 ACCESSION TRAINING			
1500 OFFICER ACQUISITION	65,423	65,423	---
1550 RECRUIT TRAINING	14,160	14,160	---
1600 ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	13,924	13,924	---
1650 RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	134,842	136,092	+1,250
1700 BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMY ONLY)	73,009	73,009	---
1750 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMY ONLY)	27,358	27,358	---
1800 BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING			
1850 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	230,145	233,645	+3,500
1900 FLIGHT TRAINING	269,609	269,609	---
1950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	87,429	88,929	+1,500
2000 TRAINING SUPPORT	466,975	470,915	+3,940
2050 BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	865,351	865,663	+312
2100 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	176,026	176,026	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
2150 RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING			
2200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	255,417	272,917	+17,500
2250 EXAMINING	77,464	77,464	---
2300 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,660	87,660	---
2350 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	65,375	65,375	---
2400 JUNIOR ROTC	74,282	80,282	+6,000
2450 BASE SUPPORT (RECRUITING LEASES)	187,393	202,893	+15,500
2500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	3,171,842	3,221,344	+49,502
2550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
2600 SECURITY PROGRAMS			
2650 SECURITY PROGRAMS	426,729	416,862	-9,867
2700 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
2750 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	546,861	546,861	---
2800 CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	419,672	424,672	+5,000
2850 LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	321,696	312,744	-8,952
2900 AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	360,210	360,210	---
2950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
3000 ADMINISTRATION	320,944	312,594	-8,350
3050 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	662,827	642,827	-20,000
3100 MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	154,769	154,769	---
3150 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	147,606	147,606	---
3200 OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	674,400	665,350	-9,050
3250 ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	116,617	73,217	-43,400
3300 REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	71,312	71,312	---
3350 BASE SUPPORT	1,106,387	1,111,037	+4,650
3375 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	346,154	346,154	---
3400 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	104,815	104,815	---
3550 SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
3600 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	224,685	224,685	---
3650 MISC SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	49,086	49,086	---
3700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	6,054,770	5,964,801	-89,969
3710 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	2,500	+2,500
3720 GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	---
3775 BASE SUPPORT	---	154,600	+154,600
3835 MEMORIAL EVENTS	---	400	+400
3940 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	625,808	+625,808
3960 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-10,000	-10,000
4070 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-55,000	-55,000
4080 REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES	---	-10,000	-10,000
4085 SPARES/WRM	---	213,500	+213,500
4090 COMMUNICATIONS REDUCTION	---	-16,000	-16,000
4100 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	18,610,994	19,629,019	+1,018,025
4150 TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
4200 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(18,660,994)	(19,679,019)	(+1,018,025)

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Army are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
250	Soldier Support—Extended Cold Weather Clothing system (ECWCS)	19,000
250	Military Gator	8,000
250	Soldier Support—Field Kitchen Modern Burner Units (MBU)	4,000
250	Soldier Support—Soldier Modernization	3,000
450	Rotational Training—NTC Prepo Fleet Maintenance	28,000
450	Rotational Training—Korea Training Area	4,100
450	Rotational Training—CMTC Mission Support	4,000
450	Rotational Training—FORSCOM Developments to National Training Center	4,000
450	Rotational Training—JRTC Prepo Fleet Maintenance	2,000
550	Training Area Environmental Management	23,984
650	Depot Maintenance/System Sustainment Tech Support	35,600
650	Humanitarian Airlift Aircraft Maintenance	200
750	Transportation Improvements-National Training Center	12,500
750	Ft. Baker Repairs and Maintenance	6,000
750	NTC Airhead	2,000
750	Security Improvements-NTC Heliport	300
850	Headquarters growth	−4,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:		
1650	Air Battle Captain Program	1,250
1850	Improved Moving Target Simulator (IMTS)	3,500
1950	Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies	1,500
2000	University of Mounted Warfare	3,000
2000	Armor Officers Distance Learning	500
2000	Training Area Environmental Management	440
2050	Training Area Environmental Management	312
2200	Recruiting and Advertising	17,500
2400	Junior ROTC	6,000
2450	Recruiting Leases	15,500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
2650	Security Program (Arms Control, DSS)	−9,867
2800	Pulse Technology	5,000
2850	Supercomputing Work	6,500
2850	Logistics and Technology Project	1,100
2850	Power Projection C4 Infrastructure	−16,552
3000	Acquisition Travel and Contracts	−3,350
3000	Headquarters growth	−5,000
3050	Service-wide communication underexecution	−20,000
3200	Ft. Atkinson Preservation	250
3200	DFAS Reduction	−9,300
3250	Claims Underexecution	−43,400
3350	Corps of Engineers Building Demolition	4,650
Undistributed:		
3710	Classified Undistributed	2.500
3775	Base Operations Support	154,600
3835	Memorial Events	400
3940	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer From Quality of Life Enhancements)	625,808
3960	Contract and Advisory Services	−10,000
4070	Management Headquarters	−55,000
4080	Reductions in JCS Exercises	−10,000
4085	Spares/War Reserve Material	213,500
4086	Communications Reduction	−16,000
	CECOM telecommunications upgrades (Ft. Monmouth)	(18,600)

LOGISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY PROJECT

The Committee recognizes the need for substantial improvements in the Department of Defense logistics system. Accordingly, the Committee directs that $1,100,000 of the funds provided for Operation and Maintenance, Army be used only to initiate a Logistics

and Technology project to establish benchmarks based on civilian technologies and to develop and present educational materials to DoD logistics personnel.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED, CONTRACTOR-OPERATED (GOCO) FACILITIES

The Committee remains concerned about the Army's lack of progress in recovering costs associated with the environmental restoration of GOCO facilities. The Committee is disappointed with the gaps in the Army's information collection efforts on 24 GOCO facilities, frustrated with the continued failure to file claims, and skeptical that the Army's proposed recovery strategy will produce results. Accordingly, the Committee includes a provision in Operation and Maintenance, Army which withholds $4,000,000 of the funds available in the Army Administration subactivity group until the completion of a 120-day assessment of the prospects of recovering costs associated with the environmental restoration at these 24 GOCO facilities.

Consistent with its request in last year's Conference Report, the Committee further directs that no later than March 30, 2000, the Secretary of the Army shall submit a report on the results of that assessment to the congressional defense committee that provides: a summary of historical third-party insurance coverage for each GOCO facility; a detailed legal analysis of the potential claims for each of the GOCO facilities; recommendations as to which insurance carriers to notify, including the procedure for notifying the carriers; recommendations for interfacing with past and present GOCO contractors relative to the pursuit of insurance recovery; recommendations for responding to insurance carrier inquiries and/or coverage positions; and recommendations for maximizing the insurance recovery in an efficient and cost effective manner, including a projected timetable for completion.

HUMANITARIAN AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

The Committee understand that Department of the Army is in possession of a C–12 Aircraft which may be deemed surplus. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, this plane to a non-governmental organization (NGO) which provides humanitarian airlift primarily to sub-Saharan Africa. Further, the committee includes $200,000 solely for the purposes of repairing the aircraft prior to transfer.

NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER HELIPORT SECURITY

The Committee believes that there is not adequate security for the National Training Center's heliport. To begin addressing this problem, the Committee provides $300,000 only to begin implementing the planned security improvements at this facility.

MEMORIAL EVENTS

The Committee has included an additional $400,000 above the budget request of $1,500,000 only to support memorial events to reflect increased costs.

GENERAL PURPOSE TENTS

Of the funds made available in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for soldier life support equipment, the Committee directs that $18,000,000 be made available for the purpose of meeting prospective requirements for modular general purpose tents (M.G.P.T.) associated with wartime and other mobilizations. The Committee understands that the M.G.P.T. system developed by the Army provides a more durable and habitable replacement for the current general purpose tent, and has provided funds to continue the program under Army management.

ABRAMS INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Department of Defense budget request for fiscal year 2000 includes funding of $72,600,000 for the Abrams Integrated Management XXI Program (AIM XXI), to rebuild early versions of the Abrams tank and to bring these tanks up to the most recent configuration. The Committee supports this program, and the funding level proposed in the budget request.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Information on the Armor Officer Distance Learning, Supercomputing Work, and Power Projection C4 Infrastructure programs can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$21,872,399,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	22,188,715,000
Committee recommendation	23,029,584,000
Change from budget request	840,869,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $23,029,584,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy. The recommendation is an increase of $1,157,185,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
4250 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
4300 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
4350 AIR OPERATIONS			
4400 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,232,508	2,261,908	+29,400
4450 FLEET AIR TRAINING	693,133	698,233	+5,100
4500 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	48,792	48,792	---
4550 AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	91,823	91,823	---
4600 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	746,924	788,024	+41,100
4650 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,649	20,649	---
4800 SHIP OPERATIONS			
4850 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,859,279	1,859,279	---
4900 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	536,641	536,641	---
4950 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	379,253	379,253	---
5000 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,365,144	2,420,144	+55,000
5050 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,143,818	1,143,818	---
5200 COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT			
5250 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	253,524	253,524	---
5300 ELECTRONIC WARFARE	7,600	7,600	---
5350 SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	156,329	156,329	---
5400 WARFARE TACTICS	121,645	126,645	+5,000
5450 OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	244,484	244,484	---
5500 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	486,993	484,993	-2,000
5550 EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	168,216	168,716	+500
5600 DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	764	764	---
5750 WEAPONS SUPPORT			
5800 CRUISE MISSILE	146,555	146,555	---
5850 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	812,619	812,619	---
5900 IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	47,113	47,113	---
5950 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	375,190	404,190	+29,000
6100 WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT			
6150 NWCF SUPPORT	40,643	40,643	---
6200 BASE SUPPORT			
6210 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	391,856	391,856	---
6220 BASE SUPPORT	2,180,714	2,180,714	---
6230 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	15,552,209	15,715,309	+163,100
6250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
6300 READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES			
6350 SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	434,624	434,624	---
6400 ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS			

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
6450 AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,966	2,966	---
6500 SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	281,229	281,229	---
6550 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS			
6600 FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,018	23,018	---
6650 INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,089	1,589	+500
6700 COAST GUARD SUPPORT	18,975	18,975	---
6750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	761,901	762,401	+500
6800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
6850 ACCESSION TRAINING			
6900 OFFICER ACQUISITION	79,873	79,873	---
6950 RECRUIT TRAINING	5,096	5,096	---
7000 RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	66,278	66,278	---
7150 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
7200 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	251,459	251,459	---
7250 FLIGHT TRAINING	320,486	320,486	---
7300 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	85,374	92,874	+7,500
7350 TRAINING SUPPORT	212,318	220,318	+8,000
7500 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
7550 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	187,852	192,852	+5,000
7600 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	79,609	79,609	---
7650 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	46,632	46,632	---
7700 JUNIOR ROTC	23,048	26,548	+3,500
7820 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	47,303	47,303	---
7830 BASE SUPPORT	317,198	317,198	---
7850 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	1,722,526	1,746,526	+24,000
7900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
7950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
8000 ADMINISTRATION	648,209	638,909	-9,300
8050 EXTERNAL RELATIONS	16,765	16,765	---
8100 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	120,677	120,677	---
8150 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	88,319	88,319	---
8200 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	203,096	203,096	---
8250 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	369,665	365,665	-4,000
8425 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	263,070	263,070	---
8450 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
8500 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	161,738	161,738	---
8550 PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	329,808	329,808	---
8600 ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	681,715	686,715	+5,000
8650 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	271,426	271,426	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
8700	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	50,073	50,073	---
8750	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	46,671	48,671	+2,000
8800	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	70,288	70,288	---
8950	SECURITY PROGRAMS			
9000	SECURITY PROGRAMS	584,390	577,490	-6,900
9150	SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS			
9200	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,431	8,431	---
9220	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	101,868	101,868	---
9230	BASE SUPPORT	185,870	185,870	---
9350	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	4,202,079	4,188,879	-13,200
9355	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	508,369	+508,369
9357	FORCE PROTECTION ASHORE	---	36,400	+36,400
9360	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	5,500	+5,500
9370	GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	---
9395	BASE SUPPORT	---	91,200	+91,200
9540	NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM	---	5,000	+5,000
9590	EXECUTIVE EDUCATION DEMONSTRATION PROJECT	---	1,000	+1,000
9600	SPARES	---	85,000	+85,000
9700	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-35,000	-35,000
9705	REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES	---	-2,000	-2,000
9710	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-10,000	-10,000
9725	COMMUNICATIONS REDUCTION	---	-19,000	-19,000
9750	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	22,188,715	23,029,584	+840,869
9800	TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
9850	TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(22,238,715)	(23,079,584)	(+840,869)

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Navy are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
4400	Flying Hours (Marine Aviation Logistics CH–46/7–58)	27,400
4400	UAV Flight Hours	2,000
4450	Contractor Maintenance Support (Marine Corps Aviation)	3,100
4450	Rotational Training—Naval Air Strike Airwarfare Center	2,000
4600	Depot Maintenance—Aircraft and Support Equipment Rework	37,600
4600	Depot Maintenance—EA–6B Depot Support (Marine Corps Aviation)	2,500
4600	Depot Maintenance—EA–6B Pod Repair (Marine Corps Aviation)	1,000
5000	Depot Maintenance—Ship Depot Maintenance	55,000
5400	Joint Warfare Analysis Center	5,000
5500	Unjustified Growth for USACOM	−2,000
5550	Reverse Osmosis Desalinators	500
5950	Depot Maintenance—Aegis Cruiser Upgrade Program	15,000
5950	Depot Maintenance—MK–45 Overhaul	10,000
5950	Depot Maintenance—CWIS Overhaul	4,000
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:		
6650	NWS Concord	500
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:		
7300	Monterey Institute for Counter Proliferation Studies	4,000
7300	Naval Postgraduate School—Facility Maintenance	2,000
7300	Defense Language Institute	1,500
7350	CNET	4,000
7350	Navy Electricity and Electronic Training	4,000
7550	Recruiting and Advertising	5,000
7700	Junior ROTC	3,500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
8000	DFAS Reduction	−9,300
8250	Servicewide Communications	−4,000
8600	ATIS	2,500
8600	Object Oriented Simulations/Reengineering	2,500
8750	Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility Support	2,000
9000	Security Programs (DSS)	−6,900
Undistributed:		
9355	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	508,369
9357	Force Protection (Afloat)	24,400
9357	Force Protection (Ashore)	12,000
9360	Classified Programs Undistributed	5,500
9395	Base Operations Support	91,200
9540	Navy Environmental Leadership Program	5,000
9590	Executive Education Demonstration Project	1,000
9600	Spares	85,000
9700	Management Headquarters	−35,000
9705	Reduction in JCS Exercises	−2,000
9710	Contract and Advisory Services	−10,000
9725	Communications Reduction	−19,000

OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Within the funds provided for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, the Committee directs that $7,500,000 be used only to fund backlogs in oceanographic research.

NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD

The Committee recommends an increase of $500,000 above the budget request only to conduct a joint-use study examining the potential for joint use of the Naval Weapons Station, Concord (CA), by civilian and military entities that is consistent with the missions of the Navy and the Army and the needs of the surrounding com-

munities. The study shall be conducted by the Navy in conjunction with the Army and the cities of Concord, Martinez, and Pittsburg, Contra Costa County, the communities of Clyde and Bay Point, and the East Bay Regional Parks District. This study shall be concluded no later than December 31, 2000.

PORTABLE FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT

The Committee is concerned about the condition and types of equipment currently used by Navy and Marine Corps initial fire fighting response teams. The Committee is aware that equipment has recently become available that can improve the effectiveness of fire fighters while substantially improving the safety of working conditions for such personnel. Accordingly, the Committee directs that not less than $300,000 of the funds made available in Operation and Maintenance, Navy be used to purchase commercially available portable foam supply vests.

VIEQUES RANGE COMPLEX, PUERTO RICO

The Committee is deeply concerned about the tragic accident which occurred in April 1999 on the Navy's training range on the Island of Vieques. The Committee recognizes that the Navy considers this range to be a critical training asset, necessary to maintain the readiness of the aviation units of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet. However, because of this incident and other factors, the Committee directs the Navy to reexamine this issue, supports the Navy's decision to temporarily suspend all training at Vieques, and awaits the results of the panel that the Secretary of Defense has appointed to review this incident. The Committee believes the Panel must place special emphasis on reviewing the actual need for the Navy's use of the Vieques range, and should study the results of the Puerto Rican Special Commission on Vieques. In addition, the Committee directs the Panel to look at the use of alternative sites.

NAVAL AIR STATION (NAS) LEMOORE

The Committee strongly believes that a key to enhancing retention rates in the Navy is to improve the quality of life at its key bases and installations. In particular, the Committee has been told by many Navy fighter pilots that the deficiency of quality of life facilities, including recreation facilities, at NAS Lemoore, California is a significant reason for the retirement of experienced personnel. As the major new concentration for west coast tactical Naval Aviation, the excellence of this facility is critical to morale and retention. Because NAS Lemoore is located in a remote and isolated location, the normal metrics defining policy for construction of revenue generating recreational facilities cannot prevail. The Committee encourages the Department of Defense to find a method such as designation as remote and funding by appropriated funds, or waiver of the normal parameters for rates of return to allow for construction of necessary recreation facilities at NAS Lemoore. The Committee directs DoD to report on this plan by December 31, 1999.

NAVY ELECTRICITY AND ELECTRONICS TRAINING SERIES

Information on this project can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$2,578,718,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,558,929,000
Committee recommendation	2,822,004,000
Change from budget request	263,075,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,822,004,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps. The recommendation is an increase of $243,286,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
9900 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
9950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
10000 EXPEDITIONARY FORCES			
10050 OPERATIONAL FORCES	378,762	451,162	+72,400
10100 FIELD LOGISTICS	231,138	246,038	+14,900
10150 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	96,685	116,685	+20,000
10200 BASE SUPPORT	712,187	712,187	---
10250 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	247,401	247,401	---
10300 USMC PREPOSITIONING			
10350 MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	81,849	83,849	+2,000
10400 NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,770	3,770	---
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,751,792	1,861,092	+109,300
10500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
10550 ACCESSION TRAINING			
10600 RECRUIT TRAINING	9,917	9,917	---
10650 OFFICER ACQUISITION	294	294	---
10700 BASE SUPPORT	55,333	55,333	---
10750 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	18,557	18,557	---
10800 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
10850 SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	31,443	31,443	---
10900 FLIGHT TRAINING	162	162	---
10950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,575	8,575	---
11000 TRAINING SUPPORT	84,800	84,800	---
11050 BASE SUPPORT	57,212	57,212	---
11100 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	24,262	24,262	---
11150 RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION			
11200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	90,953	95,953	+5,000
11250 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	14,879	17,879	+3,000
11300 JUNIOR ROTC	9,506	11,506	+2,000
11350 BASE SUPPORT	8,032	8,032	---
11400 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,447	2,447	---
11450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	416,372	426,372	+10,000
11500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
11550 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT			
11650 SPECIAL SUPPORT	229,433	227,433	-2,000
11700 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	28,632	28,632	---
11750 ADMINISTRATION	25,241	25,241	---
11800 BASE SUPPORT	14,569	14,569	---
11850 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	2,056	2,056	---
11875 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	90,834	90,834	---
11900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	390,765	388,765	-2,000
11905 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	120,225	+120,225
11945 BASE SUPPORT	---	10,000	+10,000
12030 REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES	---	-2,400	-2,400
12070 MARINE CORPS SECURITY GUARDS	---	4,100	+4,100
12075 SPARES/WRM	---	25,000	+25,000
12085 COMMUNICATIONS REDUCTION	---	-150	-150
12090 IRV TRANSFER	---	-11,000	-11,000
12300 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,558,929	2,822,004	+263,075
12400 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(2,558,929)	(2,822,004)	(+263,075)

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
10050	Soldier Support—Initial Issue	30,000
10050	Rotational Training—MCAGCC Improvements	25,700
10050	Training and OPTEMPO (III MEF Airlift Requirements)	10,600
10050	Soldier Support—Body Armor	5,000
10050	NBC Defense Equipment	1,100
10100	Corrosion Control	13,800
10100	Fuel Conversion to JP 5/8	1,100
10150	Depot Maintenance	20,000
10350	Care in Storage (WRM Materials)	2,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:		
11200	Recruiting and Advertising	5,000
11250	Off-Duty and Voluntary Education	3,000
11300	Junior ROTC	2,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
11650	DFAS Reduction	−2,000
Undistributed:		
11905	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	120,225
11945	Base Operations Support	10,000
12030	Reduction in JCS Exercises	−2,400
12070	Marine Corps Security Guards	4,100
12075	Spares/War Reserve Materiel	25,000
12085	Communications Reductions	−150
12090	IRV Transfer	−11,000

BLOUNT ISLAND

The Committee supports the actions of the Marine Corps to acquire the Blount Island Command Complex property that is currently under lease. The Committee expects that this initiative will include acquisition of all surrounding property impacted by the current explosive safety quantity distance (ESQD) arc to permanently prevent development that is incompatible with the loading/offloading of ordnance on Maritime Prepositioning Ships.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$19,021,045,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	20,313,203,000
Committee recommendation	21,641,099,000
Change from budget request	1,321,896,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $21,641,099,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force. The recommendation is an increase of $2,619,964,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
12450 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
12500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
12550 AIR OPERATIONS			
12600 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,401,247	2,405,247	+4,000
12650 PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	264,665	265,665	+1,000
12700 COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	204,091	204,091	---
12750 AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	657,352	699,652	+42,300
12775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,096,870	1,130,370	+33,500
12800 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	936,390	934,390	-2,000
12850 BASE SUPPORT	1,835,256	1,835,256	---
12900 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	577,565	577,565	---
12950 COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS			
13000 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	665,827	665,827	---
13050 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	136,485	136,485	---
13100 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	247,715	252,976	+5,261
13150 JCS EXERCISES	34,588	34,588	---
13200 MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	123,289	123,289	---
13250 TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	254,547	254,547	---
13300 SPACE OPERATIONS			
13350 LAUNCH FACILITIES	218,743	228,743	+10,000
13400 LAUNCH VEHICLES	112,504	112,504	---
13450 SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	259,203	259,203	---
13500 SATELLITE SYSTEMS	52,753	52,753	---
13550 OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	90,461	90,461	---
13600 BASE SUPPORT	324,539	324,539	---
13650 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	55,960	55,960	---
13700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	10,550,050	10,644,111	+94,061
13750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
13800 MOBILITY OPERATIONS			
13850 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,359,999	1,759,499	+399,500
13900 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	30,401	30,401	---
13950 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	142,983	142,983	---
13975 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	312,062	317,462	+5,400
14000 PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	312,237	312,237	---
14050 BASE SUPPORT	455,730	455,730	---
14100 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	72,147	72,147	---
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	2,685,559	3,090,459	+404,900

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
14200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
14250 ACCESSION TRAINING			
14300 OFFICER ACQUISITION	60,067	60,067	---
14350 RECRUIT TRAINING	4,494	4,494	---
14400 RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	58,012	58,012	---
14450 BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	20,263	20,263	---
14500 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (ACADEMIES ONLY)	63,119	63,119	---
14550 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING			
14600 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	240,449	240,449	---
14650 FLIGHT TRAINING	471,526	471,526	---
14700 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	98,868	98,868	---
14750 TRAINING SUPPORT	69,964	69,964	---
14775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,532	14,532	---
14800 BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	411,644	411,644	---
14850 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY (OTHER TRAINING)	63,610	63,610	---
14900 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION			
14950 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	102,502	111,802	+9,300
15000 EXAMINING	3,036	3,036	---
15050 OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,587	87,587	---
15100 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	72,475	72,475	---
15150 JUNIOR ROTC	26,095	41,095	+15,000
15200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	1,868,243	1,892,543	+24,300
15250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
15300 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS			
15350 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	744,819	750,254	+5,435
15400 TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	398,063	398,063	---
15450 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	217,401	217,401	---
15475 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	58,334	58,334	---
15500 BASE SUPPORT	1,109,593	1,109,593	---
15550 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	245,214	245,214	---
15600 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
15650 ADMINISTRATION	150,381	146,200	-4,181
15700 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	346,821	342,821	-4,000
15750 PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	130,710	119,310	-11,400
15800 RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	60,228	60,228	---
15900 ARMS CONTROL	35,477	35,477	---
15950 OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	619,830	610,430	-9,400
16000 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	31,812	31,812	---
16050 CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,970	21,470	+7,500
16075 COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	309,061	309,061	---
16100 BASE SUPPORT	158,343	158,843	+500
16150 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	18,277	18,277	---
16200 SECURITY PROGRAMS			
16250 SECURITY PROGRAMS	596,798	589,498	-7,300
16300 SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS			
16350 INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	14,219	14,219	---
16400 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	5,259,351	5,236,505	-22,846

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

		BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
16410	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	-800	-800
16420	GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	---
16480	BASE SUPPORT	---	109,300	+109,300
16670	FORCE PROTECTION INFRASTRUCTURE	---	5,000	+5,000
16680	REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	400,826	+400,826
16700	SPARES	---	115,000	+115,000
16775	REAL PROPERTY SUPPORT	---	34,900	+34,900
16795	NBC HIGH LEVERAGE PROGRAMS	---	18,800	+18,800
16800	C130J LOGISTICS AND TRAINING	---	6,055	+6,055
16810	ICBM PRIME CONTRACT	---	16,300	+16,300
16825	AEF JOINT EXPERIMENTATION (JEFX)	---	35,600	+35,600
16835	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-20,000	-20,000
16840	REDUCTION IN JCS EXERCISES	---	-10,000	-10,000
16845	CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-10,000	-10,000
16850	RIVET JOINT SUPPORT	---	32,400	+32,400
16855	AIR FORCE MTAP	---	4,000	+4,000
16865	AIR FORCE ICS TRANSFER	---	106,100	+106,100
16870	COMMUNICATIONS REDUCTION	---	-16,000	-16,000
16910	TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	20,313,203	21,641,099	+1,327,896
16920	TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	---
16940	TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(20,363,203)	(21,691,099)	(+1,327,896)

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
12600	Battlelabs—Engineering and Technical Support	4,000
12650	Reverse Osmosis Dersalinators	1,000
12750	Rotational Training—AETC Mission Essential Equipment	14,000
12750	Rotational Training—Utah Test and Training Range Support	11,700
12750	Rotational Training—Funding for Air Warfare Center Range Support	6,100
12750	Rotational Training—AETC Range Improvements	5,900
12750	Rotational Training—Funding for Air Warfare Center Fiber Link	4,600
12775	Depot Maintenance	31,000
12775	Object Oriented Simulations/Reengineering	2,500
12800	Communications, Other Contracts	−2,000
13100	Power Scene	4,000
13100	SIMVAL	1,261
13350	Launch Facility Enhancements	10,000
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:		
13850	Interim Contractor Support (C–17)	396,600
13850	Airlift Operations (C–17 Sustainability)	2,900
13975	Depot Maintenance	5,400
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:		
14950	Recruiting and Advertising	9,300
15150	Junior ROTC	15,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
15350	REMIS	3,500
15350	Joint Service Ammo Management Automated Info System (JAMSS)	1,935
15650	Acquisition Travel and Contracts	−4,181
15700	Servicewide Communications	−4,000
15750	Personnel Programs	−11,400
15950	DFAS Reduction	−9,400
16050	Civil Air Patrol Corporation	7,500
16100	William Lehman Aviation Center	500
16250	Security Programs (DSS)	−7,300
Undistributed:		
16410	Classified Undistributed	−800
16480	Base Operations Support	109,300
16670	Force Protection Infrastructure	5,000
16680	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	400,826
16700	Spares	115,000
16775	Base Operations Support (Real Property Support)	34,900
16795	NBC High Leverage Programs	18,800
16800	C–130J Logistics and Training	6,055
16810	ICBM Prime Contract	16,300
16825	AEF Joint Experimentation (JEFX)	35,600
16835	Management Headquarters	−20,000
16840	Reduction in JCS Exercises	−10,000
16845	Contract and Advisory Services	−10,000
16850	Depot Maintenance—Rivet Joint #15–16/COBRA BALL 3	32,400
16855	Air Force MTAP	4,000
16865	Air Force ICS Transfer	106,100
16870	Communications Reduction	−16,000

INTERIM CONTRACTOR SUPPORT

As described elsewhere in this report, the Committee has transferred a total of $502,700,000 from various Air Force procurement accounts to Operation and Maintenance, Air Force. This includes $396,600,000 associated with the C–17, and $106,600,000 associated with various other weapons systems. In the Committee's view, this funding, since it covers expenses such as sustainment spares

and depot maintenance, should be both budgeted for and appropriated under Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, rather than in the procurement accounts.

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE PILOT PROGRAM

The Committee recommends an increase of $4,000,000 above the budget request to continue and expand the Manufacturing Technology Assistance Pilot Program (MTAPP). Of this amount, not less than $2,000,000 shall be available only to expand the MTAP program to Pennsylvania.

MC CLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE

The Committee notes that with the impending closure of McClellan Air Force Base, unique research assets will become available to the local community. Accordingly, the Committee supports the provision included in the House-passed National Defense Authorization bill for fiscal year 2000 which provides for the transfer of the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center.

ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION PROGRAM

The Committee urges the Air Force and the Defense Logistics Agency to jointly consider the development and implementation of an Enterprise Integration program to improve the quality and availability of logistical data necessary to support the acquisition of spare and repair parts required to field Air Force weapons systems.

REMIS

Information on this project can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$10,914,076,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	11,419,233,000
Committee recommendation	11,401,733,000
Change from budget request	− 17,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $11,401,733,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide. The recommendation is an increase of $487,657,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
16950 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
17000 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
17050 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	382,269	347,269	-35,000
17100 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,219,698	1,217,198	-2,500
17150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,601,967	1,564,467	-37,500
17200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION			
17250 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	38,312	41,312	+3,000
17350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
17450 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	9,512	9,512	---
17460 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,380	102,380	+2,000
17470 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	18,000	18,000	---
17480 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	58,100	58,100	---
17490 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,254	7,254	---
17510 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	913	913	---
17600 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	44,344	44,344	---
17650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	238,503	240,503	+2,000
17700 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
17750 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	95,865	95,865	---
17775 CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	87,503	72,803	-14,700
17800 CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,067,679	4,079,279	+11,600
17900 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	340,624	333,624	-7,000
17950 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	27,138	27,138	---
18000 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	190,226	155,026	-35,200
18050 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	822,904	822,904	---
18150 DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	9,483	9,483	---
18200 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,186,236	1,207,736	+21,500
18300 DEFENSE POW/MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,505	14,505	---
18310 DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY	65,638	63,638	-2,000
18320 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	84,395	84,395	---
18475 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AND TREATY COMPLIANCE AGENCY	195,533	189,033	-6,500
18500 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,376,909	1,378,909	+2,000
18600 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	158,647	158,147	-500
18650 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	30,940	42,940	+12,000
18700 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	423,493	429,293	+5,800
18850 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	40,263	40,263	---
18900 WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	322,470	282,970	-39,500
18950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	9,540,451	9,487,951	-52,500
19110 IMPACT AID	---	35,000	+35,000
19250 JCS MOBILITY ENHANCEMENT FUND	---	50,000	+50,000
19295 HUMAN RESOURCES ENTERPRISE STRATEGY	---	7,500	+7,500
19305 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION	---	-40,000	-40,000
19335 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-10,000	-10,000
19341 UNITED SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS	---	25,000	+25,000
19350 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	11,419,233	11,401,733	-17,500
19450 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(11,419,233)	(11,401,733)	(-17,500)

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
17050	JCS Exercises:	−35,000
17100	SOCOM—ASDS Slip	−3,000
17100	SOCOM—JTT/CIBS–M	500
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:		
17250	DLA—Warstopper	3,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:		
17460	DAU—Organizational Composition Research	2,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
17775	Starbase	300
17775	Innovative Readiness Training	−15,000
17800	Classified and Intelligence	11,600
17900	DCAA—Low priority program growth	−5,000
17900	DCAA—Performance Measures	−2,000
18000	DHRA—DIMHRS	−41,200
18000	DHRA—DEERS	8,000
18000	DHRA—DCPDS (program slip)	−2,000
18200	DLA—Automated Document Conversion	12,500
18200	DLA—Security Locks	10,000
18200	DLA—Performance Measures	−5,000
18200	DLA—Improved Cargo Methods	4,000
18310	DSCA—Performance Measures	−2,000
18475	DTRA—Treaty Implementation	−4,500
18475	DTRA—Performance Measures	−2,000
18500	DoDEA—WIC Program Overseas	2,000
18600	JCS—JMEANS	4,500
18600	JCS—Management Support	−5,000
18650	OEA—Pico Rivera	2,000
18650	OEA—Completion of Fort Ord conversion support	5,000
18650	OEA—Completion of San Diego Conversion Center	5,000
18700	OSD—C4ISR	6,000
18700	OSD—NGB Project Management System	5,000
18700	OSD—NE/SA Center for Security Studies	1,500
18700	OSD—Middle East Regional Security Issues	1,500
18700	OSD—Energy Savings Performance Contracts	8,000
18700	OSD—Job Placement Program	4,000
18700	OSD—Youth Development and Leadership Program	300
18700	OSD—Performance Measures	−10,000
18700	OSD—Youth Development Initiative	2,500
18700	OSD—Management and Contract Support	−15,000
18700	OSD—(A&T) Travel and Contracts	−10,000
18700	OSD—Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities	12,000
18900	WHS—Low Priority Programs	−10,000
18900	WHS—Defense Travel Service	−32,000
18900	WHS—Emergency Notification	2,500
19110	Impact Aid	35,000
19250	JCS Mobility Enhancements	50,000
19295	Human Resources Enterprise Strategy	7,500
19305	Headquarters and Management	−40,000
19335	Contract and Advisory Services	−10,000
19341	United Service Organizations	25,000

PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Committee is disappointed with the quality of the performance measures included in the Department's Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide budget justification books. On multiple occasions the Congress has made clear its intentions to link an agency's budget to the quality of its performance measures and the progress it makes in improving its performance. The Committee recommends reductions totaling $21,000,000 against those defense agencies that presented weak or non-existent performance goals.

DLA—WARSTOPPERS

The Committee recommends $3,000,000 only for the warstopper program to be used to maintain industrial readiness through microcircuit solutions like the Department's Generalized Emulation of Microcircuits program.

DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY

The Committee recommends $2,000,000 for the Defense Systems Management College, only for the Information Technology Organizational Composition Research Project. The Committee also supports the Defense Acquisition University's efforts to use state-of-the-art commercial training technology that would train the acquisition workforce in a simulated government procurement environment.

FAMILY THERAPY PROGRAM

The Department's National Guard Youth Challenge program has developed a residential program for at-risk youths which focuses on providing leadership, responsible citizenship, job skills, life coping skills, and educational and physical fitness programs. The Committee urges the Department to consider adding to this curriculum an in-depth family reintegration phase to the Challenge Youth program, which addresses the problems of family disintegration and juvenile violence.

DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE

The Committee understands that due to unusual circumstances the Department had to budget for $400,000 in security costs in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account, but that starting in fiscal year 2001, these expenses will be properly realigned to the Defense Working Capital Fund.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Information on Defense Human Resources Agency (DEERS), Defense Human Resources Agency (DIMHRS), Military Personnel Information Systems, and Automated Document Conversion programs can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

DLA—SECURITY LOCKS

Federal Specification FF–L–2740A was established by the Inter-Agency Committee on Security Equipment as the standard for providing secure protection to our nation's most sensitive classified material. In the past, the Committee has supported Department of Defense efforts to retrofit existing containers with security locks that conform to this specification.

The Committee is concerned, however, that sensitive classified materials in the possession of defense contractors are not subject to the same protection under Federal Specification FF–L–2740A, as mandated by Executive Order 12829. While new containers purchased by defense contractors must have locks which meet or exceed this specification, there remain a great deal of classified mate-

rials stored by defense contractors in containers which fall well below the prescribed standard.

The Committee therefore directs the Department to retrofit all security containers under the control of, or accessed by defense contractors with locks meeting the federal specification FF–L–2740A. The Committee has provided $10,000,000 for this purpose, and expects full utilization of these funds in the current fiscal year.

DLA—IMPROVED CARGO METHODS

The Committee recommends $4,000,000 only to test, develop and implement cost saving opportunities identified in ongoing studies of private sector logistics technology, practices and procedures to move military cargo more cheaply, with greater speed, and with greater reliability.

DTRA—TREATY IMPLEMENTATION

The Committee recommends a reduction of $4,500,000 due to delays in treaty implementation and changes in requirements. If additional funds prove necessary to meet emergent requirements stemming from valid treaty obligations, the Committee expects the Department to submit a reprogramming request subject to normal, prior approval reprogramming procedures.

JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF (JCS)—MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Committee recommends a reduction of $5,000,000 from JCS Management Support. None of this, or any other reduction, is to be taken against the Joint Staff's efforts in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide to support Joint Vision 2010.

JCS—J–MEANS

The Committee recommends $4,500,000 only for the Joint Multi-Dimensional Education and Analysis System (J–MEANS). This program will incorporate the National Defense University's wargaming modules and allow students to fully assess the effect of alternate strategies and technologies in an information age battlefield.

OSD—C4ISR

The Committee recommends $6,000,000 only to sustain the enhanced Command, Control, Communications, Computer, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Integrated Architecture Program and to extend the development across all the unified commands.

OSD—NEAR EAST/SOUTH ASIA CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES

The Committee supports the Department's plans to examine establishing a Near East/South Asia Center for Security Studies to promote a stable regional security environment, enhance military-to-military exchanges and to promote regional security cooperation. The Committee recommends $1,500,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, to facilitate planning for the Center.

OSD—MIDDLE EAST REGIONAL SECURITY ISSUES

The Committee recommends providing $1,500,000 for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs only to support current and established programs, conducted since 1993, to promote informal region-wide dialogues on Arms Control and regional security issues for Arab and Israeli officials and experts.

OSD–ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS

The Committee recommends $8,000,000 only to assist in training, providing technical expertise, performing energy audits, and otherwise assisting in the ESPC process.

OSD—JOB PLACEMENT PROGRAM

The Committee understands that the Department has been fully briefed on an innovative job placement and community outreach services program, FirstDay of the Future. With the imminent closure of Kelly and McClellan Air Force Bases, the Committee continues to believe that this innovated program will be beneficial to the effected military and civilian personnel and their families. Therefore, the Committee recommends $4,000,000 only to expeditiously implement this program.

OSD—YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AND LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The Committee recommends an increase of $300,000 over the budget request for the Youth Development and Leadership program, only to develop a safety net program to serve as the follow-up activity for the program initiated under Public Law 105–174.

OSD—YOUTH DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

The Committee recommends $2,500,000, consistent with Section 8107, only for a grant to a widely respected non-profit organization to finance on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis efforts to mobilize individuals, groups, and organizations to build and strengthen the character and competence of America's youth.

OSD—MANAGEMENT AND CONTRACT SUPPORT

The Committee is concerned about the continued growth in contractor support to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), that more than offsets the reductions made in OSD personnel. The Committee therefore recommends a reduction of $15,000,000 and directs that none of this, or any other reduction, be taken against the studies funded through the Office of Net Assessment.

WHS—EMERGENCY NOTIFICATION

The Committee notes the success the Pentagon's Army Operation Center has had with its automated emergency notification system and recommends $2,500,000 only to field the system to other organizations in the Department with similar notification requirements.

JCS MOBILITY ENHANCEMENTS

The Committee recommends $50,000,000 to support Transportation Command's mobility enhancements efforts. The Committee

believes that the Center for Commercial Deployment of Transportation Technologies should be considered for up to $15,000,000 of this amount.

NATIONAL CURATION PILOT PROJECT

The Committee understands that the Department has a requirement to safely store over 41,000 cubic feet of cultural and historical artifacts collected from public lands and to make these collections available to the public. In response to this, the Defense Legacy Resources Management Program awarded a grant to the Corps of Engineers, in cooperation with the State of Montana, to study and develop a design for a curatorial collections and processing building. The curation pilot project is designed to lead to the construction of new facilities in cooperation with the pilot institutions who will rehabilitate federally-associated collections for the Department. The Committee understands that the study is complete. The Committee therefore directs the Department to provide this report to the Committee by September 30, 1999, and the Department is encouraged to move forward with this important effort.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY EDUCATION

The increasing dependence by the Department of Defense on computers and computer communications has also increased its vulnerability to attacks on these information systems. This threat to a national critical infrastructure mandates the fostering and ongoing support of well-educated professionals that are able to protect our critical information system. The President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection completed a two-year study that concluded, in part, that a significant portion of the nation's infrastructure protection is tied to the development of information security professionals.

The Committee is aware that, although there are several postgraduate level educational programs currently available for advanced training in this area, there are no doctorate level programs currently available. The Committee believes that the development of a doctoral program in information security is required to provide a flow of individuals with the knowledge and credentials to support the expanding needs of the Department. The Committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review requirements for doctorate-level information systems security professionals within the Department and, if appropriate, consider sponsoring the establishment of doctorate level education programs in educational institutions capable of providing this level of training.

IMPROVED GENERAL PURPOSE TENTS

The Committee is pleased with the Army's successful development of a modular general purpose tent system (M.G.P.T.S.) to replace the current general purpose small, medium and large tents, which use 1940's design and manufacturing techniques. The M.G.P.T.S. has been designed to serve as a new generation of tents, providing greater durability and improved performance when exposed to severe weather. The Committee believes the new system

may better support Marine and Air Force field operations and encourages utilization of the improved system by these forces.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY

The Committee understands that before and after school programs are a strong support system to families living on military bases. The Committee believes that consideration should be given to enhancing services including tutorial and learning enrichment programs.

PINE BLUFF ARSENAL SUSTAINMENT TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to establish a Sustainment Training and Technical Assistance Program at Pine Bluff Arsenal, AR, for chemical and biological defense equipment in support of the Department of Justice equipment grant program.

LEGACY

The Committee encourages the Department to consider the U.S.S. Constitution museum for funding in its legacy program.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Additional recommendations by the Committee are described in the classified annex accompanying this report.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
19500 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
19550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
19560 LAND FORCES			
19570 DIVISION FORCES	12,469	12,469	---
19580 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	26,496	26,496	---
19590 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	196,704	196,704	---
19595 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	99,091	99,091	---
19600 MISSION OPERATIONS			
19610 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	299,852	299,852	---
19620 INCREASED OPTEMPO	---	20,000	+20,000
19630 LAND FORCES READINESS			
19640 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	128,297	129,297	+1,000
19650 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	32,172	32,172	---
19660 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	33,174	36,574	+3,400
19670 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
19680 BASE SUPPORT	314,261	324,261	+10,000
19690 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	78,295	78,295	---
19710 UNIFIED COMMANDS	40	40	---
19720 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,354	1,354	---
19900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,222,205	1,256,605	+34,400
19950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
20000 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
20025 ADMINISTRATION	31,108	31,108	---
20050 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	23,199	23,199	---
20060 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	46,346	46,346	---
20070 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	46,355	71,355	+25,000
20075 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	147,008	172,008	+25,000
20090 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	10,000	+10,000
20120 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	3,500	+3,500
20360 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	39,563	+39,563
20365 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONS	---	31,400	+31,400
20700 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,369,213	1,513,076	+143,863

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,202,622,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,369,213,000
Committee recommendation	1,513,076,000
Change from budget request	+143,863,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,513,076,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve. The recommendation is an increase of $310,454,000 above the $1,202,622,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
19620 Mission Operations/Increased Optempo	20,000
19640 Forces Readiness Operations Support/Training Area Environmental Management	1,000
19660 Depot Maintenance	3,400
19680 Base Support	10,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
20070 Recruiting and Advertising	25,000
Other Adjustments:	
20090 Real Property Maintenance	10,000
20120 Recruiting Support	3,500
20360 Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	39,563
20365 Information Management	27,000
20365 Information Operations	4,400

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$957,239,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	917,647,000
Committee recommendation	969,478,000
Change from budget request	+51,831,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $969,478,000 for Operation and maintenance, Navy Reserve. The recommendation is an increase of $12,239,000 above the $957,239,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
20850 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
20900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
20950 RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS			
21000 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	283,792	283,792	---
21100 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,232	17,232	---
21150 AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,829	3,829	---
21200 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	104,087	104,087	---
21250 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	267	267	---
21400 RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS			
21450 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	72,200	72,200	---
21500 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	615	615	---
21550 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	9,323	9,323	---
21600 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	92,988	92,988	---
21650 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,760	2,760	---
21700 RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT			
21800 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	26,678	26,678	---
21950 RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT			
22000 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,224	5,224	---
22030 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	21,469	21,469	---
22040 BASE SUPPORT	155,805	155,805	---
22050 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	---	3,000	+3,000
22060 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	5,000	+5,000
22090 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	796,269	804,269	+8,000
22100 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
22150 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
22200 ADMINISTRATION	6,768	6,768	---
22250 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,299	1,299	---
22300 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	24,551	24,551	---
22400 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	82,260	82,260	---
22550 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,899	5,899	---
22600 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	601	601	---
22605 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT			
22750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	121,378	121,378	---
22794 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	13,831	+13,831
22796 BASE OPERATIONS	---	10,000	+10,000
22810 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	10,000	+10,000
22815 CONTRIBUTORY SUPPORT TO CINCS	---	10,000	+10,000
23150 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	917,647	969,478	+51,831

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
22055 Recruiting and Advertising	3,000
22060 Recruiting Support	5,000
Other Adjustments:	
22794 Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	13,831
22796 Base Operations	10,000
22810 Real Property Maintenance	10,000
22815 Contributory Support to CINCs	10,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$117,893,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	123,266,000
Committee recommendation	143,911,000
Change from budget request	+20,645,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $143,911,000 for Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve. The recommendation is an increase of $26,018,000 above the $117,893,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
23300 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
23350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
23400 MISSION FORCES			
23450 TRAINING	18,121	18,121	---
23500 OPERATING FORCES	38,529	38,529	---
23550 BASE SUPPORT	14,588	14,588	---
23600 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	6,054	10,054	+4,000
23650 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,350	11,350	---
23700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	88,642	92,642	+4,000
23750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
23800 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
23850 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,841	7,841	---
23900 SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,116	11,116	---
23950 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	476	476	---
24000 ADMINISTRATION	7,441	7,441	---
24050 BASE SUPPORT	7,750	7,750	---
24105 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	34,624	34,624	---
24110 INCREASED USE OF GUARD AND RESERVE	---	1,200	+1,200
24220 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	945	+945
24250 INITIAL ISSUE	---	10,000	+10,000
24260 782 GEAR ISSUE	---	3,000	+3,000
24270 SPARES	---	1,500	+1,500
24600 TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	123,266	143,911	+20,645

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
23600 Maintenance of Real Property	4,000
Other Adjustments:	
24110 Increased Use of Guard and Reserves	1,200
24220 Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	945
24250 Initial Issue	10,000
24260 782 Career Gear Issue	3,000
24270 Spares	1,500

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,747,696,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,728,437,000
Committee recommendation	1,788,091,000
Change from budget request	+59,654,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,788,091,000 for Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve. The recommendation is an increase of $40,395,000 above the $1,747,696,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
24750 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
24800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
24850 AIR OPERATIONS			
24900 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,058,142	1,058,142	---
24950 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	45,972	45,972	---
24970 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	265,429	280,429	+15,000
25000 BASE SUPPORT	235,907	235,907	---
25050 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	38,474	38,474	---
25150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,643,924	1,658,924	+15,000
25200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
25250 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
25300 ADMINISTRATION	46,819	46,819	---
25350 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,254	20,254	---
25400 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,418	11,918	+1,500
25410 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	1,000	+1,000
25450 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,390	6,390	---
25500 AUDIOVISUAL	632	632	---
25505 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	84,513	87,013	+2,500
25510 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	10,000	+10,000
25520 BASE OPERATIONS	---	10,000	+10,000
25558 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	12,154	+12,154
25570 C-130 OPERATIONS	---	10,000	+10,000
25950 TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,728,437	1,788,091	+59,654

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
24970 Depot Maintenance	15,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
25400 Recruiting and Advertising	1,500
25410 Recruiting Support	1,000
Other Adjustments:	
25510 Real Property Maintenance	10,000
25520 Base Operations	10,000
25558 Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	12,154
25570 C–130 Operations	10,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$2,678,015,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,903,549,000
Committee recommendation	3,103,642,000
Change from budget request	+200,093,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,103,642,000 for Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard. The recommendation is an increase of $425,627,000 above the $2,678,015,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
26100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
26120 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
26140 LAND FORCES			
26180 DIVISIONS	367,379	367,379	---
26200 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	773,892	773,892	---
26220 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	183,763	183,763	---
26240 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	139,382	139,382	---
26260 LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	94,098	94,098	---
26280 LAND FORCES READINESS			
26320 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	5,889	5,889	---
26340 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	187,327	197,327	+10,000
26360 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT			
26400 BASE OPERATIONS	468,029	474,293	+6,264
26420 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	111,716	111,716	---
26440 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	400,988	400,988	---
26580 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,732,463	2,748,727	+16,264
26600 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
26620 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
26660 STAFF MANAGEMENT	58,902	58,902	---
26680 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	18,981	36,481	+17,500
26720 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	50,840	50,840	---
26740 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	42,363	48,863	+6,500
26760 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	171,086	195,086	+24,000
26860 MILITARY (CIVILIAN) TECHNICIANS SHORTFALL	---	48,000	+48,000
26865 OPTEMPO INCREASE	---	10,000	+10,000
26866 SCHOOL HOUSE SUPPORT	---	10,000	+10,000
26867 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	60,629	+60,629
26880 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	10,000	+10,000
26900 EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM	---	14,000	+14,000
26910 ANGEL GATE ACADEMY	---	4,200	+4,200
26920 NGB PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	---	3,000	+3,000
26980 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NAT. GUARD	2,903,549	3,103,642	+200,093

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
26340	Depot Maintenance	10,000
26400	Base Operations/Training Area Environmental Management	6,264
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
26680	Information Management/Distance Learning	17,500
26740	Recruiting and Advertising	6,500
Other Adjustments:		
26860	Military (Civilian) Technicians Shortfall	48,000
26865	Optempo Increase	10,000
26866	School House Support	10,000
26867	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	60,629
26880	Real Property Maintenance	10,000
26900	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	14,000
26910	Angel Gate Academy	4,200
26920	NGB Project Management System	3,000

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD CENTER

The Committee understands that the Headquarters, 53rd Support Battalion, Army National Guard is in extensive need of repair and renovation. The Committee has provided additional funds for Real Property Maintenance for the Army National Guard's backlog of repair and maintenance projects, and directs that $1,000,000 be designated for repair of the armory in Florida.

ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER

The Committee has provided additional funds for Real Property Maintenance for the Army National Guard and directs that $3,000,000 be provided for remedial site preparation for the Eugene Armed Forces Reserve Center and Organizational Maintenance Shop.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU NATIONWIDE FIBER OPTICS NETWORK

Information on this project can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

NATIONAL GUARD DISTANCE LEARNING

Information on this project can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

NGB PROJECT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The Committee recommends a total increase of $8,000,000 for the National Guard's Project Management System. The Committee understands that the National Guard Bureau has taken the lead within the Department to implement a project management system using the latest commercially developed off-the-shelf technology, which will enable program managers to better manage programs in a timely manner and stay within budget and cost limits. The Committee believes that the National Guard Bureau Project Management System Pilot Project has tremendous applicability throughout all services and urges the Secretary of Defense to implement this program throughout the Department. The Committee has included

$3,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard for the continuation of the Project Management System Pilot Project, and $5,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide to implement this project management system throughout the Department.

REPAIR OF UH–1 ENGINES

The Committee understands that the Army National Guard's UH–1 Iroquois helicopter fleet has been restricted in the types of missions flown because of the unreliability of the T–53 engines, many of which require major repairs or overhaul for deficiencies. The Committee urges the Secretary of the Army to consider the use of commercial practices regarding the repair and overhaul of these helicopter engines.

MOFFETT FIELD AND MARCH AIR RESERVE BASE

The Committee recognizes the many advantages of the Moffett Airfield complex and the March Air Reserve Base for providing needed facilities in supporting the ongoing effort to upgrade domestic preparedness against weapons of mass destruction. Moffett's infrastructure and command and control capabilities include not only the airfield, but critical Federal, civil and housing assets, including NASA/Ames, Onizuka Air Station, DoD and DoT activities, together with the unique emergency support capabilities of the California Air National Guard 129th Rescue Wing, FEMA and the Red Cross.

March Air Reserve Base hosts various military and civilian activities including Air Mobility, National Guard Refueling, and a Fighter Wing serving the U.S. Customs Service Domestic Air Interdiction. March is a fully operational public safety training complex which combines law enforcement, fire and rescue, emergency management, response and medical training for first responders or biological and chemical terrorism, SWAT training, domestic terrorism and fire technology for hazardous materials.

The Committee urges the Department and cognizant state and local officials to fully consider Moffett's and March's operational and support capabilities when selecting new locations for expanding the capability of weapons of mass destruction first responders to train, equip and support local authorities in California. The Committee requests a report from DoD/National Guard and Reserves by December 31, 1999 on use of these key Federal facilities.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$3,106,933,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,099,618,000
Committee recommendation	3,239,438,000
Change from budget request	+139,820,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,239,438,000 for Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard. The recommendation is an increase of $132,505,000 above the $3,106,933,000 appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
27500 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
27550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES			
27600 AIR OPERATIONS			
27650 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	1,977,442	1,977,442	---
27660 AIRCRAFT SPARES	---	10,000	+10,000
27700 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	357,487	357,487	---
27750 BASE SUPPORT	299,089	308,889	+9,800
27800 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	38,130	48,130	+10,000
27850 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	415,185	435,185	+20,000
27860 F-16 FLIGHT TRAINING HOURS	---	15,000	+15,000
27900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	3,087,333	3,152,133	+64,800
27950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
28000 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
28050 ADMINISTRATION	2,656	2,656	---
28100 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,629	13,629	+4,000
28110 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	12,285	16,285	+4,000
28150 QOLE(D) RPM TRANSFER	---	63,020	+63,020
28160 C-130 OPERATIONS	---	5,000	+5,000
28175 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	2,000	+2,000
28180 NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	---	1,000	+1,000
28550 TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,099,618	3,239,438	+139,820

The adjustments to the budget activities for Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard are shown below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
27660	Aircraft Spares	10,000
27750	Base Support	5,000
27750	Base Support/Buckley ANG Base	4,800
27800	Maintenance of Real Property	10,000
27850	Depot Maintenance	20,000
27860	F–16 Flight Training Hours	15,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:		
28100	Recruiting and Advertising	4,000
Other Adjustments:		
28150	Real Property Maintenance (Transfer from Quality of Life Enhancements)	63,020
28160	C–130 Operations	5,000
28175	Recruiting Support	2,000
28180	National Guard State Partnership Program	1,000

NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

The Committee recommends $1,000,000 only for the National Guard's State Partnership Program. The Committee directs that these funds be used to support theater engagement opportunities for National Guard soldiers and state civilian personnel who directly support the State Partnership Program and civil-military engagement goals and for the National Guard Minuteman Fellows Program which the Committee has supported in the past.

C–130 OPERATIONS

The Committee recommends a total of $1,500,000 over the budget request for personnel and operation and maintenance costs to support the restoration of C–130 operational capabilities for the Florida Air National Guard.

159TH AIR NATIONAL GUARD FIGHTER GROUP

The Committee recommends an increase of $1,500,000 over the budget request in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard and directs that these funds be used for the operation of C–130H operational support aircraft of the 159th ANG Fighter Group.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$439,400,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,387,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,812,600,000
Change from budget request	−575,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,812,600,000 for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund. The funding in this paragraph provides for ongoing DoD operations in Southwest Asia and Bosnia. Due to the termination of air operations over Kosovo and reduced air operations tempo over Southwest Asia, the Committee recommends a reduction of $575,000,000 from the budget request.

BUDGET JUSTIFICATION AND BUDGET EXECUTION MATERIALS

The Committee notes that the budget request includes a relative lack of justification data concerning U.S. participation in contin-

gency operations in both the Military Personnel accounts, the Procurement accounts and the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund. Accordingly, the Committee includes a new general provision, Section 8111, which requires the Department of Defense to include the same type of budget justification materials as are provided for other Department of Defense activities. In addition, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees at the end of each quarter of the fiscal year, with the first such report due on December 31, 1999, detailing both the financial transactions associated with the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund as well as all other appropriation accounts from which contingency operations expenses are paid, and programmatic data for each contingency operation. This budget execution data shall include the amounts paid from each appropriation account to include funds distributed from the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund to each appropriation account, for each contingency operation; a comparison of actual troop strength for active duty and Guard and Reserve components for each contingency operation compared to the amounts anticipated in the budget request; and, a comparison of major weapons systems, including but not limited to all types of aircraft, naval vessels and major ground equipment items for each active duty and Guard and Reserve component for each contingency operation compared to the level assumed in the budget request.

KOSOVO BASE CAMP CONSTRUCTION

The Committee is aware of ongoing efforts to construct two base camps that will house U.S. troops deployed in support of the NATO peacekeeping force in Kosovo. While the Committee acknowledges that such efforts are essential to support the quality of life for deployed troops, the Committee agrees with the language included in the report accompanying the House version of the fiscal year 2000 Military Construction Appropriations bill. Accordingly, the Committee reminds the Department of Defense that Section 110 of Public Law 105–237 prohibits construction of new bases overseas without prior notification to the Committee on Appropriations.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$7,324,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,621,000
Committee recommendation	7,621,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,621,000 for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. The recommendation is an increase of $297,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$370,640,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	378,170,000
Committee recommendation	378,170,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $378,170,000 for Environmental Restoration, Army. The recommendation is an increase of $7,530,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL

The Committee is encouraged by the Department's progress in remediating the environmental contamination at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal site near Denver, Colorado, and in facilitating the successful conversion and reuse of the property. The Committee encourages the Defense Department to continue to fully support the cleanup and conversion projects at this site.

ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION CONTRACTS

The Committee is concerned about the Department's limited use of indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contracts for environmental remediation. The Committee directs the Department to report to the congressional defense committees on how this contract vehicle compares with other contract options in cost, involvement of small businesses and inclusion of local companies.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$274,600,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	284,000,000
Committee recommendation	284,000,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $284,000,000 for Environmental Restoration, Navy. The recommendation is an increase of $9,400,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$372,100,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	376,800,000
Committee recommendation	376,800,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $376,800,000 for Environmental Restoration, Air Force. The recommendation is an increase of $4,700,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$26,091,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	25,370,000
Committee recommendation	25,370,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,370,000 for Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide. The recommendation is a decrease of $721,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$225,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	199,214,000
Committee recommendation	209,214,000
Change from budget request	+10,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $209,214,000 for Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites. The recommendation is a decrease of $15,786,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

CAMP CROFT

The Committee is concerned about the unexploded ordnance at the former Camp Croft and the danger this poses to the safety of the citizens living on or near this former military base. The Committee encourages the Department to address this problem as quickly and as completely as possible.

LAKE CITY ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

The Committee is concerned about the soil and groundwater contamination at the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant. The Committee understands that the U.S. Army has signed an interagency agreement with the Environmental Protection agency and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources and urges the Department to allocate the funds necessary to implement the projects required by this agreement.

NEWMARK

The Committee continues to have serious concern about the Department's failure to respond at a senior level to groundwater contamination at the Newmark and Muscoy Superfund sites in California. The Committee understands that both the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the City of San Bernardino believe that the contamination is a direct result of industrial waste from Camp Ono, a World War II depot and maintenance facility. The EPA has reported that there is "no other reasonable source for the contamination," than the former Army base, and, more recently, that the Army is "a likely source of the contamination."

Report language in the conference reports accompanying the fiscal year 1997 and 1998 Defense Appropriations Bills highlighted the urgency of this problem and requested adequate funding and prompt action by the Department to remediate this site. The Committee is disappointed with the Department's response. The Department has, thus far, ignored a September, 1998 court order to mediate the dispute. The Committee is particularly concerned by the Department's lack of a response to the Committee's November, 1998 request for senior-level mediation involving the Department and the Environmental Protection Agency. As a result, the Committee strongly believes that the Department should, within 60 days of enactment of this Act, initiate mediation in this matter with the EPA and report to the congressional defense committees fully explaining the Department's plan to reach a timely resolution to this matter.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$50,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	55,800,000
Committee recommendation	55,800,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $55,800,000 for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid. The recommendation is an increase of $5,800,000 from the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$440,400,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	475,500,000
Committee recommendation	456,100,000
Change from budget request	−19,400,000

This appropriation funds the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	475,500	456,100	−19,400
Strategic Nuclear Arms Elimination Ukraine	33,000	43,000	+10,000
Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination Russia	157,300	177,300	+20,000
Weapons Transportation Russia	15,200	15,200	0
Weapons Storage Security Russia	40,000	90,000	+50,000
Warhead Dismantlement Processing Russia	9,300	9,300	0
Reactor Core Conversion	20,000	20,000	0
Fissile Material Storage Russia	64,500	60,900	−3,600
Chemical Weapons Destruction Russia	130,400	24,600	−105,800
Defense and Military Contacts	2,000	0	−2,000
Other Assessments	1,800	1,800	0

PROJECT LEVEL TABLE

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Biological Weapons Proliferation Prevention Russia	2,000	14,000	+12,000

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

The Department recommended $475,500,000 for the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction programs. The Committee recommends $456,100,000, a net decrease of $19,400,000. The Committee has recommended changes to each program in accordance with the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. However, the Committee is also recommending an increase of $12,000,000 for the biological weapons proliferation prevention program for additional security enhancements.

QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$455,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,845,370,000
Committee recommendation	800,000,000
Change from budget request	−1,045,370,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $800,000,000 for Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense. The recommendation is an increase of $345,000,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

The President's budget proposed providing $1,845,370,000 for this account. However, upon examination the Committee has determined these funds are intended to be used for general real property maintenance projects, and not solely quality of life-related efforts, which was the basis for the Committee's having created this account several years ago. Accordingly, the Committee recommends providing the $1,845,370,000, requested by the administration in this account directly to the Services in their respective Operation and Maintenance accounts.

For this account, the Committee provides an increase of $800,000,000 for active component real property maintenance which is reserved only for quality of life related projects. The Committee designates the increased funding provided in this account as a special interest item, subject to normal prior approval reprogramming procedures.

The adjustments to the budget request for Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense are shown in the table below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense: Program Increases:	
Army	$182,600
Navy	285,200
Marine Corps	62,100
Air Force	259,600
Defense-Wide	10,500
NTC LEA	(1,200)
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense: Transfers Out:	
Army	625,808
Navy	508,369
Marine Corps	120,225
Air Force	400,826
Army Reserve	39,563
Navy Reserve	13,831
Marine Corps Reserve	945
Air Force Reserve	12,154
Army National Guard	60,629
Air National Guard	63,020

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS SUMMARY

The fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense procurement budget request totals $51,851,538,000. The accompanying bill recommends $53,031,397,000. The total amount recommended is an increase of $1,179,859,000 above the fiscal year 2000 budget estimate and is $4,440,977,000 above the total provided in fiscal year 1999. The table below summarizes the budget estimates and the Committee's recommendations.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
SUMMARY						
ARMY:						
AIRCRAFT		1,229,888		1,590,488		+360,600
MISSILES		1,358,104		1,272,798		-85,306
WEAPONS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		1,416,765		1,556,665		+139,900
AMMUNITION		1,140,816		1,228,770		+87,954
OTHER		3,423,870		3,604,751		+180,881
TOTAL, ARMY		8,569,443		9,253,472		+684,029
NAVY:						
AIRCRAFT		8,228,655		9,168,405		+939,750
WEAPONS		1,357,400		1,334,800		-22,600
AMMUNITION		484,900		537,600		+52,700
SHIPS		6,678,454		6,656,554		-21,900
OTHER		4,100,091		4,252,191		+152,100
MARINE CORPS		1,137,220		1,333,120		+195,900
TOTAL, NAVY		21,986,720		23,282,670		+1,295,950
AIR FORCE:						
AIRCRAFT		9,302,086		8,298,313		-1,003,773
MISSILES		2,359,608		2,329,510		-30,098
AMMUNITION		419,537		481,837		+62,300
OTHER		7,085,177		6,964,227		-120,950
TOTAL, AIR FORCE		19,166,408		18,073,887		-1,092,521
DEFENSE-WIDE		2,128,967		2,286,368		+157,401
NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT		---		130,000		+130,000
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES		---		5,000		+5,000
TOTAL PROCUREMENT		51,851,538		53,031,397		+1,179,859

SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrases "only for" or "only to" in this report are Congressional interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount, or a revised amount if changed during conference or if otherwise specifically addressed in the conference report. These items remain special interest whether or not they are repeated in a subsequent conference report.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Adjustments to classified programs are addressed in a classified annex accompanying this report.

RANGELESS TRAINING

Last year, the Congress directed the Defense Department to conduct a technical evaluation between the Joint Tactical Combat Training System and other alternatives to ensure that the best and most affordable system is chosen to accomplish the rangeless training mission for the Navy and the Air Force. The Department did an outstanding job of initiating the evaluation on a timely basis. In particular, the Committee commends the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology; the Director of Test, Systems Engineering and Evaluation, Ranges and Resources; the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness, Readiness and Training; the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, Conventional Systems; and the Joint Tactical Training System project office. The Committee recognizes that implementing the initiative took a great deal of time and commitment from these organizations. The result of these efforts will allow the Department to field a much-needed rangeless training system in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

The Navy and the Air Force requested a total of $42,300,000 to continue the Joint Tactical Training System in fiscal year 2000 which the Committee recommends. The procurement funds are designated to be of special interest, and may only be obligated to procure equipment for the system which DoD selects as the result of the congressionally-directed technical evaluation.

FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TEST NEW STARTS

The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all DoD components follow new start notification procedures prior to award of production contracts resulting from successful foreign comparative tests. The Committee notes that DoD notification of the desire to test a foreign system does not constitute notification of procurement of that system.

AIR FORCE INTERIM CONTRACTOR SUPPORT

Interim Contractor Support is the maintenance and support of a new weapon system provided by a commercial vendor pending transition to organic support. Current DoD policy allows procurement

appropriations to fund Interim Contractor Support (ICS) whereas organic support is funded in the operation and maintenance (O&M) appropriations. DoD policy calls for all acquisition programs to minimize the scope and duration of ICS. However, the Committee has recently learned of a growing trend in the Air Force to abuse the ICS concept by maximizing its scope and duration, effectively shifting the O&M burden of certain programs to the procurement accounts. For example, the C–17 program now plans to use approximately $400 million a year of procurement funding to finance flying hour spares and depot aircraft maintenance for the life of the C–17 production program.

The Committee believes that using ICS in this manner blurs the distinction between O&M and procurement appropriations and therefore seriously compromises oversight in Congress and OSD. ICS represents large pools of funding that a program manager could divert, without the prior knowledge of Congress, for additional procurement end-items or acquisition cost overruns while "shorting" operational forces. The Committee also notes that in the last several years, DoD witnesses have highlighted efforts to increase modernization funding to meet the Joint Staff goal of $60 billion per year. Funding high levels of O&M effort in the procurement accounts gives Congress a false picture of how well DoD is meeting these higher modernization funding goals.

Given these concerns, the Committee recommendation includes a transfer of $502.7 million from Air Force procurement to O&M appropriations. The Committee directs the Air Force to fund all ICS in the O&M accounts in future budget submissions.

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The Committee understands that DoD policy prevents defense components from acting on notification reprogrammings until written approval has been provided by the Senate defense committees. The Committee further understands that DoD policy does not extend this courtesy to House defense committees. The Committee believes that each of the congressional defense committees should be accorded the same opportunity to review and approve all reprogrammings submitted for Congressional consideration, including notification reprogrammings. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure the reprogramming policy is updated to reflect the requirement to receive written approval from all congressional defense committees prior to implementing reprogrammings, including notification reprogrammings. This direction applies to all defense appropriations.

ARMY PROCUREMENT ISSUES

UNFUNDED REQUIREMENTS LIST

This year, as in the past, the Committee requested that the Service Chiefs provide "unfunded requirements lists". Usually the lists include critical activities or items that the Services believe are not adequately funded in the budget request, for example, base operations. It has also been the Committee's understanding that the Secretary of Defense only allows the Services to include those items that are included in the current budget request and the outyears.

However, the Committee notes that several items on the Army's shortfall list are not funded in the Future Years' Defense Plan and have such large outyear funding requirements that the Committee does not believe they can be accommodated in future budget submissions, such as the Huey, Blackhawk, and the Bradley Service Life Extension Programs (SLEP). While programs such as the Blackhawk SLEP have merit, the Committee is reluctant to add a "down payment" of $31 million in fiscal year 2000 if the Army will not budget the half billion dollars required in the outyears. Although the Committee appreciates the Army Chief of Staff's candor when submitting the Army's unfunded requirements list, the Committee encourages him to include only items which are included in the budget request and can be supported in future budget submissions.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,388,268,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,229,888,000
Committee recommendation	1,590,488,000
Change from budget request	+360,600,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of tactical and utility airplanes and helicopters, including associated electronics, electronic warfare, and communications equipment and armament, modification of in-service aircraft, ground support equipment, components and parts such as spare engines, transmissions gear boxes, and sensor equipment. It also funds related training devices such as combat flight simulators and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
CH–47 Cargo Helicopter Mods	70,738	126,838	+56,100
Utility/Cargo Airplane Mods	6,308	9,308	+3,000
AH–64 Longbow Mods	729,536	774,536	+45,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
UH–60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	86,140	207,140	+121,000
UH–60L Blackhawks (+6)			+54,000
(NOTE: UH–60L aircraft are only for the Dual Mission General Support Aviation Company, National Guard, 40 Infantry Division)			
UH–60Q (+5)			+67,000
(NOTE: UH–60Q aircraft are only for the National Guard)			
AH–64 MODS	22,565	116,565	+94,000
LOLA boost pump			+3,000
Vibration management enhancement program			+7,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
(NOTE: Only for the National Guard)			
Oil debris detection system			+3,000
Apache A model second generation FLIR			+75,000
Apache A model HF radio integration			+6,000
UH–60 MODS	12,087	13,587	+1,500
UH–60Q training device			+1,500
AIRBORNE AVIONICS	43,690	47,090	+3,400
Airborne video recorder & image transceiver			+3,400
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	88	24,188	+24,100
ASET IV			+18,100
AN/AVR–2A laser detection sets			+6,000
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	35,915	37,915	+2,000
Helicopter external lift enhancer			+2,000
AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	4,394	14,894	+10,500
UH–60 A\L cockpit air bag system			+10,500

APACHE A MODEL READINESS

The deployment of Task Force Hawk to Albania during Operation Allied Force revealed a series of personnel training, readiness, and equipment problems affecting the Army's Apache forces. The Committee is extremely concerned with the condition of the current Apache fleet and has recommended the following increases in procurement to alleviate recognized deficiencies: $75,000,000 only to procure and integrate the Second Generation Forward Looking Infrared Radar and $6,000,000 only to procure and integrate HF radios on Apache A model helicopters. The Committee also recommends an increase of $213,500,000 in Operations and Maintenance, Army for spare parts and war reserve material. The Committee expects that a portion of these funds will be used to meet Apache requirements.

The Committee's recommendation procures upgrades for 24 Apache A model helicopters. The Committee encourages the Army to adequately fund upgrades for the remaining fleet in subsequent budget requests.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
ROTARY						
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	8	86,140	19	207,140	+11	+121,000
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY)	--	16,700	--	16,700	--	---
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT		102,840		223,840		+121,000
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	--	18,863	--	18,863	--	---
ARL MODS	--	5,828	--	5,828	--	---
AH1F MODS	--	432	--	432	--	---
AH-64 MODS	--	22,565	--	116,565	--	+94,000
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	--	70,738	--	126,838	--	+56,100
UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	--	6,308	--	9,308	--	+3,000
OH-58 MODS	--	468	--	468	--	---
AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	--	761	--	761	--	---
LONGBOW	--	729,536	--	774,536	--	+45,000
LONGBOW (AP-CY)	--	35,702	--	35,702	--	---
UH-1 MODS	--	4,380	--	4,380	--	---
UH-60 MODS	--	12,087	--	13,587	--	+1,500
KIOWA WARRIOR	--	39,046	--	39,046	--	---
EH-60 QUICKFIX MODS	--	4,915	--	4,915	--	---
AIRBORNE AVIONICS	--	43,690	--	47,090	--	+3,400
ASE MODS (SIRFC)	--	11,796	--	11,796	--	---
GATM	--	7,090	--	7,090	--	---
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	2,586	--	2,586	--	---
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		1,016,791		1,219,791		+203,000
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARE PARTS (AIR)	--	16,075	--	16,075	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	--	88	--	24,188	--	+24,100
OTHER SUPPORT						
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	--	35,915	--	37,915	--	+2,000
AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	--	4,394	--	14,894	--	+10,500
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	--	8,760	--	8,760	--	---
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	1,462	--	1,462	--	---
AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	--	43,563	--	43,563	--	---
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		94,182		130,782		+36,600
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,229,888		1,590,488		+360,600

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,226,335,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,358,104,000
Committee recommendation	1,272,798,000
Change from budget request	−85,306,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of surface-to-air, surface-to-surface, and anti-tank/assault missile systems. Also included are major components, modifications, targets, test equipment, and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Avenger System Modifications	33,750	35,050	+1,300
Avenger Modifications	0	4,300	+4,300

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
JAVELIN (AAWS–M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP–CY)	98,406	0	−98,406
Economic order quantity for multi-year contract			−98,406
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	130,634	138,134	+7,500
Vehicular intercommunications system (AN/VIC–3)—cordless			+2,500
Loader Launch Module and Fire Control System			+5,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
OTHER MISSILES						
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	20	33,750	20	35,050	--	+1,300
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2,200	296,472	2,200	296,472	--	---
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM						
JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	2,682	307,677	2,682	307,677	--	---
JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (AP-CY)	--	98,406	--	---	--	-98,406
MLRS ROCKET	--	3,338	--	3,338	--	---
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	47	130,634	47	138,134	--	+7,500
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS (AP-CY)	--	15,993	--	15,993	--	---
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	110	95,619	110	95,619	--	---
ATACMS/BAT	61	76,787	61	76,787	--	---
BAT	846	149,254	846	149,254	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		1,207,930		1,118,324		-89,606
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
MODIFICATIONS						
PATRIOT MODS	--	30,840	--	30,840	--	---
STINGER MODS	--	17,392	--	17,392	--	---
AVENGER MODS	--	---	--	4,300	--	+4,300
ITAS/TOW MODS	--	68,306	--	68,306	--	---
MLRS MODS	--	6,654	--	6,654	--	---
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES		123,192		127,492		+4,300
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	19,002	--	19,002	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	--	2,373	--	2,373	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	--	989	--	989	--	---
MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	--	1,397	--	1,397	--	---
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	--	3,221	--	3,221	--	---
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		7,980		7,980		---
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY		1,358,104		1,272,798		-85,306

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,548,340,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,416,765,000
Committee recommendation	1,556,665,000
Change from budget request	+139,900,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of tanks; personnel and cargo carriers; fighting vehicles; tracked recovery vehicles; self-propelled and towed howitzers; machine guns; mortars; modification of in-service equipment, initial spares; and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendations	Change from request
Armor Machine Gun, 7.62MM M240	12,204	40,004	+27,800
Machine Gun, 5.56 (SAW)	0	10,100	+10,100

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Bradley base sustainment	308,762	392,762	+84,000
AO to ODS conversion			+80,000
(Note: Only for the National Guard)			
Vehicular intercommunications system (AN/VIC–3)			+4,000
Carrier, MOD	53,463	68,463	+15,000
Upgrade			+15,000
Howitzer, 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	6,259	7,259	+1,000
Vehicular intercommunications system (AN/VIC–3)			+1,000
M1 Abrams Tank Modifications	29,815	31,815	+2,000
Vehicular intercommunications system (AN/VIC–3)			+2,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	--	2,640	--	2,640	--	---
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	--	308,762	--	392,762	--	+84,000
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT (AP-CY)	--	27,675	--	27,675	--	---
BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	--	23,441	--	23,441	--	---
HAB TRAINING DEVICES	--	14,910	--	14,910	--	---
BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	--	4,334	--	4,334	--	---
ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	--	8,086	--	8,086	--	---
COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE	12	54,545	12	54,545	--	---
COMMAND & CONTROL VEHICLE (AP-CY)	--	2,559	--	2,559	--	---
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
CARRIER, MOD	--	53,463	--	68,463	--	+15,000
FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	--	27,338	--	27,338	--	---
BFVS SERIES (MOD)	--	7,087	--	7,087	--	---
HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	--	6,259	--	7,259	--	+1,000
FAASV PIP TO FLEET	--	230	--	230	--	---
BREACHER SYSTEM (MOD)	--	19,680	--	19,680	--	---
HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	--	67,312	--	67,312	--	---
ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	--	1,443	--	1,443	--	---
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	--	29,815	--	31,815	--	+2,000
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	--	422,996	--	422,996	--	---
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (AP-CY)	--	213,406	--	213,406	--	---
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	--	192	--	192	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TCV-WTCV)	--	138	--	138	--	---
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	--	8,924	--	8,924	--	---
TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		1,305,235		1,407,235		+102,000
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	1,304	12,204	1,304	40,004	--	+27,800
MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	--	---	--	10,100	--	+10,100
GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	1,085	18,290	1,085	18,290	--	---
M16 RIFLE	12,479	5,744	12,479	5,744	--	---
XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	85	1,138	85	1,138	--	---
5.56 CARBINE M4	8,687	5,309	8,687	5,309	--	---
MODIFICATION OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	--	1,980	--	1,980	--	---
M4 CARBINE MODS	--	5,315	--	5,315	--	---
SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	--	8,326	--	8,326	--	---
HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	--	3,345	--	3,345	--	---
M119 MODIFICATIONS	--	4,784	--	4,784	--	---
M16 RIFLE MODS	--	7,180	--	7,180	--	---
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	--	1,006	--	1,006	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	--	1,206	--	1,206	--	---
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	--	4,566	--	4,566	--	---
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	--	3,084	--	3,084	--	---
SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	--	5,214	--	5,214	--	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES		88,691		126,591		+37,900
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	--	22,839	--	22,839	--	---
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		1,416,765		1,556,665		+139,900

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,065,955,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,140,816,000
Committee recommendation	1,228,770,000
Change from budget request	+87,954,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of ammunition, modification of in-service stock, and related production base support including the maintenance, expansion, and modernization of industrial facilities and equipment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendations	Changes from request
25MM, All Types	46,618	48,618	+2,000
40MM, All Types	36,645	44,645	+8,000
105MM DPICM XM915	0	5,000	+5,000
Bunker Defeating Munition	0	10,000	+10,000
Grenades, All types	11,431	16,431	+5,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
CTG, Mortar 60MM Smoke WP M722	0	4,000	+4,000
Procure additional rounds			+4,000
CTG Mortar 81MM Prac 1/10 Range M880	1,906	3,306	+1,400
Refurbishment kits			+1,400
CTG Mortar 120MM HE M934 W/MO Fuze	46,279	49,279	+3,000
Procure additional rounds			+3,000
CTG Mortar 120MM Illum XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	0	10,000	+10,000
Procure additional rounds			+10,000
CTG 120MM WP Smoke M929A1	51,819	59,619	+7,800
Procure additional rounds			+7,800
CTG 120MM APFSDS–T M829A2/M829E3	0	32,000	+32,000
Procure additional M829A2 rounds			+32,000
CTG 120MM HEAT–MP–T M830A1	0	22,000	+22,000
Procure additional rounds			+22,000
Proj Arty 155MM SADARM M898	54,546	0	−54,546
Terminate basic SADARM production			−54,546
Mine at M87 (VOLCANO)	0	15,000	+15,000
Procure additional systems			+15,000
Wide Area Munitions	10,387	20,837	+10,000
Procure additional systems			+10,000
Provision of Industrial Facilities	46,139	53,439	+7,300
IOWA AAP production line			+5,400
Large caliber, deep drawn cartridge facility			+1,900

PROGRAM MANAGER FOR AMMUNITION

A July 1997 study conducted for the Army advocated the reconfiguration and management of the U.S. munitions industrial base through the creation of a single, general-officer level Program Man-

ager who would be responsible for overseeing the life-cycle development of ammunition. According to the study, creating a single Program Manager for ammunition would significantly reduce costs for the Army and provide better management of the U.S. munitions industrial base. To date, the Army has not implemented this recommendation. The Committee encourages the Army to create a Program Manager for Ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal and directs the Commander of the Army Materiel Command to report by January 5, 2000, on his plan to implement this recommendation.

SELF-DESTRUCT FUZES

The Committee is aware that the Army has completed testing of, and type classified, M234 and M235 self-destruct fuzes for artillery and rocket grenades. The Committee believes that using a self-destruct fuze in future production of grenades, bomblets and submunitions could reduce the risk of unexploded ordnance casualities on the battlefield. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committee, no later than December 31, 1999, an analysis of unexploded ordnance issues and the recommended solutions including the use of self-destruct fuzes.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
AMMUNITION						
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	--	127,087	--	127,087	--	---
CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	--	1,891	--	1,891	--	---
CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	--	8,529	--	8,529	--	---
CTG 7.62MM ARMOR PIERCING XM993	600	1,355	600	1,355	--	---
CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	--	983	--	983	--	---
CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	--	23,374	--	23,374	--	---
CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES	--	2,764	--	2,764	--	---
CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	--	46,618	--	48,618	--	+2,000
CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	--	5,353	--	5,353	--	---
CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	--	36,645	--	44,645	--	+8,000
NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	--	7,989	--	7,989	--	---
MORTAR AMMUNITION						
60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	--	15,616	--	15,616	--	---
CTG MORTAR 60MM SMOKE WP M722	--	---	--	4,000	--	+4,000
CTG MORTAR 81MM FRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	30	1,906	30	3,306	--	+1,400
CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/M60 FUZE	60	46,279	60	49,279	--	+3,000
CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	--	---	--	10,000	--	+10,000
CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	56	51,819	56	59,619	--	+7,800
TANK AMMUNITION						
CTG 120MM APFSDS-T M829A2/M829E3	--	---	--	32,000	--	+32,000
CTG 120MM HEAT-MP-T M830A1	--	---	--	22,000	--	+22,000
CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	57	32,623	57	32,623	--	---
CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	165	86,027	165	86,027	--	---
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	68	2,570	68	2,570	--	---
CTG ARTY 105MM BLANK M395	125	6,774	125	6,774	--	---
CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	--	---	--	5,000	--	+5,000
CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	14	8,000	14	8,000	--	---
PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	--	14,789	--	14,789	--	---
PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M795	20	9,860	20	9,860	--	---
PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	227	54,546	227	---	--	-54,546
REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADAM)	100	48,250	100	48,250	--	---
PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	113	24,973	113	24,973	--	---
MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	367	42,938	367	42,938	--	---
ARTILLERY FUZES						
FUZE ARTY ELEC TIME M767	235	32,041	235	32,041	--	---
FUZE MULTI OPTION	45	14,061	45	14,061	--	---
MINES						
MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	251	8,067	251	8,067	--	---
MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	--	---	--	15,000	--	+15,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	79	10,387	79	20,387	--	+10,000
ROCKETS						
BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	--	---	--	10,000	--	+10,000
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	245	144,760	245	144,760	--	---
OTHER AMMUNITION						
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	--	11,246	--	11,246	--	---
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	--	11,431	--	16,431	--	+5,000
SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	--	9,782	--	9,782	--	---
SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	--	2,265	--	2,265	--	---
MISCELLANEOUS						
AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	--	6,876	--	6,876	--	---
CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	--	2,928	--	2,928	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	7,659	--	7,659	--	---
AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	--	10,679	--	10,679	--	---
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	--	5,303	--	5,303	--	---
TOTAL, AMMUNITION		987,043		1,067,697		+80,654
AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	46,139	--	53,439	--	+7,300
LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	3,525	--	3,525	--	---
MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	--	13,043	--	13,043	--	---
CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	--	86,291	--	86,291	--	---
ARMS INITIATIVE	--	4,775	--	4,775	--	---
TOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		153,773		161,073		+7,300
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		1,140,816		1,228,770		+87,954

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$3,339,486,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	3,423,870,000
Committee recommendation	3,604,751,000
Change from budget request	+180,881,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of: (a) tactical and commercial vehicles, including trucks, semi-trailers, and trailers of all types to provide mobility and utility support to field forces and the worldwide logistical system; (b) communications and electronics equipment of all types to provide fixed, semi-fixed, and mobile strategic and tactical communication equipment; (c) other support equipment such as chemical defensive equipment, floating and rail equipment, generators and power units, material handling equipment, medical support equipment, special equipment for user testing, and non-system training devices. In each of these activities, funds are also included for modification of in-service equipment, investment spares and repair parts, and production base support.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles	190,399	196,399	+6,000
Product Improved Combat Vehicle Crewman Headset	0	15,000	+15,000
Lightweight Video Reconnaissance System	3,436	5,936	+2,500
Combat Support Medical	25,250	40,250	+15,000
Roller, vibratory, self-propelled	0	10,300	+10,300
Compactor, high speed	9,798	12,938	+2,600
Crane, wheel mounted, 25 ton	12,089	20,089	+8,000
Items less than $2 million (Construction Equipment—UBM)	4,286	6,286	+2,000
Pusher tug, small	0	9,000	+9,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Tactical Trailers/Dolly Sets	15,277	20,277	+5,000
Trailer modernization/life cycle sustainment			+5,000
HEMTT Modifications	4,901	11,701	+6,800
HEMTT-load handling system (Note: Transfer from PE 0203761A)			+6,800
Modification of Inservice Equipment	29,769	33,269	+3,500
HET air-conditioning			+1,500
Fuel injection test stand upgrade (A8020)			+2,000
SHF Term	31,950	0	−31,950
STAR-T schedule delay			−31,950
SMART-T (Space)	61,761	31,761	−30,000
Program slip			−30,000
SCAMP (Space)	5,033	0	−5,033
Program slip			−5,033
Army Data Distribution System	36,763	58,763	+20,000
EPLRS (Note: Only for the National Guard)			+20,000
SINCGARS Family	13,205	33,205	20,000
Additional SINCGARS (Note: Only for the National Guard)			+20,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
ACUS Mod Program (WIN T/T)	109,056	115,956	+6,900
High speed multiplexers (HSMUX), (Note: Only for the National Guard			+900
Facsimile machines (TS–21 Blackjack)			+6,000
Medical Comm for CBT Casualty Care (MC4)	20,600	21,600	+1,000
Medical logistics—division (Note: Transfer from PE 0203761A)			+1,000
Information System Security Program-ISS	28,750	39,450	+10,700
Secure terminal equipment			+2,000
Airterm and Minterm security devices			+8,700
Joint Stars (Army) (TIARA)	82,176	107,176	+25,000
Common Ground Station Upgrade			+25,000
CI HUMINT Automated Tool Set (CHATS) (TIARA)	3,137	4,637	+1,500
Procure additional units			+1,500
Shortstop	0	28,000	+28,000
Procure additional systems			+28,000
Night Vision Devices	20,977	67,777	+46,800
25mm gen III tubes			+25,000
Night vision goggles (AN/PVS–7D)			+10,000
AN/PEQ–2A TPIALS devices			+5,200
AN/PAQ–4C infrared aiming lights			+6,600
Combat Identification Aiming/Light	9,486	0	−9,486
Transfer to PE 0603001A			−9,486
Mod of In-Svc Equip (Tac Surv)	6,533	29,533	+23,000
Firefinder—additional systems			+23,000
Digitization Applique	66,423	56,423	−10,000
Reduction in quantity			−10,000
Mortar Fire Control System	3,740	0	−3,740
Program slip			−3,740
Maneuver Control System (MCS)	52,049	10,000	−42,049
Program delay			−27,049
Transfer to PE 0203759A			−15,000
Production Base Support (C–E)	378	2,878	+2,500
IOC—Tobyhanna			+2,500
Heavy Dry Supt Bridge System	13,980	17,980	+4,000
Vehicular intercommunications system (AN/VIC–3)			+4,000
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Eqpmt (EOD E)	4,989	10,989	+6,000
Zeus laser ordnance neutralizatioun system			+6,000
Lightweight Maintenance Enclosure (LME)	2,128	3,728	+1,600
Procure additional units			+1,600
Distribution Sys, Pet and Water	10,716	13,716	+3,000
Tactical water purification systems			+3,000
Generators and Associated Equip	78,639	81,639	+3,000
Small generators			+500
5–60k generators			+2,500
Combat Training Centers Support	2,450	9,050	+6,600
JTRC MOUT instrumentation			+6,600
Training Devices, Nonsystem	67,374	75,124	+7,750
GUARDFIST (Note: Only for the National Guard)			+3,750
BEAMHIT			+4,000
SIMNET/Close Combat Tactical Trainer	75,367	40,367	−35,000
Reliability issues			−35,000
Intergrated Family of Test Equipment (IFTE)	41,602	56,602	+15,000
Electro-optics test facilities			+15,000
Modification of In-Svc Equipment (OPA–3)	24,852	39,352	+14,500
D–7 Dozer service life extension program (Note: Only for the National Guard			+10,000
Laser leveling equipment			+4,500
Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System	0	20,000	+20,000
Procure systems			+20,000

FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES

Recently, the Committee's Surveys and Investigations (S&I) staff completed an in-depth analysis of the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles Program (FMTV). The Committee was very disturbed when it became aware of the S&I staff's findings. The S&I staff, which spent many hours in the field with unit personnel, found many problems with the truck. For example: (1) Door latches do not secure properly causing the doors to open during normal operations; (2) Starters which fail after only 2,000 miles of operation; (3) Transmission tanks that crack causing anti-freeze and transmission fluid to mix; (4) Tail gates that cannot be closed with troops seated because the truck bed warps; and (5) Batteries that boil over and leak acid onto air tanks causing corrosion. The S&I staff found many other problems, from poorly constructed seats to fragile bumpers. The Committee remains troubled that the FM TV truck has so many outstanding technical issues.

Additionally, the S&I staff found that even though the Army claims that many of the problems identified by the S&I staff are being resolved, the Army is unable to provide even rudimentary cost estimates for fixing the problems. The Committee directs that the Army provide the Congress, no later than December 15, 1999, a report that addresses the outstanding technical and operational problems with the FMTV, the solution for each problem and the cost of implementing each solution.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Information on the Committee's proposed adjustments to the LAN, LogTech, STAMIS, and ADPE programs can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)

The Committee supports the Army's revised Acquisition Strategy for the Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (TUAV). This revised strategy was outlined in a March 26, 1999 letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology. The revised strategy includes the termination of the Outrider Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration and a new competition to meet the Army's TUAV requirement.

The Committee notes that since the new strategy was presented to Congress after submission of the fiscal year 2000 budget, funding for the TUAV was not requested in the proper appropriation. The Army requested procurement funding for the Outrider vehicle, not research and development funding for the new acquisition strategy. The Committee has made the necessary correction by reducing Outrider procurement funding by $45,863,000 and increasing the research and development funding for tactical unmanned aerial vehicle by $40,000,000, a net reduction of $5,863,000 which the Committee believes is justified given the revised acquisition plan.

The Committee directs that the Army consider reliability and interoperability with the Tactical Control System (TCS) as critical source selection evaluation criteria for the new TUAV.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES						
TACTICAL VEHICLES						
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	632	15,277	632	20,277	--	+5,000
SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	208	7,108	208	7,108	--	---
SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	24	1,926	24	1,926	--	---
SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	285	25,365	285	25,365	--	---
SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	63	4,124	63	4,124	--	---
SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	70	6,260	70	6,260	--	---
HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	867	92,092	867	92,092	--	---
TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	--	13,076	--	13,076	--	---
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,179	425,855	2,179	425,855	--	---
FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	--	7,374	--	7,374	--	---
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	450	190,399	450	196,399	--	+6,000
ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	12	7,043	12	7,043	--	---
TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	344	50,131	344	50,131	--	---
TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	24	1,960	24	1,960	--	---
HVY EXPANDED MOBILITY TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	23	4,901	23	11,701	--	+6,800
LINE HAUL ESP	115	9,256	115	9,256	--	---
MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	--	29,769	--	33,269	--	+3,500
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)	--	1,558	--	1,558	--	---
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	3	588	3	588	--	---
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	36	846	36	846	--	---
GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	--	998	--	998	--	---
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	--	1,034	--	1,034	--	---
TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES		896,940		918,240		+21,300
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	--	7,568	--	7,568	--	---
JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	--	5,119	--	5,119	--	---
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	--	68,489	--	68,489	--	---
SHF TERM	16	31,950	16	---	--	-31,950
SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	--	1,547	--	1,547	--	---
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	--	6,557	--	6,557	--	---
SMART-T (SPACE)	--	61,761	--	31,761	--	-30,000
SCAMP (SPACE)	--	5,033	--	---	--	-5,033
GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	40	10,920	40	10,920	--	---
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	--	500	--	500	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
COMM - C3 SYSTEM						
ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	--	12,963	--	12,963	--	---
COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	--	38,763	--	58,763	--	+20,000
SINCGARS FAMILY	--	13,205	--	33,205	--	+20,000
JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	--	980	--	980	--	---
ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	--	109,056	--	115,956	--	+6,900
COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	--	4,151	--	4,151	--	---
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	--	3,326	--	3,326	--	---
PRODUCT IMPROVED COMBAT VEHICLE CREWMAN HEADSET	--	---	--	15,000	--	+15,000
MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	--	20,600	--	21,600	--	+1,000
COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM						
CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	--	1,585	--	1,585	--	---
INFORMATION SECUTITY						
TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	--	11,038	--	11,038	--	---
INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	--	28,750	--	39,450	--	+10,700
COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	--	2,029	--	2,029	--	---
BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	--	1,836	--	1,836	--	---
ARMY DISN ROUTER	--	3,700	--	3,700	--	---
ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	--	440	--	440	--	---
WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	--	2,891	--	2,891	--	---
COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	--	56,915	--	56,915	--	---
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	--	18,454	--	18,454	--	---
LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	--	100,018	--	116,570	--	+16,552
PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	--	17,256	--	17,256	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)						
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	--	1,846	--	1,846	--	---
GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	--	18,345	--	18,345	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	--	56,514	--	56,514	--	---
JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	155	24,262	155	24,262	--	---
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	--	45,863	--	---	--	-45,863
JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	12	82,176	12	107,176	--	+25,000
DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	36	24,500	36	24,500	--	---
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NAT CAPABILITIES	--	4,370	--	4,370	--	---
COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS)	--	2,791	--	2,791	--	---
TROJAN (TIARA)	--	4,268	--	4,268	--	---
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	--	9,090	--	9,090	--	---
CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA)	--	3,137	--	4,637	--	+1,500
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.OM (TIARA)	--	530	--	530	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
SHORTSTOP	--	---	--	28,000	--	+28,000
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	--	1,691	--	1,691	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
FAAD GBS	11	38,379	11	38,379	--	---
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	9,448	20,977	9,448	67,777	--	+46,800
LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	66	43,223	66	43,223	--	---
LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	145	3,436	145	5,936	--	+2,500
NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	3,330	35,901	3,330	35,901	--	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	275	9,486	275	---	--	-9,486
ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	--	4,283	--	4,283	--	---
PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SETTER (PIA	3,492	4,137	3,492	4,137	--	---
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	--	6,533	--	29,533	--	+23,000
DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	--	66,423	--	56,423	--	-10,000
LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	14	6,262	14	6,262	--	---
COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	--	2,852	--	2,852	--	---
MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	15	3,740	15	---	--	-3,740
INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	--	5,469	--	5,469	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	--	28,098	--	28,098	--	---
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	456	43,343	456	43,343	--	---
FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	--	980	--	980	--	---
CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	270	19,922	270	19,922	--	---
FAAD C2	2	10,594	2	10,594	--	---
FAADC2I MODIFICATIONS	--	5,880	--	5,880	--	---
AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMC	1	2,939	1	2,939	--	---
FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	--	15,822	--	15,822	--	---
STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	30	12,307	30	12,307	--	---
LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	--	863	--	863	--	---
LOGTECH	--	4,190	--	9,190	--	+5,000
TC AIMS II	--	1,739	--	1,739	--	---
GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	81	7,465	81	7,465	--	---
ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	--	14,714	--	14,714	--	---
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	--	52,049	--	10,000	--	-42,049
STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	--	33,711	--	15,611	--	-18,100
STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	--	30,700	--	30,700	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION						
ARMY TRAINING XXI MODERNIZATION	--	15,361	--	15,361	--	---
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	--	138,607	--	176,607	--	+38,000
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	--	83,040	--	83,040	--	---
ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
AFRTS	--	490	--	490	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	--	2,689	--	2,689	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT						
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E).....	--	378	--	2,878	--	+2,500
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....		1,703,765		1,769,996		+66,231
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
SMOKE/OBSCURANT SYSTEMS ROLL.....	--	6,286	--	6,286	--	---
GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58.....	--	3,420	--	3,420	--	---
M6 DISCHARGER.....	1,878	3,038	1,878	3,038	--	---
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
HEAVY DRY SUPT BRIDGE SYSTEM.....	3	13,980	3	17,980	--	+4,000
RIBBON BRIDGE.....	65	12,077	65	12,077	--	---
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING.....	--	3,972	--	3,972	--	---
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT).....	--	4,989	--	10,989	--	+6,000
BN COUNTERMINE SIP.....	--	8,900	--	8,900	--	---
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
ARMY SPACE HEATER 120,000 BTU (ASH).....	58	912	58	912	--	---
LARGE CAPACITY FIELD HEATER, 400K BTU.....	20	1,312	20	1,312	--	---
AIR CONDITIONERS.....	--	3,756	--	3,756	--	---
LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES.....	--	9,844	--	9,844	--	---
FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS.....	--	2,370	--	2,370	--	---
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT.....	--	3,586	--	3,586	--	---
LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME).....	197	2,128	197	3,728	--	+1,600
FORCE PROVIDER.....	3	18,622	3	18,622	--	---
FIELD FEEDING AND REFRIGERATION.....	55	8,654	55	8,654	--	---
AIR DROP PROGRAM.....	14,698	3,371	14,698	3,371	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CSS-EQ).....	--	2,553	--	2,553	--	---
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
FAMILY OF TANK ASSEMBLIES, FABRIC, COLLAPSIBLE.....	--	11,249	--	11,249	--	---
LABS, PETROLEUM & WATER.....	--	6,252	--	6,252	--	---
DISTRIBUTION SYS, PET & WATER.....	--	10,716	--	13,716	--	+3,000
PUMPS, WATER AND FUEL.....	146	3,695	146	3,695	--	---
INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM.....	--	6,855	--	6,855	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (POL).....	--	3,083	--	3,083	--	---
WATER EQUIPMENT						
WATER PURIFICATION SYS.....	--	10,396	--	10,396	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (WATER EQ).....	--	1,737	--	1,737	--	---
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL.....	--	25,250	--	40,250	--	+15,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED		CHANGE FROM REQUEST	
	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	135	7,811	135	7,811	--	---
WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	95	6,072	95	6,072	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	--	3,085	--	3,085	--	---
STEAM CLEANER, TRAILER MOUNTED	47	1,249	47	1,249	--	---
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
CONCRETE MOBILE MIXER MODOULE, 8 CUBIC YARD	19	2,170	19	2,170	--	---
BITUMINOUS DISTRIBUTOR MODULE, 2800 GAL	12	1,086	12	1,086	--	---
ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	--	---	--	10,300	--	+10,300
COMPACTOR, HIGH SPEED	67	9,798	67	12,398	--	+2,600
LOADER, SCOOP TYPE, 4-5 CU YD (CCE)	27	7,737	27	7,737	--	---
DUMP MODULE, 12 CUBIC YARD	63	2,241	63	2,241	--	---
HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	34	8,300	34	8,300	--	---
DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	43	16,650	43	16,650	--	---
CRANE SHOVEL CRAWLER MTD, 20-40 TON W/ATTACH	5	3,865	5	3,865	--	---
CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	4	7,359	4	7,359	--	---
CRANE, WHEEL MTD, 25T, 3/4 CU YD, RT	47	12,089	47	20,089	--	+8,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $2.0M (CONST EQUIP)	--	4,286	--	6,286	--	+2,000
RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT						
PUSHER TUG, SMALL	--	---	--	9,000	--	+9,000
LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)	1	18,924	1	18,924	--	---
CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	--	16,740	--	16,740	--	---
RAILWAY CAR, FLAT, 89 FOOT	--	4,951	--	4,951	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	--	6,837	--	6,837	--	---
GENERATORS						
GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	--	78,639	--	81,639	--	+3,000
LARGE SETS	--	486	--	486	--	---
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	215	23,569	215	23,569	--	---
ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	22	10,930	22	10,930	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MHE)	--	1,763	--	1,763	--	---
TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	--	2,450	--	9,050	--	+6,600
TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	--	67,374	--	75,124	--	+7,750
SIMNET/CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	--	75,367	--	40,367	--	-35,000
FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	--	24,518	--	24,518	--	---
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	--	11,407	--	11,407	--	---
ELECTRONIC REPAIR SHELTER	--	10,462	--	10,462	--	---
INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	--	41,602	--	56,602	--	+15,000
TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	--	14,257	--	14,257	--	---
ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (ADIP)	--	5,194	--	5,194	--	---
RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	--	2,408	--	2,408	--	---
PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	--	18,093	--	18,093	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
MOBILE DETECTION ASSESSMENT RESPONSE SYSTEM	--	887	--	887	--	---
BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	--	6,769	--	6,769	--	---
MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	--	24,852	--	39,352	--	+14,500
SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	--	16,847	--	16,847	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (OTH SPT EQ)	--	2,417	--	2,417	--	---
MA8975	--	4,406	--	4,406	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		778,950		852,300		+73,350
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
INITIAL SPARES - TSV	--	72	--	72	--	---
INITIAL SPARES - C&E	--	43,263	--	43,263	--	---
INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	--	880	--	880	--	---
TOTAL, SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS		44,215		44,215		---
LIGHTWEIGHT CAMOUFLAGE SYSTEM	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY		3,423,870		3,604,751		+180,881

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$7,541,709,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	8,228,655,000
Committee recommendation	9,168,405,000
Change from budget request	+939,750,000

This appropriation provides funds for the procurement of aircraft and related support equipment and programs; flight simulators; equipment to modify in-service aircraft to extend their service life, eliminate safety hazards, and improve their operational effectiveness; and spare parts and ground support equipment for all end items procured by this appropriation.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
V–22	796,392	856,392	+60,000
Special Project Aircraft	28,782	30,782	+2,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Commitee recommended	Change from request
CH–60S	208,493	284.493	+76,000
Additional aircraft			+76,000
JPATS	44,826	55,826	+11,000
ECO allowance			−1,000
Additional aircraft only for UNFO replacement			+12,000
KC–130J	12,257	576,257	+564,000
Additional aircraft			+564,000
EA–6 Series	161,047	272,047	+111,000
Night vision devices			+31,000
Simulators			+60,000
Refurbish test aircraft to operational configuration			+20,000
F–18 Series	308,789	281,789	−27,000
ATFLIR premature award			−27,000
AH–1W Series	13,726	16,726	+3,000
Night targeting system			+3,000
SH–60 Series	56,824	60,324	+3,500
AQF–13F dipping sonar			+3,500
H–1 Series	6,339	16,339	+10,000
AN/AAQ–22 thermal imaging system			+10,000
EP–3 Series	27,433	44,433	+17,000
Specific emitter identification/LPI			+12,000
Assessment study for additional sensors			+5,000
P–3 Series	276,202	361,202	+85,000
Additional AIP modification kits			+60,000
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachutes			+5,000
Advanced digital recorders			+5,000
Specific emitter identification			+15,000
E–2 Series	28,201	55,101	+26,900
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachutes			+5,000
Cooperative engagement capability			+21,900
E–6 Series	86,950	85,250	−1,700
Modified miniature receive terminals, program slip			−1,700

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Commitee recommended	Change from request
Special Project Aircraft	28,782	30,782	+2,000
Common data link on special project aircraft			+2,000
Common ECM Equipment	50,584	58,584	+8,000
ALR–67 radar warning receivers			+6,000
APR–39 radar warning receivers			+2,000
Common Ground Equipment	413,732	379,782	−33,950
CASS savings for multiple year acquisition			−2,900
High pressure pure air generators			+3,750
Jet start units (cancelled program)			−35,800
Direct support squadron readiness training			+1,000
Other Production Charges	39,991	64,991	+25,000
TARPS–CD			+25,000

V–22 AIRCRAFT

The Navy requested $796,392,000 for 10 V–22 aircraft. The Committee recommends $856,392,000, an increase of $60,000,000 for one additional V–22. The Committee strongly endorses the Department's plan to replace aging CH–46E's and CH–53D's with the versatile and comparatively quieter V–22 Osprey. The Committee expects the Department to accelerate the procurement of the V–22 to achieve the most economical buy rate. In addition, the Committee directs the Department to accelerate the stand up of West Coast V–22 squadrons in order to provide better operational support and geographical balance.

KC–130J AIRCRAFT

The Marine Corps requested $12,257,000 for support of KC–130J aircraft. The Committee recommends $576,257,000 to procure eight aircraft and their associated support equipment, an increase of $564,000,000. The Marine Corps requires 51 KC–130J aircraft to replace KC–130F air-to-air refueler/tactical transports, the oldest aircraft in the Marine Corps' inventory, which were procured between 1960–1962 and are currently being flown by the active forces. KC–130Fs comprise 73 percent of the Marine Corps active force tanker inventory and 45 percent of the Department of Defense's rotary wing capable tanker inventory. They play a vital role in supporting forward-deployed Marine Air-Ground Task Forces and other CINC forward presence missions.

Current KC–130F aircraft are not night vision capable, they lack external fuel tanks (which reduces range by 1000 miles or fuel offload capability by 18,000 pounds), and they lack defensive systems to warn and protect from enemy missile attack. The KC–130F fleet averages over 22,000 flight hours and 12,000 landings per aircraft. An engineering assessment completed in December 1998 indicated that actual center wing fatigue life remaining on these aircraft is significantly less than previously estimated. The Marine Corps subsequently informed the Committee that the urgency of the need for KC–130J aircraft to replace those in-service aircraft significantly increased after the fiscal year 2000 budget request was submitted to Congress. During the last four years, 3 aircraft (6 percent of the active tanker fleet) were struck from operation due to fatigue.

Today, while the inventory requirement is 79 KC–130 tanker aircraft, the Marines are only operating at 77 aircraft.

The Committee agrees with Marine Corps assessments concerning the overwhelming need to modernize the tactical tanker aircraft force. The Committee notes that even with congressional funding, 80 percent of the Marine Corps requirement for KC–130J aircraft has not been budgeted. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the fiscal year 2001 and subsequent budgets contain sufficient funds to sustain the KC–130J line at an efficient rate after fiscal year 2000.

JOINT PRIMARY AIRCRAFT TRAINING SYSTEM

The Navy requested $44,826,000 for procurement of 8 JPATS training aircraft. The Committee recommends $55,826,000 for 12 aircraft, an increase of $11,000,000. This includes $12,000,000 for procurement of 4 additional aircraft only for the navigator (UNFO) mission, and a decrease of $1,000,000 as recommended by House authorization action due to excessive engineering change order allowances. The Navy recently informed the Committee that by replacing 16 older training aircraft with 9 new JPATS aircraft, it could save $16,000,000 annually while also significantly improving the quality of training. In this bill, the Committee has recommended the maximum number of additional JPATS aircraft in both Navy and Air Force aircraft procurement accounts allowable under the current contract, in order to take advantage of the contract's favorable pricing. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the fiscal year 2001 budget contains funds for the remaining 5 JPATS UNFO aircraft.

E/A–6B AIRCRAFT

With the retirement of the Air Force EF–111 aircraft, the EA–6B has become the Defense Department's primary escort jammer aircraft to support combat strike missions. The crews and aircraft of Navy and Marine EA–6B squadrons performed admirably during Operation Allied Force. However, due to the Department's overall lack of jamming aircraft, the forces were stretched, air crews were stressed, and the logistics support tail was strained. This operation also made it clear that even advanced stealth aircraft benefit from escort jamming from the EA–6B, counter to assumptions made when the EF–111s were retired.

The Committee views recent EA–6B operations be it in Operation Allied Force, or in the ongoing sanctions enforcement operations around Iraq, as a premier example of the actual and potential future benefits of joint service combat operations. The Committee believes this clearly indicates that more, not less, tactical escort jamming support, will be needed in the future. Yet the EA–6B airframe has limited life remaining and its limited numbers have already posed severe challenges to operational planners. Therefore, the Committee bill recommends an additional $227,000,000 to reinvigorate the tactical jamming aircraft force.

The fiscal year 1999 Supplemental Appropriations Act financing the cost of Operation Allied Force provided $300,000,000 for a operational rapid response fund. The Defense Department has indicated that a number of EA–6B near-term upgrades will be financed

from the supplemental funds, to include: $45,000,000 for band 9/10 jammers, $39,000,000 for universal exciters, and $30,400,000 for miniaturized automated tactical terminals/integrated data modems. Although these items provide important and quick warfighting improvements to the EA–6B fleet (a use for the fund consistent with its creation by this Committee), they do not address the mid and long term fleet force structure and modernization issues.

Therefore, the Committee recommends an additional $111,000,000 in Aircraft Procurement, Navy for EA–6B enhancements. This includes $60,000,000 for the procurement of high-fidelity simulators for EA–6B bases at Cherry Point, North Carolina and Whidbey Island, Washington; $31,000,000 to procure and install EA–6B night vision equipment; and $20,000,000 to remanufacture a test aircraft into an operational asset. The rationale for these additions as follows. After the budget was submitted, the Navy informed the Committee that competitively procuring high fidelity simulators for east and west coast EA–6B bases was feasible and would result in reduced need for aircraft flight training hours, more airframes for forward deployment, and reduced airframe wear. Outfitting the EA–6Bs with night vision devices increases operational effectiveness while reducing crew risk to enemy optically guided surface-to-air missiles. Finally, refurbishment of an EA–6B test asset will result in one additional combat aircraft deployed to the fleet.

The EA–6B force structure, already heavily tasked to meet current commitments, will decline over time due to aircraft wear and attrition and cannot be augmented with new production aircraft on a cost-effective basis. Moreover, in about ten years, the EA–6B fleet size and capabilities will begin a steady decline as older aircraft reach the age of retirement. The Defense Department currently has no plan to meet these eventualities, and therefore, the Committee believes it would be prudent to begin planning now to ensure that no EA–6B force degradation occurs. Elsewhere in this report, the Committee recommends an additional $116,000,000 in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy account for tactical jamming aircraft enhancements. This includes $60,000,000 to provide the EA–6B with Link 16 connectivity; $16,000,000 to initiate an analysis of alternatives for a follow-on jammer aircraft; and $40,000,000 to immediately begin risk reduction and concept development for a F/A–18E/F variant to become the follow-on tactical jamming aircraft. The Committee urges the Defense Department to expand the tactical jammer aircraft fleet, in particular to capitalize upon the operational need and advantages which accrue from combining jamming with stealth aircraft, by introducing a tactical jamming variant of the F/A–18E/F aircraft by the year 2006.

CONSOLIDATED AUTOMATED SUPPORT SYSTEM

The Navy has standardized its aircraft support equipment through the Consolidated Automated Support System. The Committee believes that the Navy should develop a longer term acquisition strategy, rather than using annual buys, in order to stabilize the program and achieve cost reductions.

ADVANCED TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEM (ATARS)

The Committee remains concerned about the lack of progress that has been made in fielding new technologies to meet Marine Corps tactical reconnaissance requirements. The F/A–18 ATARS program has been hindered with a troubled past and despite its recent deployment to meet emergency requirements in the Balkans region, is limited by technology developed in the mid-1980's. Following an investment of almost $1,000,000,000 and 15-years of development effort, the ATARS program remains plagued with annoying maintenance issues, has yet to complete a successful Operational Evaluation (OPEVAL), and has not been certified for full rate production.

Therefore, the Committee directs that prior to the obligation of any fiscal year 2000 appropriations, the Marine Corps must complete a "by the book" OPEVAL of the full-up ATARS system. If the ongoing operational assessment tests and the OPEVAL indicate that the system does not meet the stated requirements, the Committee requires that it be immediately notified of the shortfalls and the Marine Corps plan for the future of ATARS.

The Committee notes that in fiscal year 1999, the Navy's budget justification material indicated that it intended to use 1999 funds to finance the ATARS OPEVAL and initiation of Full Rate Production. Congress agreed and this became the "Congressionally approved" program. The Committee understands that the Navy now desires to not use 1999 appropriations to initiate Full Rate Production, but intends to waive acquisition regulations and move to a Low Rate Initial Production (LRIP) III decision prior to completion of the OPEVAL. With the execution of the LRIP III, the Navy will have committed, through the LRIP process, to procure half of the ATARS inventory objective. The Committee requests that prior to making such a decision, the Secretary of the Navy submit to the Committee a revised acquisition plan for ATARS. Additionally, the Secretary of the Navy should submit a letter to the Committee that addresses the Navy's desire to alter the fiscal year 1999 Congressionally approved program and request approval to use appropriated funds for a similar, although alternative, purpose.

Additionally, the Committee directs that the Marine Corps complete and submit to the Committee by November 1, 1999, a report that addresses its future plans for meeting reconnaissance requirements. This "road map" of tactical reconnaissance must address the Marine Corps plan to acquire the Navy's Shared Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP) system when it successfully completes evaluation and testing and becomes available for procurement.

TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE POD SYSTEM—COMPLETELY DIGITAL (TARPS-CD)

The Committee understands that TARPS(CD) is the proof of concept for the next generation of tactical reconnaissance systems: the Shared Airborne Reconnaissance Pod (SHARP). TARPS(CD) is employing off the shelf technology similar to the more capable technology being developed for the SHARP system. The Committee fully supports this approach and the rapid prototyping process that

the Navy, particularly the Naval Research Lab, is promoting with SHARP.

The Committee also supports the Navy's decision to deploy TARPS(CD) on board the USS John F. Kennedy to support peacekeeping operations in the Balkans region. The opportunity now presents itself for additional limited operational experience with TARPS(CD) and through that experience, to assist with the design and risk mitigation for SHARP. The operational lessons learned from a limited, interim deployment of TARPS(CD) therefore would have a two-fold effect: preparing operational forces to more quickly integrate the capability increases of SHARP into their tactics and also allowing that experience to assist the final design of the SHARP system to ensure it meets fleet operational requirements.

Therefore, the Committee adds $25,000,000 only to procure and test additional TARPS(CD) systems. These additional systems will provide for continued development in support of the rapid prototyping process for SHARP, as well as spares for the system deployed with the USS John F. Kennedy.

RESCISSIONS

The Committee recommends rescissions of $62,500,000 from several fiscal year 1999 Aircraft Procurement, Navy programs. These include: $41,500,000 in Common Ground Equipment due to the cancellation of the jet start unit project; $11,000,000 in AV–8B due to cancellation of the aircraft life extension program; and $10,000,000 due to contract savings resulting from E–2C multiyear procurement.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER	12	260,444	12	260,444	--	---
AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (AP-CY)	--	30,832	--	30,832	--	---
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	36	2,691,989	36	2,691,989	--	---
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (AP-CY)	--	162,240	--	162,240	--	---
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	10	796,392	11	856,392	+1	+60,000
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY)	--	71,044	--	71,044	--	---
AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	--	1,961	--	1,961	--	---
SH-60B	7	216,692	7	216,692	--	---
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE	3	210,462	3	210,462	--	---
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (AP-CY)	--	172,554	--	172,554	--	---
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		4,614,610		4,674,610		+60,000
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
CH-60S	13	208,493	17	284,493	+4	+76,000
CH-60S (AP-CY)	--	73,792	--	73,792	--	---
C-40A	1	49,029	1	49,029	--	---
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		331,314		407,314		+76,000
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	15	325,476	15	325,476	--	---
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK (AP-CY)	--	9,552	--	9,552	--	---
JPATS	8	44,826	12	55,826	+4	+11,000
TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT		379,854		390,854		+11,000
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
EC-130J	--	12,257	8	576,257	+8	+564,000
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
EA-6 SERIES	--	161,047	--	272,047	--	+111,000
AV-8 SERIES	--	39,126	--	39,126	--	---
F-14 SERIES	--	83,352	--	83,352	--	---
F-18 SERIES	--	308,789	--	281,789	--	-27,000
H-46 SERIES	--	17,888	--	17,888	--	---
AH-1W SERIES	--	13,726	--	16,726	--	+3,000
H-53 SERIES	--	45,240	--	45,240	--	---
SH-60 SERIES	--	56,824	--	60,324	--	+3,500
H-1 SERIES	--	6,339	--	16,339	--	+10,000
H-3 SERIES	--	45	--	45	--	---
EP-3 SERIES	--	27,433	--	44,433	--	+17,000
P-3 SERIES	--	276,202	--	361,202	--	+85,000
S-3 SERIES	--	94,119	--	94,119	--	---
E-2 SERIES	--	28,201	--	55,101	--	+26,900
TRAINER A/C SERIES	--	8,914	--	8,914	--	---
C-2A	--	19,524	--	19,524	--	---
C-130 SERIES	--	15,250	--	15,250	--	---
FEWSG	--	600	--	600	--	---
CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	--	16,412	--	16,412	--	---
E-6 SERIES	--	86,950	--	85,250	--	-1,700
EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	--	12,761	--	12,761	--	---
SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	--	28,782	--	30,782	--	+2,000
T-45 SERIES	--	9,675	--	9,675	--	---
POWER PLANT CHANGES	--	15,595	--	15,595	--	---
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	--	50,584	--	58,584	--	+8,000
COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	--	81,599	--	81,599	--	---
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT		1,504,977		1,742,677		+237,700
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	871,820	--	871,820	--	---
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	--	413,732	--	379,782	--	-33,950
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	12,769	--	12,769	--	---
WAR CONSUMABLES	--	11,683	--	11,683	--	---
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	--	39,991	--	64,991	--	+25,000
SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	34,177	--	34,177	--	---
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	--	1,471	--	1,471	--	---
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES		513,823		504,873		-8,950
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY		8,228,655		9,168,405		+939,750

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,211,419,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,357,400,000
Committee recommendation	1,334,800,000
Change from budget request	−22,600,000

This appropriation provides funds for the procurement of strategic and tactical missiles, target drones, torpedoes, guns, associated support equipment, and modification on in-service missiles, torpedoes, and guns.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommended	Change from request
Standard missile	198,867	155,267	−43,600
Block IVA missiles, authorization reduction			−43,600
Aerial Targets	21,177	51,177	+30,000
BQM–74 targets			+30,000
Penguin missiles	0	10,000	10,000
Tomahawk	50,894	50,894	0
Note: Funds provided only to convert Anti-Ship Tomahawks to the block III C variant.			

JSOW

The Navy requested $154,913,000 for JSOW. The Committee recommends $135,913,000, a net decrease of $19,000,000. This amount includes a decrease of $39,300,000 for the anti-armor JSOW variant and an increase of $20,300,000 for the baseline JSOW variant. As discussed in the Air Force section of this report, the Committee recommends deferring production of the anti-armor variant of the JSOW pending resolution of technical problems with the improved BLU–108 submunition and pending resolution of targeting problems. In order to minimize disruption to the JSOW production flow, the Committee recommends converting the proposed BLU–108 weapons to baseline weapons resulting in a savings of $19,000,000. The Committee expects the Navy to include separate budget exhibits for each variant of JSOW in future budget submissions.

RESCISSIONS

The Committee recommends a rescission of $8,000,000 from fiscal year 1999 Weapons Procurement, Navy due to delay in procurement of the Improved Tactical Air Launched Decoy resulting from deficiencies revealed in recent operational testing.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
BALLISTIC MISSILES						
TRIDENT II	12	437,488	12	437,488	--	---
TRIDENT II (AP-CY)	--	51,400	--	51,400	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	2,180	--	2,180	--	---
TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES		491,068		491,068		---
OTHER MISSILES						
STRATEGIC MISSILES						
TOMAHAWK	148	50,894	--	50,894	-148	---
ESSM	--	11,668	--	11,668	--	---
TACTICAL MISSILES						
AMRAAM	100	46,261	100	46,261	--	---
JSOW	615	154,913	615	135,913	--	-19,000
SLAM-ER	56	38,088	56	38,088	--	---
STANDARD MISSILE	91	198,867	91	155,267	--	-43,600
RAM	90	45,429	90	45,429	--	---
PENGUIN	--	---	--	10,000	--	+10,000
AERIAL TARGETS	--	21,177	--	51,177	--	+30,000
OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	--	12,784	--	12,784	--	---
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
SIDEWINDER MODS	75	29,387	75	29,387	--	---
STANDARD MISSILES MODS	--	41,927	--	41,927	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	20,199	--	20,199	--	---
FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON (AP-CY)	--	9,789	--	9,789	--	---
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	4,125	--	4,125	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		685,508		662,908		-22,600
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT						
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.						
ASW TARGETS	--	1,996	--	1,996	--	---
MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	--	28,699	--	28,699	--	---
MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	--	52,755	--	52,755	--	---
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	23,350	--	23,350	--	---
ASW RANGE SUPPORT	--	15,166	--	15,166	--	---
DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	--	1,663	--	1,663	--	---
TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT		123,629		123,629		---
OTHER WEAPONS						
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	--	880	--	880	--	---
MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
CIWS MODS	--	2,977	--	2,977	--	---
5/54 GUN MOUNT MODS	--	1,444	--	1,444	--	---
MK-75 76MM GUN MOUNT MODS	--	1,969	--	1,969	--	---
MODS UNDER $2.0M	--	1,311	--	1,311	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS		8,581		8,581		---
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	48,614	--	48,614	--	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		1,357,400		1,334,800		-22,600

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$484,203,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	484,900,000
Committee recommendation	537,600,000
Change from budget request	+52,700,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of ammunition, ammunition modernization, and ammunition related material for the Navy and Marine Corps.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Air Expendable Countermeasure	34,259	39,259	+5,000
5.56MM, All Types	12,958	21,958	+9,000
7.62MM, All Types	7	5,007	+5,000
40MM, All Types	11,247	12,547	+1,300
60MM, All Types	12,433	16,433	+4,000
25MM, All Types	3,194	11,394	+8,200
Demolition Munitions, All Types	14,733	21,933	+7,200

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
50 Caliber	16,364	18,364	+2,000
Procure additional rounds	.....	.....	+2,000
Grenades, All Types	2,270	4,270	+2,000
M69 practice grenades	.....	.....	+2,000
Rockets, All Types	11,030	20,030	+9,000
Procure additional rounds	.....	.....	+9,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS						
NAVY AMMUNITION						
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	--	77,915	--	77,915	--	---
JDAM	785	35,563	785	35,563	--	---
2.75 INCH ROCKETS	--	21,229	--	21,229	--	---
MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	--	9,153	--	9,153	--	---
PRACTICE BOMBS	--	49,106	--	49,106	--	---
CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	--	26,826	--	26,826	--	---
AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	--	10,469	--	10,469	--	---
AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	--	34,259	--	39,259	--	+5,000
JATOS	--	4,969	--	4,969	--	---
5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	--	15,758	--	15,758	--	---
EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	--	3,004	--	3,004	--	---
76MM GUN AMMUNITION	--	7,012	--	7,012	--	---
OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	--	5,841	--	5,841	--	---
SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	--	8,030	--	8,030	--	---
PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	--	8,165	--	8,165	--	---
MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	--	9,199	--	9,199	--	---
AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5.0M	--	2,226	--	2,226	--	---
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, NAVY		328,724		333,724		+5,000
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	--	12,958	--	21,958	--	+9,000
7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	--	7	--	5,007	--	+5,000
LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	--	28,639	--	28,639	--	---
.50 CALIBER	--	16,364	--	18,364	--	+2,000
40 MM, ALL TYPES	--	11,247	--	12,547	--	+1,300
60MM, ALL TYPES	--	12,433	--	16,433	--	+4,000
81MM, ALL TYPES	--	6,152	--	6,152	--	---
120MM, ALL TYPES	--	12,010	--	12,010	--	---
CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	--	3,194	--	11,394	--	+8,200
9 MM ALL TYPES	--	1,922	--	1,922	--	---
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	--	2,270	--	4,270	--	+2,000
STINGER SLEP	--	1,972	--	1,972	--	---
ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	--	11,030	--	20,030	--	+9,000
ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	--	166	--	166	--	---
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	--	14,733	--	21,933	--	+7,200
FUZE, ALL TYPES	--	2,410	--	2,410	--	---
NON LETHALS	--	1,977	--	1,977	--	---
AMMO MODERNIZATION	--	10,702	--	10,702	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	5,990	--	5,990	--	---
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, MC		155,176		203,876		+47,700
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS		484,900		537,600		+52,700

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$6,035,752,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	6,678,454,000
Committee recommendation	6,656,554,000
Change from budget request	−21,900,000

This appropriation provides funds for the construction of new ships and the purchase and conversion of existing ships, including hull, mechanical, and electrical equipment, electronics, guns, torpedo and missile launching systems, and communication systems

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommended	Change from Request
CVN Refueling Overhauls (AP-CY)	345,565	323,665	−21,900
Savings from Navy/Newport News MOU	.....	.....	−21,900

POST DELIVERY TEST AND TRIALS

The Committee directs that in future budgets, the costs associated with post delivery test and trials conducted during the post delivery period for all fiscal year 1997 and subsequent ships be included in the subdivision of funds appropriated in the fiscal year in which the test and trials occur.

RESCISSIONS

The Committee recommends rescissions of $46,400,000 from several fiscal year 1999 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy programs. These include: $32,400,000 in the Virginia class submarine due to reduction in shipyard labor and overhead rates resulting from the multi-mission modification to SSN–23; $11,400,000 due to contract savings in the CVN–69 CVN refueling advance planning contract; and $2,600,000 due to contract savings in nuclear propulsion components for the Virginia class submarine.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY						
OTHER WARSHIPS						
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY)	--	751,540	--	751,540	--	---
NEW SSN (AP-CY)	--	748,497	--	748,497	--	---
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	--	345,565	--	323,665	--	-21,900
DDG-51	3	2,681,653	3	2,681,653	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS		4,527,255		4,505,355		-21,900
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
LPD-17	2	1,508,338	2	1,508,338	--	---
TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS		1,508,338		1,508,338		---
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM						
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM CO						
ADC(X)	1	439,966	1	439,966	--	---
OUTFITTING	--	171,119	--	171,119	--	---
LCAC SLEP	2	31,776	2	31,776	--	---
TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM		642,861		642,861		---
TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY		6,678,454		6,656,554		-21,900

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$4,072,662,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	4,100,091,000
Committee recommendation	4,252,191,000
Change from budget request	+152,100,000

This appropriation provides funds for the procurement of major equipment and weapons other than ships, aircraft, missiles, and torpedoes. Such equipment ranges from the latest electronic sensors for updating naval forces to trucks, training equipment, and spare parts.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Undersea Warfare Support Equipment	2,605	11,205	+8,600
SATCOM ship Terminals (Space)	237,722	247,722	+10,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommended	Change from request
Other Navigation Equipment	67,516	87,516	+20,000
WQN–2 doppler sonar velocity logs			+10,000
Computer aided dead reckoning tracers	0		+10,000
Note: CADRT funds are only to begin low rate initial production.			
Pollution Control Equipment	113,506	116,506	+3,000
Ozone friendly refrigerants	0		+3,000
Strategic Platform Support Equipment	6,070	21,070	+15,000
Submarine workstation replacement	0		+15,000
Note: For procurement of submarine workstations, to include but not be limited to the navigation system workstation, OJ–172, and the data exchange auxilliary console, on SSN–688 and Trident class submarines.			
Minesweeping Equipment	16,302	20,802	+4,500
Dyad mine countermeasures system	0		+4,500
Items Less Than $5.0M	126,133	154,533	+28,400
Afloat force protection	0		+24,400
Integrated condition assessment system	0		+4,000
Radar Support	0	22,300	+22,300
AN/BPS–16 submarine navigation radar upgrade	0		+8,000
AN/SPS–73 surface search radar	0		+14,300
Surface Sonar Support Equipment	0	5,000	+5,000
New material sonar dome	0		+5,000
Undersea Warfare Support Equipment	2,605	11,205	+8,600
Surface ship torpedo defense	0		+8,600
Note: Only for procurement of surface ship enhanced capability torpedo defense systems for large deck ships and LEAD countermeasure units for all ships to include upgraded torpedo countermeasure winch and tow capability for littoral operations.			
Sonar Support Equipment	0	3,000	+3,000
CV–TAS	0		+3,000
C–3 Countermeasures	0	10,000	+10,000
Outlaw bandit signature reduction for surface ships	0		+10,000
Shipboard IW Exploit	48,031	21,531	−26,500

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommended	Change from request
Cooperative outboard logistics update, milestone III delay due to test ship collision/repairs	0		−20,200
Price revisions	0		−6,300
Common High Bandwidth Data Link	40,083	31,283	−8,800
BGPHES common high band data link for ES–3	0		−8,800
Navy Tactical Data System	0	25,000	+25,000
LHA combat display console upgrade	0		+20,000
Note: To install Wintel-based shipboard display emulator computers workstations, and displays in LHA–1, LHA–3, and LHA–5 ships.			
Display emulators for land based sites	0		+5,000
Other Training Equipment	44,229	54,229	+10,000
BFTT air traffic control trainers for aircraft carriers	0		+5,800
BFTT electronic warfare trainers	0		+4,200
TADIX–B	6,248	23,548	+17,300
Additional joint tactical terminals—Navy	0		+17,300
Naval Space Surveillance System	6,634	7,834	+1,200
Super span ultimate building machines	0		+1,200
GCCS–M Equipment Tatical/Mobile	7,077	17,077	+10,000
MIUW upgrades	0		+10,000
RADIAC	7,778	4,278	−3,500
Dosimetry system contract award delay	0		−3,500
Items Less Than $5.0M	5,206	10,206	+5,000
Shipboard display emulators for surface ships	0		+5,000
Submarine Communication Equipment	85,368	53,268	−32,100
Submarine high data rate antennas, milestone III delay/submarine antenna distribution system cancellation	0		−32,100
SATCOM Ship Terminals (Space)	237,722	247,722	+10,000
AN/USC–52 mini-DAMA SATCOM terminals	0		+10,000
Note: Includes procurement/installation of mini-DAMA UHF SATCOM terminals on MCM and MHC ships, and mini-DAMA medium data rate upgrades for DDGs, SSN–688s, MHCs, MCMs, and submarine shore sites.			
JEDMICS	0	17,000	+17,000
Encryption	0		+12,000
Note: Only for the continued procurement and integration of the same security solution implemented in 1999.			
Enhancements	0		+5,000
Naval Shore Communications	114,339	92,439	−21,900
IT–21 excessive program growth			−21,900
Passive Sonobuoys (non-Beam forming)	15,933	23,933	+8,000
Additional AN/SSQ–53 sonobouys	0		+8,000
AN/SSQ–57 (Special purpose)	0	1,000	+1,000
Additional AN/SSQ–57 sonobouys	0		+1,000
AN/SSQ–62 (DICASS)	17,111	17,711	+600
Unit price savings based on FY 99 actual costs	0		−4,400
Additional sonobouys	0		+5,000
AN/SSQ–101 (ADAR)	12,773	18,773	+6,000
Additional sonobouys	0		+6,000
Aviation Life Support	17,053	23,053	+6,000
Inertial reels			+6,000
Aegis Support Equipment	86,668	93,668	+7,000
CAST lesson authoring system			+2,000
Wireless sensors			+5,000
Command Support Equipment	14,471	16,471	+2,000
Advanced technical information system			+2,000

POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT

The Committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of Navy's pollution control equipment program for upgrading equipment on Navy ships.

RESCISSIONS

The Committee recommends rescissions of $22,700,000 from several Other Procurement, Navy programs. This includes $6,384,000 in fiscal year 1998 and $8,953,000 in fiscal year 1999 due to the recent program slip in the Combat Survivor Evader Radio; $5,500,000 in fiscal year 1999 for FFG upgrades; and $1,900,000 in fiscal year 1999 due to a reduction in quantity in the MK XII IFF digital interrogator systems.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	--	8,333	--	8,333	--	---
ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	--	8,378	--	8,378	--	---
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	--	67,516	--	87,516	--	+20,000
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT						
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	--	15,638	--	15,638	--	---
PERISCOPES						
SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	--	65,039	--	65,039	--	---
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	--	17,031	--	17,031	--	---
COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	--	12,301	--	12,301	--	---
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	--	113,506	--	116,506	--	+3,000
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	50,981	--	50,981	--	---
SUBMARINE BATTERIES	--	13,101	--	13,101	--	---
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	--	6,070	--	21,070	--	+15,000
DSSP EQUIPMENT	--	7,989	--	7,989	--	---
LCAC	--	4,048	--	4,048	--	---
MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	--	16,302	--	20,802	--	+4,500
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	126,133	--	154,533	--	+28,400
SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	--	949	--	949	--	---
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT						
REACTOR COMPONENTS	--	199,110	--	199,110	--	---
OCEAN ENGINEERING						
DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	--	5,521	--	5,521	--	---
EOD UNDERWATER EQUIPMENT	--	292	--	292	--	---
SMALL BOATS						
STANDARD BOATS	--	3,143	--	3,143	--	---
TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	3,862	--	3,862	--	---
PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
OPERATING FORCES IPE	--	4,548	--	4,548	--	---
OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	--	108,918	--	108,918	--	---
TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		858,709		929,609		+70,900

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
SHIP RADARS						
AN/SPS-49	--	2,245	--	2,245	--	---
RADAR SUPPORT	--	---	--	22,300	--	+22,300
TISS	--	1,755	--	1,755	--	---
SHIP SONARS						
AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	--	31,914	--	31,914	--	---
SSN ACOUSTICS	--	227,042	--	227,042	--	---
SURFACE SONAR WINDOWS AND DOME	--	---	--	5,000	--	+5,000
UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	2,605	--	11,205	--	+8,600
SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	3,000	--	+3,000
SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	--	12,095	--	12,095	--	---
ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	--	11,202	--	11,202	--	---
FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	--	16,674	--	16,674	--	---
SURTASS	--	7,267	--	7,267	--	---
ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	--	4,434	--	4,434	--	---
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
AN/SLQ-32	--	1,918	--	1,918	--	---
INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	--	4,121	--	4,121	--	---
C-3 COUNTERMEASURES	--	---	--	10,000	--	+10,000
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	--	48,031	--	21,531	--	-26,500
COMMON HIGH BANDWIDTH DATA LINK	--	40,083	--	31,283	--	-8,800
SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	--	35,201	--	35,201	--	---
OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	--	---	--	25,000	--	+25,000
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	--	60,494	--	60,494	--	---
GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	--	25,067	--	25,067	--	---
NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	--	48,222	--	48,222	--	---
ATDLS	--	19,143	--	19,143	--	---
MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	--	20,762	--	20,762	--	---
SHALLOW WATER MCM	--	18,813	--	18,813	--	---
NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	--	8,518	--	8,518	--	---
ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	--	4,229	--	4,229	--	---
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	--	21,820	--	21,820	--	---
TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	1,011	--	1,011	--	---
OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	44,229	--	54,229	--	+10,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
MATCALS	--	12,412	--	12,412	--	---
SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	--	7,543	--	7,543	--	---
AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	--	19,440	--	19,440	--	---
NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	--	35,115	--	35,115	--	---
AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	7,277	--	7,277	--	---
MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	--	5,318	--	5,318	--	---
FACSFAC	--	4,514	--	4,514	--	---
ID SYSTEMS	--	13,400	--	13,400	--	---
SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	--	590	--	590	--	---
TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	--	20,769	--	20,769	--	---
OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
GCCS-M EQUIPMENT ASHORE	--	9,440	--	9,440	--	---
TADIX-B	--	6,248	--	23,548	--	+17,300
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	--	6,634	--	7,834	--	+1,200
GCCS-M EQUIPMENT TACTICAL/MOBILE	--	7,077	--	17,077	--	+10,000
COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	--	41,255	--	41,255	--	---
RADIAC	--	7,778	--	4,278	--	-3,500
GPETE	--	9,006	--	9,006	--	---
INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	--	4,356	--	4,356	--	---
EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	--	6,554	--	6,554	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	5,206	--	10,206	--	+5,000
SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	--	21,487	--	21,487	--	---
SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	--	220,670	--	220,670	--	---
SHIP COMM ITEMS UNDER $5.0M	--	20,746	--	20,746	--	---
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	--	36,361	--	36,361	--	---
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	--	85,368	--	53,268	--	-32,100
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
SATCOM SHIP TERMINALS (SPACE)	--	237,722	--	247,722	--	+10,000
SATCOM SHORE TERMINALS (SPACE)	--	65,710	--	65,710	--	---
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	--	3,703	--	3,703	--	---
NSIPS	--	5,022	--	5,022	--	---
JEDMICS	--	---	--	17,000	--	+17,000
NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	--	114,339	--	92,439	--	-21,900
CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	--	64,139	--	64,139	--	---
CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	--	21,133	--	21,133	--	---
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		1,845,227		1,896,827		+51,600

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SONOBUOYS						
PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	--	15,933	--	23,933	--	+8,000
AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	--	17,111	--	17,711	--	+600
AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	--	12,773	--	18,773	--	+6,000
MISCELLANEOUS SONOBUOYS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	2,193	--	2,193	--	---
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	12,166	--	12,166	--	---
EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	--	62	--	62	--	---
AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	--	12,456	--	12,456	--	---
AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	--	48,659	--	48,659	--	---
METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	--	31,504	--	31,504	--	---
OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	--	1,685	--	1,685	--	---
AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	--	17,053	--	23,053	--	+6,000
AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	--	40,455	--	40,455	--	---
OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	4,187	--	4,187	--	---
TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		216,237		236,837		+20,600
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	--	5,871	--	5,871	--	---
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
NATO SEASPARROW	--	492	--	492	--	---
RAM GMLS	--	39,295	--	39,295	--	---
SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	--	38,790	--	38,790	--	---
AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	86,668	--	93,668	--	+7,000
SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	85,782	--	85,782	--	---
SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	--	2,075	--	2,075	--	---
VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	--	7,218	--	7,218	--	---
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	--	9,359	--	9,359	--	---
STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	--	239,514	--	239,514	--	---
ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	--	20,446	--	20,446	--	---
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	--	26,056	--	26,056	--	---
SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	3,700	--	3,700	--	---
SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	6,138	--	6,138	--	---
ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	6,407	--	6,407	--	---
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	--	8,965	--	8,965	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	4,362	--	4,362	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	--	10,701	--	10,701	--	---
SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	--	27,579	--	27,579	--	---
TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		629,418		636,418		+7,000
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	25	557	25	557	--	---
GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	--	1,631	--	1,631	--	---
CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	--	2,677	--	2,677	--	---
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	--	2,285	--	2,285	--	---
TACTICAL VEHICLES	--	9,373	--	9,373	--	---
AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	--	20,484	--	20,484	--	---
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	--	24,062	--	24,062	--	---
ITEMS UNDER $5.0M	--	6,075	--	6,075	--	---
TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		67,144		67,144		---
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	--	6,245	--	6,245	--	---
OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	5,825	--	5,825	--	---
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	--	1,658	--	1,658	--	---
SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	--	125,900	--	125,900	--	---
TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		139,628		139,628		---
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
TRAINING DEVICES						
TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	3,076	--	3,076	--	---
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	14,471	--	16,471	--	+2,000
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	5,033	--	5,033	--	---
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	19,439	--	19,439	--	---
OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	5,848	--	5,848	--	---
ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	18,354	--	18,354	--	---
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	--	1,377	--	1,377	--	---
TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		67,598		69,598		+2,000
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	276,130	--	276,130	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		4,100,091		4,252,191		+152,100

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$874,216,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,137,220,000
Committee recommendation	1,333,120,000
Change from budget request	+195,900,000

This appropriation provides the Marine Corps with funds for procurement, delivery and modification of missiles, armament, communication equipment, tracked and wheeled vehicles, and various support equipment.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Night Vision Equipment	9,032	17,532	+8,500
Material Handling Equipment	50,010	66,510	+16,500

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousand of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Modification Kits (TRKD Veh)	22,853	83,353	+60,500
Improved recovery vehicle			+60,500
Comm Switching and Control Systems	65,125	98,025	+32,900
Upgrade			+32,900
(Note: Further details are provided in the Information Technology section of this report)			
Comm and Elec Infrastructure Support	81,770	139,070	+57,300
Upgrade			+57,300
(Note: Further details are provided in the Information Technology section of this report).			
Mod Kits MAGTF C41	13,821	18,821	+5,000
MEWSS–MAGTF C41 modernization kits			+5,000
Fire Support System	0	6,000	+6,000
Shortstop			+6,000
Command Support Equipment	0	2,000	+2,000
Ultimate building machine			+2,000
Field Medical Equipment	2,445	7,645	+5,200
Small unit biological detector			+5,200
Modification Kits	0	2,000	+2,000
Laser leveling equipment			+2,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES						
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
AAV7A1 PIP	--	80,714	--	80,714	--	---
LAV PIP	--	1,706	--	1,706	--	---
MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	--	22,853	--	83,353	--	+60,500
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	--	3,288	--	3,288	--	---
MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	--	2,956	--	2,956	--	---
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	--	323	--	323	--	---
OTHER SUPPORT						
OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	--	1,462	--	1,462	--	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES		113,302		173,802		+60,500
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT						
JAVELIN	954	92,737	954	92,737	--	---
ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	--	3,731	--	3,731	--	---
TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT		96,468		96,468		---
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT						
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	--	29,068	--	29,068	--	---
GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP	--	7,863	--	7,863	--	---
INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
ITEMS UNDER $5.0M (COMM & ELEC)	--	10,303	--	10,303	--	---
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	18,466	--	18,466	--	---
MOD KITS (INTEL)	--	18,482	--	18,482	--	---
ITEMS UNDER $5.0M (INTELL)	--	2,083	--	2,083	--	---
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
GENERAL PRUPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	--	4,774	--	4,774	--	---
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	--	9,032	--	17,532	--	+8,500
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	--	102,814	--	102,814	--	---
COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	--	4,383	--	4,383	--	---
MANEUVER C2 SYSTEMS	--	6,838	--	6,838	--	---
RADIO SYSTEMS	--	82,881	--	82,881	--	---
COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	--	65,125	--	98,025	--	+32,900

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	--	81,770	--	139,070	--	+57,300
MOD KITS MAGTF C41	--	13,821	--	18,821	--	+5,000
AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	--	4,152	--	4,152	--	---
INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	--	8,286	--	8,286	--	---
FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	--	---	--	6,000	--	+6,000
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT		470,141		579,841		+109,700
SUPPORT VEHICLES						
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	43	1,325	43	1,325	--	---
COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	--	8,900	--	8,900	--	---
TACTICAL VEHICLES						
5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	2,078	124,407	2,078	124,407	--	---
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	788	138,268	788	138,268	--	---
OTHER SUPPORT						
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.OM	--	9,927	--	9,927	--	---
TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES		282,827		282,827		---
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	--	3,629	--	3,629	--	---
BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	--	3,228	--	3,228	--	---
TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	--	9,727	--	9,727	--	---
DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS	--	8,358	--	8,358	--	---
POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	--	10,887	--	10,887	--	---
SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE (SECM)	--	3,281	--	3,281	--	---
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	2,000	--	+2,000
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	--	5,685	--	5,685	--	---
GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	--	6,956	--	6,956	--	---
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	--	50,010	--	66,510	--	+16,500
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	--	4,154	--	4,154	--	---
GENERAL PROPERTY						
FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	--	2,445	--	7,645	--	+5,200
TRAINING DEVICES	--	13,848	--	13,848	--	---
CONTAINER FAMILY	--	5,714	--	5,714	--	---
OTHER SUPPORT						
MODIFICATION KITS	--	---	--	2,000	--	+2,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.OM	--	9,102	--	9,102	--	---
TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT		137,024		162,724		+25,700

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS.....	--	37,458	--	37,458	--	---
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS.....		1,137,220		1,333,120		+195,900

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$8,095,507,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	9,302,086,000
Committee recommendation	8,298,313,000
Change from budget request	−1,003,773,000

This appropriation provides for the procurement of aircraft, and for modification of in-service aircraft to improve safety and enhance operational effectiveness. It also provides for initial spares and other support equipment to include aerospace ground equipment and industrial facilities. In addition, funds are provided for the procurement of flight training simulators to increase combat readiness and to provide for more economical training.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
F–16 Post Production Support	30,010	50,010	+20,000
C–17 Modifications	95,543	93,543	−2,100

Project Level Changes

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
C–17 (MYP)	3,080,147	2,671,047	−409,100
Excess nonrecurring funds			−2,500
Rephase funding for trainer concurrency			−10,000
Transfer ICS to O&M			−396,600
C–17 (MYP) (AP–CY)	304,900	301,700	−3,200
Underexecution of prior year AP			−3,200
JPATS	88,232	106,332	+18,100
Additional aircraft			+21,000
Transfer ICS to O&M			−2,900
V–22 OSPREY	29,203	16,736	−12,467
Support equipment procured ahead of need			−12,467
Operational Support Aircraft	0	63,000	+63,000
737–700ER for CINC CENTCOM			+63,000
TARGET DRONES	36,152	31,652	−4,500
Contract savings on BQM–34 targets			−4,500
B–1B	130,389	147,039	+16,650
Excess Link 16 funds			−8,350
Conventional Bomb Modules			+25,000
Predator UAV	38,003	58,003	+20,000
5 Attrition Aircraft			
A–10	24,360	29,360	+5,000
CUPID			+5,000
F–16	249,536	295,536	+46,000
Unjustified modification cost growth			−7,100
Litening II ANG			+30,000
Digital Terrain System (DTS)			+12,000
F–16 Digital Engine Control			+11,100
KC–10A (ATCA)	53,366	29,757	−23,609
Transfer to RDTEAF for GATM			−23,609

Project Level Changes—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
C–130	207,646	165,546	−42,100
Transfer to RDTEAF for Avionics Modernization Program			−38,600
Excess ECO funding in Airlift Defense Systems			−3,500
DARP	138,436	302,936	+164,500
Two additional RC–135 re-enginings			+60,000
TAWS on RC–135 Rivet Joint			+17,300
SYERS on U–2			+9,000
Common Data Link on U–2			+5,000
Quick Reaction Capabilities for RC–135 Rivet Joint			+13,400
U–2 upgrades			+22,000
Program transfer from GDIP			+37,800
E–3	124,061	94,561	−29,500
Proper phasing of SATCOM integration funding			−6,000
Restructured computer upgrade program			−16,700
Accelerate Block 30/35 installations			+11,200
Excess RSIP NRE, ECO, and OGC funds			−6,000
Proper phasing of RSIP SE/PM funding			−12,000
E–4	19,985	9,985	−10,000
Delays in Modified Mobile Receive Terminal			−10,000
PASSENGER SAFETY MODIFICATIONS	0	75,000	+75,000
TAWS (Note: Funding includes, but is not limited to upgrade of the KC–135)			+40,000
GATM			+35,000
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	171,369	185,897	+14,528
Modular Airborne Firefighting System for ANG			+6,000
Common, multi-platform boresight equipment			+1,400
LANTIRN Support and Bomb Damage Assessment			+10,600
Self Generating Nitrogen Servicing Cart			+4,000
JSECTS production delayed to FY 2001			−7,472
CAPRE			−2,528
B–2A	106,882	75,482	−31,400
B–2 shelters			+16,200
Transfer ICS to O&M			−47,600
WAR CONSUMABLES	29,282	54,282	+25,000
ALE–50 Towed Decoys			+25,000

F–22

The Committee recommendation with respect to F–22 is discussed elsewhere in this report.

F–15

The Committee recommendation includes $440,000,000 to procure 8 F–15E aircraft. The budget proposed no funding for new F–15 production. The F–15E is a multi-role fighter with both robust air-to-air and air-to-ground capabilities, and was a key player in Operation Allied Force because of its ability to carry a wide range of precision guided munitions. The F–15E is the only Air Force all-weather deep interdiction aircraft capable of employing the entire range of available or programmed precision guided munitions including laser guided bombs, AGM–130, JDAM, JSOW, JASSM, and WCMD. The procurement of these aircraft will not only significantly enhance warfighting capability, but also, in view of the Committee's recommendation regarding a production "pause" on the F–

22, it will preserve fighter modernization options pending delivery of the Joint Strike Fighter.

F–16

The Air Force requested $252,610,000 for 10 F–16 aircraft. The Committee recommends $350,610,000, a net increase of $98,000,000, for a total of 15 F–16s. (This amount includes a $17,000,000 reduction for excess engineering change orders and nonrecurring engineering funding. The Committee notes that given the maturity of the F–16 program, there should be few changes demanding such funding.)

The Air Force budget this year included 10 F–16s in fiscal year 2000 and a total of 30 F–16s over the next 4 years, none of which were programmed prior to submission of the fiscal years 2000–2005 defense program. The Air Force has made this adjustment in light of the need to bolster the Suppression of Enemy Air Defense (SEAD) mission area, as well to address various inventory and unit shortfalls and modernization needs by cascading active F–16s to the Air National Guard and Reserves. The Committee agrees with the Air Force plan and notes that that Operation Allied Force has further highlighted the urgent need for additional SEAD assets, and the limitations of those early model F–16s which remain fielded largely in Guard and Reserve units. Accordingly, the Committee believes the Air Force F–16 procurement plan could be accelerated through purchase of additional aircraft in fiscal year 2000 and has included an additional $115,000,000 over the budget request to procure an additional 5 F–16 Block 50 aircraft. The Committee has also provided an additional $24,000,000 in F–16 advance procurement to allow follow-on buys to be accelerated into fiscal year 2001.

C–130J

The Air force requested $30,618,000 for the C–130J program. The Committee recommends $17,718,000, a reduction of $17,718,000 representing a transfer of Interim Contractor Support to the Operations and Maintenance account as discussed elsewhere in this report.

The Committee is concerned with the current Air Force C–130J acquisition plan. The Air Mobility Command (AMC) has clearly indicated its requirement for 150 new production C–130J aircraft beyond those already purchased. In fact, the Committee notes AMC has just issued preliminary basing plans for the aircraft. Yet the Air Force budget does not include funding for these aircraft until fiscal year 2002, and under the preliminary AMC fielding plan these assets will not begin arriving at active duty units until 2006. Moreover, an Air Force failure to budget for any C–130Js for two years could cause significant disruption to the existing production program. As stated throughout this report, this is yet another example of a well documented CINC operational requirement which is being deferred or not funded (a need which in this case is further buttressed by production line concerns).

As discussed earlier in this report, to ameliorate this disruption and to satisfy an even more urgent Marine Corps requirement, the Committee has recommended eight KC–130J aircraft for the U.S. Marine Corps. Given its own tactical airlift needs, the Committee

directs the Air Force to accelerate the start of its buy of C–130J aircraft into next year's budget (fiscal year 2001) which, along with continued Marine Corps purchases, would minimize the inefficiencies in the current production profile.

E–8C

The Air Force requested $280,265,000 for one E–8C Joint STARS aircraft. The Committee recommends $468,465,000 for two Joint STARS aircraft (a net increase over the budget of $188,200,000). This amount includes a decrease of $13,000,000 budgeted for shutdown, a decrease of $23,000,000 based on refurbishment cost savings of the newly acquired German Boeing 707, and a $25,800,000 decrease associated with transfer of Interim Contractor Support funding to the Air Force Operations and Maintenance account.

The Committee recommendation also includes a $250,000,000 increase to procure the fifteenth Joint STARS aircraft. The Committee notes the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) approved requirement for Joint STARS is 19 aircraft. Though all 19 aircraft were budgeted several years ago, the quantity was reduced largely in anticipation of sales to NATO. NATO has decided not to buy Joint STARS, leaving a shortfall of five aircraft. Operation Allied Force has only highlighted the importance of Joint STARS, whose performance has been lauded by the operational community. However, it has also reinforced the importance of, and need to adequately budget for, a sufficient quantity of these and other "low-density, high demand" assets. The Joint STARS operational base of aircraft and crews is among the most stressed in the U.S. military's force structure, and there are clearly not enough Joint STARS programmed to support the current strategy of being able to conduct two near-simultaneous major theater wars.

Given these concerns, the Committee believes it is prudent to procure an additional aircraft in fiscal year 2000. The Committee further strongly encourages the Air Force to fund the remaining four aircraft in its fiscal year 2001–2006 budget plan.

C–135 MODIFICATIONS

The Air Force requested $347,088,000 for C–135 Modifications. The Committee recommends $552,988,000, a net increase of $205,900,000. This amount includes a $2,100,000 decrease for Pacer Crag in accordance with House authorization action, and a $208,000,000 increase to procure eight additional KC–135E to R reengining conversions for the Air National Guard.

Having a robust and capable aerial refueling capability is yet another critical link in the overall ability of the American military to conduct global operations and meet its worldwide security commitments. This has been demonstrated repeatedly in recent years, be it through humanitarian relief deployments or military operations abroad. Like the need for intelligence support, or adequate air- and sealift, the aerial refueling mission area is critical national military asset. Operation Allied Force stressed that capability, both in terms of the sheer number of aerial refueling platforms and aircrews needed to support that air campaign, and the adjustments, workarounds and disruptions to other U.S. global military activi-

ties that resulted from the diversion of assets to EUCOM's area of operation.

At present, the bulk of the nation's aerial refueling capability resides in the KC–135 tanker fleet, which was largely acquired during the 1950's and 1960's. Despite its age, this fleet has been slowly modernized over the last fifteen years, largely as a result of funds added by the Congress for the KC–135E to R engine conversion program. Each aircraft so upgraded has a 25 percent increase in fuel offload capability, a 35 percent reduction in time-to-climb, and a 23 percent decrease in take-off distance, and also meets all Stage III noise and emission standards. Combined, these improvements greatly enhance operational utility and flexibility, as well as access to a wider number and variety of airfields.

This re-engining program is a high priority for the Air Mobility Command, and the Committee notes that there are still over 130 Air National Guard tankers requiring this upgrade, many of which are over 40 years old. Yet the current Air Force outyear budget plan defers additional conversions until fiscal year 2002. Given the operational need and considerable utility of a more modern, robust and available aerial refueling capability, the Committee recommends $208,000,000 over the budget request for an additional eight KC–135E to R conversions.

F–15 MODIFICATIONS

The Air Force requested $263,490,000 for F–15 modifications. The Committee recommends $321,818,000, a net increase of $58,328,000. This amount includes a decrease of $22,000,000 for excess funds budgeted for APG–63 radar nonrecurring costs, a decrease of $8,672,000 for excess funds in various modification programs as identified by GAO, an increase of $21,000,000 for F–15C fighter datalinks for active combat coded aircraft, an increase of $18,000,000 for fighter datalinks for the Air National Guard, an increase of $25,000,000 for E-kit engine upgrades for Air National Guard aircraft, and an increase of $25,000,000 for E-kit engine upgrades for active component Air Force aircraft.

At relatively modest cost and in relatively short time, such upgrades can provide considerably improved operational capabilities to the Air Force's fighter inventory. For example, the fighter datalinks are estimated to provide the F–15 with a 5-to-1 increase in kill ratio, and are part of a capability which Air Force testimony to the Committee this year described as "the most significant increase in fighter avionics since the introduction of the on-board radar." The funds added by the Committee over the budget request will outfit all remaining active and guard combat coded F–15 air superiority aircraft with this vital capability. The E-kit engine upgrades recommended by the Committee likewise provide significant benefits including 86 percent increased availability, 46 percent reduction in engine flight hour costs, increased throttle response and overall thrust, and an estimated improvement in aircraft safety rates.

T–38 MODIFICATIONS

The Air Force requested $94,487,000 for T–38 modifications. The Committee recommends $43,987,000, a decrease of $50,500,000.

The Air Force request includes funding for the T–38 Avionics Update Program. When structuring this program, the Air Force wisely adopted a "fly before buy" acquisition strategy with operational testing scheduled to complete prior to procurement. However, initial flight tests revealed both hardware and software deficiencies which will delay completion of operational testing approximately one year. The Committee believes it is important to preserve the "fly before buy" acquisition strategy, especially in light of the development problems recently experienced. Therefore, the Committee recommends deferring the production program one year to accommodate the delayed testing by rescinding fiscal year 1999 production funds and reducing fiscal year 2000 funds by $50,000,000. In addition, the Committee recommends a reduction to the T–38 propulsion upgrade by $500,000. The Committee fully supports this program, but believes production funding in fiscal year 2000 is premature.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED		CHANGE FROM REQUEST	
	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
TACTICAL FORCES						
F-22 RAPTOR	6	1,574,981	--	---	-6	-1,574,981
F-22 RAPTOR (AP-CY)	--	277,094	--	---	--	-277,094
F-15	--	---	8	440,000	+8	+440,000
F-16 C/D (MYP)	10	252,610	15	350,610	+5	+98,000
F-16 C/D (MYP) ADV PROC	--	---	--	24,000	--	+24,000
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT		2,104,685		814,610		-1,290,075
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
C-17 (MYP)	15	3,080,147	15	2,671,047	--	-409,100
C-17 (MYP) (AP-CY)	--	304,900	--	301,700	--	-3,200
OTHER AIRLIFT						
C-130J	--	30,618	--	17,718	--	-12,900
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT		3,415,665		2,990,465		-425,200
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
JPATS	21	88,232	28	106,332	+7	+18,100
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
HELICOPTERS						
V-22 OSPREY	--	29,203	--	16,736	--	-12,467
V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY)	--	20,290	--	20,290	--	---
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	--	---	1	63,000	+1	+63,000
CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	27	2,531	27	2,531	--	---
TARGET DRONES	--	36,152	--	31,652	--	-4,500
E-8C	1	280,265	2	468,465	+1	+188,200
PREDATOR UAV	3	38,003	3	58,003	--	+20,000
TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT		406,444		660,677		+254,233
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT						
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
B-2A	--	20,083	--	20,083	--	---
B-1B	--	130,389	--	147,039	--	+16,650
B-52	--	15,973	--	15,973	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
F-117	--	34,646	--	34,646	--	---
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
A-10	--	24,360	--	29,360	--	+5,000
F-15	--	263,490	--	321,818	--	+58,328
F-16	--	249,536	--	295,536	--	+46,000
T/AT-37	--	85	--	85	--	---
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
C-5	--	70,037	--	70,037	--	---
C-9	--	11,863	--	11,863	--	---
C-17A	--	95,643	--	93,543	--	-2,100
C-21	--	8,713	--	8,713	--	---
C-22	--	174	--	174	--	---
C-32A	--	499	--	499	--	---
C-37A	--	383	--	383	--	---
C-141	--	10,021	--	10,021	--	---
TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
T-1	--	10	--	10	--	---
T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	--	2,196	--	2,196	--	---
T-38	--	94,487	--	43,987	--	-50,500
T-41 AIRCRAFT	--	91	--	91	--	---
T-43	--	721	--	721	--	---
OTHER AIRCRAFT						
KC-10A (ATCA)	--	53,366	--	29,757	--	-23,609
C-12	--	2,441	--	2,441	--	---
C-18	--	343	--	343	--	---
C-20 MODS	--	3,486	--	3,486	--	---
VC-25A MOD	--	9,262	--	9,262	--	---
C-130	--	207,646	--	165,546	--	-42,100
C-135	--	347,088	--	552,988	--	+205,900
DARP	--	138,436	--	302,936	--	+164,500
E-3	--	124,061	--	94,561	--	-29,500
E-4	--	19,985	--	9,985	--	-10,000
E-8	--	28,558	--	28,558	--	---
H-1	--	254	--	254	--	---
H-60	--	15,565	--	15,565	--	---
OTHER AIRCRAFT	--	20,204	--	20,204	--	---
OTHER MODIFICATIONS						
CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	--	9,390	--	9,390	--	---
PASSENGER SAFETY MODIFICATIONS	--	---	--	75,000	--	+75,000
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT		2,013,485		2,427,054		+413,569
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	420,921	--	420,921	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES						
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	--	171,369	--	183,369	--	+12,000
POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
A-10	--	8,300	--	8,300	--	---
B-2A	--	106,882	--	75,482	--	-31,400
F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	--	7,398	--	7,398	--	---
F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	--	30,010	--	50,010	--	+20,000
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	--	24,794	--	24,794	--	---
WAR CONSUMABLES	--	29,282	--	54,282	--	+25,000
MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	--	339,624	--	339,624	--	---
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	--	4,866	--	4,866	--	---
DARP	--	130,129	--	130,129	--	---
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES		852,654		878,254		+25,600
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		9,302,086		8,298,313		-1,003,773

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$2,069,827,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,359,608,000
Committee recommendation	2,329,510,000
Change from budget request	−30,098,000

This appropriation provides for procurement, installation, and checkout of strategic ballistic and other missiles, modification of in-service missiles, and initial spares for missile systems. It also provides for operational space systems, boosters, payloads, drones, associated ground equipment, non-recurring maintenance of industrial facilities, machine tool modernization, and special program support.

MINUTEMAN III GUIDANCE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM

For the past several years, the Air Force has reduced the budget for the Minuteman III Guidance Replacement Program (GRP) as a billpayer for other Service priorities. The Committee is concerned about how these actions are impacting the projected reliability of the Minuteman III weapon system. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a report separately detailing the inventory and the weapon system reliability (required and projected) of each Minuteman III variant (unmodified missiles, missiles modified with GRP only, and missiles modified with GRP and Propulsion Replacement Program) by year for fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2010. The Committee further directs that this report be provided to the congressional defense committees no later than September 1, 1999.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
AGM–65 Maverick	2,800	12,800	+10,000
Spaceborne equipment	9,594	4,594	−5,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from requests
AMRAAM	97,279	190,279	+93,000
Transfer funds to RDTEAF for P3I phase III			−7,000
Procure additional AMRAAMs			+100,000
MM III Modifications	242,960	277,960	+35,000
Guidance Replacement Program			+40,000
Pricing of Propulsion Replacement Program			−5,000
Global Positioning (Space)	139,049	103,349	−35,700
Rubidium Clock Build			−5,500
Premature GPS Block IIF launch services and on-orbit support			−25,200
Delays in GPS IIF crosslink			−5,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from requests
Global Positioning (Space) (AP–CY)	31,798	0	−31,798
Defer Block IIF based on 2 year extended life of current constellation			−31,798
NUDET Detection System	11,375	1,575	−9,800
Excess funds			−9,800
DEF Meteorological SAT Prog (Space)	38,223	34,223	−4,000
Unjustified growth in on-orbit support			−4,000
Defense Support Programs (Space)	111,609	106,609	−5,000
Unjustified growth in post production services			−5,000
Evolved Expendable Launch Veh (Space)	70,812	66,812	−4,000
Program reduction			−4,000
MILSTAR	0	150,000	+150,000
Transfer from RDTEAF			+150,000
Convert program to full funding			+65,000
Contract underrun			−65,000

JSOW

The Air Force request includes $79,981,000 for procurement of JSOW precision guided munitions. The Committee recommends $60,981,000, a net decrease of $19,000,000 which includes a decrease of $39,300,000 for BLU–108 JSOW and an increase of $20,300,000 for baseline JSOW. The BLU–108 is designed to attack armored vehicles, however, Air Force testimony provided to the Committee states that the technology which would allow aircraft to target these vehicles is years away. Air Force testimony further states that the technology required to transfer targeting data from a third party such as JSTARS is also years away. Without realtime targeting, the Air Force and Navy must rely on prior intelligence to develop pre-planned JSOW missions. However, predicting the precise location of vehicles 24 to 48 hours in advance (in order to incorporate the missions into the theater's Air Tasking Order) is extremely difficult.

The Committee further notes that recently identified delays in the improved BLU–108 submunition have further degraded the performance of the JSOW anti-armor variant. Because of the development delays in the improved BLU–108, the Air Force and Navy propose to procure the JSOW anti-armor variant using the older, less capable BLU–108 submunition. The Committee believes it is more prudent to defer procurement of the anti-armor variant until the Air Force and Navy can resolve the targeting issues and complete development on the improved BLU–108 submunition. In order to minimize disruption to the JSOW production flow, the Committee recommends converting the proposed BLU–108 weapons to baseline weapons resulting in a savings of $19,000,000.

TITAN

The Air Force budget for Titan assumes approval of a Special Termination Cost Clause which waives the requirement to budget for termination liability. The Committee notes that the Air Force has not yet submitted an STCC notification letter to the Congress. Nevertheless, the Committee sees no reason to make an exception to the longstanding requirement to budget for termination liability

for this program. The Committee directs the Air Force to fully fund the Titan contract including all termination liability.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
BALLISTIC MISSILES						
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - BALLISTIC						
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	--	15,593	--	15,593	--	---
OTHER MISSILES						
STRATEGIC						
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	--	1,050	--	1,050	--	---
TACTICAL						
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	193	79,981	193	60,981	--	-19,000
AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	--	220	--	220	--	---
AMRAAM	210	97,279	210	190,279	--	+93,000
TARGET DRONES						
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	--	3,064	--	3,064	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES		181,594		255,594		+74,000
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES						
CLASS IV						
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	--	2,950	--	2,950	--	---
SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	--	31,103	--	31,103	--	---
MM III MODIFICATIONS	--	242,960	--	277,960	--	+35,000
AGM-65D MAVERICK	--	2,800	--	12,800	--	+10,000
PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	--	8,919	--	8,919	--	---
MODIFICATIONS UNDER $5.0M	--	100	--	100	--	---
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES		288,832		333,832		+45,000
MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	18,022	--	18,022	--	---
OTHER SUPPORT						
SPACE PROGRAMS						
SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	--	9,594	--	4,594	--	-5,000
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	--	139,049	--	103,349	--	-35,700
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) (AP-CY)	--	31,798	--	---	--	-31,798
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	--	11,375	--	1,575	--	-9,800
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	--	38,223	--	34,223	--	-4,000
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE)	--	111,609	--	106,609	--	-5,000
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM(SPACE)	--	30,765	--	30,765	--	---
TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)	--	431,165	--	431,165	--	---
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	1	70,812	1	66,812	--	-4,000
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE(SPACE)	--	64,834	--	64,834	--	---
SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
SPECIAL PROGRAMS	--	716,703	--	636,703	--	-80,000
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	--	199,640	--	75,840	--	-123,800
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT		1,855,567		1,556,469		-299,098
MILSTAR (SPACE)	--	---	--	150,000	--	+150,000
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		2,359,608		2,329,510		-30,098

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$379,425,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	419,537,000
Committee recommendation	481,837,000
Change from budget request	+62,300,000

This appropriation finances the acquisition of ammunition, modifications, spares, weapons, and other ammunition-related items for the Air Force.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Practice Bombs	24,325	24,325	(6000)
Cast Ductile Bomb			(6000)
Sensor Fuzed Weapon	61,334	73,634	+12,300
SFW shortfall			+12,300
Joint Direct Attack Munition	125,605	175,605	+50,000
JDAM			+50,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST		COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED		CHANGE FROM REQUEST	
	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT	QTY	AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE						
ROCKETS						
ROCKETS	--	9,806	--	9,806	--	---
CARTRIDGES						
CARTRIDGES	--	70,703	--	70,703	--	---
BOMBS						
PRACTICE BOMBS	--	24,325	--	24,325	--	---
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	--	40,553	--	40,553	--	---
SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	203	61,334	203	73,634	--	+12,300
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	5,410	125,605	5,410	175,605	--	+50,000
WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	2,922	48,875	2,922	48,875	--	---
FLARES						
OTHER MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS	--	5,593	--	5,593	--	---
INITIAL SPARES	--	2,304	--	2,304	--	---
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	657	--	657	--	---
FUZES						
FLARES	--	26,342	--	26,342	--	---
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE		416,097		478,397		+62,300
WEAPONS						
SMALL ARMS						
SMALL ARMS	--	3,440	--	3,440	--	---
TOTAL, WEAPONS		3,440		3,440		---
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE		419,537		481,837		+62,300

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$6,960,483,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,085,177,000
Committee recommendation	6,964,227,000
Change from budget request	−120,950,000

This appropriation provides for the procurement of weapon systems and equipment other than aircraft and missiles. Included are vehicles, electronic and telecommunications systems for command and control of operation forces, and ground support equipment for weapon systems and supporting structure.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Mechanized Material Handling Equip	15,320	25,320	+10,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommendation	Change from request
60K A/C Loader	81,163	69,863	−11,300
Transfer ICS to O&M			−11,300
Intelligence Comm Equip	5,495	28,395	+22,900
Additional Joint Tactical Terminals			+22,900
Air Traffic Ctrl/Land Sys (Atcals)	887	5,887	+5,000
MPN-25 Tactical Air Traffic Control System			+5,000
National Airspace System	54,394	45,394	−9,000
Reduce radar LRIP quantities below 10% of total buy			−9,000
Theater Air Control Sys Improvement	37,917	23,417	−14,500
Reduced requirements for interface units			−8,500
Transfer to RDTEAF for Expert Missile Tracker			−6,000
Automatic Data Processing Equip	71,173	84,173	+13,000
SPARES			+10,000
Battlelab Collaborative Network			+3,000
Theater Battle MGT C2 Sys	47,648	44,548	−3,100
Transfer ICS to O&M			−3,100
Base Information Infrastructure	122,839	197,839	+75,000
Information assurance			+30,000
Communication infrastructure			+45,000
Defense Message System (DMS)	14,025	4,125	−9,900
Delay hardware pending software maturity			−9,900
NAVSTAR GPS Space	14,614	13,314	−1,300
Reduce risk from early buyout of new GPS unit			−1,300
AF Satellite Control Network Space	33,591	17,591	−16,000
Delay hardware pending software maturity			−16,000
Eastern/Western Range I&M Space	83,410	107,910	+24,500
Funded Air Force identified shortfall in space ranges			+27,000
Transfer ICS to O&M			−2,500
MILSATCOM Space	46,257	37,757	−8,500
Program delays			−6,300
Delay hardware pending software maturity			−2,200
Radio Equipment	16,685	20,435	+3,750
SCOPE command			+3,750

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommendation	Change from request
Comm Elect Mods	56,195	53,995	−2,200
Reduced requirements for BEWS replacement parts			−2,200
Base/ALC Calibration Package	10,157	7,557	−2,600
Late contract award			−2,600
Night Vision Goggles	2,800	4,800	+2,000
Night vision goggles for groundcrews			+2,000
Items Less Than $5.0M	3,559	6,559	+3,000
Laser eye protection			+3,000
Base Procured Equipment	14,035	25,035	+11,000
Master Cranes for ANG			+5,000
Ultimate building machines for ANG			+1,000
Ultimate building machines for Reserve			+1,000
Laser leveling			+2,000
Hazardous gas detection equipment			+2,000
Items Less than $5.0M	22,500	21,500	−1,000
Reduced requirements for pallets			−1,000
Intelligence Production Activity	40,047	16,247	−23,800
Cobra Upgrades			+10,000
Software Development and Training Facility			+4,000
Program transfer to JMIP			−37,800
Tech Surv Countermeasures EQ	2,976	3,976	+1,000
OSI computer crime investigation			+1,000

Program Recommended

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT						
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	53	986	53	986	--	---
CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	194	11,343	194	11,343	--	---
CAP VEHICLES	--	751	--	751	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	28,220	--	28,220	--	---
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	272	7,710	272	7,710	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	21,808	--	21,808	--	---
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	3,869	--	3,869	--	---
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	89	6,983	89	6,983	--	---
60K A/C LOADER	39	81,163	39	69,863	--	-11,300
NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	13	9,754	13	9,754	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	6,637	--	6,637	--	---
BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
TRUCK, DUMP	105	5,428	105	5,428	--	---
RUNWAY SNOW REMOVE & CLEANING EQUIP	65	7,392	65	7,392	--	---
MODIFICATIONS	--	887	--	887	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	10,070	--	10,070	--	---
TOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT		203,001		191,701		-11,300
ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP						
COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
COMSEC EQUIPMENT	--	28,133	--	28,133	--	---
MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	--	488	--	488	--	---
INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
INTELLIGENCE DATA HANDLING SYS	--	23,931	--	23,931	--	---
INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	--	2,042	--	2,042	--	---
INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	--	5,495	--	28,395	--	+22,900
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	--	887	--	5,887	--	+5,000
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	--	54,394	--	45,394	--	-9,000
THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	--	37,917	--	23,417	--	-14,500
WEATHER OBSERV/FORECAST	--	25,434	--	25,434	--	---
STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	--	22,143	--	22,143	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	--	6,371	--	6,371	--	---
TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	--	1,801	--	1,801	--	---
SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	--	71,173	--	84,173	--	+13,000
AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	--	5,722	--	5,722	--	---
MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	--	10,366	--	10,366	--	---
AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	--	32,583	--	32,583	--	---
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	--	17,503	--	17,503	--	---
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	--	5,168	--	5,168	--	---
C3 COUNTERMEASURES	--	13,275	--	13,275	--	---
JOINT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	--	2,871	--	2,871	--	---
BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	--	28,361	--	28,361	--	---
THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	--	47,648	--	44,548	--	-3,100
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
INFORMATION TRANSMISSION SYSTEMS	--	14,012	--	14,012	--	---
BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	--	122,839	--	197,839	--	+75,000
USCENTCOM	--	5,770	--	5,770	--	---
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	--	14,025	--	4,125	--	-9,900
DISA PROGRAMS						
NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	--	14,614	--	13,314	--	-1,300
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG SPACE	--	1,011	--	1,011	--	---
NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	--	3,490	--	3,490	--	---
AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	--	33,591	--	17,591	--	-16,000
EASTERN/WESTERN RANGE I&M SPACE	--	83,410	--	107,910	--	+24,500
MILSATCOM SPACE	--	46,257	--	37,757	--	-8,500
SPACE MODS SPACE	--	2,835	--	2,835	--	---
ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	--	49,710	--	49,710	--	---
COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	--	843	--	843	--	---
RADIO EQUIPMENT	--	16,685	--	20,435	--	+3,750
TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	--	1,991	--	1,991	--	---
CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	--	3,208	--	3,208	--	---
BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	--	41,589	--	41,589	--	---
CAP COM & ELECT	--	382	--	382	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.OM	--	7,034	--	7,034	--	---
MODIFICATIONS						
COMM ELECT MODS	--	56,195	--	53,995	--	-2,200
TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		963,197		1,042,847		+79,650
OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP						
TEST EQUIPMENT						
BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	--	10,157	--	7,557	--	-2,600
PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	--	1,071	--	1,071	--	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	9,750	--	9,750	--	---
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP						
NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	--	2,800	--	4,800	--	+2,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	3,559	--	6,559	--	+3,000
DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ						
MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	--	15,320	--	25,320	--	+10,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	8,533	--	8,533	--	---
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT						
FLOODLIGHTS	--	13,461	--	13,461	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	7,638	--	7,638	--	---
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	--	14,035	--	25,035	--	+11,000
MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	--	14,331	--	14,331	--	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	--	955	--	955	--	---
AIR BASE OPERABILITY	--	4,417	--	4,417	--	---
PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	--	5,932	--	5,932	--	---
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	--	15,093	--	15,093	--	---
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	--	46,865	--	46,865	--	---
AIR CONDITIONERS	--	6,711	--	6,711	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	22,500	--	21,500	--	-1,000
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	--	40,047	--	16,247	--	-23,800
TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	--	2,976	--	3,976	--	+1,000
DARP RC135	--	12,658	--	12,658	--	---
DARP, MRIGS	--	106,394	--	106,394	--	---
SELECTED ACTIVITIES	--	5,352,231	--	5,163,331	--	-188,900
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	--	142,515	--	142,515	--	---
DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	--	7,910	--	7,910	--	---
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	--	1,151	--	1,151	--	---
MODIFICATIONS	--	179	--	179	--	---
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	--	13,304	--	13,304	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP		5,882,493		5,693,193		-189,300
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS						
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	36,486	--	36,486	--	---
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		7,085,177		6,964,227		-120,950

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$1,944,833,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	2,128,967,000
Committee recommendation	2,286,368,000
Change from budget request	+157,401,000

This appropriation funds the Procurement, Defense-Wide activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Major Equipment, OSD	88,976	166,976	+78,000
High Performance Computing (HPC) [Note: $20 million is only for the Army High Performance Computing Research Center (AHPCRC) to upgrade its installed computing systems base]			+75,000
Mentor-protégé			+3,000
Major Equipment, DLA.			
Defense Support Activities	47,455	56,455	+9,000
Electronic Commerce Resource Centers			+9,000
Transfer from RDT&E,DW (for ECRC's)			(+6,000)
Automatic Document Conversion System	0	12,500	+12,500
Special Operations Command			
SOF Rotary Wing Upgrades	41,233	83,233	+42,000
MH–47E			+42,000
Advanced Seal Delivery Sys	21,213	7,400	−13,813
ASDS schedule slip			−13,813
SOF Intelligence Systems	19,154	21,154	+2,000
Joint Threat Warning System (PRIVATEER)			+2,000
SOF Small Arms and Weapons	23,355	30,355	+7,000
Nightstar binoculars			+7,000
Chemical/Biological Defense:			
Individual Protection	124,612	125,612	+1,000
M42 protective mask reclamation			+1,000
Human Resources Enterprise Strategy	0	7,500	7,500

ELECTRONIC COMMERCE RESOURCE CENTERS

The Committee has long supported the Electronic Commerce Resource Center (ECRC) program as a means to streamline acquisition procedures and reduce acquisition costs, and has provided a total of $39,491,000 to continue this program for FY 2000. The ECRC program continues to provide valuable service to small- and medium-sized businesses to move to paperless electronic contracting when conducting business affairs with the Department of Defense. The Committee believes it is important to ensure that small- and medium-sized businesses are not placed at further competitive disadvantages as the Department rapidly moves to more sophisticated methods of electronic commerce as part of its acquisition reform strategy.

The Committee is disappointed that the Department has requested significantly less funding for this program in FY 2000 than was requested in FY 1999 with no apparent justification for this decrease provided in the budget submission. In addition, the Committee is disturbed to learn that ECRC program funds appropriated for FY 1999 have not been released and in fact have been

used for other purposes or for activities of lower value, including reimbursement of administrative support contractors. The Committee has recommended bill language to ensure that ECRC funds are used as intended by the Congress. The Committee is also aware that the Undersecretary of Defense (Acquisition) finally has chartered a panel to review this program pursuant to the direction of this Committee two years ago. The Committee intends that this review be a constructive effort to retool and expand the ECRC program to become a more integral part of the Department's broader paperless contracting strategy. This should include a strategy to spin off those centers that become self-sustaining, consolidate overlapping centers, create new centers, and develop program performance measures.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Information on the Automated Document Conversion and Human Resources Enterprise Strategy programs can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Additional recommendations by the Committee are described in the classified annex accompanying this report.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS						
MOTOR VEHICLES	--	309	--	309	--	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	--	88,976	--	166,976	--	+78,000
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	--	20,530	--	20,530	--	---
ARMED FORCES INFORMATION SERVICES	--	5,472	--	5,472	--	---
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	--	1,560	--	1,560	--	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	--	11,513	--	11,513	--	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
MOBILE SATELLITE SYSTEM TECH	--	25,977	--	25,977	--	---
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	--	20,889	--	20,889	--	---
CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	--	3,557	--	3,557	--	---
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	--	28,279	--	28,279	--	---
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	--	4,119	--	4,119	--	---
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	--	4,755	--	4,755	--	---
STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	--	2,969	--	2,969	--	---
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	13,785	--	13,785	--	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	--	47,455	--	56,455	--	+9,000
AUTOMATIC DOCUMENT CONVERSION SYSTEM	--	---	--	12,500	--	+12,500
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M	--	4,734	--	4,734	--	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	--	31,417	--	31,417	--	---
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION						
PATRIOT PAC-3	32	300,898	32	300,898	--	---
NAVY AREA TBDM PROGRAM	7	55,002	7	55,002	--	---
DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
VEHICLES	--	147	--	147	--	---
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	--	34,286	--	34,286	--	---
DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY						
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	--	419	--	419	--	---
TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT		707,048		806,548		+99,500

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND						
AVIATION PROGRAMS						
SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	--	41,233	--	83,233	--	+42,000
SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	--	2,107	--	2,107	--	---
MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	--	16,895	--	16,895	--	---
CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	--	3,582	--	3,582	--	---
AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	--	26,796	--	26,796	--	---
C-130 MODIFICATIONS	--	98,893	--	98,893	--	---
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	--	1,729	--	1,729	--	---
SHIPBUILDING						
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	--	21,213	--	7,400	--	-13,813
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS (AP-CY)	--	17,286	--	8,000	--	-9,286
SUBMARINE CONVERSION	--	3,284	--	3,284	--	---
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	--	37,876	--	37,876	--	---
SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	--	15,992	--	15,992	--	---
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	--	86,758	--	86,758	--	---
SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	--	19,154	--	21,154	--	+2,000
SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	--	23,355	--	30,355	--	+7,000
MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	--	2,183	--	2,183	--	---
SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	--	18,771	--	18,771	--	---
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	--	29,836	--	29,836	--	---
SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	--	4,949	--	4,949	--	---
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	10,073	--	10,073	--	---
SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	--	2,432	--	2,432	--	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	--	110,147	--	110,147	--	---
PSYOP EQUIPMENT	--	11,716	--	11,716	--	---
TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND		606,260		634,161		+27,901
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE						
CBDP						
INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	--	124,612	--	125,612	--	+1,000
DECONTAMINATION	--	10,920	--	10,920	--	---
JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	--	99,573	--	99,573	--	---
COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	--	36,732	--	36,732	--	---
CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	--	105,559	--	105,559	--	---
TOTAL, CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE		377,396		378,396		+1,000
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	--	438,263	--	459,763	--	+21,500
HUMAN RESOURCES ENTERPRISE STRATEGY	--	---	--	7,500	--	+7,500
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		2,128,967		2,286,368		+157,401

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$352,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	0
Committee recommendation	130,000,000
Change from budget request	+130,000,000

This appropriation provides funds for the procurement of tactical aircraft and other equipment for the National Guard and Reserve.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

In all accounts throughout the bill, the Committee recommends a total of $2,485,300,000 for procurement of National Guard and Reserve equipment, a net increase of $796,400,000 above the budget request.

The Committee believes that the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components should exercise control of modernization funds provided in Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment account, and directs that they provide a separate submission of a detailed assessment of their modernization requirements and priorities to the congressional defense committees. The Committee expects the component commanders to give priority consideration for funding in this appropriation of the following items: CH–47 helicopters, AN/PEQ–2A TPIALs and AN/PAQ–4C infrared aiming lights, master crane aircraft component hoisting systems, aluminum mesh gas tank liners for C–130 aircraft and Army ground vehicles, A/B FIST 21 training systems, CH–60S combat search and rescue kits, super scooper aircraft, modular airborne fire fighting systems, F–16 ALR–56M radar warning receivers, deployable rapid assembly shelters, C–40A aircraft, C–22 replacement aircraft, secure communications and data systems, CH–60 helicopters, M270A1 long-range surveillance launchers, M106A Paladin self-propelled howitzer/M1992A2 FAASV ammunition carrier, AN/AVR–2A(V) laser detecting sets, ALQ–184(V)9 electronic countermeasure pods, extended cold weather clothing systems, HEMTT trucks, multi-role bridge companies, medium tactical wreckers, rough terrain container cranes, CH–47 cargo compartment expanded range fuel systems, C–38A aircraft, C–17 communications suite upgrades, mobile radar approach control, internal crashworthy fuel cells, DFIRST, F/A–18 series mods, UH–60 Q kits, MLRS launchers, meterological measuring systems, improved target simulators, and C–17 maintenance training systems.

FIRE-FIGHTING

The Committee is aware that National Guard Units in California and Florida are providing valuable assistance to federal, state, and local firefighters whose states have been ravaged by an unusually large number of wildfires. The Committee is also aware that the current inventory of aircraft available to assist in these efforts is inadequate and that there are a number of platforms and systems available for lease or purchase which could improve the National Guard's fire-fighting capabilities dramatically. The Committee has included a general provision (Section 8112) providing $20,000,000 to the Army National Guard to begin to improve fire-fighting capabilities and directs the National Guard Bureau to provide a report

to the Committee examining the various options available for this mission prior to the expenditure of any of these funds.

SUPPORT TO NON-PROFIT AGENCIES

The Committee is aware that National Guard units throughout the United States provide assistance to non-profit organizations including the transportation and lending of equipment as goodwill in their community relations programs. One such example is the cooperative relationship between the Alabama Sports Festival and the Alabama Army National Guard. The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is interfering with these relationships by impeding the ability of National Guard units to assist local non-profit organizations and directs the Secretary of Defense to review current policy to determine if it has become overly restrictive.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
ARMY RESERVE						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	30,000	--	+30,000
NAVY RESERVE						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
MARINE CORPS RESERVE						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
TOTAL, RESERVE EQUIPMENT		---		90,000		+90,000
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT						
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD						
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	--	---	--	20,000	--	+20,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT		---		40,000		+40,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT		---		130,000		+130,000

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	0
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	0
Committee recommendation	$5,000,000
Change from request	+5,000,000

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 only for microwave power tubes. The Annual Industrial Capabilities Report to Congress, submitted by the Secretary of Defense in February 1999, stated that the most pressing concern for the microwave power tube industry was the difficulty in obtaining reliable suppliers of various critical materials and components. Microwave power tubes generate and amplify microwave energy for applications in radar, electronic warfare, and telecommunications systems. DOD currently uses over 270 different types of operating systems employing over 180,000 microwave tubes. Microwave power tubes will be used in these and similar applications for at least the next two to three decades since there are no foreseeable replacement technologies. The additional funding will provide DOD assured access to affordable microwave tubes by incentivizing the insertion of consistent, quality-driven improvements in the tube industry's supplier chain.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Department requested $16,216,119,000 for Information Technology. The Committee recommends $16,517,219,000, an increase of $301,100,000 as explained below:

[In thousands of dollars]

Operation and Maintenance, Army:	
Armor Officer Distance Learning	500
PPC4I	−16,552
Supercomputing work	6,500
Operation and Maintenance, Navy:	
Electricity and Electronics Training Series	4,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force:	
REMIS	3,500
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide:	
DIMHRS	−41,200
DEERS	8,000
DCPDS (Schedule slip)	−2,000
Automated Document Conversion	12,500
Human Resources Enterprise Strategy	7,500
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard:	
Fiber Optics Study	2,500
Distance Learning	15,000
Other Procurement, Army:	
PPC4I	16,552
Maintenance AIT	5,000
GCSS-Army	−18,100
Ammunition AIT	15,000
NG Distance Learning	15,000
NG Distance Learning Courseware	8,000
Other Procurement, Navy:	
JEDMICS—Encryption	12,000
JEDMICS—Enhancements	5,000
Procurement, Marine Corps:	
Base Telecommunications Infrastructure	32,900
Network Infrastructure	57,300
Other Procurement, Air Force:	
Spares Information System	10,000
Communications Infrastructure	45,000
Supply Asset Tracking System	10,000

Procurement, Defense-Wide:	
Automated Document Conversion	12,500
Human Resources Enterprise Strategy	7,500
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
Digital Information Technology Testbed	2,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy:	
Advanced Distributed Learning	10,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force:	
IMDS	9,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide:	
Joint Systems Education and Training Systems Development	5,000
DIMHRS	41,200

YEAR 2000 (Y2K) COMPUTER PROBLEM

In the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, the Congress directed the Department to undertake an extensive program of system tests, functional end-to-end tests and warfighting operational evaluations to ensure the Department's readiness to deal with the Year 2000 computer problem. In the subsequent Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, the Congress provided $1,100,000,000 in emergency appropriations to support the testing and remediation efforts.

Although it was initially difficult to get the Department to focus on the Year 2000 computer problem, the Committee is pleased with the progress the Department has made since last Fall. The direct intervention of the Deputy Secretary of Defense proved critical to focusing the attention of the services, regional commanders and functional managers on this important issue and ensuring the sustained level of effort needed to address this problem. The numerous audit reports prepared by the Department of Defense Inspector General were very effective in focusing the attention of individual commanders on this problem and in keeping the reporting system honest. In addition, the Committee appreciates the Department's openness and, in particular, its willingness to include representatives from several congressional committees in its oversight process.

This summer, the Department is entering the most critical phase of the process, conducting tests to evaluate multiple computer systems working together as part of "end-to-end" testing for different functional capabilities. With little time remaining for the Department to conduct hundreds of related end-to-end test events it is critical that these events and their evaluations be well planned and well managed. The Committee agrees with the recommendations of the recent General Accounting Office report and encourages the Department to establish a strong quality assurance program for its testing efforts.

YEAR 2000 (Y2K) LESSONS LEARNED

There have been many positive outcomes to dealing with the Y2K computer problem. The Department has developed a series of databases, tests, and exercises that are readily applicable to information assurance. The Department, for instance, has created a database listing its information technology systems, examined the interfaces between systems, outlined a "thin line" series of systems that have to work to complete particular warfighting missions, and has

conducted operational evaluations of how regional commanders would continue to fight even if certain key systems failed.

One of the unfortunate lessons of the Y2K process, however, was the inability of the Department's Chief Information Officer (CIO) to get the services and agencies to concentrate on this problem earlier. With the exception of a few activities (the White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico deserves particular mention for its early and aggressive Y2K remediation effort), the Department did not become fully engaged until the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense made it a continued priority. The Committee is concerned that similar problems will occur in addressing the Department's information assurance problem.

The Committee believes that the problems the Department encountered and the steps it has taken to deal with the Y2K problem are directly related to addressing the problem of information assurance. For example, maintaining the database of information technology systems, with key information about the system interfaces, is a prerequisite to any information assurance effort. To this end, the Committee has included a general provision (Section 8125) requiring all information technology systems to register with the CIO by March 31, 2000 and to provide additional information as the Secretary of Defense may require. The Committee directs the Department to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 15, 2000 on the lessons learned from Y2K with particular emphasis on what additional programs should be continued and what lessons can be applied to information assurance.

INADEQUATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT

The Committee is disappointed with the Department's current level of oversight of its information technology systems. In the words of the Department of Defense Inspector General (DoD IG), information technology projects "have tended to overrun budgets, slip schedules, evade data standardization and interoperability requirements, and shortchange user needs". The DoD IG rates this as one of the Department's top ten most serious management problems. Likewise, the General Accounting Office has consistently designated the Department's information technology project management as a high risk area.

Despite these concerns, the senior group responsible for reviewing and approving information technology investments (called the IT OIPT) has not even met in over a year. Those systems that are reviewed are often approved despite lacking key documentation. For example, at least seven programs totaling $780,000,000 are moving forward despite lacking an Acquisition Program Baseline, a critical tool for program management. Others have gone forward without being able to demonstrate the costs and benefits of the investment. In hearings, when the Committee has requested lists of systems terminated or significantly restructured as part of the Department's oversight process, the answers have consistently indicated that this rarely if ever happens. In fact, an investigation of the systems terminated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense reveals that the majority of them were canceled because their sponsoring organization was abolished, not because of any problems with the system.

DEFENSE JOINT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

A recent example of these problems is the Defense Joint Accounting System (DJAS), currently under development. Despite the importance of developing joint systems, the Department has allowed the Air Force and the Navy to opt out of this program and to develop and modernize their own distinct systems. Thus, this 'joint' system will be fielded only to the Army and a few defense-wide activities. After its initial Milestone O approval, the timeline for completing the DJAS software development effort expanded from 16 months to six or more years, the benefits declined from $322,000,000 to $204,000,000 and are now characterized as "productivity savings", whereas before they were real cost savings. In November, the DoD IG issued a draft report warning that DJAS had not completed the steps required under the program management process to be prepared for a Milestone I review. In March, the Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation issued similar warnings about the dramatic change in the programs scope, cost and duration. Despite these serious concerns, the Department not only issued Milestone I approval, but also Milestone II approval at the same time, all without having a meeting of the IT OIPT to review the system. The Committee rejects this approval as inconsistent with the intent of the Information Technology oversight process and the Clinger-Cohen Act. Further, the Committee directs that the DoD IG update and complete their audit of DJAS with particular emphasis on determining if DJAS meets the standards for Milestone I or Milestone II approval and the requirements of the Clinger-Cohen Act. In addition, following the Inspector General's report, the Committee directs the Department to conduct a proper Milestone I review of this system and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees consistent with the requirements of general provision Section 8125 of this bill.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OVERSIGHT—COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The basic policies and procedures necessary for sound oversight and program management are clearly outlined in the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. The Committee believes that a strong Chief Information Officer, with visibility over the programs and a commitment to implementing the Clinger-Cohen Act, is the best approach to correcting the Department's problem. The Committee therefore supports the Department's request for a $14,710,000 increase in the ASD(C3I)/CIO operation and maintenance budget specifically for improving information technology oversight and for compliance with the Clinger-Cohen Act and directs that no reductions be taken against this account.

Furthermore, the Committee has included a new general provision (Section 8125) that prohibits any information technology system from receiving Milestone I, Milestone II, or Milestone III approval until the Chief Information Officer certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the system is in compliance with the provisions of the Clinger-Cohen Act. The Committee provides this funding and this additional authority in the expectation that they will be used to instill discipline into the process. The

Committee is prepared to make an activity's or a program's compliance with the Clinger-Cohen Act a condition of future funding.

In addition, the Committee directs the Department to take the following steps and except where otherwise noted, to provide a report on its progress to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2000.

1. Ensure that program managers for all major information technology investments are adequately trained and provide to the congressional defense committees a status report on the number of program managers who meet the training requirements and the plans to train those who do not meet the requirements.

2. Establish separate program elements for each major information technology system.

3. Review how information technology infrastructure is acquired and consolidate infrastructure resources into infrastructure specific accounts, if appropriate.

4. Establish procedures to ensure infrastructure efforts, such as the Metropolitan Area Networks, are consistent with Department policy and architecture.

5. Establish clear guidance for how economic analyses should be done and ensure that they are implemented uniformly.

6. Periodically, conduct post-implementation reviews to determine if programs are achieving the anticipated benefits.

7. Resolve the discrepancies between how the Acquisition Program Baselines, the Economic Analysis, and the IT–42s report costs and benefits to ensure consistency in reporting and analysis.

8. Include in the 300b reports the original baseline costs and benefits, any revised baseline costs and benefit projections as well as the actual costs and benefits achieved.

9. Examine the Milestone review process for information technology to determine if changes are needed to reflect the front loaded costs of software development.

10. Complete a coordinated, final 1999 DOD Information Technology strategic plan and the incorporated CIO Action Plan and provide to the congressional defense committees no late than September 1, 1999. In addition, the Department should provide a detailed report on the progress made thus far toward achieving the established priorities as outlined in the Action Plan.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

In last year's report this Committee highlighted its concern that the Department's use of operation and maintenance funds to develop and modernize its information technology systems was inconsistent with the Financial Management Regulations and directed the Department to correct this in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission. The Department failed to do so. The Committee is concerned the continuation of this practice undermines the most basic distinction between appropriations and puts the Department in jeopardy of committing anti-deficiency violations. Consistent with last year's report the Committee directs the Department to submit prior approval reprogrammings as necessary to bring its programs into compliance. The Committee, however, remains prepared to work with the Department to realign funding between appropriation accounts prior to the completion of the fiscal year 2000 defense

appropriations bill in order to bring the Department into compliance with the least disruption.

STANDARD PROCUREMENT SYSTEM

The Committee is concerned about the ability of the Standard Procurement System to meet the requirements of its users. The Committee recommends that the Chief Information Officer delay the fielding of the infrastructure for this system, until it confirms that the software release version 5.0 satisfies the users requirements and until there is resolution on the appropriateness of the Defense Logistic Agency's contracting strategy.

ARMOR OFFICER DISTANCE LEARNING

The Committee recommends $500,000 only to continue developing distance learning technologies for the Armor officer's courses at Fort Knox.

POWER PROJECTION C4 INFRASTRUCTURE

The Committee recommends transfering $16,552,000 from the Operation and Maintenance, Army account to the Other Procurements, Army account (Local Area Network) to ensure that this program is funded in accordance with fiscal law and the Department's Financial Management Regulations for investments.

SUPERCOMPUTING WORK

The Committee recommends an increase of $6,500,000 only for the Army's High Performance Computing Research efforts to enable the Army to continue its supercomputing work.

ELECTRICITY AND ELECTRONICS TRAINING SERIES

The Committee recommends $4,000,000 only for the Center for Navy Education and Training (CNET), for the conversion of Navy training manuals into an enhanced interactive electronic format suitable for distance learning.

IMDS/REMIS

The Committee recommends $12,500,000 only for the Integrated Maintenance Data Systems (IMDS) and the Reliability and Maintainability Information System (REMIS). Of this amount, $9,000,000 is provided in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force for accelerated development and fielding in addition to improved training for IMDS. The remaining $3,500,000 is provided in Operations and Maintenance, Air Force to ensure continued support for the legacy REMIS system while the necessary changes are being made to transition it to the IMDS system.

DIMHRS

The Committee supports section 8147 of the 1999 Department of Defense Appropriations Act which directed the Department to establish a Defense Reform Initiative (DRI) enterprise program for military manpower, personnel, training and compensation programs using a revised Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) as a baseline. The Committee supports

the President's request of $65,100,000 for the DIMHRS program. In coordination with the Department and the Program Manager's office, $41,200,000 has been realigned from Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide to be consistent with the Financial Management Regulations (FMR) and to provide more flexibility in managing the program. The Committee directs that this funding be used only to develop a system that is consistent with the Human Resources Enterprise Strategy. The Committee recommends $7,500,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide and $7,500,000 in Procurement, Defense-wide only to support the development of the Human Resources Enterprise Strategy and to continue program support and infrastructure improvements at the Systems Executive Officer for Manpower and Personnel (SEO/MP) and the Navy/DoD Information Technology Center. The Committee directs the Department to provide these funds only for and under the management and control of the Secretary of the Navy and the SEO/MP. The Committee expects that these funds will be allocated quickly and that the Department will coordinate the modernization of individual service systems to ensure they are consistent with the Human Resources Enterprise Strategy.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU NATIONWIDE FIBER OPTICS NETWORK

The Committee recommends $2,500,000 for the National Guard Bureau only for feasibility study and engineering design of NDFON to provide a dedicated fiber optic network to satisfy high volume telecommunications traffic generated by the National Guard's distance learning initiative. The Committee expects this initiative to determine if a fiber optic network can satisfy the National Guard's requirements and save the government money while being consistent with the Department's information architecture.

NATIONAL GUARD DISTANCE LEARNING

The Committee recommends $15,000,000 in Other Procurement, Army (ADPE) and $15,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard only for the continued fielding of the National Guard Distance Learning Network Program.

MAINTENANCE AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends an increase of $5,000,000 to Other Procurement, Army (LogTech) only to allow the implementation of the Maintenance Automated Identification Technology Initiative into the Army's Blackhawk aviation units and at the Corpus Christi Army Depot.

GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM—ARMY

The Committee recommends a reduction of $18,100,000 from Other Procurement, Army (STAMIS) for the Global Combat Support System—Army. This program was awarded a combined Milestone O/I/II without even a cost—benefit analysis. The budget requests procurement funds to begin fielding this system in fiscal year 2000 even though the first tier of the program is not scheduled for a Milestone III review until fiscal year 2001. The Com-

mittee is skeptical of this program's approval process and opposes providing any funds for fielding until after it has achieved Milestone III.

AMMUNITION AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY

The Committee recommends providing $15,000,000 in Other Procurement, Army (ADPE) to be used only for the completion of the ongoing Radio-Frequency Tagging/Intransit Visibility program at the remaining Army ammunition depots and related ammunition supply points and ports.

NATIONAL GUARD DISTANCE LEARNING—COURSEWARE

The Committee recommends an increase of $8,000,000 in Other Procurement, Army (ADPE) for the Washington State Army National Guard only to develop online distance learning courses. This program is important to meet unfunded Army National Guard training requirements and to take full advantage of the Army National Guard Distance Learning Network.

JOINT SYSTEMS EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 only for the Simulation Training and Instrumentation Command and the Naval Air Warfare Center—Training Systems Division for the development of an advanced distributed learning (ADL) prototype.

SERVICE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE SHORTFALLS

In response to significant shortfalls identified in the service unfunded requirements list, the Committee recommends providing an additional $135,200,000. Of this amount, $32,900,000 is to upgrade the Marine Corps base telecommunications infrastructure. Another $57,300,000 is to procure upgrades and replacement of information transfer components located inside buildings on Marine Corps bases and stations (to include Barstow, 29 Palms, Camp Pendleton, and Quantico). Finally $45,000,000 is for upgrades to the Air Force Communications Infrastructure.

SHARE IN SAVINGS

The Committee is interested in the potential benefits of the share-in-savings pilot program as authorized in the Clinger-Cohen Act and encourages the Department to present its recommendations to the congressional defense committees on how to expand the use of this program.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATION SUMMARY

The fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense research, development, test and evaluation budget request totals $34,375,219,000. The accompanying bill recommends $37,169,446,000. The total amount recommended is an increase of $2,794,227,000 above the fiscal year 2000 budget estimate and is $412,796,000 above the total provided in fiscal year 1999. The table below summarizes the budget estimates and the Committee's recommendations.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RECAPITULATION			
RDTE, ARMY	4,426,194	5,148,093	+721,899
RDTE, NAVY	7,984,016	9,080,580	+1,096,564
RDTE, AIR FORCE	13,077,829	13,709,233	+631,404
RDTE, DEFENSE-WIDE	8,609,289	8,930,149	+320,860
DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION	253,457	271,957	+18,500
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	24,434	29,434	+5,000
GRAND TOTAL, RDTE	34,375,219	37,169,446	+2,794,227

SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided as shown in the project level tables or in paragraphs using the phrases "only for" or "only to" in this report are Congressional interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD Form 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount, or a revised amount if changed during conference or if otherwise specifically addressed in the conference report. These items remain special interest whether or not they are repeated in a subsequent conference report.

CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS

Adjustments to classified programs are addressed in a classified annex accompanying this report.

TECHNICAL DATA

The Rand Corporation has been funded by many federal agencies to create a common data base for government and private-sector research, in order to prevent duplication of effort by individual researchers funded under federal contracts. The Committee directs the Defense Department to continue its support for and participation in the Rand RADIUS data base. In addition, the Department shall ensure that access to defense technical data is provided to Members of Congress and their staffs on the same level as Defense Department employees. The Committee directs the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 1999 on how these objectives will be met.

EXPERIMENTATION

The Committee directs that with each annual budget submission to Congress, the Defense Department provide a report to the congressional defense committees which identifies all funds for experimentation by appropriation, fiscal year, P–1 or R–1 line item, and effort. The report shall include Atlantic Command experimentation, other experimentation, exercises with significant experimentation, wargaming, advanced concept technology demonstrations, modelling and simulation, science and technology exercises, CINC initiative funding, BMDO experiments, and advanced technology demonstrations.

INFORMATION ASSURANCE AS PART OF INDEPENDENT OPERATIONAL TESTING

The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that information assurance testing is included in the Independent Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) of all DOD information technologies and national security systems. The Committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2000 on the Department's plans to implement the directed testing.

SPECIAL TERMINATION COST CLAUSE

The Committee reaffirms the existing policy of providing the congressional defense committees notification 30 days prior to contractual implementation of a special termination cost clause. The Committee further notes that the need to budget for termination liability is a fundamental financial management principle and therefore discourages, as a general principle, the use of special termination cost clauses for either procurement or research and development programs.

JOINT MISSION PLANNING SYSTEM

The Committee is concerned that several DOD programs are continuing to develop separate, "stove-piped" mission planning systems rather than taking full advantage of the joint mission planning system architecture currently under development by the Air Force and Navy. The Committee notes that efforts are underway to develop new or upgraded planning systems for Tomahawk, CALCM, and Air Mobility Command's Advanced Computer Flight Plan System. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review these programs and make recommendations on the merits, cost, and timetable of migrating these systems to the joint mission planning system architecture. The Committee directs that this report be provided to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2000.

UTILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The Committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has made great strides at developing programs that foster small business involvement in the material development and acquisition process. There are a number of programs that provide opportunities for small businesses to develop new technologies, and a number of management organizations and mechanisms already in place in an effort to facilitate such opportunities. The Committee also recognizes that the military department scientific and technology communities also play an active role in encouraging small business participation in development of advanced technologies for military applications. The Committee encourages such activities and urges that they be strengthened.

During the last decade, corporate mergers, acquisitions, and downsizing have considerably reduced the number of competitors in defense industry generally. While this may be desirable to the Defense Department to reduce infrastructure costs and to minimize the unnecessary duplication of capabilities, it may have the effect of making it much more difficult for small businesses to gain access to compete with large industrial organizations than just five years ago. Further, the fiscal pressure on the Defense budget and major contractors during the last few years have driven down both government funded and corporate R&D investments in new technologies and processes. Technology development itself, particularly in the areas of advanced communications and information technologies, is evolving at such a rapid pace that it is incompatible with DoD weapon system acquisition timelines. These factors argue for an increased emphasis on technology development and insertion

by small businesses, which are more affordable and more able to take risk and to innovate.

The Committee notes that the current Department of Defense system relating to small businesses does well on the front-end of the process: providing R&D funds to small businesses for development of new concepts, approaches, and technologies. However, the Committee believes that the present system could do better in terms of integrating small businesses into mainstream weapons acquisition programs. The present system is geared to providing incentives to DoD weapon system managers to use small businesses, who however are under no real pressure to utilize or foster small businesses in their programs for the long term. The Committee recognizes that there are some unique defense areas—such as nuclear reactor technology—that do not readily lend themselves to small business approaches. On the other hand, the Committee believes that program managers for major weapons system should be more prone to use and grow small business participation in their programs that may span 20 and 30 year timeframes. The Committee is also concerned that the present DoD system for small business innovative research is viewed as a "tax" by weapon system program managers. Once taxed, they may no longer feel compelled to foster small business involvement within their programs as the funds they would use to do this have been taken from them and given to another organization to manage.

An area that may be ripe for increased small business participation is DOD upgrades or modifications to major platforms which tend to be done with incumbent contractors who have little real incentive to innovate and little competitive pressure once awarded a contract. The budget situation generally has caused DoD to forgo new system development and to rely more on modifications, upgrades, and conversions of existing systems. A main feature of such upgrades is the insertion of new technologies, particularly those involving computing and communications.

The Department of Defense reported to Congress in February 1999 on its plan on processes that would facilitate the rapid transition of successful SBIR projects to Phase III incorporation into DoD acquisition programs. While the Committee supports these initiatives and believes that they may bring together initial SBIR research and development with acquisition program needs, the Committee also strongly believes that unless program managers budget for phase III SBIR participation in their acquisition programs that the increased utilization of small businesses will not occur. The Committee also believes that program managers for weapon system upgrades should expressly be charged with the responsibility for generating small business participation in their modification/upgrade programs, including budgeting for SBIR phase III activities.

The Committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2000 which: (1) describes the current system for small business participation, technology development, and technology insertion into defense weapon system acquisition programs; (2) describes improvements that are underway to improve the SBIR process; (3) provides options, including legislative initiatives, to increase SBIR participation in DoD weapon sys-

tem programs and contracts; and (4) provides options and incentives for weapon system program mangers to themselves foster development of small business technologies and integration of small business products into long term weapon system acquisition or modernization programs.

ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS MASTER PLAN

In the fiscal year 1999 Statement of the Managers, the DoD was directed to provide Anti-Armor Weapons Master Plan with the fiscal year 2000 budget. To date, the Congress has not received the plan. The Committee understands that the Master Plan is complete, but disagreements on the recommendations and analysis between the Services and the Office of Secretary of Defense prevent the plan from being delivered to the Congress. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to deliver the Anti-Armor Weapons Master Plan immediately. Absent the Anti-Armor Weapons Master Plan, the Committee has recommended the following program reductions and terminations: The Army's Javelin missile system, the Army's Line-of-Sight Anti-tank missile system, and the joint Navy and Air Force Joint Stand-off Weapon Anti-Armor missile variant.

TACTICAL RADIOS

The Committee directs that no more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated for the research and development of any tactical radio program may be obligated until the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that the development program meets interoperability requirements, is not duplicative of other developmental efforts, and is fully funded in the budget.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$5,031,788,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	4,426,194,000
Committee recommendation	5,148,093,000
Change from budget request	+721,899,000

This appropriation finances the research, development, test and evaluation activities for the Department of the Army.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Human Factors Engineering Technology	16,932	19,792	+3,400
MLRS Product Improvement Program	36,540	67,440	+30,900
Maneuver Control System	45,125	46,125	+1,000
Information Systems Security Program	9,426	15,426	+6,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Sensors and Electronic Survivability	22,978	25,978	+3,000
Passive millimeter wave imaging			+3,000
Missile Technology	32,892	43,892	+11,000
Scramjet			+2,000
Aero-optic evaluation center			+5,000
GPS/IMU			+4,000
(Note: Only to accelerate the development of a low cost guidance unit for precision guided weapons and munitions)			
Combat Vehicle and Automotive Technology	39,749	42,249	+2,500
Full spectrum active protection			+2,500
Weapons and Munitions Technology	34,687	37,187	+2,500
Electro-rheological fluid recoil system			+1,500
Extended range DPICM mortar munition, XM984			+1,000
Electronics and Electronic Devices	25,796	37,596	+11,800
ARL, Electronics and electronic devices			+5,000
Improved high rate alkaline cell			+1,000
Low cost reusable alkaline managenese-zinc battery			+1,400
Rechargeable coin cells			+600
Lithium carbon monfluoride coin cell			+400
''AA'' zinc battery			+400
Microchannel diesel fuel reformer technology			+3,000
Countermine Systems	10,321	14,121	+3,800
Standoff, multi-sensor mine system			+3,800
Military Engineering Technology	41,085	61,085	+20,000
GEOSAR			+15,000
(Note: For the continuation of the dual-use geographic synthetic aperture radar (GeoSAR) program. The development and implementation of this airborne dual and interferometic SAR technology will not only provide the Army with highly detailed, comprehensive data and significantly contribute to target identification, trafficability analysis, and battlefield awareness capabilities, but will serve to clearly demonstrate the productivity and cost benefits which accrue through the Defense Department's dual-use policy).			
Climate change fuel cells			+5,000
Warfighter Technology	23,971	26,971	+3,000
Rapid deployment, air-transportable airbeam shelter			+3,000
Dual Use Applications Program	18,222	10,000	−8,222
Program Growth			−8,222
Medical Technology	70,136	169,636	+99,500
Dreams			+10,000
Center for Minimally Invasive Therapy			+12,000
Neurofibromatosis			+15,000
Osteoporosis			+5,000
Polynitroxylated Hemoglobin			+4,000
Tissue regeneration			+2,500
Informatics-based medical emergency decision tools [NOTE: $4,500,000 is only for the development of the IMED tools project.]			+4,500
Ovarian Cancer			+15,000
Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research Program			+6,000
[Note: $6,000,000 is only to continue the Army Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research program.]			
National Medical Testbed			+15,000
Synchrotron-based high energy radiation beam cancer treatment [Note: $5,000,000 is only to continue the Army synchrotron-based radiation beam cancer treatment program.]			+5,000
Blood Research [Note: $5,500,000 is only for Improved blood products and safety in systems compatible with military field use.]			+5,500
Warfighter Advanced Technology	31,287	42,773	+11,486
Transfer from other procurement (CIDS)			+9,486
Army metrology			+2,000
Medical Advanced Technology	10,539	69,339	+58,800
Diabetes Project			+7,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Diabetes Project [Note: $7,000,000 only to continue the research program on juvenile diabetes performed at the Children's Hospital at Pittsburgh as recommended by the Diabetes Research Working Group.]			+7,000
Gallo Cancer Center			+5,000
Alcoholism Research			+7,000
HIV Research			+10,000
LSTAT			+7,500
Advanced Cancer Detection			+3,500
Laser Vision Correction			+4,000
Enzymatic Wound Disinfectant			+3,800
Epidermolysis Bullosa (EB)			+1,000
Smart Aortic Research			+3,000
Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology	39,893	67,643	+27,750
Precision guided mortar munitions			+8,000
Warhead and Energetics Center of Excellence			+5,000
(Note: This Center of Excellence will focus on the development and demonstration of the next generation of warheads and explosives, and would provide the Army with the smart munitions and enhanced ballistics necessary to maintain our military's lethality overmatch)			
120mm, one-tenth range training round		1,800	+1,800
Future direct support weapon system			+5,000
Microchip lasers			+750
Future combat vehicle			+4,000
(Note: Only for concurrent development of light cannon armament systems for use with future vehicles)			
Combat vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology	90,941	137,441	+46,500
Advanced Combat Automotive Technology			+10,000
(Note: Only to further the Army's development and deployment of the advanced combat vehicle building of the programs initiated in this area by DARPA)			
Silicon carbide fiber research			+13,500
Mobile parts hospital			+6,000
Giesel engine			+6,000
Composite armor vehicle			+3,000
Combat vehicle research			+8,000
(Note: Only for a technology transfer center to identify and transfer weight reduction technologies and processes for ground vehicles)			
Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology	43,639	51,639	+8,000
Future missile technology integration			+8,000
Night Vision Advanced Technology	36,628	45,628	+9,000
Helmet mounted sensors for firefighters and damage control			+3,000
Lightweight Man-portable Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)			+1,000
(Note: The UAV could be employed as an adjunct to ground reconnaissance units. The funds are to be applied by the U.S. Army Armor Center, Ft. Knox, for concept exploration, initial hardware development and evaluation.)			
Wire detection and obstacle avoidance			+5,000
Advanced Tactical Computer Science and Sensor	22,610	27,610	+5,000
Telemaintenance			+5,000
Army Missile Defense Systems Integration (DEM/V)	12,353	24,853	+12,500
Microelectromechanical (MEMS) systems process technology			+6,500
Missile systems integration			+3,000
(Note: Only for multi-mission battlefield sensors program including spectral analysis, isotope identification, and real time forensic analysis in support of WMD detection and counter-terrorism.)			
Aero-acoustic instrumentation			+3,000
Landmine Warfare and Barrier—Adv Dev	4,099	12,099	+8,000
Transfer from PE 0604808A			+8,000
Armament Enhancement Initiative	36,937	56,937	+20,000
XM 1007 development			+20,000
Tactical Electronic Surveillance System—Adv Dev	0	2,500	+2,500
Semi-automated imagery processor			+2,500

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Weapons and Munitions—Adv Dev	1,751	4,751	+3,000
Shoulder-launched multipurpose assault weapon—bunker defeat munition (SMAW–D)			+3,000
(Note: Funds are to improve the SMAW–D by leveraging SMAW–CS technology to give the system a fire from confined space capability)			
All Source Analysis System	49,684	57,684	+8,000
Army Tactical Light Analysis System (ALTAS)			+8,000
(Note: The successful development of this lightweight laptop computer will complete the intelligence fusion architecture and provide a ''seamless intelligence flow'' to all echelons)			
Logistics and Engineer Equipment—Adv Dev	6,514	9,514	+3,000
Real time container port control project			+3,000
Family of Heavy Tactical Vehicles	0	1,400	+1,400
PLS water distributors			+1,400
Air Traffic Control	1,981	5,981	+4,000
MEANPALS development and testing			+4,000
Tactical Unmanned Ground Vehicle	0	7,000	+7,000
Joint U.S./Norwegian mine clearing vehicle			+7,000
(Note: To continue research on joint mine-clearing flail technology under the direction of the Unmanned Ground Vehicles/Systems Joint Program Office)			
Night Vision Systems—Eng Dev	30,644	36,544	+5,900
Combustion driven eyesafe laser			+4,000
Enhanced night vision goggle			+1,900
Combat Feeding, Clothing, and Equipment	110,829	84,329	−26,500
Landwarrior			−26,500
Non-System Training Devices—Eng Dev	71,034	74,234	+3,200
Aerial weapon scoring system			+3,200
Automatic Test Equipment Development	10,252	20,252	+10,000
Integrated Family of Test Equipment			+10,000
(Note: Only to continue the development of the Improved Target Acquisition Systems electro-optical avionics support)			
Brilliant Anti-Armor Submunition (BAT)	128,026	144,026	+16,000
TACMS 2000			+16,000
Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar System	11,535	27,535	+16,000
Common ground station			+13,000
(Note: Of this amount, $5,000,000 is only for Engineering Support for Requirements Development and $8,000,000 is only for the Surveillance Common DataLink.)			
Joint service wideband datalink			+3,000
Aviation—Eng Dev	6,312	13,312	+7,000
Aircrew common helmet			+7,000
Weapons and Munitions—Eng Dev	54,943	73,143	+18,200
Small arms fire control system			+4,500
Mortar anti-personnel/anti-material round			+7,200
M2HB.50 caliber with quick change barrel			+3,000
M795E1 extended range high explosive base burner			+2,500
Rifle launch entry munition			+1,000
(Note: Transferred from PE 0203761A)			
Landmine Warfare/Barrier—Eng Dev	40,916	30,120	−10,796
Schedule delay			−10,796
(Note: Transfer $8,000,000 to 0603619A)			
Army Tactical Command & Control Hardware & Software	35,299	39,799	+4,500
Next generation command and control system			+4,500
(Note: Only to leverage advanced 3D display technology development work in support of other services at a not-for-profit technology transfer center for incorporation into Army command and control modernization initiatives for fixed sites and at tactical command centers at the corps, division and brigade levels)			
Concepts Experimentation Program	16,990	19,990	+3,000
Mounted maneuver battlespace lab			+3,000
Army Test Ranges and Facilities	137,193	147,193	+10,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
White Sands Missile Range instrumentation			+10,000
Army Technical Test Instrumentation and Target	30,470	31,670	+1,200
Characterization and quantification of missile debris study			+1,200
Survivability/Lethality Analysis	30,138	40,138	+10,000
Information warfare vulnerability analysis			+10,000
DOD High Energy Laser Test Facility	14,230	34,230	+20,000
HELSTF			+10,000
Solid state laser			+10,000
Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety	10,537	19,037	+8,500
Contained detonation technology			+3,000
Bluegrass Army depot			+2,500
Cryofracture disposal of anti-personnel mines			+3,000
Environmental Compliance	0	8,000	+8,000
Natural gas boilers			+3,000
Near-term climate change fuel cells			+5,000
Adv Field Artillery Tactical Data System	36,222	42,722	+6,500
Interface development			+6,500
Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs	29,544	42,544	+13,000
Lightweight vehicle track development			+2,000
M1 large area flat panel displays			+8,000
VIS AN/VIC–3, cordless			+3,000
Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program	2,900	4,900	+2,000
Variable displacement vane pump and lola boost pump			+2,000
Digitization	28,180	30,180	+2,000
Ft. Hood digitization research			+2,000
Force XXI Battle Command, Brigade and Below (FBC)	44,225	59,225	+15,000
Transfer from Other Procurement, Army			+15,000
Missile/Air Defense Product Improvement Program	29,985	34,985	+5,000
SWORD			+5,000
Digital Information Technology Test Bed	0	2,000	+2,000
Develop security and multimedia data integration			+2,000
Security and Investigative Activities	0	10,000	+10,000
Land information warfare activity			+10,000
(Note: Funds are only for the U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command's Information Dominance Center)			
End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities	66,167	102,667	+36,500
Munitions manufacturing technology			+15,000
Rotary wing sustainment technology			+3,000
Instrumental Factory for Gears (INFAC)			+4,000
Totally Integrated Manufacturing Enterprise (TIME)			+7,000
Electro-Optics Center			+1,500
(Note: To support the existing Mantech Electro-Optics Center in meeting precision manufacturing requirements)			
Natural gas engine drive air compressors			+4,000
Best Practices			+2,000
Army Ground Intelligence Center	0	35,000	+35,000

HUNTER UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (UAV)

The Hunter UAV, a system whose production the Army has terminated, was deployed to Operation Allied Force in the Balkans region. The Army has lost seven air vehicles in theater. Despite these losses, the Army claims it possesses sufficient Hunter inventory to continue operational support.

While the Army is not continuing to develop the Hunter, it has incorporated certain modifications to improve performance and reduce support costs for deployment to the Balkans region. The Committee understands that the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) has recommended that $15,650,000 from the amount ap-

propriated in Public Law 106–31 for the Operational Rapid Response Transfer Fund, be used to offset the cost of Hunter operations in the Balkans region. The Committee supports this recommendation.

The Committee directs the Secretary of the Army to ensure that within available resources, adequate funds are provided for all necessary Hunter requirements.

BASIC RESEARCH

DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES

The Army requested $125,613,000 for defense research sciences. The Committee recommends the budget request and directs that $3,000,000 is only for vehicle mobility research at the Center for Advanced Propulsion Systems.

APPLIED RESEARCH

BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY

The Army requested $36,287,000 for ballistics technology. The Committee recommends $42,287,000, an increase of $6,000,000 only for electromagnetic (EM) gun pulsed power technology. Furthermore, the Committee directs that within the available amount, $2,500,000 is only for electrothermal-chemical technology development.

HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

The Committee urges all the military services to budget for the implementation of the lessons learned through the Army's MedTeams program to reduce emergency department errors and improve patient satisfaction.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY

The Army requested $12,758,000 for environmental quality technology. The Committee recommends $81,258,000, an increase of $68,500,000. Of this amount $9,000,000 is only for the Plasma Energy Pyrolysis System, which is capable of destroying hazardous, chemical and medical waste. In addition, $7,000,000 is only for the Sustainable Green Manufacturing Initiative to develop advanced, environmentally responsible manufacturing processes for weapons systems. Of the total, $3,000,000 is only to continue efforts to develop a computer-based land management model for the Army to reduce time and costs attributable to military training area recovery and restoration. Further, $8,000,000 is only for the continuation of the Commercialization of Technologies to Lower Defense Costs Initiative. In addition, $13,000,000 is only for the continuation of the Demanufacturing of Electronic Equipment for Reuse and Recycling (DEER2) Initiative. Another $3,000,000 is only to continue the next phase of the ongoing DEER2 program by establishing a state of the art product and material recycling site. Furthermore, $9,000,000 is only for a Corrosion Measurement and Control Project to leverage available technologies and tools to detect, measure and control corrosion to meet the Department's sustainment and readiness goals and to lower maintenance costs.

Another $10,000,000 is only for the Range Safe Technology Demonstration Initiatives which include clean-up demonstrations at five installations. An additional, $4,500,000 is only for the continuation of the environmental pollution projects at Watervliet Arsenal. Finally, $2,000,000 is only to advance the maturation of Vessel Plating Technology, an environmental friendly process for chrome plating long gun tubes.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY

The Committee is very concerned about the roughly $15 million the Services spend on alcohol rehabilitation each year. Research to uncover the biological basis for alcoholism and to develop a chemical block to the addiction appears promising. The Committee encourages the Department to participate or partner in this research to identify the pharmacological causes of alcoholism.

MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCE TECHNOLOGY

Last year, the Congress terminated the EFOG–M program. The Committee is aware that adequate funding was appropriated in fiscal year 1999 to pay for any termination costs incurred for the EFOG–M program, and no additional funds are required for program termination.

LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

The Army requested $41,619,000 for the Line-of-Sight Technology (LOSAT) Demonstration. The Committee recommends no funds for this program based on recommendations in the Army's Light Anti-Tank (LAT) Study/Program and inadequate outyear funding.

The Army LAT Study indicated an improved TOW missile, with a Fire and Forget capability is of higher priority of than LOSAT. It is the Committee's understanding that the Army has decided to begin developing an improved TOW fire and forget system in fiscal year 2001 and has included this item on this year's unfunded requirements list. Therefore, the Committee has included funds to accelerate the TOW Fire and Forget Program. Additionally, the Army budget does not include adequate funds to procure LOSAT and the Army has identified a shortfall in excess of $250 million. Further details are provided under the heading "Other Missile Product Improvement Programs."

JOINT TACTICAL RADIO

The Committee understands that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology will make key architecture and acquisition strategy decisions on the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) in October 2000. Although the Committee is pleased that top management attention is being given to this program, the Committee believes that the architecture and acquisition strategy decisions need to be made at an earlier date in order to influence key development decisions.

Since JTRS will resolve interoperability issues among service radios, the Committee believes the DoD should accelerate this effort. The Committee recognizes the difficult task of replacing approximately 750,000 radios in the DoD inventory; but believes the task can be made less daunting if DoD will determine which radios and wave forms will be given priority. Additionally, the Committee believes an operational test and evaluation plan needs to be established with adequate criteria to measure successful operations, both in joint and coalition operations.

The Committee directs the DoD to provide to the Committee by December 15, 1999, a report on its strategy for developing and fielding the JTRS. The plan is to include priority radios for replacement, cost of the development program, a development schedule and estimated unit cost of production radios.

ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—DEMONSTRATION AND VALIDATION

The Army requested $282,937,000 for artillery systems demonstration and validation. The Committee recommends the budget request. The Committee expresses its continued support for the Crusader development program and encourages the Army to provide adequate funding in future budget submissions for this program.

OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

FORCE XXI, WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM

The Army requested $55,921,000 for the Force XXI, Warfighting Rapid Acquisition Program (WRAP). The Committee recommends $36,621,000, a decrease of $19,300,000. Of the decrease $10,500,000 is excess funds due to the denial of a fiscal year 1999 WRAP initiative. The Committee also recommends the transfer of $8,800,000 from this program element to other lines, as follows:

Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
Rifle Launch Entry Munitions (Transferred to PE 0604802A)	$1,000,000
Other Procurement, Army:	
HEMTT-Load handling	$6,800,000
MEDLOG-Division	$1,000,000

The Army's rationale for establishing the WRAP initiative was to accelerate the development and fielding of mature technologies. Once again, the Committee notes a significant number of WRAP initiatives have experienced schedule delays and cost growth, such as the Mortar Fire Control, Gun Laying and Positioning System, and the Airborne Command and Control System. Additionally, the Committee notes the Army has not fully supported all of the WRAP initiatives in subsequent budget requests such as the Airborne Command and Control system. Therefore, the Committee directs the Army to submit with its fiscal year 2001 budget request a detailed report describing the status of the WRAP initiatives. The report is to include the original and current schedule and cost estimates for each approved initiative.

The Committee directs that none of the WRAP funds may be obligated without prior approval from the congressional defense committees. Notification of the Army's intent to obligate the funds is to include supporting criteria outlining the technical merit and ma-

turity; criticality and priority to warfighting requirements; affordability; effectiveness; and sustainability in future budget submissions. Further, the Committee directs that none of the WRAP funds may be used for technologies included in the budget request, such as, but not limited to, applique, night vision equipment, and radios. Instead, WRAP funds are to be reprogrammed, with prior approval, to the proper project for obligation.

OTHER MISSILE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

The Army requested $9,914,000 for other missile improvement programs. The Committee recommends $20,914,000, an increase of $11,000,000 only for a TOW Fire and Forget missile. Based on the Army's Light Anti-Armor Study, the Committee believes that the TOW Fire and Forget System will increase lethality and survivability for the light forces. The Committee understands this particular initiative is among the programs analyzed in the Anti-Armor Weapons Master Plan. Also, the Committee understands that the Army is reviewing various options for fielding a TOW Fire and Forget capability to include modifications to existing missiles; producing new Fire and Forget missiles; and developing a new TOW-like Fire and Forget missile. Therefore, the Committee directs that none of the funds appropriated for the improved TOW Fire and Forget may be obligated until 30 days after Congress receives the Anti-Armor Weapons Master Plan. Additionally, none of the funds may be obligated until the Army submits a TOW Fire and Forget program plan to the Congress for prior approval. The plan is to include the TOW Fire and Forget requirement, the alternatives for satisfying that requirement, and the total program cost for each alternative.

AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Army's unfunded requirements list included $31,400,000 for a Blackhawk Service Life Extension Program (SLEP). Although the Committee believes that the current Blackhawk fleet is aging and needs to be upgraded, the Committee believes it is premature to add funds for this initiative at this time. The Committee directs the Army to provide with the fiscal year 2001 budget request a report on the state of the Blackhawk fleet. The report is to include the various Blackhawk models in the inventory, the average age of each model type, required upgrades and the estimated cost of a Service Life Extension Program as compared to the cost of procuring new aircraft. Furthermore, the Committee directs the Army to provide adequate funds for either the Blackhawk SLEP or new aircraft in subsequent budget submissions.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total program recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
BASIC RESEARCH			
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,193	14,193	---
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	125,613	125,613	---
UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	47,066	47,066	---
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	186,872	186,872	---
APPLIED RESEARCH			
TRACTOR ROSE	6,766	6,766	---
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	13,849	13,849	---
SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	22,978	25,978	+3,000
TRACTOR HIP	9,298	9,298	---
AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	30,165	30,165	---
EW TECHNOLOGY	17,487	17,487	---
MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	32,892	43,892	+11,000
MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	24,955	24,955	---
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	39,749	42,249	+2,500
BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	36,287	42,287	+6,000
CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,996	3,996	---
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,187	5,187	---
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	34,687	37,187	+2,500
ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	25,796	37,596	+11,800
NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,111	20,111	---
COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	10,321	14,121	+3,800
HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	16,392	19,792	+3,400
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	12,758	81,258	+68,500
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,613	19,613	---
COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	5,210	5,210	---
MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	41,085	61,085	+20,000
MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	12,071	12,071	---
WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	23,971	26,971	+3,000
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	70,136	169,636	+99,500
ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,276	1,276	---
DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,222	10,000	-8,222
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	555,258	782,036	+226,778
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	31,287	42,773	+11,486
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,539	69,339	+58,800
AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	34,167	34,167	---
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,893	67,643	+27,750
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	90,941	137,441	+46,500
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,883	20,883	---
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,030	3,030	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
TRACTOR HIKE	12,553	12,553	---
TRACTOR RED	4,582	4,582	---
TRACTOR ROSE	11,151	11,151	---
MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,976	5,976	---
TRACTOR HIP	2,432	2,432	---
GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECH.	24,618	24,618	---
EW TECHNOLOGY	16,169	16,169	---
MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,639	51,639	+8,000
TRACTOR CAGE	2,665	2,665	---
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	47,456	47,456	---
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,869	4,869	---
LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	41,619	---	-41,619
NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,628	45,628	+9,000
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,337	1,337	---
MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,881	15,881	---
ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH.	22,610	27,610	+5,000
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	524,925	649,842	+124,917
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION			
ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,353	24,853	+12,500
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	4,099	12,099	+8,000
ARMAMENT ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE	36,937	56,937	+20,000
ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	1,937	1,937	---
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	10	10	---
SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	12,804	12,804	---
TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	---	2,500	+2,500
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,188	3,188	---
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,872	1,872	---
AVIATION - ADV DEV	5,746	5,746	---
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	1,751	4,751	+3,000
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	6,514	9,514	+3,000
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION	11,062	11,062	---
MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	12,723	12,723	---
TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	1,087	1,087	---
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	282,937	282,937	---
SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	10,703	10,703	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	405,723	454,723	+49,000
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL			
AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	6,372	6,372	---
COMANCHE	427,069	427,069	---
EW DEVELOPMENT	78,603	78,603	---
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	36,797	36,797	---
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	49,684	57,684	+8,000
TRACTOR CAGE	2,848	2,848	---
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,973	1,973	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV.....	918	918	---
JAVELIN.....	493	493	---
LANDMINE WARFARE.....	13,318	13,318	---
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES.....	---	1,400	+1,400
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.....	1,981	5,981	+4,000
TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV).....	---	7,000	+7,000
LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES.....	7,498	7,498	---
ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG DEV.....	2,899	2,899	---
ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	58,321	58,321	---
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV.....	30,644	36,544	+5,900
COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT.....	110,829	84,329	-26,500
NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV.....	71,034	74,234	+3,200
TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV.....	5,348	5,348	---
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	2,318	2,318	---
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE.....	4,552	4,552	---
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE-ENG DEV.	7,995	7,995	---
AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT.....	10,252	20,252	+10,000
DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENG DEV..	7,657	7,657	---
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD..	70,940	70,940	---
BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT).....	128,026	144,026	+16,000
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM.....	11,535	27,535	+16,000
POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE).....	443	443	---
COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE.....	19,925	19,925	---
AVIATION - ENG DEV.....	6,312	13,312	+7,000
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV.....	54,943	73,143	+18,200
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV.....	22,996	22,996	---
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV....	23,987	23,987	---
MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT.	9,705	9,705	---
LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV.....	40,916	30,120	-10,796
SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV.....	19,366	19,366	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION.....	8,658	8,658	---
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE...	35,299	39,799	+4,500
RADAR DEVELOPMENT.....	5,128	5,128	---
FIREFINDER.....	32,353	32,353	---
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD.....	65,806	65,806	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL.....	1,495,741	1,559,645	+63,904
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	13,680	13,680	---
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	13,397	13,397	---
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT.....	39,380	39,380	---
RAND ARROYO CENTER.....	17,656	17,656	---
ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL.....	140,344	140,344	---
CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM.....	16,990	19,990	+3,000
ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES.....	137,193	147,193	+10,000
ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS.....	30,470	31,670	+1,200
SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS.....	30,138	40,138	+10,000
DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY.....	14,230	34,230	+20,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,021	3,021	---
METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,843	6,843	---
MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	8,796	8,796	---
EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	4,143	4,143	---
SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	68,946	68,946	---
ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	24,255	24,255	---
PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,121	64,121	---
TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	15,973	15,973	---
MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	10,537	19,037	+8,500
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	---	8,000	+8,000
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	5,191	5,191	---
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	665,304	726,004	+60,700
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT			
MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	36,540	67,440	+30,900
AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,903	24,903	---
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	36,222	42,722	+6,500
COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	29,544	42,544	+13,000
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	45,125	46,125	+1,000
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	51,644	51,644	---
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,900	4,900	+2,000
DIGITIZATION	28,180	30,180	+2,000
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	44,225	59,225	+15,000
FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION	55,921	36,621	-19,300
MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	29,985	34,985	+5,000
OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	9,914	20,914	+11,000
TRACTOR CARD	3,898	3,898	---
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	18,432	18,432	---
JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	28,061	28,061	---
SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	6,584	6,584	---
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	9,426	15,426	+6,000
SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	36,230	36,230	---
WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	11,606	11,606	---
DIGITAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TEST BED	---	2,000	+2,000
SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	---	10,000	+10,000
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	3,866	43,866	+40,000
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,932	4,932	---
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	8,066	8,066	---
END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	66,167	102,667	+36,500
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	592,371	753,971	+161,600
ARMY GROUND INTELLIGENCE CENTER	---	35,000	+35,000
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, ARMY	4,426,194	5,148,093	+721,899

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$8,636,649,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	7,984,016,000
Committee recommendation	9,080,580,000
Change from budget request	+1,096,564,000

This appropriation provides funds for the research, development, test and evaluation activities of the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
ASW systems development	17,780	23,780	+6,000
Industrial preparedness	59,104	74,104	+15,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Air and Surface Launched Weapons Technology	37,616	54,616	+17,000
Free electron laser			+3,000
Phased array weather radar			+10,000
Pulse detonation engine technology			+4,000
Ship, Submarine & Logistics Technology	43,786	64,586	+20,800
Stainless steel double hull			+5,000
Modernization through remanufacturing and conversion			+2,000
Curved plate double hull technology			+8,000
(Note: Funds for curved plate double hull are only to continue the demonstration of developed techniques for the advancement of curved plate advanced double hull technology for naval and commercial applications.)			
Three dimensional printing metalworking technology at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard			+4,000
Bioenvironmental hazards			+1,800
NOTE: Funds for metalworking technology are only for test and evaluation of systems that provide more efficient and affordable methods of metal fabrication for components on navy ships, carriers and submarines performed at the Center for Concurrent Technology in Bremerton, Washington.			
Communications, Command and Control, Intel, Surveillan	68,823	78,073	+9,250
Hybrid fiberoptic wireless communication technology			+2,500
Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamformer			+4,750
Optoelectric high definition camera			+2,000
Human Systems Technology	30,586	37,086	+6,500
Biological hazard detection system			+6,500
Materials, Electronics and Computer Technology	77,957	90,457	+12,500
Silicon carbide semiconductor substrates			+3,000
Ultra-high thermal conductivity fibers			+2,500
Engineered wood composite lumber			+5,000
NOTE: Funds for engineered wood composite lumber are only to continue the ongoing collaborative research to adapt wood based composites for specific building applications for improved Navy construction.			
Smart wiring technology			+2,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Oceanographic and Atmospheric Technology	60,334	71,084	+10,750
Autonomous UUV			+10,000
Completion of PM–10 air quality study			+750
Undersea Warfare Weaponry Technology	34,066	39,066	+5,000
Microelectromechanical systems			+2,000
6.25′ multimission weapon			+3,000
Dual Use Applications Program	18,390	10,000	−8,390
Program reduction, excessive growth			−8,390
Air Systems and Weapons Advanced Technology	42,046	51,046	+9,000
Aircraft affordability project (DP–2)			+5,000
RAMJET propulsion technologies at Naval Air Warfare Center, China Lake			+4,000
Precision Strike and Air Defense Technology	52,580	82,080	+29,500
Small combatant craft			+18,000
NOTE: Funds for small combatant craft are only for the purchase, test, and evaluation of small combatant craft (one low radar signature and one high effective operational speed), for close inshore naval operations.			
Extending the littoral battlespace			+7,500
Hybrid LIDAR/RADAR technology			+4,000
Surface Ship & Submarine HM&E Advance Technology	41,515	75,515	+34,000
Power node control centers			+3,000
Project M			+5,000
Virtual test bed for advanced electrical ship systems			+3,000
Electronmagnetic propulsion systems			+3,000
High temperature superconducting AC synchronous motor			+5,000
Permanent magnet motor			+5,000
Superconducting DC motor			+10,000
Marine Corps Advanced Technology Demonstration (ATD)	56,943	62,943	+6,000
Advanced lightweight grenade launcher			+3,000
BURRO			+3,000
Medical Development	15,064	81,864	+66,800
Dental research at the Naval Dental Research Institute			+6,000
Bone marrow program			+34,000
Improved Bone Marrow Transplantation [Note: $2,000,000 is only for unrelated donor marrow transplantation clinical trials of graft engineering.]			+2,000
Teleradiology			+3,000
Disaster management and humanitarian assistance			+3,000
Medical readiness telemedicine initiative			+9,000
Rural health			+3,000
Naval blood research lab			+5,000
National biodynamics research			+1,800
Manpower, Personnel and Training Adv Tech Dev	20,632	39,632	+19,000
Remanufacturing and resource recovery			+3,000
Advanced distributed learning			+10,000
NOTE: Funds are only to continue effort to standardize distributed learning courseware.			
Distrbuted simulation, warfighting concepts			+6,000
NOTE: Funds are only to begin phase I, developing linkage between joint and military service demonstration and experimentation initiatives and the design of future carriers using methodology demonstrated in the JMO–T program.			
Environmental Quality and Logistics Advanced Tech	23,809	28,809	+5,000
Aviation depot maintenance technology demonstration at NADEP Jacksonville			+3,000
Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory			+2,000
NOTE: Only for Integrated Data Environment Systems development and testing.			
Navy Technical Information Presentation System	41,840	19,940	−21,900
Joint warfighting experimentation program			−21,900

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
NOTE: $520,000 is only to establish the Center for Defense Technology and Education for the military services at the Naval Postgraduate School to focus on the impact of emerging technologies on joint warfare.			
Advanced Technology Transition	75,635	96,535	+20,900
Littoral warfare fast patrol craft			+5,000
Vectored thrust ducted propeller			+5,900
Demonstration of advanced sub carrier modulation/magnetic resonance technology in current and advanced sonobouy and databouy R&D efforts to detect metallic objects at extremely long ranges			+10,000
NOTE: Sub carrier modulation is to be managed by the Navy Undersea Warfare Center.			
C3 Advanced Technology	23,808	39,808	+16,000
National technology alliance			+5,000
Dominant battlespace command initiative			+6,000
SPAWAR/NATAC program			+5,000
C2W Replacement for EA–6B	0	16,000	+16,000
Analysis of alternatives			+16,000
Software Development and Management	0	2,000	+2,000
Tri-service software program managers network			+2,000
Aviation Survivability	7,280	16,280	+9,000
Smart aircrew integrated life support system			+3,000
Dynamic flow ejection seat facility improvements			+3,000
NOTE: Funds are only for improvements to the existing ejection seat test facility at Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division.			
Lightweight environmentally sealed parachute assembly sealing technology			+1,500
Pilot vehicle interface center upgrades			+1,500
ASW Systems Development	17,780	23,780	+6,000
Beartrap/stochastic resonance			+6,000
Surface and Shallow Water Mine Countermeasures	82,465	94,465	+12,000
Remote minehunting system			+12,000
Advanced Submarine Combat Systems Development	0	10,000	+10,000
Conformal array velocity sensor			+6,800
Common towed array program			+3,200
Surface Ship Torpedo Defense	640	5,640	+5,000
Cooperative international program			+5,000
NOTE: Funds are only to continue the joint collaborative SSTD program with the United Kingdom including the upgrade of the SLQ–25 A torpedo countermeasure capability, including the winch and tow, for littoral operations.			
Shipboard System Component Development	108,334	114,484	+6,150
Man overboard indicator			+3,150
Ship survivability and personnel protection			+2,000
Advanced waterjet technology			+1,000
Advanced Submarine System Development	115,767	124,267	+8,500
Affordable advanced acoustic arrays			+5,000
Enhanced performance motor brush			+3,500
Ship Concept Advanced Design	5,318	29,818	+24,500
Smart propulsor model			+1,500
Trident SSGN design			+13,000
Automated maintenance environment			+10,000
NOTE: Automated maintenance environment funds are only to integrate the NAVSEA AME project with the NAVAIR GAME project to create a deployable battle group level integrated maintenance system under the NAVSEA AME contract.			
Advanced Surface Machinery Systems	17,727	22,727	+5,000
Intercooled recuperated gas turbine			+5,000
Combat System Integration	46,740	79,740	+33,000
Common command and decision system			+30,000
NAVSEA methodology for fleet legacy systems			+3,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Conventional Munitions	34,309	43,309	+9,000
Environmentally safe energetic materials			+2,000
Optical correlation technology for automatic target recognition			+7,000
Marine Corps Assault Vehicles	94,843	112,843	+18,000
Advanced amphibious assault vehicle			+18,000
Marine Corps Ground Combat/Support System	42,654	45,654	+3,000
SMAW–CS system level qualification test and evaluation			+3,000
Cooperative Engagement	114,931	190,931	+76,000
Low cost data distribution system/cooperative engagement processor			+15,000
CEC network capacity expansion			+12,700
System protection			+10,000
Low cost planar array			+5,000
Forward pass/remote launch			+5,000
Modeling and simulation			+7,500
One additional land based unit to evaluate CEC/Patriot			+6,800
Airborne antenna improvement			+4,000
Area Air Defense Commander			+10,000
Environmental Protection	70,793	84,793	+14,000
Asbestos conversion pilot program			+4,000
NOTE: Only to continue the validation of a thermochemical conversion process used to decontaminate mixed waste streams and PCB's from retired Navy submarines at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.			
Resource preservation initiative at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard			+10,000
Navy Energy Program	4,984	7,984	+3,000
Demonstration of desiccant-based dehumidification in naval facilities			+3,000
Navy Logistics Productivity	0	27,500	+27,500
Virtual system implementation program			+10,000
Rapid retargeting of electronic circuits			+10,000
Compatible processor upgrade program			+7,500
Ship Self Defense—Dem/Val	5,654	10,654	+5,000
Test ship repairs			+5,000
Land Attack Technology	101,489	111,489	+10,000
ERGM guidance system cost reduction			+10,000
Projectile common guidance and control			+3,000
Proximity fuze for DPICM submunitions			+2,000
Continuous processor, NSWC Indian Head			+5,000
Land attack standard missile, program delays			−10,000
Space and Electronic Warfare (SEW) Architecture/Engine	35,170	37,170	+2,000
Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative			+2,000
Other Helo Development	48,776	80,776	+32,000
SH–60 third test asset			+19,000
Development, construction, and system integration of a CH–60 AMCM engineering development model			+10,000
Ship-air mission system integration			+3,000
Standards Development	74,325	78,825	+4,500
Joint services metrology program			+4,500
S–3 Weapon System Improvement	2,095	7,095	+5,000
Surveillance system upgrade			+5,000
P–3 Modernization Program	3,010	18,010	+15,000
Radar upgrades: moving target indicator/periscope detection			+15,000
Tactical Command System	41,599	45,599	+4,000
Ocean Surveillance Information System (OED)			+4,000
Air Crew Systems Development	6,801	14,301	+7,500
Front line ejection equipment testing			+4,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
NOTE: Funds are only for continuation of Navy effort in concert with a similar Air Force program to define ejection seat deficiencies and identify corrective actions relative to stability, restraint, and accommodation configurations.			
Ejection seat stability, enhancements in fins, booms, trailing afterbodies, drogue parachutes, and pintal propulsion system technologies.	.....	.....	+3,500
EW Development	163,077	237,577	+74,500
Location of GPS system jammers	.....	.....	+4,500
EA–6B connectivity (link 16)	.....	.....	+60,000
Integrated defensive electronic countermeasures	.....	.....	+10,000
Surface Combatant Combat System Engineering	204,480	244,480	+40,000
Cruiser conversion, flight I ships	.....	.....	+7,500
Interoperability/tactical display services	.....	.....	+25,000
NOTE: Funds for displays are only to address AEGIS-specific interoperability issues and the development of tactical display services supporting TMD and CEC systems.			
Advanced food service technology	.....	.....	+7,500
SSN–688 and Trident Modernization	48,896	76,896	+28,000
Multipurpose processors	.....	.....	+25,000
BQG–5 wide aperture array	.....	.....	+3,000
NOTE: BQG–5 funds are for integration and installation planning for the inboard segment and testing on a submarine.			
Submarine Combat System	6,546	9,546	+3,000
Integration of UYQ–70 into backfit submarines	.....	.....	+3,000
New Design SSN	241,456	251,456	+10,000
Non-propulsion electronics systems	.....	.....	+10,000
Navy Tactical Computer Resources	3,300	58,300	+55,000
Submarine communications/computer infrastructure	.....	.....	+20,000
NOTE: Funds are only to develop selected submarine combat system Q–70 retrofits for SSN–688/Trident class submarines.			
Computer aided dead reckoning tracer	.....	.....	+5,000
UYQ–70 improvements/technology refreshment	.....	.....	+25,000
NOTE: UYQ–70 technology refresh funds are only to develop and implement technology refresh, to include but not be limited to, Q–70 COTS networking and interconnect infrastructure, common system service software components, advanced human to machine interfaces, IT21 workstation, systems compatibility design and logistics streamlining.			
Advanced digital logistics integrated data capture and analysis	.....	.....	+5,000
NOTE: ADLIDCA equipment only for Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.			
Ship Self Defense—EMD	96,580	111,580	+15,000
AIEWS for DDG–91 and LPD–22	.....	.....	+12,000
AIEWS middleware/multi-purpose processors	.....	.....	+3,000
Medical Development	4,285	10,285	+6,000
Voice interactive device	.....	.....	+6,000
NOTE: Only for continued development of a Navy voice interactive device to facilitate the collection, processing, storing, and forwarding of critical medical information for treatment of combat casualties.			
Distributed Surveillance System	14,910	38,910	+24,000
Advanced deployable system improved detection/tracking algorithms	.....	.....	+19,000
Network centric warfare	.....	.....	+5,000
Commerical Operations and Support Savings Initiative	18,729	16,500	−2,229
Program reduction	.....	.....	−2,229
Major T&E Investment	42,621	49,621	+7,000
NAWC, PAX range tracking system upgrades	.....	.....	+3,500
Advanced virtual environment	.....	.....	+3,500
Studies and Analysis Support—Navy	8,531	6,031	−2,500
Program reduction, excessive growth	.....	.....	−2,500
Sew Surveillance/Reconnaissance Support	12,121	16,121	+4,000
Hyperspectral analysis	.....	.....	+4,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	FY 2000 budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Marine Corps Program Wide Support	8,198	28,398	+20,200
Acquifer vulnerability/contamination assessment			+1,500
Chemical biological individual sampler			+4,800
Small unit biological detector			+4,100
Probable cause detection system			+3,000
Chem/bio integrated information system			+4,800
Human Effects Advisory Panel			+2,000
Strategic Sub & Weapons System Support	45,907	60,407	+14,500
Models for radiation hardened electronics/upgrade integrated circuit fabrication facility at SPAWAR Systems Center			+14,500
F/A–18 Squadrons	315,714	373,214	+57,500
LAU–138A/A BOL chaff countermeasures			+2,500
EA–6B follow-on support jammer, F/A–18E/F variant			+40,000
Radar ECCM improvements			+15,000
E–2 Squadrons	16,132	55,132	+39,000
Radar modernization program			+15,000
Advanced support aircraft (follow-on to E–2/C–2)			+9,000
Satellite communications			+15,000
Tomahawk and Tomahawk Mission Planning Center (TMPC)	147,223	142,223	−5,000
Tactical Tomahawk schedule delay			−5,000
Consolidated Training Systems Development	26,257 500	33,757	+7,500
Battle force tactical training (conversion to Windows environment)			+7,500
Harm Improvement	23,642	43,642	+20,000
Advanced anti-radiation guided missile			+20,000
Aviation Improvements	53,292	63,292	+10,000
C–2 composite propeller flight testing			+10,000
Marine Corps Communications Systems	90,293	94,293	+4,000
MEWSS/MAGTF C4I modernization kits			+4,000
Marine Corps Ground Combat/Supporting Arms Systems	39,941	36,741	−3,200
Improved recovery vehicle			−7,200
Shortstop			+4,000
Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	69,742	77,242	+7,500
Multifunction self-aligned gate			+4,500
Tactical control system—UAV			+3,000
System integration lab			+4,500
Tactical control system—program office			−4,500
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	4,958	18,958	+14,000
EO framing technologies			+10,000
NOTE: Funds are only for Electro-Optical Framing with on chip FMC.			
Hyperspectral modular airborne reconnaissance system			+4,000
Manned Reconnaissance Systems	30,958	39,958	+9,000
SHARP			+9,000
NOTE: Funds are only for testing and evaluation of a small light-weight synthetic aperture radar for the SHARP reconnaissance system.			
Naval Space Surveillance	712	2,712	+2,000
RESIC			+2,000
Industrial Preparedness	59,104	74,104	+15,000
Program increase			+15,000
Maritime Technology (Maritech)	19,681	24,681	+5,000
Maritime technology development			+5,000

JOINT EXPERIMENTATION

The Navy requested $41,840,000 for joint experimentation conducted by the United States Atlantic Command (ACOM). The Committee recommends $19,940,000, a decrease of $21,900,000 due to delay in the fiscal year 1999 program and to reduce program scope as explained below. The Committee notes that a reprogramming request to accelerate the fiscal year 1999 program was not approved

by Congress until the last quarter of the fiscal year, and these funds can be used to partially offset the amount requested in fiscal year 2000. Within the amount requested in fiscal year 2000, $18,720,000 has been identified for the highest priority: attack operations against critical mobile targets. This highest priority is fully funded in the Committee's recommendation.

The joint experimentation program has noble goals, namely to improve wartime operations and interoperability of the military services' forces by analyzing, evaluating, and perhaps changing organizations, doctrine, tactics, weapon system acquisitions, and identifying or defining requirements for the development of future technologies. The budget request envisions an expenditure of over $374 million and establishing a bureaucracy of 161 personnel during the next six years to address these issues. The output of this large expenditure of funds, according to the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Atlantic Command, is workshops, seminars, and wargames. The Committee notes that for $374 million proposed for this initiative, not a single item of equipment would be fielded to combat troops, who today face many shortages of equipment and parts. The proposed ACOM organization would operate autonomously and not be integrated with or responsible to any other chain of command. The potential for duplication of effort or wasted effort is of major concern to the Committee. The Atlantic Command also cannot articulate with clarity how these funds would be used, other than to provide general categorization of broad potential activities.

The Committee agrees that ACOM could play a useful role in improving joint organizations, tactics, and doctrine. The Committee questions whether ACOM can play a significant role in weapon systems acquisition or technology development. Before agreeing to the manpower and funding investments envisioned in the budget, the Committee would like to see ACOM focus on a well-defined area of weapon systems acquisition and demonstrate to the Defense Department and to Congress that through its activities it can make a meaningful contribution to the process. The Committee directs that ACOM experimentation funds in fiscal years 1999 and 2000 may only be used for attack operations against critical mobile targets, limited infrastructure investments needed to facilitate that single objective, and participation in OSD weapon system reviews. The Committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to report quarterly to the congressional defense committees on the results of ACOM activities during the previous quarter. Such reports should not focus on inputs (how much ACOM has spent, how many seminars it conducted, how many trips were taken) but rather on outputs (changes that have been made to organizations, tactics, doctrine, or weapon system acquisitions).

The claimed rationale for an investment of $374 million and establishment of a new bureaucracy of 161 non-combat personnel is the perception that the Defense weapon system oversight process is not working properly and weapons are not being fielded which are interoperable among the military services. The Committee views the ACOM initiative as a politically-driven substitute to addressing the real problem, managing the weapon system acquisition process to ensure that the best systems are fielded to U.S.

combat forces, to provide the best performance during wartime when conducting joint service operations. The Commander-in-Chief of the United States Atlantic Command informed the Committee that the test of whether the ACOM joint experimentation initiative is successful is whether or not ACOM "gets a seat at the table" when weapon systems acquisition decisions are made. The Committee believes this concern can be addressed in a straightforward manner without a huge investment of funds for studies and establishment of a huge new bureaucracy. The Committee has therefore included a new general provision (Section 8120) which: requires the Defense Acquisition Board to include the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Command as a fully participating member; prohibits approving weapons systems from moving into subsequent phases unless the Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Command certifies to the congressional defense committees that an acquisition before the Defense Acquisition Board fully meets joint service interoperability requirements as determined by theater Commanders-in-Chief; and requires that funds to support the U.S. Atlantic Command participation in Defense Acquisition Board reviews be absorbed within those proposed in the President's budget for ACOM activities.

OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY

The Committee encourages the Navy to accelerate transfer of the research ship USNS Hayes from Cape Canaveral to the South Florida Test Facility as soon as possible.

INTERCOOLED RECUPERATIVE GAS TURBINE ENGINE

The Navy requested $17,700,000 for continued development of the intercooled recuperated gas turbine engine. The Committee recommends $22,700,000, an increase of $5,000,000 to provide a federal government share of a cost improvement program with industry and international partners that could allow the engine to be better suited for future ships such as DD–21. The Committee has included bill language to implement the cost improvement program, while limiting the Navy's program share to not more than one-third of the total program cost, to capitalize on the approximate $400 million investment in this program to date. The Committee hereby withdraws the program development cost cap stated in the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, since the Navy has indicated that it desires to participate in the allied engine qualification effort and to reflect the additional costs of the cost improvement initiative.

JSOW

The Navy requested $30,567,000 for JSOW. The Committee recommends $15,000,000, a net decrease of $15,567,000. This amount includes a decrease of $30,567,000 for the JSOW unitary variant and an increase of $15,000,000 only for GPS anti-spoofing. Last year, the Committee recommended termination of the Navy-unique JSOW unitary variant based on its high cost and low performance relative to other DoD stand-off munitions. Despite the Committee's

recommendation last year, the Navy has requested additional funds in fiscal year 2000 for development of a new, cheaper unitary variant. As a cost saving measure, the new variant no longer includes "man-in-the-loop" which severely limits the weapon's capability against moving targets. However, the GAO has learned that the Navy's JSOW unitary inventory requirement is based almost completely on the use of the weapon against just this class of targets. The small number of fixed targets that drive the inventory requirement hardly justifies development of another service-unique weapon system, given the acquisition plans for such other service-unique systems as SLAM-ER, Tactical Tomahawk, and JASSM which can more effectively attack the same targets. Accordingly, the Committee once again recommends termination of the JSOW unitary program.

AERIAL TARGETS

The Navy is conducting a competition for development and production of the Supersonic Sea-Skimming Target (SSST). The Committee directs the Navy conclude the competition and select a vendor by October 15, 1999. The Committee further directs that none of the funds in this Act may be used for the SSST after October 15, 1999 if the Navy has not concluded the competition by that time.

BONE MARROW REGISTRY

The Committee provides $34,000,000 to be administered by the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program, also known, and referred to, within the Naval Medical Research Center, as the Bone Marrow Registry. This DoD donor center has recruited 200,000 DoD volunteers, and provides more marrow donors per week than any other donor center in the Nation. The Committee is aware of the continuing success of this life saving program for military contingencies and civilian patients, which now includes more than 3,600,000 potential volunteer donors, and encourages agencies involved in contingency planning to include the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program in the development and testing of their contingency plans. DD Form 1414 shall show this as a special congressional interest item, and the Committee directs that all of the funds appropriated for this purpose be released to the C.W. Bill Young Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program within 60 days of enactment of the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations Act.

SHARED RECONNAISSANCE POD (SHARP)

The Committee is pleased with the commitment the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations have made in the development of the SHARP system. The Committee notes that in a June 1, 1999 report to Congress, the Secretary of the Navy determined that the SHARP program is the "most effective reconnaissance system for the F/A–18, the scheduled replacement for F–14 Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance Pod System (TARPS)."

Given these results, it is difficult to understand why the Marine Corps has not aggressively pursued this technology in conjunction

with the Navy. The Committee requests that the Secretary of the Navy review the Marine Corps proposals for its roadmap to meet future tactical reconnaissance requirements to ensure that this plan includes a transition to SHARP when the system becomes available for acquisition.

The rapid prototyping development and acquisition strategy for SHARP is unique in that the Navy seeks to use off the shelf sensor technology and integrate this technology into a pod that can be used on the F/A–18. The Committee believes that significant progress has been made in the commercial sector to develop electro-optic sensor, radar, and pod technologies that can meet most of SHARP's operational needs immediately. However, several challenges exist, both technically and philosophically, to getting this technology integrated, tested, and fielded on the F/A–18.

Technical challenges include development of a suitable pod and the integration of the sensors, radar, and the ground station data link with the aircraft. The Committee is confident that the Navy will overcome these challenges. The philosophical challenge includes a new development and acquisition strategy that requires the Service to adopt a rapid prototyping process with "off-the-shelf" technology. The Committee believes a flexible and dynamic development and acquisition approach is necessary to quickly and effectively field SHARP.

The Committee has included $9,000,000 for the SHARP program only to pursue the acquisition and testing of a small, lightweight synthetic aperture radar for inclusion into SHARP. Significant work has already been conducted on such a system that is being leveraged by the Navy on other platforms. The Navy should not use these funds to pursue a new developmental effort for this SAR, but should test what is available today. This is a congressional interest item. These funds shall not be used for other program requirements without prior approval.

The Committee is aware that there could be future funding shortfalls in the SHARP program based on additional requirements and technology enhancements. The Committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that any and all SHARP program requirements are fully funded in future budget requests.

Finally, the Committee is concerned that technical challenges in the development of a suitable pod could potentially delay fielding of SHARP. The Navy should aggressively pursue the most innovative and competitive SHARP pod design and development. It appears the current acquisition approach does not allow for participation by small innovative companies.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total recommended in the bill will provide the following program in fiscal year 2000.

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
BASIC RESEARCH			
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	15,630	15,630	---
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	361,118	361,118	---
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	376,748	376,748	---
APPLIED RESEARCH			
AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,616	54,616	+17,000
SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	43,786	64,586	+20,800
AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	20,660	20,660	---
MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	10,534	10,534	---
COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTEL, SURVEILLAN	68,823	78,073	+9,250
HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,586	37,086	+6,500
MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	77,957	90,457	+12,500
ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	24,659	24,659	---
UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	51,406	51,406	---
MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	45,022	45,022	---
OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,334	71,084	+10,750
UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	34,066	39,066	+5,000
DUAL USE APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,390	10,000	-8,390
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	523,839	597,249	+73,410
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	42,046	51,046	+9,000
PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	52,580	82,080	+29,500
ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,984	18,984	---
SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	41,515	75,515	+34,000
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	56,943	62,943	+6,000
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	15,064	81,864	+66,800
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	20,632	39,632	+19,000
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECH	23,809	28,809	+5,000
NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	41,840	19,940	-21,900
UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,956	57,956	---
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,711	48,711	---
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	75,635	96,535	+20,900
C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,808	39,808	+16,000
C2W REPLACEMENT FOR EA-6B	---	16,000	+16,000
SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT	---	2,000	+2,000
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	519,523	721,823	+202,300
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION			
AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,109	30,109	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	7,280	16,280	+9,000
ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,780	23,780	+6,000
TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,975	1,975	---
ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	6,828	6,828	---
SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	82,465	94,465	+12,000
ADVANCED SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	---	10,000	+10,000
SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	640	5,640	+5,000
CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	142,783	142,783	---
SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	108,334	114,484	+6,150
PILOT FISH	94,085	94,085	---
RETRACT LARCH	7,834	7,834	---
RETRACT JUNIPER	5,983	5,983	---
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	605	605	---
SURFACE ASW	2,949	2,949	---
ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	115,767	124,267	+8,500
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,667	4,667	---
SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	5,318	29,818	+24,500
SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	12,012	12,012	---
ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	146,208	146,208	---
ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	17,727	22,727	+5,000
CHALK EAGLE	95,329	95,329	---
COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	46,740	79,740	+33,000
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	34,309	43,309	+9,000
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	94,843	112,843	+18,000
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	42,654	45,654	+3,000
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	11,168	11,168	---
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	114,931	190,931	+76,000
OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,813	16,813	---
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	70,793	84,793	+14,000
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,984	7,984	+3,000
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,985	1,985	---
CHALK CORAL	42,707	42,707	---
NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	---	27,500	+27,500
RETRACT MAPLE	122,217	122,217	---
LINK PLUMERIA	48,254	48,254	---
RETRACT ELM	19,535	19,535	---
SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	5,654	10,654	+5,000
LINK EVERGREEN	7,879	7,879	---
SPECIAL PROCESSES	69,332	69,332	---
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	5,461	5,461	---
LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	101,489	111,489	+10,000
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	241,238	241,238	---
NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,277	23,277	---
ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM	13,027	13,027	---
HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS)	4,924	4,924	---
SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	35,170	37,170	+2,000
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	2,086,062	2,372,712	+286,650

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL			
TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	311	311	---
OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	48,776	80,776	+32,000
AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	38,599	38,599	---
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	74,325	78,825	+4,500
MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	118,701	118,701	---
S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	2,095	7,095	+5,000
AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,095	6,095	---
P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,010	18,010	+15,000
TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	41,599	45,599	+4,000
H-1 UPGRADES	157,683	157,683	---
ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	25,953	25,953	---
V-22A	182,885	182,885	---
AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,801	14,301	+7,500
EW DEVELOPMENT	163,077	237,577	+74,500
SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	162,056	162,056	---
SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	204,480	244,480	+40,000
LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	2,608	2,608	---
TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,020	2,020	---
STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,140	1,140	---
AIRBORNE MCM	50,642	50,642	---
SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	48,896	76,896	+28,000
AIR CONTROL	8,696	8,696	---
ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	970	970	---
SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,052	9,052	---
COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	8,126	8,126	---
SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	6,546	9,546	+3,000
NEW DESIGN SSN	241,456	251,456	+10,000
SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	32,001	32,001	---
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	13,353	13,353	---
SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	61,135	61,135	---
NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,300	58,300	+55,000
MINE DEVELOPMENT	3,315	3,315	---
UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	1,598	1,598	---
LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	9,297	9,297	---
MARINE CORPS MINE COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	1,002	1,002	---
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	11,782	11,782	---
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,133	7,133	---
PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,252	1,252	---
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,446	5,446	---
BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	1,791	1,791	---
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	30,567	15,000	-15,567
SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	96,580	111,580	+15,000
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	4,285	10,285	+6,000
NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	19,808	19,808	---
DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	14,910	38,910	+24,000
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	18,729	16,500	-2,229
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	1,953,882	2,259,586	+305,704

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	29,644	29,644	---
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	52,265	52,265	---
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,621	49,621	+7,000
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,531	6,031	-2,500
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,694	43,694	---
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	3,103	3,103	---
TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	6,696	6,696	---
MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	19,447	19,447	---
STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,371	2,371	---
RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	52,777	52,777	---
RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	9,258	9,258	---
RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	73,163	73,163	---
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,992	270,992	---
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	9,172	9,172	---
NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,436	2,436	---
SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,121	12,121	---
MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,198	28,398	+20,200
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	646,489	671,189	+24,700
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT			
STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	45,907	60,407	+14,500
SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,239	33,239	---
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	3,195	3,195	---
F/A-18 SQUADRONS	315,714	373,214	+57,500
E-2 SQUADRONS	16,132	55,132	+39,000
FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	9,947	9,947	---
TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	147,223	142,223	-5,000
INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	18,025	18,025	---
CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	26,257	33,757	+7,500
ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,162	9,162	---
HARM IMPROVEMENT	23,642	43,642	+20,000
TACTICAL DATA LINKS	46,666	46,666	---
SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	16,633	16,633	---
MK-48 ADCAP	20,426	20,426	---
AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	53,293	63,293	+10,000
F-14 UPGRADE	1,390	1,390	---
OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,564	53,564	---
MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	90,293	94,293	+4,000
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	39,941	36,741	-3,200
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	9,817	9,817	---
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	40,051	40,051	---
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	13,544	13,544	---
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	38,921	38,921	---
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	22,978	22,978	---
NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	14,507	14,507	---
JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	8,125	8,125	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	2,064	2,064	---
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	69,742	77,242	+7,500
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,958	18,958	+14,000
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	30,958	39,958	+9,000
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	5,583	5,583	---
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	712	2,712	+2,000
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,621	9,621	---
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	39,986	39,986	---
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,104	74,104	+15,000
MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	19,681	24,681	+5,000
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	516,472	523,472	+7,000
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	1,877,473	2,081,273	+203,800
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, NAVY	7,984,016	9,080,580	+1,096,564

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$13,758,811,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	13,077,829,000
Committee recommendation	13,709,233,000
Change from budget request	+631,404,000

This appropriation funds the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation activities of the Department of the Air Force.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

CONSOLIDATION AND ELIMINATION OF SMALL PROGRAMS

The Committee is concerned about the proliferation of program element line-items in the Air Force research and development budget. The Committee notes that several of these program elements request appropriations below a million dollars often to fund legacy programs that have long since transitioned from development to production to fielding. The Committee believes that these efforts should either be consolidated with other similar efforts or eliminated altogether. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation denies funding for these small programs with the expectation that the Air Fore will make further suggestions regarding consolidation or elimination.

AF/NATIONAL PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION

The Air Force request included three line-items each funding different aspects of cooperation among national intelligence programs and the Air Force. The Committee believes it would be more efficient to consolidate these efforts into a single line-item. The Committee recommendation for this new line-item totals $23,500,000, which includes $19,500,000 (representing a 15 percent reduction based on consolidation efficiencies) and a $4,000,000 increase for a TENCAP program as authorized in the House version of the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Authorization Act.

AIR FORCE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The Air Force budget reduces various Science and Technology efforts by $94,600,000 to fund the Space Based Laser and Space Based Radar programs. The Air Force subsequently submitted a request for $94,600,000 as part of its list of unfunded priorities. The Committee recommendation includes the additional $94,600,000 of Science and Technology funding. This additional funding has been spread to the various Science and Technology line-items in accordance with specific project recommendations made by the Air Force. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the Committee recommendation further includes reductions to the budgeted amounts for Space Based Laser and termination of the Space Based Radar.

WRIGHT PATTERSON LANDING GEAR FACILITY

The Committee understands that the Air Force intends to keep the Wright Patterson Landing Gear Facility open and available to both military and commercial users, but plans to shift ownership of the facility from the Air Force Research Laboratory to either an-

other Air Force organization or a commercial firm. The Committee further understands that the Air Force is evaluating options and will make a decision on the final disposition of the facility by the end of fiscal year 1999. The Committee agrees with the Air Force that the facility should stay open and makes no judgments as to the final ownership. However, the Committee does expect the Air Force to notify the Committee of its final decision on the disposition of the facility prior to implementation of this decision.

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
EELV	324,803	322,803	−2,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Defense Research Sciences	209,505	216,505	+7,000
National Solar Observatory			(600)
Astronomical active optics			+4,000
Coal based advanced thermally stable jet fuels			+3,000
Materials	63,334	74,234	+10,900
Friction stir welding			+2,000
Thermal management for space structures			+2,500
Carbon foam development for aircraft and spacecraft			+1,500
Materials and processes for metal cleaning, corrosion control, and coatings			+1,000
High temperature materials			+1,900
Advanced composite materials and processing technology transfer (NCC)			+2,000
Aerospace Flight Dynamics	43,898	49,298	+5,400
Autonomous control technology			+2,100
Extreme environment structures			+1,200
Virtual development and demonstration environment			+2,100
Human Effectiveness Applied Research	51,512	72,412	+20,900
Solid electrolyte oxygen separator			+3,000
Environmental quality technology, Tyndall AFB			+4,000
Materials and processes for metal cleaning, corrosion control, and coatings			+1,000
Sustained operations			+2,500
Oxygen research (ATD)			+2,100
Spatial disorientation			+900
Altitude protection			+600
Physiology			+1,500
Information training			+3,200
Space training			+2,100
Aerospace Propulsion	62,012	77,212	+15,200
Magnetic bearing cooling turbine technology			+8,500
Aircraft and weapon power			+3,400
Fuels, lubes, combustion			+3,300
Aerospace Sensors	64,988	75,688	+10,700
Connectivity and collaboration infrastructure among modeling, simulation, and computer resources			+6,000
Space protection			+2,200
Automatic target recognition			+2,500
Hypersonic Technology Program	0	16,600	+16,600

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Hypersonic and high speed propulsion technology			+16,600
Phillips Lab Exploratory Development	115,313	147,613	32,300
IHPRPT			+5,300
Hyperspectral imaging technology			+6,400
Tropo-weather			+2,500
Space survivability			+600
Terabit			+5,000
Post boost control system			+2,900
Missile propulsion technology			+1,700
Tactical missile propulsion			+3,000
Orbit transfer propulsion			+2,300
Space optics relay mirror concept			+1,000
Laser remote optical sensing			+1,600
Command Control and Communications	46,448	47,548	+1,100
Defer bistatic effort			−2,600
Distributed agent based C2 planning			+1,000
Common battle space algorithms/processing			+800
Intelligent networks for global information assurance			+900
Computer forensics			+500
Real time knowledge based sensor to shooter decision making			+500
Dual Use Science and Technology Program	17,927	10,000	−7,927
Reduce to FY 1999 level			−7,927
Advanced Materials for Weapon Systems	25,890	31,890	+6,000
Advanced low observable coatings			+6,000
Advanced Aerospace Sensors	29,405	47,805	+18,400
Multispectral battlespace simulation for IDAL			+15,000
Combat ID AGRI ATD			+3,400
Flight Vehicle Technology	5,992	11,992	+6,000
Aging aircraft life extension			+6,000
Aerospace Propulsion and Power Technology	38,778	39,378	+600
Aircraft and weapon power			+600
Personnel, Training and Simulation Technology	4,827	7,027	+2,200
Night vision training			+2,200
Electronic Combat Technology	27,334	34,434	+7,100
CLIRCM			+7,100
Space and Missile Rocket Propulsion	11,231	26,531	+15,300
IHPRPT			+11,000
Missile propulsion technology			+2,600
Orbit transfer propulsion			+1,700
Ballistic Missile Technology	0	23,000	+23,000
GPS range safety demo			+23,000
Advanced Spacecraft Technology	76,229	67,259	−8,970
Terminate Discoverer II			−28,670
Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS)			+4,000
Radiation hardened microelectronics			+10,000
Hyperspectral imaging			+1,200
Composite space launch payload dispensers			+4,500
Space Systems Environmental Interactions Technology	3,677	4,177	+500
Space survivability			+500
Conventional Weapons Technology	21,479	23,033	+1,554
Defer PIOS II technology for AMRAAM			−2,446
Optical correlator technology			+4,000
Advanced Weapons Technology	38,995	56,495	+17,500
LaserSpark			+2,500
GLINT			+15,000
Environmental Engineering Technology	0	3,000	+3,000
Environmental quality technology, Tyndall AFB			+3,000
C31 Subsystem Integration	9,122	7,922	−1,200
Defer bistatic effort			−1,200
Space-Based Laser	63,840	35,000	−28,840
Program reduction			−28,840
National Polar-Orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite	80,137	40,137	−40,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Program reduction			−40,000
Space Based Infrared Architecture (SPACE)—DEM/VAL	151,378	0	−151,378
Transfer funds to 0604442F			−151,378
C–130		43,600	+43,600
Transfer from aircraft procurement for Avionics Improvement Program			+39,600
AC–130 Leading Edge			+4,000
Wideband Milsatcom (SPACE)	53,344	44,344	−9,000
Excessive program support costs			−6,000
Excessive Joint Terminal Program Office funding			−3,000
Air Force/NRO Partnership (AFNP)	2,905		−2,905
Consolidate AF/NRO activities			−2,905
B–1B	203,544	183,544	−20,000
Delay in IDECM program			−20,000
Specialized Undergraduate Pilot Training	38,656	41,156	+2,500
Transfer from aircraft procurement for T–38 Avionics Upgrade Program			+2,500
EW Development	90,347	89,047	−1,300
Delay in IDECM program			−15,000
Precision location and ID program (PLAID)			+13,700
Space Based Infrared System (SBIRS) Low EMD	77,651	229,029	+151,378
Transfer from 0603441F			+151,378
Munitions Dispenser Development	0	3,900	+3,900
Wind corrected munitions dispensor development			+3,900
Armament/Ordnance Development	8,887	27,887	+19,000
Accelerate Miniaturized Munitions Capability			+19,000
Submunitions	4,798	10,798	+6,000
3–D advanced track acquisition and imaging system (3–Data)			+6,000
Agile Combat Support	946	0	−946
Program reduction			−946
Joint Direct Attack Munition	1,385	20,385	+19,000
Accelerate JDAM integration on strike platforms			+19,000
Life Support Systems	6,135	9,135	+3,000
Arm, torso, head & neck wind blast shielding and other aircraft inflatable restraint configurations			+3,000
Combat Training Ranges	6,220	17,820	+11,600
Advanced Data Oriented Security Module			+6,000
Mini-MUTES modernization program			+5,600
Computer Resource Technology Transition (CRTT)	196	6,396	+6,200
NPLACE National Product Line Software Initiative			+5,200
AF product line engineering			+1,000
Joint Interoperability of Tactical Command & Control	5,837	2,837	−3,000
Program reduction			−3,000
Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative	30,485	15,937	−14,548
Reduce program to FY 1999 level			−14,548
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program (SPACE)	324,803	322,803	−2,000
Unjustified growth in program support			−2,000
Target Systems Development	192	0	−192
Program reduction			−192
Major T&E Investment	47,334	69,534	+22,200
MARIAH II Hypersonic Wind Tunnel program			+6,000
Unjustified growth in propulsion wind tunnel hardware			−3,000
Eglin range improvements			+9,000
Modify B–52H as launch platform for experimental space vehicles and new weapon systems			+10,200
Initial Operational Test & Evaluation	23,819	30,569	+6,750
AFOTEC			+6,750
Test and Evaluation Support	392,104	400,104	+8,000
Big Crow program office			+8,000
Information Operations Technology	491	0	−491
Program reduction			−491
B–52 Squadrons	32,139	47,539	+15,400

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Situational awareness upgrades			+15,400
Advanced Cruise Missile	688	0	−688
Program reduction			−688
Air and Space Command and Control Agency (ASC2A)	2,946	0	−2,946
Program reduction			−2,946
Manned Destructive Suppression	5,402	3,402	−2,000
''R7'' Harm Targeting System (HTS) study			−2,000
Advanced Medium Range Air-To-Air Missile (AMRAAM)	49,783	52,783	+3,000
Transfer from missile procurement for P31 phase III			+3,000
AF TENCAP	10,102	0	−10,102
Consolidate AF/NRO activities			−10,102
Compass Call	4,908	12908	+8,000
TRACS–F Upgrade			+8,000
Aircraft Engine Component Improvement Program	160,212	175,212	+15,000
F–16 engine problems			+15,000
Theater Air Control Systems	467	6,467	+6,000
Transfer from OPAF for Expert Missile Tracker			+6,000
Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS)	33,393	36,393	+3,000
Transfer from aircraft procurement for AWACS computers			+3,000
AWACS Cooperative Engagement Funding			(15,800)
Advanced Communications Systems	2,864	0	−2,864
Program reduction			−2,864
Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System	130,488	161,988	+31,500
Properly phase Link 16 funding			−15,000
Unjustified growth of management support funding			−2,000
RTIP			+48,500
USAF Modeling and Simulation	19,299	23,799	+4,500
STORM			+2,500
Powerscene			+2,000
Wargaming and Simulation Centers	5,192	26,692	+21,500
Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility			+21,500
Mission Planning Systems	16,764	20,764	+4,000
JMASS			+4,000
War Reserve Materiel—Equipment/Secondary Items	1,467		−1,467
Program reduction			−1,467
Defense Satellite Communications System (SPACE)	8,985	3,985	−5,000
EELV integration delays and savings			−5,000
Information Systems Security Program	7,992	12,492	+4,500
Computer coordinated distributed attack detection			+4,500
Medium Launch Vehicles (SPACE)	1,179	0	−1,179
Program reduction			−1,179
Security and Invesigative Activities	466	1,466	+1,000
OSI computer crime investigations			+1,000
National Airspace System (NAS) Plan	1,756	0	−1,756
Program reduction			−1,756
Tactical Terminal	239	0	−239
Program reduction			−239
Navstar Global Positioning System (User Equipement)	53,963	49,313	−4,050
NAVWAR ACTD savings identified by GAO			−4,050
Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicles	70,835	89,800	+18,965
Dark Star			−6,035
Global Hawk			+25,000
Airborne Reconnaissance Systems	124,608	144,008	+19,400
High Data Rate Laser Comms			+2,000
JSAF			+17,400
Manned Reconnaissance Systems	9,388	12,488	+3,100
MSAG on RC–135			+3,000
Program transfer from GDIP			+100
Distributed Common Ground Systems	12,820	33,820	+21,000
Eagle Vision—Air National Guard			+21,000
NCMC—TW/AA System	16,408	4,524	−11,884
Defer new Cheyenne Mountain Upgrade (NUWSS)			−11,884

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Space Architect	9,898	0	−9,898
Consolidate AF/NRO activities			−9,898
Modeling and Simulation Support	1,069	0	−1,069
Program reduction			−1,069
C–5 Airlift Squadrons	63,041	60,041	−3,000
Unjustified mission support growth in AMP			−3,000
C–17 Aircraft	170,718	149,918	−20,800
Rephase communications avionics			−15,000
Unjustified funding for ''other'' on-going improvements			−5,800
Air Cargo Material Handling	502	0	−502
Program reduction			−502
KC–10		23,609	+23,609
Transfer from aircraft procurement for GATM			+23,609
Depot Maintenance (non-IF)	1.500	5,000	+3,500
AF metrology			+3,500
Joint Logistics Program—Ammunition Standard System	11,333	13,268	+1,935
Transfer from O&M			+1,935
Support Systems Development	22,383	37,383	+15,000
Simulation Based Forecasting Decision Support System (SBFDSS)			+3,000
Integrated Maintenance Data Systems			+9,000
Reengineering and enabling technologies			+2,000
Air Resource Rapid Reapplication Tools			+1,000

AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION

The Air Force requested $29,825,000 for Aerospace Propulsion Subsystems Integration. The Committee recommends $8,925,000, a decrease of $20,000,000 associated with the advanced engine demonstration project for next generation fighter and bomber aircraft. The Committee notes that all next generation aircraft currently in development already have dedicated engine development programs. In the absence of a clear transition path to a next generation aircraft, the Committee believes it is premature to fund such an engine demonstration project at this time.

ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY

The Air Force requested $4,507,000 for Advanced Computing Technology. The Committee recommends no funding for this program given that the commercial computer marketplace is making sufficient investment in this technology area.

CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY

The Air Force requested $14,841,000 for crew systems and personnel protection technology. The Committee recommends $34,341,000, an increase of $19,500,000. Of this amount, $4,500,000 is only for the high brightness head-mounted display project and $15,000,000 is only for risk reduction to initiate a program to conduct pre-qualification testing and modifications for ejection seats from all viable competitors. The Committee believes there is a great need to upgrade ejection seat technology to maximize safety at all airspeeds, attitudes and altitudes for all pilot profiles to include lighter weight female pilots. The Committee is aware that at least three different manufacturers are actively engaged in development efforts to improve ejection seat safety and be-

lieves that a fair and open competitive process will best ensure safety, performance and affordability. The Committee therefore has added $15,000,000 to this account and directs that this sum be combined with $5,000,000 from the amount requested for ejection seat risk reduction efforts. This program shall be a joint Air Force—Navy program, and shall have as its goal to complete prequalification testing within 12 months of contract award. The Committee expects that this program will lead to development of fully qualified generic seats that can be competed for installation into the Joint Strike Fighter and other current and future aircraft.

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

The Air Force requested $235,374,000 for the Joint Strike Fighter program. The Committee recommends $335,374,000, an increase of $100,000,000 only for further risk reduction for the Joint Strike Fighter program. The Joint Strike Fighter program is being designed to be a joint, affordable, multi-mission aircraft. The Committee believes these attributes are fully consistent with the changed national security environment. The Committee provides the additional funds to ensure the Joint Strike Fighter program remains on track to meet its objectives.

B–2

The Air Force requested $201,765,000 for B–2 bomber development efforts. The Committee recommends $344,165,000, an increase of $142,400,000. This amount includes a decrease of $31,600,000 for JASSM integration contract savings, a decrease of $37,000,000 based on rephased upgrades to AV–3, an increase of $30,100,000 for a classified program identified by the Air Force, an increase of $92,000,000 for Link 16/Center Instrument Display upgrades, an increase of $35,900,000 for EGBU–28 integration, an increase of $35,000,000 for an inflight replanning upgrade, an increase of $16,000,000 for stealth enhancements, and an increase of $2,000,000 for a next generation bomber study.

With respect to the reduction associated with aircraft designated AV–3, the Committee notes that the AV–3 Block 30 modification budgeted in fiscal year 2000 will now be delayed to future years to allow the aircraft to serve as a test vehicle for JSOW, LO maintenance improvements, SATCOM/DAMA, software updates, and JASSM integration. These funds should be budgeted in the year of need.

With respect to the next generation bomber study, the Committee believes that the conflict in Kosovo has clearly demonstrated the value of a highly capable bomber force. The Committee supports the Long Range Air Power Panel recommendation that "the Department develop a plan to replace the existing force over time." However, the Committee notes that the Air Force's Long Range Bomber Roadmap postpones the start of any program to fulfill the requirements of such a plan until 2013. The Committee believes this decision is unsupportable given the long-lead times associated with bomber development programs. The Committee notes that in the past several years, three different studies have each indicated the need for additional bombers. These studies have recognized that bombers are force multipliers, providing the inherent advan-

tage of being able to carry large payloads over extremely long ranges.

The Committee further believes that the integration of precision guided munitions on bombers provides a tremendous capability to attack multiple targets per sortie at a fraction of the cost of using expensive cruise missiles. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Air Force to study alternatives for modernizing the bomber force with new aircraft. The Committee directs that this study include required capabilities, required quantities, projected costs (by year, by appropriation and in total), and nominal schedules for two alternatives: (1) a new design bomber, and (2) a new "low cost" B–2 using acquisition reform measures and commercial best practices. The Committee believes RAND should review the Air Force assumptions, analysis, and conclusions and provide its comments along with the Air Force report. Finally, the Committee directs that this report be provided no later than May 1, 2000.

MILSTAR

The Air Force requested $361,308,000 for the MILSTAR program. The Committee recommends $214,308,000, a net decrease of $147,000,000. The Committee recommendation includes a $3,000,000 increase for integrated satellite communication control and a $150,000,000 decrease to transfer MILSTAR satellite procurement to the missile procurement account. The Committee is concerned with the Air Force's compliance with past legislation on this program. Over the last two years, Congress has passed legislation preventing the use of research and development funds to procure end-items for operational use unless these end-items are required for testing purposes. Over these past two years, the Air Force has ignored this provision of law with respect to the MILSTAR program and has continued to budget and execute the program using research and development funding. The Committee was further dismayed to learn that by incrementally funding satellite procurement along with various development activities, the Air Force is now unable to determine an accurate unit cost of the MILSTAR satellite recently lost. Therefore, the Air Force has no way to determine a fair and reasonable cost for any MILSTAR satellite replacement. The Committee finds this lack of accountability astonishing and is a perfect example of the dangers of budgeting for procurement items in the research and development account. Accordingly, the Committee recommendation transfers the remaining funding for MILSTAR satellite procurement to the Missile Procurement, Air Force account and expects the Air Force to budget for MILSTAR and other satellites not specifically needed as test articles in the procurement accounts.

SBIRS HIGH

The Air Force requested $328,653,000 for SBIRS High. The Committee recommendation provides this amount. The Committee is concerned that the currently proposed Air Force production program maximizes hardware concurrency, an unacceptably high risk acquisition approach. For example, the Air Force proposes to procure hardware in fiscal year 2001 for the entire SBIRS High constellation (including all development and production satellites), a

full four years before launch and test of the first development satellite. Parts for the fifth satellite are being procured more than 4 years ahead of need and will presumably "sit on a shelf" for these years. Given the significant remaining development risk in this program, by all appearances such a highly concurrent acquisition strategy is unwise, representing a potential "rush to failure" that the Government would be well advised to avoid.

In addition, the proposed production program is incrementally funded, in violation of the long-standing "full funding policy" for procurement. There is no sound reason to make an exception to this long-standing and important acquisition principle for the SBIRS program. If the program is a priority, then it should be funded in the traditional manner, with Air Force budget submissions and program execution so configured.

Accordingly, the Committee directs that no more than $100,000,000 of the funds provided for SBIRS High shall be obligated until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the production program complies with all DoD full funding policies (including the prohibition against funding more than 20% of the end-item cost using advance procurement) and that program concurrency risk has been minimized through the use of annualized production buys. The Committee further directs that concurrent with the Secretary of Defense certification above, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation submit an assessment of whether the SBIRS High acquisition strategy allows for adequate on-orbit testing prior to a final production decision.

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

The Air Force requested $5,696,000 for development planning. The Committee specifically denies funding for this program. This program is ostensibly intended to perform pre-milestone I studies and analysis in order to transition projects into later phases of the acquisition process. Though the FY 1999 President's Budget requested funding in this program for specific efforts which received subsequent appropriations, the Committee has learned that the Air Force diverted these appropriated funds to an entirely different set of efforts without prior notification to congressional defense committees. Such diversion of funds is inconsistent with the spirit, if not the letter, of Section 8111 of the Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act prohibiting initiation of new programs without prior congressional notification. Though this abuse alone would be sufficient justification to deny funding for this line-item, the Committee further notes the program's failure to transition projects into later phases of the acquisition process. The Committee simply will not tolerate these abuses, and therefore specifically denies all funding for this program.

F–16 SQUADRONS

The Air Force requested $112,670,000 for F–16 squadron development. The Committee recommends $152,670,000, an increase of $15,000,000 only for jamming countermeasure improvements for F–16 aircraft. The Committee believes that the Air Force has not sufficiently prioritized the need to address advances in threat jamming techniques in its current fighters. Consistent with the De-

partment's strategy of maintaining Information Dominance on the battlefield, the Committee believes it is critical to maintain superiority in electronic counter countermeasures (ECCM) and provides the additional funds to accelerate efforts in this area. The Committee is further concerned about limitations in the combat range of F–16s and encourages the Air Force to explore ways to increase this range.

F–15 SQUADRONS

The Air Force requested $112,670,000 for F–15 squadron development. The Committee recommends $152,670,000, an increase of $40,000,000. Of the additional funds provided, $20,000,000 is only for F–15 service life extension and $20,000,000 is only for jamming countermeasure improvements for F–15 aircraft as discussed in association with the F–16. The Committee understands that F–15 aircraft service life can be extended to 16,000 flight hours without major structural modifications, allowing the aircraft to stay in service well past 2015. To maximize the return on the nation's significant investment in this platform, the Committee provides an additional $20,000,000 to ensure the aircraft reaches its maximum economic service life.

SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM

The Air Force requested $43,186,000 for the Spacelift Range System. The Committee recommends $60,986,000, an increase of $17,800,000 which includes $9,300,000 only to fund Air Force identified shortfalls in on-going space range modernization and an additional $8,500,000 only to prepare a comprehensive study of required modernization, upgrades, and enhancement of existing space launch related facilities at Vandenberg AFB and Edwards AFB. The Committee is deeply troubled with the pace, scope, and cost of the space range modernization program. The space launch "business" has changed dramatically in recent years, going from a "design, test, fix, and retest" approach dominated by relatively infrequent government launches to a significant increase in launches dominated by the commercial sector. Much of the equipment at the ranges is 30 years old and manpower intensive and simply cannot support the nation's space launch needs in an efficient manner. For years, range modernization funds have been used as a funding "source" to address other Air Force priorities. Now there appears to be growing recognition, both in and out of the Air Force, that the range problems must be fixed quickly. For example, recommendation 24 of the Cox Commission report states that it is in the national security interest of the United States to increase U.S. domestic launch capacity. In addition, the White House has recently initiated a major review of the space ranges with participation from DOD, NASA, and industry. The Committee further notes that the Air Force unfunded priority list requests additional funds to address range problems which the Committee has provided. The Committee further recommends an increase of $8,500,000 for the state spaceport authority to prepare a comprehensive study of required modernization, upgrades, and enhancements of existing space launch related facilities at Vandenberg AFB and Edwards AFB. The study shall include, but is not limited to, engineering

plans and designs for a universal launch complex, solid rocket motor storage facility, hazardous structural test systems, launch vehicle processing facility, and gas storage and distribution system.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, AF			
BASIC RESEARCH			
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	209,505	216,505	+7,000
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	209,505	216,505	+7,000
APPLIED RESEARCH			
MATERIALS	63,334	74,234	+10,900
AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	43,898	49,298	+5,400
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	51,512	72,412	+20,900
AEROSPACE PROPULSION	62,012	77,212	+15,200
AEROSPACE SENSORS	64,988	75,688	+10,700
HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	---	16,600	+16,600
PHILLIPS LAB EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT	115,313	147,813	+32,500
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	42,205	42,205	---
COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	46,448	47,548	+1,100
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	17,927	10,000	-7,927
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	507,637	613,010	+105,373
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	10,786	10,786	---
ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	25,890	31,890	+6,000
AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	29,825	8,925	-20,900
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	29,405	47,805	+18,400
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	5,992	11,992	+6,000
AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	13,749	13,749	---
AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	38,778	39,378	+600
PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	4,827	7,027	+2,200
CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	14,841	34,341	+19,500
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	8,335	8,335	---
ADVANCED SENSOR INTEGRATION	9,443	9,443	---
ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	27,334	34,434	+7,100
SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	11,231	26,531	+15,300
BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	---	23,000	+23,000
ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	76,229	67,259	-8,970
SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,677	4,177	+500
CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	21,479	23,033	+1,554
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	38,995	56,495	+17,500
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	---	3,000	+3,000
C3I SUBSYSTEM INTEGRATION	9,122	7,922	-1,200
ADVANCED COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY	4,507	4,507	---
C3 ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	17,402	17,402	---
SPACE-BASED LASER	63,840	35,000	-28,840
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	465,687	526,431	+60,744

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION			
INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,534	4,534	---
AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	308,634	308,634	---
ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	97,066	97,066	---
POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	39,678	39,678	---
NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATE	80,137	40,137	-40,000
SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,822	9,822	---
SPACE BASED INFRARED ARCHITECTURE (SPACE) - DEM/VAL	151,378	---	-151,378
COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS	7,833	7,833	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	7,393	7,393	---
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H)	4,283	4,283	---
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	235,374	335,374	+100,000
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	24,446	24,446	---
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	28,628	28,628	---
C-130	---	43,600	+43,600
WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	53,344	44,344	-9,000
AIR FORCE/NRO PARTNERSHIP (AFNP)	2,905	---	-2,905
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	16,488	16,488	---
HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS)	4,910	4,910	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	1,076,853	1,017,170	-59,683
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL			
JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	2,970	2,970	---
INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT	723	723	---
NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	8,489	8,489	---
B-1B	203,544	183,544	-20,000
DISTRIBUTED MISSION TRAINING (DMT)	3,835	3,835	---
SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	38,656	41,156	+2,500
F-22 EMD	1,222,232	1,222,232	---
B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	201,765	344,165	+142,400
EW DEVELOPMENT	90,347	89,047	-1,300
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	328,653	328,653	---
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD	77,651	229,029	+151,378
MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	361,308	214,308	-147,000
MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	---	3,900	+3,900
ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,887	27,887	+19,000
SUBMUNITIONS	4,798	10,798	+6,000
AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	946	---	-946
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,385	20,385	+19,000
AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	7,135	7,135	---
LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	6,135	9,135	+3,000
CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,719	2,719	---
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	10,307	10,307	---
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	6,220	17,820	+11,600
COMPUTER RESOURCE TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (CRTT)	196	6,396	+6,200
INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,345	1,345	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,705	8,705	---
COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)..	5,893	5,893	---
JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL..	5,837	2,837	-3,000
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE..	30,485	15,937	-14,548
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD.....	38,804	38,804	---
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE).....	324,803	322,803	-2,000
RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT.....	4,889	4,889	---
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR.....	13,412	13,412	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL.....	3,023,074	3,199,258	+176,184
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT.....	32,391	32,391	---
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	192	---	-192
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT.....	47,334	69,534	+22,200
RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE.....	20,560	20,560	---
RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY.....	4,510	4,510	---
INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION.....	23,819	30,569	+6,750
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT.....	392,104	400,104	+8,000
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING.....	5,696	---	-5,696
POLLUTION PREVENTION.....	2,553	2,553	---
ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE).....	7,913	7,913	---
SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP).....	51,658	51,658	---
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....	3,750	3,750	---
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT.....	592,480	623,542	+31,062
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT			
INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	491	---	-491
B-52 SQUADRONS.....	32,139	47,539	+15,400
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE.....	688	---	-688
AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM).....	5,344	5,344	---
REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION..	13,239	13,239	---
AIR AND SPACE COMMAND AND CONTROL AGENCY (ASC2A).....	2,946	---	-2,946
A-10 SQUADRONS.....	8,108	8,108	---
F-16 SQUADRONS.....	112,520	127,520	+15,000
F-15E SQUADRONS.....	112,670	152,670	+40,000
MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION.....	5,402	3,402	-2,000
F-117A SQUADRONS.....	4,807	4,807	---
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES.....	41,007	41,007	---
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM).....	49,783	52,783	+3,000
AF TENCAP.....	10,102	---	-10,102
SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM.....	85,168	95,168	+10,000
COMPASS CALL.....	4,908	12,908	+8,000
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	160,212	175,212	+15,000
SENSOR FUSED WEAPONS.....	11,785	11,785	---
JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM).....	166,408	166,408	---
THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS.....	467	6,467	+6,000

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	33,393	36,393	+3,000
ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,864	---	-2,864
EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	73,336	73,336	---
ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	54,046	64,046	+10,000
THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	43,727	43,727	---
JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	130,488	161,988	+31,500
SEEK EAGLE	23,133	23,133	---
ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	248,342	259,842	+11,500
USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	19,299	23,799	+4,500
WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,192	26,692	+21,500
MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	16,764	20,764	+4,000
WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,467	---	-1,467
THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	26,129	26,129	---
TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	92,990	92,990	---
SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	61,198	68,298	+7,100
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	3,200	3,200	---
E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	12,666	12,666	---
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	8,985	3,985	-5,000
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	45,907	45,907	---
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,992	12,492	+4,500
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,389	19,389	---
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,929	3,929	---
MILSATCOM TERMINALS	7,026	7,026	---
SELECTED ACTIVITIES	3,000	3,000	---
GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	6,517	6,517	---
SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	61,918	61,918	---
WEATHER SERVICE	19,069	19,069	---
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM	5,588	5,588	---
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	1,179	---	-1,179
SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	466	1,466	+1,000
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	1,756	---	-1,756
TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	45,379	45,379	---
TACTICAL TERMINAL	239	---	-239
DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	36,824	36,824	---
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,535	21,535	---
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT)	53,963	49,913	-4,050
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL)	98,890	98,890	---
SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	43,186	60,986	+17,800
ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	70,835	89,800	+18,965
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	124,608	144,008	+19,400
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	9,388	12,488	+3,100
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	12,820	33,820	+21,000
NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	16,408	4,524	-11,884
SPACETRACK (SPACE)	54,806	54,806	---
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,459	7,459	---
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,430	14,430	---
SPACE ARCHITECT	9,898	---	-9,898
AF/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (TENCAP)	---	23,500	+23,500
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,069	---	-1,069
SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	11,532	11,532	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	63,041	60,041	-3,000
KC-10	---	23,609	+23,609
C-17 AIRCRAFT	170,718	149,918	-20,800
AIR CARGO MATERIAL HANDLING (463-L) (NON-IF)	502	---	-502
KC-135S	2,268	2,268	---
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,500	5,000	+3,500
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	51,814	51,814	---
PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN	9,382	9,382	---
JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,333	13,268	+1,935
SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	22,383	37,383	+15,000
CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	6,973	6,973	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,360,261	4,392,111	+31,850
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	7,202,593	7,513,317	+310,724
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, AF	13,077,829	13,709,233	+631,404

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$9,036,551,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	8,609,289,000
Committee recommendation	8,930,149,000
Change from budget request	+320,860,000

This appropriation funds the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes to the budget request in accordance with House authorization action.

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations	117,969	88,569	−29,400
PATRIOT PAC-3	29,141	77,641	+48,500
Industrial Preparedness	6,665	10,415	+3,750

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Defense Research Sciences	64,293	66,293	+2,000
Nanoelectric research			+2,000
University Research Initiatives	216,778	227,278	+10,500
DEPSCOR			(25,000)
Remote sensing			+5,000
Defense commercialization research initiative			+5,500
Chemical and Biological Defense Program	31,386	45,386	+14,000
Chemical and biological detection programs			+1,000
Laboratory-based and analytical threat assessment research (non-agent specific) (USAMRIID)			+10,000
Chemical and biological point detectors			+3,000
Next Generation Internet	40,000	41,000	+1,000
Next generation internet			+1,000
Support Technologies—Applied Research	65,328	80,328	+15,000
Wide band gap materials			+10,000
High frequency surface wave radar (HFSWR)			+5,000
Medical Free Electron Laser	9,719	12,000	+2,281
Program increase			+2,281
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)	14,329	16,329	+2,000
Minority research program (HSI) [Note: $2,000,000 is only for Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSI).]			+2,000
Computing Systems and Communications Technology	322,874	330,874	+8,000
Systems engineering for miniature devices [Note: $5,000,000 is only for the National Applied Software Engineering Center to build on its work in VLSI, artificial intelligence, embedded control systems, software architecture, systems integration, to develop technology for the next generation of miniature, mobile robots.]			+5,000
RTAPS			+3,000
Extensible Information Systems	70,000	30,000	−40,000
Program reduction due to excessive growth			−40,000
Biological Warfare Defense	145,850	101,850	−44,000
Reduction per House Authorization			−12,000
Aerogel special silica material			+4,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Asymmetrical protocols for biological warfare defense			+4,000
Program reduction due to excessive growth			−40,000
Chemical and Biological Defense Program	64,780	99,280	+34,500
Protocols to enhance biological defense			+10,000
Countermeasures to biological and chemical threats			+13,000
Safeguard			+3,000
Chemical and biological point detectors			+4,500
Chemical and biological chemical hazard detection			+4,000
Tactical Technology	137,626	137,626	
Integrated Command and Control Technology	31,296	43,996	+12,700
High definition systems/flat panel displays			+8,700
Flat panel displays and schott glass technology			+4,000
Materials and Electronics Technology	235,321	248,821	+13,500
Fabrication of 3–D micro structures, including research on materials			+4,000
Materials in sensors (MINSA)			+9,500
WMD Related Technology	203,512	215,512	+12,000
Thermionics			+5,000
Discrete particle methods			+2,000
Nuclear weapons effects (x-ray simulator)			+5,000
Explosives Demilitarization Technology	11,183	22,383	+11,200
Explosives demilitarization technology			+7,000
Hydrothermal oxidation of explosives waste			+3,000
Waterjet cutting technology			+1,200
Counterterror Technical Support	52,223	57,223	+5,000
Facial recognition technology			+5,000
Support Technologies—Advanced Technology Development	173,704	196,317	+22,613
Atmospheric interceptor technology			+20,000
Excalibur			+5,000
Scorpius			+5,000
Space based laser			−16,187
PRIME			+1,300
Cruise missile defense initiative			(7,000)
KE ASAT			+7,500
Chemical and Biological Defense Program—Advanced Development	40,910	45,910	+5,000
Biological counterterrorism response programs for emergency medical support			+5,000
Special Technical Support	10,948	15,948	+5,000
Complex systems design			+5,000
Verification Technology Demonstration	58,455	76,455	+18,000
Nuclear detection, analysis			+6,000
Center for Monitoring Research			(10,000)
Basic and applied research to support nuclear testing			+12,000
Generic Logistics R&D Technology Demonstrations	17,336	30,536	+13,200
Microelectronics (DMEA)			+4,700
Computer assisted technology transfer (CATT)			+6,000
Competitive sustainment demonstration			+2,500
Strategic Environmental Research Program	53,506	59,506	+6,000
Environmental cleanup workers safety			+3,000
Toxic chemical cleanup criteria			+3,000
Advanced Electronics Technologies	246,023	256,523	+10,500
Defense techlink			+1,500
Center for advanced microstructure and devices (CAMD)			+4,000
Laser plasma x-ray [Note: $5,000,000 is only to continue development of laser plasma point-source lithography technology to use in the fabrication of missile seekers, digital battlefield systems and F–22 radar modules.]			+5,000
High Performance Computing Modernization Program	159,099	167,099	+8,000
Multithread architecture system for high performance computing			+8,000
Sensor and Guidance Technology	232,319	182,658	49,661
Underground facilities detection			+2,000
Large millimeter telescope			+3,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Low cost cruise missile defense			−4,000
Discoverer II termination			−50,661
Marine Technology	22,538	23,538	+1,000
Waterhammer ship defense			+1,000
Physical Security Equipment	37,107	25,792	−11,315
Program reduction due to excessive growth			−11,315
Joint Robotics Program	12,937	16,937	+4,000
Joint robotics			+4,000
Advanced Sensor Applications Program	15,345	26,845	+11,500
Solid state dye laser applications (ASAP)			+6,000
High power mid-infrared laser			+2,000
Remote Operating Minehunting Sonar			+3,500
Theater High-Altitude Area Defense System—TMD	34,133	527,871	+493,738
Navy Theater-Wide Missile Defense System	329,768	419,768	+90,000
Radar improvements competition			+50,000
Navy Theater Wide acceleration			+40,000
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $35,000,000 in additional funding for Navy Theater-Wide accleration to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			* [+35,000]
MEADS—DEM/VAL	48,597	0	−48,597
National Missile Defense—DEM/VAL	836,555	761,555	−75,000
National Missile Defense DEM/VAL			−75,000
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $75,000,000 in additional funding for National Missile Defense to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			* [+75,000]
Joint Theater Missile Defense—DEM/VAL	195,722	200,722	+5,000
Liquid surrogate target development program			+5,000
BMD Technical Operations	190,650	200,650	+10,000
IR sensor data			[10,000]
Development of wide bandwidth information infrastructure			+10,000
International Cooperative Programs	36,650	36,650	
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $45,000,000 in additional funding for the Arrow Third Battery to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			* [+45,000]
Chemical and Biological Defense Program—DEM/VAL	62,033	69,533	+7,500
M93A1 Fox Simulation Training Suites			+5,000
Counterterror research			+2,500
Joint Systems Education and Training	0	5,000	+5,000
Humanitarian Demining	15,847	20,647	+4,800
Demining			+3,000
Humanitarian demining			+1,800
Chemical and Biological Defense Program—EMD	116,365	120,865	+4,500
Chemical biological protective material			+4,500
Commercial Operations and Support Savings Initiative	16,976	8,000	−8,976
Program reduction due to excessive growth			−8,976
Theater High-Altitude Area Defense System—TMD—EMD	577,493	0	−577,493
Patriot PAC–3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition—EMD	29,141	77,641	+48,500
Program cost growth			+48,500
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $75,000,000 in additional funding for PAC 3 to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			* [+75,000]
Navy Area Theater Missile Defense—EMD	268,389	310,189	+41,800
Program cost growth			+41,800
DIMHRS	0	41,200	+41,200
OSD Technical Studies and Assessments [Note: Consolidation of studies lines.]	0	30,021	+30,021
Network Security	0	12,000	+12,000
Protection of vital data			+12,000
[Note: The Department is directed to transfer funds provided for this project to the National Security Agency for execution.]			
Defense Imagery and Mapping Program	88,401	101,401	+13,000
National technology alliance			+5,000

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
NIMA Viewer			+8,000
C3I Intelligence Programs	9,480	15,480	+6,000
C3I intelligence programs			+6,000
Manned Reconnaissance Systems	8,494	16,994	+8,500
Combat Sent RC–135			+8,500
Tactical Cryptologic Activities	109,540	106,840	−2,700
Aerial common sensor			−2,700
Industiral Preparedness	6,665	10,415	+3,750
Aging aircraft sustainment technology			+3,750
Special Operations Tactical Systems Development	106,671	149,370	+42,699
CV–22 Modifications			+9,000
CV–22 Second Digital Map			+3,600
Small Craft Propulsion Systems Improvements			+4,000
Advanced Seal Delivery Systems			+26,099
Special Operations Intelligence Systems Development	1,407	6,507	+5,100
SOTVS underwater camera			+2,100
Joint Threat Warning System			+3,000
SOF Medical Technology Development	2,039	6,039	+4,000
Clinical assessment recording enviornment			+4,000

*Funds noted in brackets are provided from within those provided for in Section 102 of division B, title 1, chapter 1 of Public Law 105–277.

Basic Research

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Department requested $31,386,000 for Chemical and Biological Defense basic research. The Committee recommends $45,386,000, an increase of $14,000,000. Within this amount $1,000,000 is only for chemical and biological detection programs, $10,000,000 is only for laboratory-based and analytical threat assessment research at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID), and $3,000,000 is only for chemical and biological point detectors.

Applied Research

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The Department requested $14,329,000 for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The Committee recommends $16,329,000, an increase of $2,000,000. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an increase of $2,000,000 only for a minority research program.

EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The Department requested $70,000,000 for Extensible Information Systems. The Committee recommends $30,000,000, a decrease of $40,000,000. The Committee recognizes the importance of advanced computing capability for defense weapon systems and requirements. However, the Committee notes that DARPA is requesting funds for three new projects: deeply networked systems (AE–01), software for autonomous systems (AE–02) and software for embedded systems (AE–03). The Committee believes that all three new technology areas have promise but notes that DARPA is re-

questing a 15 percent increase in overall computing technology programs versus the prior year. The Committee therefore recommends a total of $30,000,000 for these new programs. This is a 5 percent increase over the prior year level for computing technology programs—including Next Generation Internet ($40 million), Computing Systems and Communications Technology ($323.8 million) and Extensible Information Systems ($30 million).

BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE

The Department requested $145,850,000 for Biological Warfare Defense programs. The Committee recommends $101,850,000, a decrease of $44,000,000. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an increase of $4,000,000 only for aerogel special silica material technology and an increase of $4,000,000 only for asymmetrical protocols for biological warfare defense. In addition, the Committee recommends a decrease of $12,000,000 for consequence management software as proposed in the House-passed Defense Authorization bill. The Committee also notes that the fiscal year 2000 request represents an approximately 77 percent increase in the biological warfare defense program over last year's enacted level. While the Committee believes that the additional emphasis is warranted, it is not sure that such a significant increase in funding can be executed properly.

In addition, the Committee notes that the Army Medical Research Institute for Infectious Disease (USAMRIID) has significant experience with known and emerging biological threat agents. Furthermore, the Committee believes that USAMIIRD may be able to substantially enhance the work being done within the DARPA program through additional laboratory-based and threat assessment research—to include medical countermeasures and novel approaches to emerging biological threat agents. Therefore, as noted elsewhere in this report, the Committee recommends an increase in the Chemical and Biological Program appropriation for USAMRIID. The Committee believes that the Army research program should supplement the DARPA Biological Warfare Defense program and the Committee encourages collaboration between DARPA and USAMRIID on emerging biological defense research.

ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT

The Department requested $64,780,000 for Chemical and Biological Defense advanced development. The Committee recommends $99,280,000, an increase of $34,500,000. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an increase of $10,000,000 only for laboratory-based and analytical threat assessment research and protocols to enhance biological defense, an increase of $13,000,000 only for countermeasures to biological and chemical threats, an increase of $3,000,000 only for safeguard, an increase of $4,500,000 for chemical and biological point detectors and an increase of $4,000,000 only for biological and chemical hazard detection.

The Committee recommends an increase of $13,000,000 only to establish a program to develop interdisciplinary research and train-

ing for countermeasures to biological and chemical agents. The Committee believes that such a program will provide a working infrastructure for the scientific resources needed to improve countermeasures to chemical and biological threats.

VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

The Department requested $58,455,000 for Verification Technology Demonstration. The Committee recommends $76,455,000, an increase of $18,000,000. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an increase of $6,000,000 only for nuclear detection analysis, and an increase of $12,000,000 only for basic and applied research to support nuclear testing. In addition, the Committee recommends from within available funds $10,000,000 only for the center for monitoring research.

The Committee recommends an additional $6,000,000 only for the Nuclear Treaty sub-element of the Verification Technology Demonstration program, of which $2,500,000 is only for the continuation of an industry-based program for developing systems using advances in solid state nuclear detectors, processing electronics, and analysis software; and $3,500,000 is only for the continuation of an industry-based program for the development of detection technologies and advanced analytical and monitoring techniques.

Last year's nuclear tests in South Asia raise serious concerns about the Department's ability to support a robust operational nuclear test monitoring program. The Committee directs that $12,000,000 shall be available only for peer-reviewed basic and applied research only to support operational nuclear test monitoring. Of this amount, $4,000,000 shall be available only for peer-reviewed seismic research; and $8,000,000 shall be available only for peer-reviewed basic research—$7,000,000 of which is only for explosion seismology research. The Committee directs that the basic and applied seismic research program address the specific prioritized research topics recommended to the Department by the National Research Council.

The Committee directs the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to award these funds through a competitive peer panel review process; to segregate the basic and applied research funds for this program into clearly identifiable projects within the 6.1 and 6.2 budget categories; and to improve integration of the basic and applied components of the program. Further, the Committee directs the Department to provide by December 1, 1999, a detailed report to the Committee on the plan for obligating these funds. Finally, the Committee directs the Department to sustain funding for these activities in future budgets to ensure the expertise needed in this critical operational program.

ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

The Department requested $117,969,000 for Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations (ACTD). The Committee recommends $88,569,000, a decrease of $29,400,000 as proposed in the House-passed Defense Authorization bill.

The Committee notes that the goal of ACTDs is to get critical technology into the field so that it can be expeditiously evaluated

in an operational environment. Although the Committee supports this idea in principle, the Committee remains concerned about the process of funding these demonstrations. Furthermore, the Committee is concerned about providing funds to the Department in advance of an explicit justification of individual projects. The ACTD appropriation is provided with the understanding that the Department may make funds available for specific projects without further notification to Congress. The Department has argued that such fiscal flexibility is necessary in order to take advantage of emerging technologies and to field these technologies expeditiously and it has consistently asked for increased appropriations to expand ACTDs. However, the Committee has been reluctant to approve increases because of the potential for abuse of resources inherent in this program. Unfortunately, it has come to the Committee's attention that such an abuse has occurred.

The House Defense Appropriations Committee report for Fiscal Year 1999 contained a specific prohibition on the use of ACTD funds. The report directed that "none of these funds can be used for LOSAT or EFOGM." Unfortunately, the Department willingly disregarded this prohibition and proceeded to use $7,000,000 of Fiscal Year 1999 ACTD funds for LOSAT. As discussed at the beginning of this report, this is but one of an increasing number of instances where specific guidance from the Congress has been ignored. Therefore the Committee recommends its reduction to the budget request with prejudice, and expresses its intent to deny future funding increases for ACTDs under this account. The Committee cannot overstate its strong concern regarding this matter. Therefore, the Committee has included a general provision (Section 8118) that requires DOD to submit a report to the congressional defense committees prior to the obligation of funds for all ACTD projects.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

The Department requested $3,672,822,000 for all ballistic missile defense programs.

The Committee bill provides for a total of $3,899,543,000 for all ballistic missile defense programs. This amount includes $3,669,543,000 in new appropriations and $230,000,000 to be derived from funds previously provided in Section 102 of division B, title I, chapter 1 of Public Law 105–277. Of the new appropriations provided within this bill, a total of $2,970,009,000 is provided for research and development; $355,900,000 is provided for procurement within the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) budget; and, $343,634,000 is provided in Air Force research and development programs to include $308,634,000 for the Airborne Laser and $35,000,000 for the Space-Based Laser. The Committee bill provides the budgeted amount for the joint U.S.-Israel ARROW anti-tactical ballistic missile development program, and also provides for $45,000,000 to support deployment of a third ARROW battery. The recommended amounts represent an increase of $226,721,000 over the budget request of $3,672,822,000 for these programs.

Changes to specific programs are summarized in the following table:

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Support Technologies—Applied Research	65,328	80,328	+15,000
Wide band gap materials			+10,000
High frequency surface wave radar (HFSWR)			+5,000
Support Technologies-Advanced Technology Development	173,704	196,317	+22,613
Atmospheric interceptor technology			+20,000
Excalibur			+5,000
Scorpius			+5,000
Space based laser			−16,187
PRIME			+1,300
Cruise missile defense initiative			(7,000)
KE ASAT			+7,500
Theater High-Altitude Area Defense systems—TMD	34,133	527,871	+493,738
[Note: The Committee notes that R-1 documents submitted with the President's Budget did not accurately reflect the Department's request and has made its recommendation based upon submitted budget justification material.].			
Navy Theater Wide Missile Defense system	329,768	+419,768	+90,000
Radar improvements competition			+50,000
Navy Theater Wide acceleration			+40,000
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $35,000,000 in additional funding for Navy Theater Wide acceleration to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			*[+35,000]
MEADS—DEM/VAL	48,597	0	−48,597
National Missile Defense—DEM/VAL	836,555	761,555	−75,000
National Missile Defense—DEM/VAL			−75,000
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $75,000,000 in additional funding for National Missile Defense to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			*[+75,000]
Joint Theater Missile Defense—DEM/VAL	195,722	200,722	+5,000
Liquid surrogate target development program			+5,000
BMD Technical Operations	190,650	200,650	+10,000
IR sensor data			[10,000]
Development of wide bandwidth information infrastructure			+10,000
International Cooperative Programs	36,650	36,650	
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $45,000,000 in additional funding for the Arrow Third Battery to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			*[+45,000]
Theater High-Altitude Area Defense systems—TMD—EMD	577,493	0	−577,493
Patriot PAC–3 Theater Missile Defense Acquisition—EMD	29,141	77,641	+48,500
Program cost growth			+48,500
[Note: The Committee bill also provides $75,000,000 in additional funding for PAC 3 to be derived from funds previously provided in Public Law 105–277.]			*[+75,000]
Navy Area Theater Missile Defense—EMD	268,389	310,189	+41,800
Program cost growth			+41,800

*Funds noted in brackets are provided from within those provided for in Section 102 of division B, title I, chapter 1, of Public Law 105–277.

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SITE SELECTION

The Committee is concerned about the growing ballistic missile threat and the implications of testing by North Korea of advanced ballistic missiles. Furthermore, the Committee believes that potential deployment options for the National Missile Defense system should be fully examined for their effectiveness in defending the U.S. against a potential limited ballistic missile threat. Therefore, the Committee directs that with the submission of the Fiscal Year 2001 budget, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report that contains an assessment of the advantages or disadvantages of deploying a ground-based National Missile Defense system at more than one site.

THEATER HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE (THAAD)

The Department requested $611,626,000 for the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) program. Of that amount, $527,871,000 is requested for Demonstration and Validation and $83,755,000 is requested for Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD). The Committee recommends $527,871,000 for Demonstration and Validation and no funds for Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD).

The THAAD program has experienced serious problems—including extensive delays, cost growth, and six consecutive intercept test failures. However, the Committee believes that continued demonstration and validation flight testing is necessary to verify that "hit-to-kill" missile defense systems like THAAD will be effective against the growing theater ballistic missile threat. While the Committee is pleased that Flight Test 10 was successful in intercepting a target last month, the Committee believes that THAAD should not proceed to the next phase of acquisition until all exit criteria have been met and that senior acquisition officials are confident that the proposed system design will meet the needs of the military. Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for the EMD phase of the THAAD program at this time.

MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (MEADS)

The Department requested $48,597,000 to continue the international cooperative Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) program. The Committee denies the request. The Committee continues to be concerned about several issues regarding the MEADS program and believes that these concerns have not been addressed in the proposed Fiscal Year 2000 budget.

The Committee recognizes the valid need for a mobile ground based system for ballistic missile defense. In addition, it recognizes that a multinational program could possibly meet both U.S. needs but also those of our NATO allies. However, the MEADS program, since its inception, has been inadequately funded, ill-defined, and as currently structured is unlikely to meet the requirements of the military.

To date, more than $100,000,000 has been appropriated for MEADS with little more accomplished than a seemingly endless series of studies. This pattern is repeated in the fiscal year 2000 request. Senior OSD acquisition officials have told the Committee that the request of $48,597,000 is nothing more than a planning wedge. The Department's lack of a strong commitment to this program is further evidenced by the programming of only $146 million over the next three years for MEADS. The GAO has recently reported that MEADS development costs alone are estimated to be rougly $2 billion, with deployment costing approximately $12 billion. Under existing funding costraints, the Committee fails to see how these funding requirements can be met without reducing programmed funding and delaying the potential deployment of more mature programs such as PAC-3, THAAD, and the Navy Area and Theater-Wide programs. The Committe also notes the checkered record of other efforts to launch multinational programs, and while recognizing the importance of this program to our multinational

partners it realizes such an effort raises a series of problems which previous multinational development efforts failed to overcome. For such an ambitious undertaking as MEADS to succeed, it will require a real commitment from all partners, including the United States, as well as focused management and a solid acquisition program.

In addition to these serious programmatic issues, the Committee is also greatly disturbed about fiscal irregularities regarding the use of fiscal year 1999 funds. As indicated earlier in this report, officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense knowingly decided to expend fiscal year 1999 funds to continue the MEADS program, in direct conflict with specific congressional direction. Furthermore, the Committee is extremely disturbed that the funds used for MEADS were from the Air Directed Surface to Air Missile, appropriations which according to DoD's own internal financial management documents were not available for such purposes. In order to preclude a repeat of this experience, the Committee bill includes new general provisions, which restores the funds diverted from the Air Directed Surface to Air Missile and also implements the Committee's recommendation regarding fiscal year 2000 funds for MEADS.

For the reasons cited, even though it acknowledges the operational need for a program which meets the MEADS requiremet, the Committee cannot support the MEADS program as currently constituted and therefore denies the budget request.

RUSSIAN AMERICAN OBSERVATIONAL SATELLITE (RAMOS)

The Committee understands that the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, plans to make $16,000,000 of current and/or prior year funds available for the RAMOS program. The Committee directs that these funds shall be available only to continue the RAMOS satellite demonstration program.

SPACE-BASED LASER

The Department requested $75,000,000 and the Air Force requested $63,840,000 for the Space Based Laser (SBL) program for a total program of $138,840,000. The Committee recommends a total of $93,813,000, a decrease of $16,187,000 from the Department's request and a decrease of $28,840,000 from the Air Force request. The Committee believes that the SBL is an interesting technology program but believes that the Department has higher priority considerations and more immediate requirements for space—including the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) High and Low programs. The Committee therefore recommends no increase over the fiscal year 1999 budget request.

SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY

The Department requested $232,319,000 for Sensor and Guidance Technology. The Committee recommends $180,658,000, a net decrease of $51,661,000. Within this amount, the Committee recommends an increase of $3,000,000 only for the large millimeter telescope, a decrease of $4,000,000 for the low cost cruise missile

defense initiative and a decrease of $50,661,000 for the Discoverer II program.

DISCOVERER II

The Department requested $50,661,000, the Air Force requested $28,670,000 and the National Reconnaissance Office requested $29,150,000 for the Discoverer II satellite technology demonstration program. The Committee denies the request.

The Committee understands the Department's interest in developing and building a low-cost constellation of radar satellites to provide tactical commanders with important information—including ground moving target indication and terrain-mapping capability.

However, while the Committee agrees that the goals of the Discover II program are laudable, it does not believe that they can realistically be achieved. The Committee is very concerned about the technological risk in the program and the lack of a validated requirement. Furthermore, the Committee is extremely concerned that one of the principal goals of the program—a low cost system—is highly unrealistic given the history of space acquisition programs. The Committee notes that an Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) already concludes that the demonstration program would cost approximately twice the original $600 million estimate.

Therefore, the Committee recommends no funding for the program and directs that the Discoverer II program should be terminated.

PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT

The Department requested $37,107,000 for Physical Security Equipment. The Committee recommends $25,792,000, a decrease of $11,315,000. The Committee notes the budget request is a 44 percent increase over the fiscal year 1999 enacted level. Therefore the Committee recommends a reduction due to program growth.

COALITION WARFARE

The Department requested $12,781,000 for Coalition Warfare. The Committee denies the request. This is a new start program that would provide $12,781,000 to conduct Advanced Concept Technology Demonstrations (ACTD) with U.S. allies. The Committee agrees with the goal of increasing interoperability with coalition forces. However, the Committee believes that the first priority must be to insure that U.S. forces have the capability to be interoperable. Furthermore, the Committee believes that issues of interoperability should be considered in the normal course of planning and acquisition and does not believe that the U.S. will gain substantially by after the fact measures to force interoperability with allied forces. The Committee also notes that funding provided in this bill for the Joint Warfighting Experimentation program should provide a basis for understanding and correcting problems with U.S. military joint operations and encourages the Department to address and solve these issues before it tries to address the larger problems related to coalition warfare.

TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS

The Department requested a total of $40,861,000 for several different studies activities. These include $353,000 for Technical Studies, Support and Analysis; $4,900,000 for Assessments and Evaluations; $29,506,000 for Technical Studies, Support and Analysis; $588,000 for Technical Studies, Support and Analysis; $2,215,000 for USD(A&T) Critical Technology Support; and $3,299,000 for Industrial Capabilities Assessments. The Committee recommends no funds for these studies lines. However, the Committee recommends a new line for technical studies and assessments and provides $30,021,000 for all technical studies, support and analysis.

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The Department requested $53,506,000 for the Strategic Environmental Research Program. The Committee recommends $59,506,000, an increase of $6,000,000. Of this amount, $3,000,000 is only to continue the research, development and demonstration program devoted to health and safety issues of environmental cleanup and shipyard workers and $3,000,000 is only to continue the risk-based approach to research the effects of toxic chemicals on human health and the environment to help establish cleanup criteria for the Department's environmental cleanup sites.

DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY PROGRAM

The Department requested $88,401,000 for the Defense Imagery and Mapping Agency Program. The committee recommends $101,401,000, an increase of $13,000,000. Of the additional amount provided by the Committee, $5,000,000 is only for the National Technology Alliance (NTA) and $8,000,000 is only for NIMA's acquisition of an enterprise license of the commercial off-the-shelf NIMA viewer and for the distribution and support of the NIMA Viewer to NIMA customers.

TRI-SERVICE DIRECTED ENERGY CENTER

The Committee requests the Air Force, as the lead for the Tri-Service Directed Energy Center (Tri-DEC), to further investigate the use of non-lethal directed energy (DE) technologies for intelligence gathering in the area of counter-proliferation to support the needs of the services. The Air Force should give specific emphasis on technologies that support the following areas:

1. Long range detection and identification of development, production, and test of weapons of mass destruction;
2. Detection and identification of illicit drug production;
3. Long range detection and characterization of battlefield use of weapons of mass destruction; and,
4. Assessment of battle damage and the need for follow-up strikes against underground storage facilities for weapons of mass destruction.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

Special Operations MC–130 Combat Talon aircraft are required to provide night, all-weather infiltration and extraction of Special Operations personnel and equipment as well as the resupply of

military operations in hostile areas. The Committee is aware that the Autonomous Landing Guidance System (ALG) may provide Special Operations Force pilots with a precision approach system that enhances their ability to descend into landing strips under adverse conditions. The Committee encourages the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to investigate the feasibility of equipping its aircraft with ALG and directs USSOCOM to provide a report to the Committee not later than April 1, 2000 on the operational utility of incorporating this system into its Combat Talon aircraft.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

Information on the Joint Systems Education, Training Systems Development and DIMHRS programs can be found in the Information Technology section of this report.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE			
BASIC RESEARCH			
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,033	2,033	---
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	64,293	66,293	+2,000
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	216,778	227,278	+10,500
GULF WAR ILLNESS	19,185	19,185	---
GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEAR	6,351	6,351	---
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	31,386	45,386	+14,000
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	340,026	366,526	+26,500
APPLIED RESEARCH			
NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	40,000	41,000	+1,000
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	65,328	80,328	+15,000
MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	9,719	12,000	+2,281
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)	14,329	16,329	+2,000
LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	20,774	20,774	---
COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	322,874	330,874	+8,000
EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	70,000	30,000	-40,000
BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	145,850	101,850	-44,000
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	64,780	99,280	+34,500
TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	137,626	137,626	---
INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,296	43,996	+12,700
MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	235,321	248,821	+13,500
WMD RELATED TECHNOLOGY	203,512	215,512	+12,000
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,903	8,903	---
COMMAND AND CONTROL RESEARCH	1,968	1,968	---
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,372,280	1,389,261	+16,981
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,007	2,007	---
EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	11,183	22,383	+11,200
COUNTERTERROR TECHNICAL SUPPORT	52,223	57,223	+5,000
COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT - ADV DEV	81,245	81,245	---
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES-ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	173,704	196,317	+22,613
JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	14,786	14,786	---
AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,775	7,775	---
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	19,664	19,664	---
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEV	40,910	45,910	+5,000
SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,948	15,948	+5,000
VERIFICATION TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	58,455	76,455	+18,000
GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	17,336	30,536	+13,200
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	53,506	59,506	+6,000
JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,872	7,872	---
ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	246,023	256,523	+10,500

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	117,969	88,569	-29,400
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	159,099	167,099	+8,000
COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	222,888	222,888	---
SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	232,319	182,658	-49,661
MARINE TECHNOLOGY	22,538	23,538	+1,000
LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	97,825	97,825	---
CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	77,780	77,780	---
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	68,456	68,456	---
COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,495	1,495	---
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,798,006	1,824,458	+26,452
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION			
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	37,107	25,792	-11,315
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	12,937	16,937	+4,000
ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,345	26,845	+11,500
CALS INITIATIVE	1,652	1,652	---
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	23,260	23,260	---
THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD	34,133	527,871	+493,738
NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	329,768	419,768	+90,000
MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	48,597	---	-48,597
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	836,555	761,555	-75,000
JOINT THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	195,722	200,722	+5,000
FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	141,821	141,821	---
BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	190,650	200,650	+10,000
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	36,650	36,650	---
THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	16,497	16,497	---
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	62,033	69,533	+7,500
HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	15,847	20,647	+4,800
COALITION WARFARE	12,781	---	-12,781
TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	353	---	-353
JOINT SYSTEMS EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYS DEV	---	5,000	+5,000
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	2,011,708	2,495,200	+483,492
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL			
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	116,365	120,865	+4,500
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	12,004	12,004	---
ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	15,172	15,172	---
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	29,382	29,382	---
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	16,976	8,000	-8,976
THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	577,493	---	-577,493
PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EM	29,141	77,641	+48,500
NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	268,389	310,189	+41,800
DIMHRS	---	41,200	+41,200
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	1,064,922	614,453	-450,469

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,226	1,226	---
ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	4,900	---	-4,900
TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	29,506	---	-29,506
TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	588	---	-588
USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	2,215	---	-2,215
OSD TECHNICAL STUDIES AND ASSESSMENTS	---	30,021	+30,021
BLACK LIGHT	5,000	5,000	---
GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	2,000	2,000	---
FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	34,937	34,937	---
INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES ASSESSMENTS	3,299	---	-3,299
JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	17,079	17,079	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	---	11,842	+11,842
COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	5,315	5,315	---
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	24,043	24,043	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	627	627	---
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,713	1,713	---
DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	4,974	4,974	---
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	46,655	46,655	---
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVAL	8,261	8,261	---
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	31,387	31,387	---
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	223,725	225,080	+1,355
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT			
C3 INTEROPERABILITY	27,366	27,366	---
JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,024	1,024	---
NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	613	613	---
DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATIO	5,316	5,316	---
LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,316	1,316	---
SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	4,274	4,274	---
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	3,799	3,799	---
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	232,661	232,661	---
NETWORK SECURITY	---	12,000	+12,000
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	3,018	3,018	---
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	388	388	---
JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,823	8,823	---
DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	88,401	101,401	+13,000
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	437	437	---
C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	9,480	15,480	+6,000
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,074	22,074	---
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	8,494	16,994	+8,500
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	1,000	1,000	---
TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	109,540	106,840	-2,700
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,665	10,415	+3,750
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	9,531	9,531	---
JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	18,421	18,421	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,093	7,093	---

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT....	7,990	7,990	---
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	106,671	149,370	+42,699
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT...	1,407	6,507	+5,100
SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	2,039	6,039	+4,000
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS.....	62,567	62,567	---
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	1,048,214	1,172,414	+124,200
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT.....	1,798,622	2,015,171	+216,549
TOTAL, RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE....	8,609,289	8,930,149	+320,860

DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$258,606,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	253,457,000
Committee recommendation	271,957,000
Change from budget request	+18,500,000

This appropriation funds the Developmental, Test and Evaluation activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Central Test and Evaluation Investment Development	121,741	140,241	+18,500
Roadway simulator			+8,500
Airborne separation video system			+5,000
Magdalena ridge observatory			+5,000

CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Department requested $121,741,000 for Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program. The Committee recommends $140,241,000, an increase of $18,500,000. Within this amount, $8,500,000 is only for the roadway simulator, $5,000,000 is only for the airborne separation video system and $5,000,000 is only for the Magdalena Ridge observatory program. The Committee directs that none of the funds provided for the roadway simulator may be made available for military construction.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FROM REQUEST
DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT....	121,741	140,241	+18,500
FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING.....	31,876	31,876	---
DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION.....	99,840	99,840	---
TOTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE.....	253,457	271,957	+18,500

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$34,245,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	24,434,000
Committee recommendation	29,434,000
Change from budget request	+5,000,000

This appropriation funds the Operational Test and Evaluation activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Change from request	Committee recommendation
Live Fire Testing	9,832	14,832	+5,000
Live fire testing and training initiative			+5,000

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION, DEFENSE

RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.....	14,602	14,602	---
LIVE FIRE TESTING.....	9,832	14,832	+5,000
TOTAL, OPERATIONS TEST AND EVALUATION.....	24,434	29,434	+5,000

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$94,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	90,344,000
Committee recommendation	90,344,000
Change from budget request	

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $90,344,000 for the Defense Working Capital Funds. The recommendation is a decrease of $4,156,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

DEFENSE REUTILIZATION AND MARKETING SERVICES

The Committee does not recommend including language, as proposed in the budget request, allowing the transfer of Defense Stockpile sales proceeds to the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service (DRMS). The Committee notes that this solution, like other recent funding schemes for DRMS is a temporary measure; and would not last longer than five to six years. The Committee directs that the Department of Defense continue funding the relevant portion of DRMS operations costs through the surcharge included in the price of wholesale supply items until such time as a permanent funding mechanism can be developed for DRMS. Accordingly, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2000, which outlines a plan to provide funding for DRMS on a permanent basis.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

Fiscal Year 1999 appropriation	$708,366,000
Fiscal Year 2000 budget request	354,700,000
Committee recommendation	729,700,000
Change from budget request	+375,000,000

This appropriation provides funds for the lease, operation, and supply of prepositioning ships; operation of the Ready Reserve Force; and acquisition of ships for the Military Sealift Command, the Ready Reserve Force, and the Marine Corps.

LARGE MEDIUM SPEED ROLL-ON/ROLL-OFF (LMSR) SHIPS

In fiscal years 1995 and 1997, Congress appropriated funds for conversion of three commercial ships for the Marine Corps' Maritime Prepositioning Fleet Enhancement (MPF–E). These ships were a direct response to lessons-learned from Operation Desert Storm, and have a significant impact on the warfighting ability of the Marine Corps. Late last year, it became evident that the pro-

gram was not viable under the existing plan. Cost increases/overruns have occurred on the first two MPF–E ships, and the procurement for the third ship was canceled. This has left a major void in the combat prepositioning capability of the Marine Corps.

The Defense Department has a successful program to build 14 new-construction prepositioning ships for the Army. These Large Medium Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) ships have much more capability and a significantly longer life than the used commercial ships that the Marine Corps originally envisioned for the MPF–E mission. The Committee understands that one of the Army ships can be reconfigured for the Marine Corps mission and fielded within a year. The Committee believes reconfiguring this ship immediately to meet one-third of the Marine Corps' prepositioning enhancement requirement and replacing the diverted Army capability with a new LMSR to be delivered in the mid-term provides the best mix of sealift assets to increase warfighting capability. The Committee directs that an existing LMSR ship be transferred to the Marine Corps. The Committee recommends $320,000,000 for procurement of one additional LMSR ship for prepositioning of Army materiel. The Committee also recommends $30,000,000 to convert an existing LMSR ship to the Marine Corps MPF–E specifications.

MARITIME PREPOSITIONING FORCE ENHANCEMENT CONVERSION

The Navy recently notified Congress of a second episode of significant cost growth for the conversion a used commercial ship to meet Marine Corps Maritime Prepositioning Force Enhancement requirements. In section 8083 of the Committee bill, the Committee has transferred $38 million of previously appropriated funds within the National Defense Sealift Fund as requested by the Navy so that the conversion can continue without disruption.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FEATURES

The commercial shipping industry is contemplating the construction of a new class of high-speed, high-capacity sealift ships for cargo routes in the North Atlantic ocean. Should such ships be constructed in the United States, the Committee believes they could also provide much needed fast sealift capability for the U.S. military and would be excellent candidates for the defense features program. This program provides funding by the Department of Defense so that commercial ships constructed in the United States are to be built in a manner to facilitate their use by the military during a national emergency. This can provide substantial cost savings over existing and traditional sealift capability. Should the United States Maritime Administration (MARAD) approve loan guarantees for construction of such commercial ships, the Committee directs that the Department of Defense report to the congressional defense committees within one month of the MARAD approval on the feasibility, cost-effectiveness, desirability, and cost to the Department of Defense for installation and life cycle maintenance of such features in those ships.

DOD REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL TANKER SHIPS

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not determined with sufficient precision the extent to which it may have to request the U.S. Maritime Administration to requisition former U.S. government-owned tankers to meet defense needs in the event of a national emergency. The Department of Defense must have an adequate tanker capacity to draw upon in a national emergency. On the other hand, commercial shipping companies should not be unduly burdened with requisition and other conditions on use of their tanker ships that are in excess of legitimate defense needs. The Committee is most concerned about tanker ships which are more than 25 years old, the generally accepted useful life of a tanker ship, and whether the Maritime Administration is being too restrictive in prohibiting the disposition of ships that have exceeded their useful life estimates due to uncertainty over Department of Defense actual requirements. The Committee directs that the Secretary of Defense submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2000 on the Department's requirements and criteria for maintaining government control on commercial tanker ships which have exceeded their estimated useful lives.

MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY TRAINING SHIP

The Committee recommends $25,000,000 only for the Department of Defense to upgrade a ship for the Ready Reserve Force that can also be used as a training ship for Massachusetts Maritime Academy cadets. These funds would be used to convert an existing vessel in the Department of Defense Ready Reserve Force into a training ship for Academy's maritime cadet during peacetime which also serves as a Ready Reserve Force troop ship for use during national emergencies. The current ship that the Department of Defense uses for these dual purposes has been deemed unsuitable due to its material condition. The Commander in Chief of the U.S. Transportation Command recently approved the upgrade of a ship already in the DOD inventory on an interim basis but that ship is ported on the west coast and is too small for the wartime troop carrying mission, leaving a significant gap in the Defense Department's sealift capability for wartime. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include any additional funds beyond those contained in this bill needed to complete the ship in the fiscal year 2001.

SEALIFT SHIP LEASES

The Committee notes that no funds were requested in the National Defense Sealift Funds for leases of ships which involve new construction, and therefore none of the funds in this Act are available for such leases.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$10,149,872,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	10,834,657,000
Committee recommendation	11,078,417,000
Change from budget request	+243,760,000

This appropriation funds the Defense Health Program activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROJECT LEVEL CHANGES

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget request	Recommended	Change from request
Operation and Maintenance	10,477,687	10,471,447	−6,240
Computational neuroscience		3,000	+3,000
Lung cancer program [Note: $7,000,000 only to explore multiple avenues of research, prevention, diagnosis, and therapy that would yield new treatment options for lung cancer.]		7,000	+7,000
Post-polio		1,300	+1,300
Neuroscience research [Note: $3,000,000 only to establish West Coast Functional MRI brain research capabilities.]		3,000	+3,000
Neuroscience research [Note: $5,000,000 only to continue neurological research under cooperative agreement DAMD 17–99–2–9007.]		5,000	+5,000
Digital Mammography		5,000	+5,000
Nutrition Research		3,760	+3,760
Periscopic surgery for the spine [Note: $2,000,000 only for research into the development of minimally invasive surgical procedures for the brain, spinal cord, and spine under DAMD 17–99–1–9022.]		2,000	+2,000
Comprehensive breast cancer clinical care project [Note: $7,500,000 only for the Walter Reed Army Medical Center to establish a peer-reviewed research program to test and improve the Department's ability to provide comprehensive breast care risk assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and research. This program shall be a multi-disciplinary public/private effort in coordination with the Uniformed Services University for the Health Sciences, and a non-profit research center, and a rural primary health care center		7,500	+7,500
Coronary and prostate disease reversal [Note: $5,000,000 only to continue the non-invasive coronary and prostate disease reversal program		5,000	+5,000
Chronic disease management		10,000	+10,000
Computer based patient records [Note: $4.2 million is only for further development of the Government Computer-based Patient Record program.]		4,200	+4,200
Budget execution savings		−63,000	−63,000

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

The Department requested $10,834,657,000 for the Defense Health Program, of which $10,477,687,000 is for operation and

maintenance and $356,970,000 is for procurement. The Committee recommends $11,078,417,000, a net increase of $243,760,000. Of this amount $10,471,447,000 is for operation and maintenance, $356,970,000 is for procurement and $250,000,000 is only for research and development.

PEER REVIEWED RESEARCH

Once again, the Administration requested no funds for breast cancer and prostate cancer peer-reviewed research programs. The Committee recommends $175,000,000 for the Army peer-reviewed breast cancer research program, and $75,000,000 for the Army peer-reviewed prostate cancer research program.

TRICARE CONTRACTS AND PHARMACY COSTS

The Committee notes that the Defense Health Program budget request is significantly higher than in prior years. In fact, the DHP budget request represents over a six percent increase over the fiscal year 1999 level. The Committee is pleased that the Department has fully funded the Defense Health Program, has recognized the impact of technology and pharmaceutical costs on the military health care budget, and that it has proposed increases in funding for these purposes.

However, the Committee also understands that various trends in pharmaceutical use, to include cost shifting, may be having an adverse and unanticipated impact on existing TRICARE contracts. In addition, these increases have not been accounted for under existing TRICARE contracts nor are they reflected in the budget request.

Therefore, where it can be demonstrated that increases in pharmaceutical costs could not be anticipated by a contractor at the time of the initial contract award, the Committee believes the Department and its TRICARE vendors should work together to make arrangements for equitable adjustment.

However, the Committee also recognizes that there is no conclusive study that attributes increases in the cost of care provided under TRICARE contracts solely to increases in pharmaceutical costs. Therefore, the Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs to provide a report on the impact of pharmaceutical costs on TRICARE contracts to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2000. The report should evaluate and review civilian contractor and government data to determine the actual reasons for the increases in health care costs. If it is determined that cost shifting is a primary reason for the increase in pharmacy costs, the Department is directed to take steps to ensure that requests for equitable adjustment are promptly and fairly considered.

CUSTODIAL CARE

The Committee recommends a general provision (section 8122) clarifying the definition of "custodial care" for the provision of health care to military families with complex medical needs. The Committee strongly disagrees with the Department's decision to interpret the custodial care exclusion to include medically necessary

skilled care and thereby transition this care to Medicaid. The Committee intends that the military health care system interpret the custodial care exclusion in a manner consistent with other federal programs (FEHBP and Medicare) and related case law. The Committee intends that the military health care system continue to provide for the needs of patients with exceptionally serious, long range, and incapacitating physical or mental conditions in a manner fully consistent with the direction provided in section 726 of P.L. 102–484, and in P.L. 97–377. The Committee expects the Department to redesign its case management program to ensure that: (a) members and former members of the uniformed services, and their dependents and survivors, have access to all medically necessary health care through the health care delivery system of the uniformed services regardless of the age or health care status of the person seeking the health care; and (b) military families do not have to resort to Medicaid, welfare or charity programs for the provision of medically necessary health care services.

FATIGUE MANAGEMENT

The Committee commends the Department for its efforts to better understand the risks of fatigue and the impact of fatigue on safety. The Committee believes a department-wide fatigue management initiative, designed to minimize accidents, injuries, and fatalities associated with fatigue has merit and should be considered for implementation of such a program. The initiative should include research on non-amphetamine treatments.

JOINT DIABETES PROJECT

The Committee has provided $14,000,000 in the Army (603002A) for continued funding for the Joint Diabetes Project, as presented in testimony before the Committee. These funds are to be equally divided between the participating institutions. The project will reduce suffering and costs associated with diabetes and related complications for DOD personnel and dependents, utilizing the partnership's advanced, state-of-the-art expertise and strengths in the areas of diabetes research, detection, prevention and managed care protocol (clinical practice guidelines).

CERVICAL CANCER TESTING

The Committee strongly urges the Department to investigate emerging methods to better test for, prevent, and treat cases of cervical cancer. In 1999, there were an estimated 12,800 new cases of cervical cancer and 4,800 cervical cancer deaths in the United States. It has clearly been shown that this cancer is more than 90 percent curable if it is detected in the early stages. The Committee is aware of new testing techniques combining tests for the human papillomavirus (HPV) and conventional pap tests that can provide a new dimension to the cervical cancer screening process. The Committee is also aware of promising clinical trials of a new HPV–16 vaccine at the National Cancer Institute, which could potentially prevent the spread of the type of HPV found in 50 percent of cervical cancers. The Committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) to report to the congressional defense com-

mittees by no later than January 31, 2000 on actions taken in the military health system to establish a systematic program for early detection and prevention of cervical cancer using the most modern and up to date screening methods.

GULF WAR ILLNESS

The Committee concurs with the findings of a recent GAO report on squalene antibodies and is concerned by the Department's reluctance to test for squalene antibodies since squalene is a potential contributing factor in illnesses of veterans of the Persian Gulf War. The Secretary of Defense is directed to develop and/or validate the assay to test for the presence of squalene antibodies. A report detailing the proposals to carry out this requirement shall be submitted to the Committee by January 1, 2000.

COMPUTER BASED MODELING IN HEALTH CARE

The Committee believes that computer based modeling and simulation capabilities may assist military health planners to assess the cost, access and quality impacts of reengineering delivery processes, delivery of protocols, and insertion of technology before committing vital resources. The Committee urges the Department to consider these management tools.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$780,150,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	1,169,000,000
Committee recommendation	781,000,000
Change from budget request	−388,000,000

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

PROGRAM REDUCTIONS

The Army requested $1,169,000,000 for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army. The Committee recommends $781,000,000, a decrease of $388,000,000. Of the decrease, $4,500,000 is taken with prejudice against program management consultants. Of the funds available, $75,303,000 shall be transferred to the Federal Emergency Preparedness Program to provide off-post emergency response and preparedness assistance to the communities surrounding the eight continental United States chemical storage and disposal sites.

The Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction Program, Army mission is to safely destroy all U.S. chemical warfare munitions and related materiel while ensuring maximum protection of the public, personnel involved in the destruction effort, and the environment. The Committee commends the Army for its efforts in destroying chemical munitions in a safe manner. As of March 17, 1999, over 13.5 percent, or 4,259 tons, of the stockpile has been destroyed. Currently there are two sites operational and five sites in the design phase. Despite the fact that two additional sites are on hold until completion of the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment Demonstration, the Committee is hopeful that the U.S. will meet the deadline of April 2007 for the destruction of chemical munitions as called for by the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Although the Committee is extremely supportive of this important national program, it is troubled at the lack of management and financial oversight exercised by both the Army and OSD on such a large program. In earlier years, the Committee expressed its concern because the chemical munitions destruction program was plagued by cost growth and schedule delays. It appears as if the DoD has made an attempt to rectify cost and schedule issues by managing the program as an Aquisition Category 1 program. The Committee hopes that this action will allow the Army better control over the schedule and costs in the future.

The Committee is aware that the chemical agents and munitions program uses the practice of budgeting in advance of need and uses funds outside of the funded delivery period. As a result, the funds are often obligated later than anticipated.

The Committee remains concerned over the extremely slow obligation and expenditure rates for the chemical munitions destruction program. Recently, the Committee has learned that its concerns are valid.

Through an internal DoD comptroller memorandum, the Committee has learned that the chemical agents and munitions program uses unique and questionable budget execution actions. Not only are there large unexpended and unobligated balances of prior year funds, but the budget request is $388 million higher than last year's appropriated amount. Since not only the Committee, but also the Office of the Secretary of Defense Comptroller's staff, can not determine the validity of the program's prior year obligations, the Committee recommends the program be held at last year's level.

The Committee is disturbed to learn that individuals employed by the Department of Defense have visited the Congress with paid consultants to "promote" the chemical agents and munitions destruction program. Therefore, the Committee recommends the decrease in program management for consultants.

Given the questionable budget execution and management activities, the Committee directs that the DoD Inspector General and the General Accounting Office report to the Congress no later than March 15, 2000 on the chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS

The Committee recognizes the proximity of densely populated areas and the importance of safely and completely destroying chemical munitions such as those stored in the Bluegrass Army Depot. The Committee directs the Army to proceed in a timely manner to complete the evaluation of the merits of all practical methods, including alternatives to incineration, that may effectively and efficiently dispose of stored chemical ordnance.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

The total amount recommended in the bill will provide the following in fiscal year 2000:

(IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	BUDGET REQUEST QTY	BUDGET REQUEST AMOUNT	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED QTY	COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED AMOUNT	CHANGE FROM REQUEST QTY	CHANGE FROM REQUEST AMOUNT
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY						
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	--	593,500	--	492,000	--	-101,500
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	--	241,500	--	116,000	--	-125,500
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	--	334,000	--	173,000	--	-161,000
TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY		1,169,000		781,000		-388,000

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$735,582,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	788,100,000
Committee recommendation	883,700,000
Change from budget request	+95,600,000

This appropriation provides funds for Military Personnel; Operation and Maintenance; Procurement; Research, Development, Test and Evaluation; and Military Construction for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Defense requested $788,100,000 for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities. The Committee recommends $883,700,000, an increase of $95,600,000.

AUTHORIZATION CHANGES

The Committee recommends the following changes in the budget request in accordance with House authorization action:

[In thousands of dollars]

Item	Budget request	Committee recommendation	Change from request
Operation Caper Focus	0	6,000	+6,000
Wide Aperture Radar Facility	0	17,500	+17,500
Southwest Border Fence	0	6,000	+6,000
P–3 Forward Looking Infrared Radars	0	2,700	+2,700
Tethered Aerostat Radar System	40,489	31,689	−8,800

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

National Guard counter-drug support	+20,000
Gulf States Initiative	+10,000
Regional Counter-drug Training Academy	+2,000
Northeast Regional Counter-drug Training Center	+2,000
Counter-narcotics Center at Hammer	+2,000
Other Joint Military Intelligence Programs	+6,000
Observation Aircraft	+4,000
Mothership Operations	+3,500
Lake County HIDTA	+1,000
Appalachian HIDTA	+3,200
Multi-Jurisdictional Counter-drug Task Force	+4,000
Southwest Border States Initiative	+6,000
National Interagency Counter-drug Institute	+2,000
Young Marines	+1,500
A–10 Logistical and Demilitarization Support	+5,000

FORWARD OPERATING LOCATIONS

In the "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense" appropriations account, the Department requested $59,555,000 to establish Forward Operating Locations (FOLs) in Central and South America including $42,800,000 for Military Construction to establish these new facilities. The Committee recommends the budget request. However, it directs that none of the funds can be used for Military Construction at an FOL until a formal binding long-term agreement which specifies the extent, use of, and host

nation support for, the forward operating location is executed by both the host nation and the United States.

As a consequence of the Panama Canal Treaty, U. S. Forces are required to fully withdraw from the Republic of Panama by December 31, 1999 and Howard AFB will no longer be available as the principal operating location for Counter-drug operations in Central and South America. Negotiations for the continued use of Howard AFB beyond 1999 failed shortly before the budget was submitted. The Commander-in-Chief U.S. Southern Command (CINCSOUTH) plans to restructure his theater counter-drug concept of operations by establishing FOL staging areas at Liberia, Costa Rica; Manta, Ecuador; and Curacao and Aruba as replacements for Howard AFB. U.S. Forces are currently operating out of Curacao, Aruba, and Ecuador under interim agreements.

The Committee commends the Department and CINCSOUTH for their ability to begin operations so quickly and successfully at three of the four sites after suspending operations at Howard AFB on May 1, 1999. The Committee notes that an agreement to use the Costa Rica FOL has not been achieved. Therefore, the Departments of Defense and State are encouraged to seek another location to cover the area previously identified with that site as soon as possible.

The Committee is concerned that the military construction costs identified in the budget have grown substantially, and are still not stable. The Committee has been assured by the CINCSOUTH that these estimates will stabilize below the current estimate of $122,500,000 over the next two fiscal years.

The Committee would not normally provide Military Construction funds in the DoD appropriations bill as proposed in the budget. It does so this year only following consultation with, and with the approval of, both the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee. This one-time recommendation is an effort to facilitate and expedite plans the CINCSOUTH has made to protect the substantial investment the Committee has made above the budget in the past to stem the flow of drugs to the United States from the source zone and through the transit zone. The Committee, however, directs that future requests for Military Construction funding be contained in budget requests for Military Construction consistent with past practices.

FINGERPRINT OPERATIONS

The Committee is aware of a proposal to install and demonstrate contactless fingerprint device systems in drug theater corridors of the U.S.-Mexico border region. The Committee believes that such devices, once fully certified by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, have the potential to enhance the identification of drug traffickers, reduce costs, and reduce the time required to process Federal, State and local government drug suspects throughout the region. The Committee encourages the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Justice Department, to carry out a broad-based demonstration of contactless fingerprint device systems in those areas where the drug trafficking threat is most acute.

C–26 AIRCRAFT PHOTO RECONNAISSANCE UPGRADE

In fiscal year 1998 and 1999, the Committee provided $9,500,000 to upgrade counter-drug C–26 aircraft with an improved photo reconnaissance capability. The Committee is concerned that this program has not yet begun and directs the National Guard to expedite delivery of this enhanced mission capability to C–26 counter-drug aircraft.

DRUG TESTING

The Committee is aware of a number of new technologies in the drug testing area which have the potential to provide immediate, onsite results, at less cost than existing systems. In view of the significant existing expenditures by the Department of Defense and the services to carry out drug testing, the Committee encourages the Department to conduct an evaluation of available testing systems and technologies to determine if the methods currently in use by the DoD are the most cost-effective and efficient.

A–10 LOGISTICAL AND DEMILITARIZATION SUPPORT

The Committee recommends $5,000,000 only to provide logistical and demilitarization support for the transfer of three excess A–10 aircraft from the Aircraft Maintenance Regeneration Center for loan to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State to support international drug eradication and interdiction efforts.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$132,064,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	140,844,000
Committee recommendation	140,844,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $140,844,000 for the Office of the Inspector General. The recommendation is an increase of $8,780,000 above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

NATIONAL FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

The National Foreign Intelligence Program consists of those intelligence activities of the government which provide the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and the Congress with national foreign intelligence on broad strategic concerns bearing on U.S. national security. These concerns are stated by the National Security Council in the form of long-range and short-range requirements for the principal users of intelligence.

The National Foreign Intelligence Program budget funded in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act consists primarily of resources for the Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, National Reconnaissance Office, National Security Agency, National Imagery and Mapping Agency, intelligence services of the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force, Intelligence Community Management Staff and the CIA Retirement and Disability System Fund.

CLASSIFIED ANNEX

Because of the highly sensitive nature of intelligence programs, the results of the Committee's budget review are published in a separate, detailed and comprehensive classified annex. The intelligence community, Department of Defense and other organizations are expected to comply fully with the recommendations and directions in the classified annex accompanying the fiscal year 2000 Defense Appropriations Bill.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$201,500,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	209,100,000
Committee recommendation	209,100,000
Change from budget request	.....

This appropriation provides payments of benefits to qualified beneficiaries in accordance with the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees (P.L. 88–643). This statute authorized the establishment of a CIA Retirement and Disability System (CIARDS) for a limited number of CIA employees, and authorized the establishment and maintenance of a fund from which benefits would be paid to those beneficiaries.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $209,100,000 for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Systems Fund (CIARDS). The recommendation is the same as the budget request and $7,600,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$129,123,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	149,415,000
Committee recommendation	144,415,000
Change from budget request	−5,000,000

This appropriation provides funds for the activities that support the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) and the Intelligence Community.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The budget requested $149,415,000 for the Intelligence Community Management Account. The Committee recommends $144,415,000, a decrease of $5,000,000. Details of adjustments to this account are included in the classified annex accompanying this report.

PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND CONVEYANCE, REMEDIATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$25,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000
Change from budget request	.....

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $15,000,000 for Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund. The recommendation is a decrease of $10,000,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1999.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

Fiscal year 1999 appropriation	$3,000,000
Fiscal year 2000 budget request	8,000,000
Committee recommendation	8,000,000
Change from budget request	.....

The National Security Education Trust Fund was established to provide scholarships and fellowships to U.S. students to pursue higher education studies abroad and grants to U.S. institutions for programs of study in foreign areas and languages.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends $8,000,000 for the National Security Education Trust Fund. This recommendation is the same as the budget request and $5,000,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The accompanying bill includes 129 general provisions. Most of these provisions were included in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 and many have been included in the Defense Appropriations Act for a number of years.

Actions taken by the Committee to amend last year's provisions or new provisions recommended by the Committee are discussed below or in the applicable section of the report.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT AND ACTIVITY

For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508), the following information provides the definitions of the term "program, project, and activity" for appropriations contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. The term "program, project, and activity" shall include the most specific level of budget items, identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1999, the accompanying House and Senate Committee reports, the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the Committee on Conference, the related classified reports, and the P–1 and R–1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by Congressional action.

In carrying out any Presidential sequestration, the Department of Defense and agencies shall conform to the definition for "program, project, and activity" set forth above with the following exception:

For Military Personnel and the Operation and Maintenance accounts the term "program, project, and activity" is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

The Department and agencies should carry forth the Presidential sequestration order in a manner that would not adversely affect or alter Congressional policies and priorities established for the Department of Defense and the related agencies and no program, project, and activity should be eliminated or be reduced to a level of funding which would adversely affect the Department's ability to effectively continue any program, project, and activity.

FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES

The Committee has serious concerns over the status of the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicle Program. Since the current program

has experienced cost growth, schedule delays, and technical issues, the Committee believes it is extremely important to conduct a second source competition. The Army has requested that the Committee provide language which clarifies Section 112 of Public Law 105–261 because it hinders the second source competition strategy. Therefore, the Committee includes a new general provision (Section 8105) which makes Section 112 of Public Law 105–261 apply only to Phase III of the Army's second source acquisition strategy for the Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles.

B–52 Force Structure

The Committee includes a new general provision (Section 8108) which earmarks $47,100,000 from various Air Force appropriation accounts to fund a total force structure of 94 B–52 aircraft of which 23 shall be maintained in an attrition reserve status. Given the Air Force's continuing requirements for these aircraft, as evident in the recent campaign in Kosovo, the Committee is convinced that a robust force structure should be maintained. Of the funds earmarked for this purpose, $3,000,000 shall be derived from Military Personnel, Air Force, $34,500,000 from Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, and $9,600,000 from Aircraft Procurement, Air Force.

National Missile Defense

The Committee includes a new provision (section 8115) that requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report with the fiscal year 2001 budget on National Missile Defense basing locations. The report shall include an assessment of (1) The ability of a single site versus multiple sites to counter the expected ballistic missile threat; (2) optimum basing locations; (3) the survivability and redundancy of potential National Defense Systems; (4) the estimated costs associated with different site deployment options. The Committee is concerned that prior to the decision to deploy National Missile Defense at any particular site, all options should be evaluated.

Aggressor Squadrons

The Committee has serious concerns about the state of dedicated aggressor squadrons maintained by both the Navy and the Air Force. The committee notes that the size of such squadrons has dwindled over the course of this decade, and that the current force structure is insufficient to meet as much of the training burden as it once did. In addition, the Committee is aware that the dissimilar combat flight training provided by these squadrons is essential to developing, and maintaining the skills of Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force combat pilots. Accordingly, the Committee includes a new general provision (Section 8116) which requires the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide an inventory of the personnel and equipment available for dedicated aggressor squadrons from 1990 to the present, and an assessment of the training requirements that such squadrons are able to meet over the same time period.

ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

The Committee includes a new general provision (section 8118) that requires the Department to submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the obligation of funds for ACTDs. The Committee includes this section due to the Department's disregard for instructions included in the Fiscal Year 1999 House Report regarding Line of Site Anti-Tank (LOSAT). In addition, the section includes language regarding the use of funds made available in Public Law 105–262.

MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM

The Committee includes a new general provision (section 8119) that provides that none of the funds available in Public Law 105–262 may be used to fund MEADS. The Committee recommends this section due to DOD's improper use of fiscal year 1999 funds for MEADS. That action was in direct conflict with the Conference Report direction to terminate MEADS.

MILITARY RECRUITMENT FINANCIAL PENALTIES

The Committee includes a new general provision (Section 8124) clarifying the scope of previous law governing the withholding of federal funds from institutions of higher education that choose to restrict the U.S. military from recruiting on their campuses and from conducting ROTC programs. Section 8124 makes clear that this prohibition of federal funds affects all identified categories of federal aid except student financial assistance.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The following items are included in accordance with various requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted describing the effect of provisions in the accompanying bill which directly or indirectly change the application of existing law.

Language is included in various parts of the bill to continue ongoing activities which require annual authorization or additional legislation, which to date has not been enacted.

The bill includes a number of provisions which place limitations on the use of funds in the bill or change existing limitations and which might, under some circumstances, be construed as changing the application of existing law.

The bill includes a number of provisions, which have been virtually unchanged for many years, that are technically considered legislation.

The bill provides that appropriations shall remain available for more than one year for some programs for which the basic authorizing legislation does not presently authorize each extended availability.

In various places in the bill, the Committee has earmarked funds within appropriation accounts in order to fund specific programs and has adjusted some existing earmarking.

Those additional changes in the fiscal year 2000 bill, which might be interpreted as changing exiting law, are as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS LANGUAGE

Language has been amended in "Operation and Maintenance, Army" which changes the amount provided for emergency and extraordinary expenses, and includes language which transfers funds to the National Park Service for necessary infrastructure repair improvements at Fort Baker. Language has also been included concerning environmental remediation costs of government-owned, contractor-operated facilities.

Language has been amended in "Operation and Maintenance, Navy" which changes the amount provided for emergency and extraordinary expenses.

Language has been amended in "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force" which changes the amount provided for emergency and extraordinary expenses.

Language has been included in "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide" which earmarks funds for providing the Computer/Electronic Accommodations program to federal agencies; amends the amount provided for emergency and extraordinary expenses; deletes language concerning federally owned educational facilities located on military installations; includes language which earmarks funds provided in Public Law 105–277 for certain procurement and research and development accounts; and includes language which earmarks funds for certain classified activities to be transferred as necessary to the appropriate appropriations. Language has also been included which earmarks $10,000,000 for security locks.

Language has been deleted in "Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard" regarding base operations reporting requirements.

Language has been included in "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund" which allows for additional transfer authority for the Defense Health Program, and which provides that funds may be transferred back to this appropriation if not necessary for the purposes otherwise provided.

Language has been deleted in "Environmental Restoration, Army" which earmarked funds for environmental remediation by the Corps of Engineers; and includes language regarding additional transfer authority.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Navy" regarding additional transfer authority.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Air Force" regarding additional transfer authority.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide" regarding additional transfer authority.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites" regarding additional transfer authority.

Language has been deleted in "Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction" which earmarked funds for the dismantling and disposal of submarine reactor components in the Russian Far East.

Language has been included in "Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense" which authorizes the use of Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide funds for grants to local educational authorities.

Language has been amended in "Other Procurement, Army" which changes the number of passenger motor vehicles for replacement, and the purchase cost of vehicles for physical security of personnel.

Language has been amended in "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy" which provides specific project-level appropriations.

Language has been amended in "Other Procurement, Navy" which changes the number of passenger motor vehicles for replacement.

Language has been amended in "Procurement, Marine Corps" which changes the number of passenger motor vehicles for replacement.

Language has been amended in "Other Procurement, Air Force" which changes the number of passenger motor vehicles for replacement.

Language has been amended in "Procurement, Defense-Wide" which changes the number of passenger motor vehicles for replacement, and the purchase cost of vehicles for physical security of personnel; includes language which earmarks funds only to support Electronic Commerce Centers; and includes language which prohibits funds for the Joint Electronic Commerce Program Office.

A new appropriations paragraph, "Defense Production Act Purchases" has been included which provides funds only for microwave power tubes.

Language has been deleted in "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army" which earmarks funds for an operational test of the Starstreak and Stinger missiles.

Language has been deleted in "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy" regarding live fire stock tests on the SSN–21 submarine; and includes language which earmarks funds for the Intercooled Recuperated Gas Turbine Engine program subject to certification by the Secretary of the Navy.

Language has been deleted in "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" that restricted funds for the Navy Upper Tier program; amends language which earmarks funds for the Theater Wide Missile Defense program; and includes language which earmarks funds provided in Public Law 105–277 for ballistic missile defense, for certain missile defense programs.

Language has been included in "Defense Working Capital Funds" which provides for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for the Defense Security Service.

Language has been deleted in "National Defense Sealift Fund" which earmarked funds for alteration of bridges.

Language has been included in "Defense Health Program" which earmarks research and development funds only for the Army peer-reviewed breast cancer and prostate cancer research programs.

Language has been amended in "Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army" which deletes an earmark of funds for the Johnston Atoll off-island leave program, and includes language which would transfer funds to the Federal Emergency Management

Agency's Defense Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program.

Language has been included in "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense" which transfers funds to "Military Construction, Air Force" for construction at forward operating locations in the United States Southern Command area of responsibility.

Language has been amended in "Office of the Inspector General" which changes the amount provided for emergency and extraordinary expenses.

Language has been amended in "Intelligence Community Management Account" which earmarks funds for the Advanced Research and Development Committee.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 8005 has been amended to include restrictions on below threshold reprogramming of funds within certain accounts in Titles III and IV of the bill as discussed in the Major Committee Recommendations section of this report.

Section 8008 has been amended to restrict initiation or expansion of certain multiyear contracts as discussed in the Major Committee Recommendations section of this report.

Section 8013 has been amended to delete language which prohibited Army personnel from jointly receiving an enlistment bonus and Army College Fund benefits.

Section 8024 has been amended to delete language which referenced Public Law 105–56 concerning the availability of funds appropriated for the Indian Financing Act Incentive payments program.

Section 8033 has been amended to designate funds exclusively for use by the Civil Air Patrol.

Section 8034 has been amended to delete language which reduced amounts in the bill to reflect savings from the number of staff years to be performed by Federally Funded Research and Development Centers.

Section 8036 has been amended to change the names of the "congressional defense committees".

Section 8044 has been amended to delete language which prohibited obligation of funds until a report was submitted on details in the Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account.

Section 8056 has been amended which provides authorization of appropriations in this Act and in fiscal year 1999 supplemental appropriations on intelligence activities until enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000.

Section 8057 has been amended to include language to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to demolish and remove its former northwest district headquarters.

Section 8058 has been amended to include language which rescinds funds from the following programs:

	(Rescissions)
1998 Appropriations:	
Other Procurement, Navy:	
Combat Survivor Evader Radio	$6,384,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:	
F–16 savings	11,700,000
C–130 Avionics Modernization Program	1,800,000

	(Rescissions)
JSTARS contract savings	12,600,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force:	
Classified program	100,000,000
1999 Appropriations:	
Other Procurement, Army:	
Scamp terminals	4,000,000
CSEL	13,700,000
Maneuver Control System	3,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy:	
Universal Jet Air Start Unit	41,500,000
E–2C savings	10,000,000
AV–8B Mods, termination of life extension program	11,000,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy:	
Improved Tactical Air Launched Decoy	8,000,000
Under the heading, Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy:	
New Attack Submarine overhead savings	32,400,000
New Attack Submarine contract savings	2,600,000
CVN–69 Overhaul contract savings	11,400,000
Other Procurement, Navy:	
Combat Survivor Evader Radio	8,953,000
MK–12 IFF contract savings	1,900,000
FFG upgrades	5,500,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force:	
F–16 savings	7,800,000
C–130 Avionics Modernization Program	2,700,000
T–38 Avionics Upgrade Program	27,600,000
C–17 prior year savings (GAO)	36,400,000
B–1 prior year savings (GAO)	6,729,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force:	
GPS prior year savings (GAO)	6,800,000
Medium Launch Vehicle Savings from delayed GPS launch (GAO)	2,600,000
Classified program	146,100,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
Mines	4,000,000
Force XXI initiative	12,400,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force:	
Satellite Control Network (GAO)	10,300,000
DSCS delays in EELV integration (GAO)	2,500,000
GBS reduced receiver suites (GAO)	5,300,000
SBIRS SABRS (GAO)	3,500,000
B–2 JASSM savings	7,000,000
B–1B prior year savings (GAO)	10,721,000
Milstar (GAO)	10,600,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide:	
ACTD/LOSAT	7,000,000
Tactical Technology	16,500,000

Section 8064 has been amended to include language on the design and construction of secure offices and support facilities to the subway entrance at the Pentagon.

Section 8075 has been amended, concerning quarterly reports on loan guarantees, to reflect a name change of the congressional defense committees.

Section 8080 has been amended to change the amount of funds that would be available for transfer from operation and maintenance accounts to military personnel accounts for the Innovative Readiness Training program.

Section 8083 has been amended to change the amounts of shipbuilding and conversion transfers.

Section 8091 has been included which rescinds $452,100,000 of 1999 appropriations to reflect savings from revised economic assumptions.

Section 8097 has been amended to include the Office of Management and Budget to be notified regarding initiating a new start program.

Section 8098 has been amended to prohibit contracting with individuals who have been debarred by the Department for the unlawful manufacture or sale of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Section 8099 has been included which earmarks funds for a grant to the Women in Military Service for America Memorial.

Section 8100 has been amended to delete reporting requirements by the Secretary of Defense regarding training of foreign security forces.

Section 8101 has been included which reduces the budget request by $171,000,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations.

Section 8103 has been included which provides funding to repair and upgrade the road access route to the National Training Center.

Section 8104 has been included which makes funds appropriated to the Navy available to replace lost Treasury checks for which claims were filed.

Section 8105 has been included which make Section 112 of Public Law 105–261 apply only to Phase III of the Army's second source acquisition strategy.

Section 8106 has been included which prohibits funds appropriated to the Navy to be used to develop, lease or procure ADC(X) class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines are manufactured domestically in the United States.

Section 8107 has been included which provides funds for a nonprofit organization.

Section 8108 has been included which earmarks $47,100,000 to maintain an attrition reserve of 23 B–52 aircraft and a total inventory of 94 such aircraft.

Section 8109 has been included which reduces amounts available in several Operation and Maintenance accounts by $100,000,000 for savings related to A–76 studies, and which prohibits contracting out certain functions pursuant to such studies.

Section 8110 has been included requiring the Department of Defense to provide a summary of the results of A–76 studies conducted by DoD since 1995.

Section 8111 has been included requiring that the Department of Defense submit budget justification materials for contingency operations costs for each appropriation account.

Section 8112 has been included which appropriates $20,000,000 for the Army National Guard for the procurement or lease of firefighting aircraft or systems.

Section 8113 has been included which appropriates $50,000,000 only for Weapons of Mass Destruction Domestic Preparedness.

Section 8114 has been included which provides $150,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide for information security and assurance programs and includes reporting requirements.

Section 8115 has been included which directs the Department to submit a report regarding basing options for National Missile Defense.

Section 8116 has been included which requires a study of dedicated aggressor squadrons by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Section 8117 has been added prohibiting the Department of Defense from using funds provided in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts for the repair and maintenance of military family housing.

Section 8118 has been included which provides that funds appropriated in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide account for advance concept technology demonstrations may only be obligated after a report to the congressional defense committees is provided by the Department.

Section 8119 has been included which provides that none of the funds appropriated may be used for the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

Section 8120 has been added as discussed in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy section of this report under the heading "Joint Experimentation."

Section 8121 has been included providing $250,000 for the purpose of acquiring and preserving the cemetery site near Ft. Atkinson, Nebraska.

Section 8122 has been included which defines custodial care as care designed essentially to assist an individual in meeting the activities of daily living not medically necessary care.

Section 8123 has been amended to credit refunds associated with the use of government travel and purchase cards to the appropriation account which initially paid for purchases made with such cards.

Section 8124 has been included concerning funds for student financial assistance at schools.

Section 8125 has been included to enhance DoD oversight of information technology systems.

Section 8126 has been included which enforces current policy by prohibiting the Department from providing certain support to other agencies who are in arrears to the Department.

Section 8127 has been included which restores reimbursement rules for the Foreign Military Sales account.

Section 8128 has been included which allows the acceleration of certain spectrum sales.

Section 8129 has been included which requires a report from the Secretary of Defense on the conduct of recent contingency operations.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY LAW

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table lists the appropriations in the accompanying bill which are not authorized by law:

Military Personnel, Army
Military Personnel, Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps
Military Personnel, Air Force
Reserve Personnel, Army
Reserve Personnel, Navy

Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps
Reserve Personnel, Air Force
National Guard Personnel, Army
National Guard Personnel, Air Force
Operation and Maintenance, Army
Operation and Maintenance, Navy
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces
Environmental Restoration, Army
Environmental Restoration, Navy
Environmental Restoration, Air Force
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense
Aircraft Procurement, Army
Missile Procurement, Army
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army
Procurement of Ammunition, Army
Other Procurement, Army
Aircraft Procurement, Navy
Weapons Procurement, Navy
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy
Other Procurement, Navy
Procurement, Marine Corps
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force
Missile Procurement, Air Force
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force
Other Procurement, Air Force
Procurement, Defense-Wide
National Guard and Reserve Equipment
Defense Production Act Purchases
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense
Defense Working Capital Funds
National Defense Sealift Fund
Defense Health Program
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense

Office of the Inspector General
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund
Intelligence Community Management Account
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation and Environmental Restoration Fund
National Security Education Trust Fund
Sec. 8099.
Sec. 8112.
Sec. 8113.
Sec. 8114.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following is submitted describing the transfer of funds provided in the accompanying bill.

The following table shows the appropriation affected by the transfers:

Appropriations to which transfer is made	Amount	Appropriations from which transfer is made	Amount
Operation and maintenance, Army	$50,000,000	National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund	$150,000,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	50,000,000		
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	50,000,000		

Language has been included in "Operation and Maintenance, Army", which provides for the transfer of $6,000,000 to the "National Park Service" for improvements at Fort Baker.

Language has been included in "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide", which provides for the transfer of $40,000,000 to certain classified activities.

Language has been included in "Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund", which provides for the transfer of funds out of this account to other appropriations accounts.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Army" which provides for the transfer of funds out of and into this account.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Navy" which provides for the transfer of funds out of and into this account.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Air Force" which provides for the transfer of funds out of and into this account.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide" which provides for the transfer of funds out of and into this account.

Language has been included in "Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites" which provides for the transfer of funds out of and into this account.

Language has been included in "Procurement, Defense-Wide" which provides for the transfer of $6,000,000 out of "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide" into the account.

Language has been included in "Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army" which provides for the transfer of $75,303,000

to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for the Defense Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness program.

Language has been included in "Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense" which transfers funds to other appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense.

Language has been included in "Intelligence Community Management Account" which provides for the transfer of $27,000,000 to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center.

Ten provisions (Section 8005, 8006, 8015, 8040, 8064, 8066, 8080, 8083, 8113, and 8114) contain language which allows transfers of funds between accounts.

RESCISSIONS

Pursuant to clause 3(f)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following table is submitted describing the rescissions recommended in the accompanying bill:

Other Procurement, Navy 1998/2000	$6,384,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 1998/2000	26,100,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force 1998/2000	100,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Army 1999/2001	8,000,000
Missile Procurement, Army 1999/2001	7,000,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army 1999/2001	9,000,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army 1999/2001	6,000,000
Other Procurement, Army 1999/2001	39,700,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy 1999/2001	106,500,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy 1999/2001	16,000,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 1999/2001	3,000,000
Under the heading, Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1999/2003:	
Inflation savings	37,000,000
New Attack Submarine	35,000,000
CVN–69	11,400,000
Other Procurement, Navy 1999/2001	39,353,000
Procurement, Marine Corps 1999/2001	5,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 1999/2001	127,229,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force 1999/2001	169,500,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 1999/2001	2,000,000
Other Procurement, Air Force 1999/2001	44,400,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide 1999/2001	5,200,000
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army 1999/2000	5,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army 1999/2000	36,400,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy 1999/2000	40,900,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force 1999/2000	126,821,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 1999/2000	52,200,000

COMPLIANCE WITH CLAUSE 3 OF RULE XIII (RAMSEYER RULE)

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

SECTION 8118 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SEC. 8118. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, no funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense

may be used to award a contract to, extend a contract with, or approve the award of a subcontract to any person who within the preceding 15 years has been [convicted] *debarred by the Department of Defense based upon a conviction* under section 704 of title 18, United States Code, of the unlawful manufacture or sale of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

SECTION 337 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

SEC. 337. ALLOCATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF NEW PUBLIC SAFETY SERVICES LICENSES AND COMMERCIAL LICENSES.

(a) * * *

(b) ASSIGNMENT.—The Commission shall—

(1) commence assignment of the licenses for public safety services created pursuant to subsection (a) no later than September 30, 1998; and

[(2) commence competitive bidding for the commercial licenses created pursuant to subsection (a) after January 1, 2001.]

* * * * * * *

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that:

"Each report of a committee on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, shall include a statement citing the specific powers granted to the Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution."

The Committee on Appropriations bases its authority to report this legislation from Clause 7 of Section 9 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America which states:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of Appropriations made by law . . ."

Appropriations contained in this Act are made pursuant to this specific power granted by the Constitution.

COMPARISON WITH THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires an explanation of compliance with section 308(a)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, which requires that the report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how that authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the Act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year from the Committee's section 302(a) allocation. For purposes of determining the 302(b) allocation for this bill, all figures in this table include funding in this bill, plus previously enacted fiscal year 2000 appropriations from Public Law 106–31.

[In millions of dollars]

	302(b) allocation—		This bill—	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Discretionary	267,692	259,130	267,691	258,040
Mandatory	209	209	209	209

FIVE-YEAR OUTLAY PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(B) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, the following table contains five-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill. (This includes funding in this bill, plus previously enacted fiscal year 2000 appropriations from Public Law 106–31.)

[In millions of dollars]

Budget Authority in bill	267,900
2000	181,503
2001	55,399
2002	19,790
2003	6,897
2004	5,748

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), as amended, no new budget or outlays are provided by the accompanying bill for financial assistance to State and local governments.

FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below:

There were no recorded votes.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
Military Personnel, Army	20,841,687	22,006,632	21,475,732	+634,045	-530,900
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	559,533	+559,533	+559,533
Military Personnel, Navy	16,570,754	17,207,481	16,737,072	+166,318	-470,409
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	436,773	+436,773	+436,773
Military Personnel, Marine Corps 2/	6,263,387	6,544,682	6,353,622	+90,235	-191,060
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	177,980	+177,980	+177,980
Military Personnel, Air Force	17,211,987	17,899,685	17,565,811	+353,824	-333,874
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	471,892	+471,892	+471,892
Reserve Personnel, Army	2,167,052	2,270,964	2,235,055	+68,003	-35,909
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	40,574	+40,574	+40,574
Reserve Personnel, Navy	1,426,663	1,446,339	1,425,210	-1,453	-21,129
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	29,833	+29,833	+29,833
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	406,616	409,189	403,822	-2,794	-5,367
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	7,820	+7,820	+7,820
Reserve Personnel, Air Force	852,324	881,170	872,978	+20,654	-8,192
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	13,143	+13,143	+13,143
National Guard Personnel, Army	3,489,987	3,570,639	3,486,427	-3,560	-84,212
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	70,416	+70,416	+70,416

National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,377,109	1,486,512	1,456,248	+79,139	-30,264
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	30,462	+30,462	+30,462
Total, title I, Military Personnel 4/	70,607,566	73,723,293	72,011,977	+1,404,411	-1,711,316
Pay increase provided in P.L. 106-31	.....	.....	1,838,426	+1,838,426	+1,838,426
Total funding available	70,607,566	73,723,293	73,850,403	+3,242,837	+127,110
TITLE II					
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
Operation and Maintenance, Army	17,185,623	18,610,994	19,629,019	+2,443,396	+1,018,025
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-96,000)	.....	.....	(+96,000)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	21,872,399	22,188,715	23,029,584	+1,157,185	+840,869
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-32,087)	.....	.....	(+32,087)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,578,718	2,558,929	2,822,004	+243,286	+263,075
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-9,513)	.....	.....	(+9,513)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	19,021,045	20,313,203	21,641,099	+2,620,054	+1,327,896
(By transfer - National Defense Stockpile)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-52,200)	.....	.....	(+52,200)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	10,914,076	11,419,233	11,401,733	+487,657	-17,500
(By transfer - Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund)	(-90,020)	.....	.....	(+90,020)	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,202,622	1,369,213	1,513,076	+310,454	+143,863
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	957,239	917,647	969,478	+12,239	+51,831
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	117,893	123,266	143,911	+26,018	+20,645
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	1,747,696	1,728,437	1,788,091	+40,395	+59,654
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	2,678,015	2,903,549	3,103,642	+425,627	+200,093

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	3,106,933	3,099,618	3,239,438	+132,505	+139,820
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	439,400	2,387,600	1,812,600	+1,373,200	-575,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	7,324	7,621	7,621	+297	.....
Environmental Restoration, Army	370,640	378,170	378,170	+7,530	.....
Environmental Restoration, Navy	274,600	284,000	284,000	+9,400	.....
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	372,100	376,800	376,800	+4,700	.....
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	26,091	25,370	25,370	-721	.....
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	225,000	199,214	209,214	-15,786	+10,000
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid	50,000	55,800	55,800	+5,800	.....
Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction	440,400	475,500	456,100	+15,700	-19,400
Pentagon Renovation Transfer Fund (by transfer)	(279,820)	.....	.....	(-279,820)	.....
Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense 3/	455,000	1,845,370	800,000	+345,000	-1,045,370
Total, title II, Operation and maintenance	84,042,814	91,268,249	93,686,750	+9,643,936	+2,418,501
(By transfer)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	.....	.....
TITLE III					
PROCUREMENT					
Aircraft Procurement, Army	1,388,268	1,229,888	1,590,488	+202,220	+360,600
Missile Procurement, Army	1,226,335	1,358,104	1,272,798	+46,463	-85,306
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,548,340	1,416,765	1,556,665	+8,325	+139,900
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,065,955	1,140,816	1,228,770	+162,815	+87,954
Other Procurement, Army	3,339,486	3,423,870	3,604,751	+265,265	+180,881

Aircraft Procurement, Navy	7,541,709	8,228,655	9,168,405	+1,626,696	+939,750
Weapons Procurement, Navy	1,211,419	1,357,400	1,334,800	+123,381	-22,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps	484,203	484,900	537,600	+53,397	+52,700
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	6,035,752	6,678,454	6,656,554	+620,802	-21,900
Other Procurement, Navy	4,072,662	4,100,091	4,252,191	+179,529	+152,100
Procurement, Marine Corps	874,216	1,137,220	1,333,120	+458,904	+195,900
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	8,095,507	9,302,086	8,298,313	+202,806	-1,003,773
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,069,827	2,359,608	2,329,510	+259,683	-30,098
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	379,425	419,537	481,837	+102,412	+62,300
Other Procurement, Air Force	6,960,483	7,085,177	6,964,227	+3,744	-120,950
Procurement, Defense-Wide	1,944,833	2,128,967	2,286,368	+341,535	+157,401
National Guard and Reserve Equipment	352,000	.....	130,000	-222,000	+130,000
Defense Production Act Purchases	.....	.....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, title III, Procurement	48,590,420	51,851,538	53,031,397	+4,440,977	+1,179,859
TITLE IV					
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION					
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	5,031,788	4,426,194	5,148,093	+116,305	+721,899
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	8,636,649	7,984,016	9,080,580	+443,931	+1,096,564
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	13,758,811	13,077,829	13,709,233	-49,578	+631,404
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	9,036,551	8,609,289	8,930,149	-106,402	+320,860
Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense	258,606	253,457	271,957	+13,351	+18,500
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	34,245	24,434	29,434	-4,811	+5,000
Total, title IV, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	36,756,650	34,375,219	37,169,446	+412,796	+2,794,227

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE V					
REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS					
Defense Working Capital Funds	94,500	90,344	90,344	-4,156	.....
Transfer stockpile balances to working capital fund	.....	67,000	.....	.....	-67,000
National Defense Sealift Fund:					
Ready Reserve Force	311,266	257,000	257,000	-54,266	.....
Acquisition	397,100	97,700	472,700	+75,600	+375,000
(Transfer out)	(-28,800)	.....	.....	(+28,800)	.....
Total	708,366	354,700	729,700	+21,334	+375,000
Total, title V, Revolving and Management Funds	802,866	512,044	820,044	+17,178	+308,000
TITLE VI					
OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS					
Defense Health Program:					
Operation and maintenance	9,727,985	10,477,687	10,471,447	+743,462	-6,240
Procurement	402,387	356,970	356,970	-45,417	.....
Research and development	19,500	.....	250,000	+230,500	+250,000
Total, Defense Health Program	10,149,872	10,834,657	11,078,417	+928,545	+243,760

Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Army: 1/					
Operation and maintenance	491,700	593,500	492,000	+300	-101,500
Procurement	115,670	241,500	116,000	+330	-125,500
Research, development, test, and evaluation	172,780	334,000	173,000	+220	-161,000
Total, Chemical Agents	780,150	1,169,000	781,000	+850	-388,000
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	735,582	788,100	883,700	+148,118	+95,600
Office of the Inspector General	132,064	140,844	140,844	+8,780	.....
Total, title VI, Other Department of Defense Programs	11,797,668	12,932,601	12,883,961	+1,086,293	-48,640
TITLE VII					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund	201,500	209,100	209,100	+7,600	.....
Intelligence Community Management Account	129,123	149,415	144,415	+15,292	-5,000
Transfer to Dept of Justice	(27,000)	(27,000)	(27,000)	.....	.....
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	25,000	15,000	15,000	-10,000	.....
National Security Education Trust Fund	3,000	8,000	8,000	+5,000	.....
Total, title VII, Related agencies	358,623	381,515	376,515	+17,892	-5,000
TITLE VIII					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Additional transfer authority (sec. 8005)	(1,650,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(+350,000)	.....
Indian Financing Act incentives (sec. 8024)	8,000	.....	8,000	.....	+8,000
FFRDC's/consultants (sec. 8034)	-62,000	.....	.....	+62,000	.....

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Disposal & lease of DOD real property (sec. 8040)	25,000	32,200	32,200	+7,200	.....
Overseas Military Fac Investment Recovery (sec. 8044)	38,000	4,300	4,300	-33,700	.....
Rescissions (sec. 8058)	-415,909	.....	-612,987	-197,078	-612,987
Lapsed rescission	67,000	.....	.....	-67,000	.....
Fisher Houses	1,000	.....	.....	-1,000	.....
Division B - omnibus general provision (sec. 104)	2,000	.....	.....	-2,000	.....
Travel Cards (H. 8123)	5,000	5,000	5,000	.....	.....
Defense reform initiative (DRI) Title II savings	-70,000	.....	.....	+70,000	.....
FY 1999 Procurement inflation savings	-400,600	.....	.....	+400,600	.....
FY 1999 Economic Adjustment (rescission) (H. 8091)	.....	.....	-452,100	-452,100	-452,100
National Defense stockpile transaction fund asset sale credit	-100,000	.....	.....	+100,000	.....
Ship Transfers (FY99 with FY2000 carryover)	-636,850	-170,000	-170,000	+466,850	.....
Procurement Reductions	-142,100	.....	.....	+142,100	.....
Foreign Currency Fluctuations (H. 8101)	-193,600	.....	-171,000	+22,600	-171,000
Fuel Repricing	-502,000	.....	.....	+502,000	.....
Division B - omnibus general provision (sec. 105)	-67,000	.....	.....	+67,000	.....
Ellsworth AFB claims sup general provision	8,000	.....	.....	-8,000	.....
A-76 Studies (H. 8109)	.....	.....	-100,000	-100,000	-100,000
WMD consequence management (H. 8113)	.....	.....	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
Information Assurance (H. 8114)	.....	.....	150,000	+150,000	+150,000
Women in Service for America Memorial (H. 8099)	.....	.....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Guard Disaster Response (H. 8112)	.....	.....	20,000	+20,000	+20,000

Recovery of DoD admin expenses from FMS (H. 8127)	.....	.....	-87,000	-87,000	-87,000
Spectrum auction (H. 8128)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, title VIII	-2,436,059	-128,500	-1,318,587	+1,117,472	-1,190,087
Grand total (before emergency funding)	250,520,548	264,915,959	268,661,503	+18,140,955	+3,745,544
Pay increase provided in Supplemental	.....	.....	1,838,426	+1,838,426	+1,838,426
Total	250,520,548	264,915,959	270,499,929	+19,979,381	+5,583,970
DOD-WIDE SAVINGS	.....	-1,650,000	.....	.....	+1,650,000
EMERGENCY FUNDING					
Emergency funding (P.L. 105-277):					
Title I - Readiness	5,893,053	.....	.....	-5,893,053	.....
Title II - Antiterrorism	528,927	.....	.....	-528,927	.....
Title III - Y2K conversion	1,100,000	.....	.....	-1,100,000	.....
Supplemental (H.R. 1141)	8,573,969	.....	.....	-8,573,969	.....
Total, Emergency funding	16,095,949	.....	.....	-16,095,949	.....
Adjusted total (including emergency funding)	266,616,497	263,265,959	270,499,929	+3,883,432	+7,233,970

1/ Included in Budget under Procurement title.

2/ FY 2000 budget request was increased by $3,000,000 for a mistake in the budget appendix.

3/ FY 2000 budget amendment added $1,845,370,000.

4/ The total recommended for Title I was reduced by $1,838,426,000, the amount provided in the FY 1999 Supplemental for advance funding of pay and retirement reform initiatives.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1999 AND BUDGET REQUESTS AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 2000—Continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Adjustment for unapprop'd balance transfer (Stockpile)	150,000	150,000	150,000	.....	.....
Stockpile collections (unappropriated)	-150,000	-150,000	-150,000	.....	.....
Emergency funding	-7,521,980	.....	.....	+7,521,980	.....
Emergency funding	-8,573,969	.....	.....	+8,573,969	.....
Spectrum auction	.....	.....	-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000
Total adjustments	-16,095,949	.....	-2,600,000	+13,495,949	-2,600,000
Adjusted total (incl scorekeeping adjustments)	250,520,548	263,265,959	267,899,929	+17,379,381	+4,633,970
Appropriations	(250,869,457)	(263,265,959)	(268,965,016)	(+18,095,559)	(+5,699,057)
Rescissions	(-348,909)	.....	(-1,065,087)	(-716,178)	(-1,065,087)
Total (including adjustments)	250,520,548	263,265,959	267,899,929	+17,379,381	+4,633,970
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory	201,500	209,100	209,100	+7,600	.....
General purpose discretionary	250,319,048	263,056,859	267,690,829	+17,371,781	+4,633,970

RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Military Personnel	70,607,566	73,723,293	72,011,977	+1,404,411	-1,711,316
Title II - Operation and Maintenance	84,042,814	91,268,249	93,686,750	+9,643,936	+2,418,501
(By transfer)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	.....	.....
Title III - Procurement	48,590,420	51,851,538	53,031,397	+4,440,977	+1,179,859
Title IV - Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	36,756,650	34,375,219	37,169,446	+412,796	+2,794,227
Title V - Revolving and Management Funds	802,866	512,044	820,044	+17,178	+308,000
Title VI - Other Department of Defense Programs	11,797,668	12,932,601	12,883,961	+1,086,293	-48,640
Title VII - Related agencies	358,623	381,515	376,515	+17,892	-5,000
Title VIII - General provisions	-2,436,059	-128,500	-1,318,587	+1,117,472	-1,190,087
DoD-wide savings	.....	-1,650,000	.....	.....	+1,650,000
Total, Department of Defense	250,520,548	263,265,959	268,661,503	+18,140,955	+5,395,544
Scorekeeping adjustments	.....	.....	-2,600,000	-2,600,000	-2,600,000
Total funds provided in this Act	250,520,548	263,265,959	266,061,503	+15,540,955	+2,795,544
Funds provided in Supplemental Acts	16,095,949	.....	1,838,426	-14,257,523	+1,838,426
Total funding available for DoD	266,616,497	263,265,959	267,899,929	+1,283,432	+4,633,970

These figures include $16,095,949,000 in FY 1999 emergency defense funding included in P.L. 105-277, Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Appropriations for FY 1999, and P.L. 106-31, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for FY 1999; and $1,838,426,000 in FY 2000 emergency defense funding also included in P.L. 106-31.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

This bill may signify an important change in how Congress approaches defense budget policy in the next century as we continue to struggle under highly constrained discretionary budget caps.

F–22 FIGHTER PROGRAM

In recognition of the changing post-Cold War threat and the constraints being placed on all discretionary programs by unrealistic budget caps, the Committee has for the first time in recent years taken issue with a costly high-profile military program proposed by the Defense Department. The Committee has deleted all production funds in this budget ($1.858 billion for six aircraft) for the proposed F–22 fighter aircraft program. This action not only frees up nearly $2 billion for higher priority military programs this year, but also will allow reallocation of roughly $40 billion of military funds over the next decade for higher priority needs.

The Defense Subcommittee recommended this action in a bipartisan and unanimous fashion, and the Committee agreed by voice vote with little controversy.

Reorient Military Spending Priorities.—By this action, the Committee is sending a clear message to the Pentagon that it is time to reorient its spending priorities to meet a broader array of military budget requirements for the 21st Century. That means paying far more attention to so-called "asymmetrical" threats like chemical and biological terrorism, information warfare, smaller scales urban warfare, cruise missile defense and bolstering conventional military capabilities like airlift, sealift, electronic jamming, intelligence and surveillance, and communications. It also means we must review the force structures of our NATO allies and demand more investment from them in force modernization as well.

Tactical Aircraft Plan is Out of Balance.—For too long the Pentagon has resisted calls to restructure its hyper-expensive tactical aircraft procurement plan to buy three separate types of tactical aircraft costing in excess of $300 billion even though the traditional Cold War threats for which they were designed have dissipated and new non-conventional threats are emerging.

The most expensive of these planes is the F–22, which was first designed to meet a Cold War threat from overwhelming numbers of advanced Soviet aircraft. Over the years, even though the old Soviet threat has evaporated, the only thing that has changed about the F–22 program has been its cost and its production schedule. Development costs have nearly doubled from $12 billion in 1985 to over $23 billion today. Current estimates are that it will cost at least another $40 to $60 billion to procure. Over the next five years, the Air Force proposes to pay $151 million apiece for the F–22 fighter, about three times the cost of our top of the line F–15E fighter (about $55 million), and about six times the cost of an F–

16 fighter. And since the Air Force wants to begin buying these planes with less than 5% of the required testing completed, most independent analysts predict that F–22 costs will grow even further.

F–22 Consumes Too Much Funding Needed For Other Military Capabilities.—In making this decision, the Committee reviewed not only what capability the F–22 can provide for the future compared to other planes, but what capability we are giving up because of the cost of this plane—the so-called "opportunity cost." It is now clear from experiences in Yugoslavia and Iraq that other Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps aviation capabilities are being stretched dangerously thin in certain key areas because of the need to pay the exorbitant F–22 budget costs. It is also clear that from a larger perspective, the F–22 is consuming resources that could be used to address other critical strategic concerns such as emerging threats from chemical/biological/nuclear terrorism, information warfare, and cruise missiles.

The Committee has recognized that it takes more than an ultra-sophisticated fighter to successfully prosecute modern-day air operations. It requires a total balanced and integrated system, starting with highly trained and well-motivated aircrews. It also depends on sophisticated surveillance systems such as the AWACS and JSTARS systems, modern information and communications systems to provide instantaneous situation awareness, sophisticated missiles, electronic jamming support, intelligence gathering platforms such as the U–2 and various unmanned aerial vehicles, and support from refueling tankers and specialized helicopters.

The Committee rightly believes that the Pentagon is over-emphasizing fighter procurement, proposing to buy this expensive high tech fighter at a cost that will severely limit other weapons purchases and upgrades. This could actually degrade performance in the years ahead, since there will be no additional funds to sufficiently upgrade these other systems in a timely manner. The Air Force and the Department as a whole are already starting to pay this price. For instance:

The Air Force retired its F–111 airplanes with their electronic jamming capability in order to save money for the F–22; now we find that the military will not fly missions even with our stealthy aircraft, such as the B–2, without jammer protection and there is concern about a shortage of these critical assets;

The Air Force has greatly cut back on its "Red Flag" pilot training program using dedicated aggressor squadrons—a program widely regarded as a key to superior US pilot proficiency;

The Air Force relies on 1950s and 1960s-era aerial tankers, many of which urgently require re-engineering and other upgrades, yet no funding is requested.

One of their most critical intelligence assets—the U–2 plan—flies with outdated avionics, which the Air Force has no plan to upgrade due to budget constraints;

The Air Force has no bomber modernization plan—the best they can come up with is a plan to keep the B–52s flying until they are literally 80 years old;

To find more money for the F–22, the Air Force has forced at least a two year delay in our next generation satellite early

warning system (SBIRS–High) for the detection of ballistic missile attack—a critical system to our national security;

The Air Force isn't able to find enough new recruits and it is losing veteran pilots to early retirement at an alarming rate with the shortage now topping over 1,100 pilots—in part due to poor facilities for Air Force personnel and their families;

The Air Force has had serious ongoing spare parts shortages and has increasing equipment maintenance backlogs;

The Air Force ran out of key precision guided cruise missiles—the CALCM—during the Kosovo campaign;

There are new technologies for our top of the line F–15 and F–16 aircraft that will add significantly to their effectiveness, like the "link–16" system that could and should be fielded now—but must wait due to funding considerations;

The Marine Corps is being forced to replace its worn out helicopters with the new V–22 tiltrotor at a much slower rate than is optimal from an operational perspective.

What is the Realistic Threat? In making its recommendation on the F–22, the Committee also had to weigh whether the potential threat to future air superiority was real and as ominous as the Air Force alleges. It is fair to say that the Air Force can make a case for only an ill-defined and ambiguous potential threat that would justify this level of expenditure. In making the decision to allocate limited dollars, national security decisionmakers are put in the unenviable position of making choices based on the likelihood and severity of potential threats. It seems clear in this case that other concerns, such as the spread of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism rate a higher budget priority than the F–22 program.

There are also some issues of credibility. The Air Force does not have a particularly good record in making straightforward threat assessments to support its F–22 budget proposals. In the early 1990s, after the Soviet Union collapsed (and the Air Force's argument for procuring the F–22 with it), the Air Force changed its threat analysis to say that some 35 countries had procured aircraft with the capabilities that threatened U.S. air domination. Only later were we surprised to learn that the Air Force included countries like Switzerland, Norway, Israel, Australia, even New Guinea as possible threat countries, all of whom possessed U.S.-built F–16 aircraft that we had sold to them. We were also told at the time that new Russian planes like the Mig–29 were making our F–15s and F–16s obsolete. This of course was disproved in Iraq and Yugoslavia.

Since events of the last decade have made many of the old F–22 arguments untenable, it is not surprising that a new argument is taking shape. We are now told that yet a new Russian plan, the SU–37, and several Western European planes under development are the new threats to U.S. air supremacy

While these planes might be highly capable (an assumption that should be closely scrutinized for the SU–37), most analysts doubt whether the Russian economy will be in a position for decades to finance and produce such an expensive plane in large quantity. The Air Force budget alone is more than the entire Russian, Iraqi, North Korean, Iranian, Syrian, and Cuban authorized military budgets combined. It is reported that the Russians now spend a

paltry sum for military research and development (about $2 billion a year) and for military procurement (about $3.5 billion per year). Most analysts believe this decline has fractured the Russian defense industrial base to the point that it will not recover for decades if at all.

The real threat from Russia emanates from its weakness, not its strength. A much more productive use of just some of the funds earmarked for the F–22 program would be to expand ongoing efforts to disarm Russian nuclear and chemical warheads, and to keep Russian weapons scientists gainfully employed for peaceful purposes. This threat is much more real and ominous than the paper threat of great numbers of futuristic Russian-made aircraft.

As for the potential fielding of advanced Western European fighter aircraft, the Yugoslav air campaign exposed numerous deficiencies in the military capabilities of even our largest Western European NATO allies. Domestic pressure for continuing military budget cutbacks continues in many of these same European countries and it remains to be seen if there is the political will to undertake massive and expensive upgrades of European air force units. A strong argument could be made that these countries should undertake such upgrades to pull a far greater share of the burden in any future NATO military air operation. A valid concern may exist about proliferation of these aircraft to other nations. But it would seem that a cheaper and far more rationale response is to work with our allies diplomatically to ensure that these planes do not fall into the hands of the rogue states and other undesirable regimes (something that certainly seems attainable).

Pilot Training and Skill Levels Are Being Discounted.—Even more important than any single piece of technology or the numbers of aircraft possessed by potential opponents are the capabilities of the pilots flying those aircraft. History repeats the same lesson whether from World War I, from *Mig Alley*, from Viet Nam, or from *Desert Storm*, that the training of pilots, including their ability to see the battlefield, is the key factor in victory. That factor continues to favor the United States and should continue well into the 21st Century. It seems unlikely that any second-world or Third World nation could possibly match the training and skill of American pilots.

Threats From Rogue States.—Indeed, no serious analyst would predict that potential opponents such as Iraq, North Korea, Libya, or Iran will be in a position politically or financially to acquire such advanced aviation technology in the quantities needed to threaten U.S. air supremacy. Nor will they be able to train a sophisticated air force and provide the sophisticated support assets that would be required to sustain them in any kind of serious conflict. It is clear that if they wish to challenge the United States in the 21st Century, there are cheaper, quicker, and potentially more deadly ways to confront us. Those threats should be the focus of our budget priorities for the 21st Century.

Reassessment Is Warranted.—Given the high cost that the Air Force has proposed for addressing such an ambiguous threat to our fighter supremacy, it is time that U.S. defense planners reassess the entire tactical aircraft program. Three hundred billion dollars for three different new tactical airplanes is extravagant in a world

where we will have no military peer for at least the next 20 years. The Committee is to be congratulated for making this difficult choice on a bipartisan basis, and forcing this reassessment to take place.

PROBLEMS WITH THIS BILL

As much as I would wish to support the Committee bill because of its F–22 provision, there are other problems that prevent me from doing so at this point—problems that I hope will be corrected so that I can eventually support the conference report.

Unfortunately, this bill still exhibits many of the same tired old military spending traits we have seen in recent years from this Congress. Too many extra dollars have again been siphoned off from key domestic education, health, clean water, food and drug safety, law enforcement, veterans' health care, national parks, and other important priorities to pay for military pork barrel projects of little or no value. We still see hundreds of millions of dollars in military equipment being bought in this bill not on the basis of how much it is needed, but rather on the basis of where it is built.

Serious Congressional Oversight Is Too Often Lacking.—This Congress also has already dodged any significant attempt at reform to cut out the wasteful military spending that everyone knows is widely prevalent. For instance, the authorizing committees have once again refused to act on military base closures, rejecting the Pentagon's request for two additional rounds of base closures that some have projected would save another $20 billion by 2005, and $3 billion per year thereafter. Instead, this Congress finds it acceptable to pay billions of extra dollars per year for unneeded and unnecessary military bases that the Defense Department readily admits add little or nothing to our national security.

Many other opportunities for making large military spending savings exist as well. Little serious Congressional attention has been paid to a continuous stream of GAO reports explaining how the Pentagon's financial management operations are so weak that they are classified as a "high risk" for fraud, waste, and abuse. Despite many promises, the Pentagon still cannot properly account for billions of dollars of property, equipment, inventory, and supplies.

The Navy for instance has lost track of more than $3 billion worth of goods over the last three years, including night vision devices, communications gear of all sorts, even guided missile launchers for planes. That's the equivalent of misplacing three Navy destroyers. In April of this year, the GAO reported that about 60% of DoD's inventory of on-hand items, or about #39.4 billion of DoD's secondary inventory, exceeded DoD's requirements.

The Pentagon's financial management system is so weak that it cannot keep track of billions of dollars of yearly military expenditures. Million dollar-plus overpayments to military contractors are oftentimes found out only because the contractor voluntarily returns the money.

In past reports to Congress, the GAO has pointed out many other opportunities to save significant sums as well, only to have them fall on deaf ears in Congress. For instance, the GAO has reported that:

DoD's laboratory infrastructure is estimated to have an excess capacity approaching 35 percent;

DoD's capacity for rotary-wing aircraft training is close to double what is needed by all the military services;

The cost to educate a physician in DoD's Uniform Services University of Health Sciences is more than twice as much as the cost of providing scholarships to students in civilian medical schools;

DoD's overhead for transportation services has been two to three times the basis cost of transportation.

In my view, it is not possible to support a bill that shifts billion from key domestic accounts like education, health, veterans, and the environment to pay for extra military spending. This is especially the case when the Congress makes no serious effort to clean up the billions in wasteful and unnecessary military spending—waste that every Member of Congress knows exists.

Budget Gimmickry At An All Time.—Instead of rigorous oversight to root out these inefficiencies and wasteful practices, this Congress has spent its time concocting budget gimmickry of unprecedented proportions to pay for these excesses.

Three-and-a-half years ago, the Congressional Republican leadership closed down the federal government over its demand that the President use only "honest numbers" from the Congressional Budget Office to measure appropriations bills. They said at the time that estimates from the CBO were the only "meaningful" numbers that provided "no wiggle room" and "no smoke and mirrors."

Now, the Republican leadership has wiggled into a complete about face on this issue. For this bill, the Republican leadership has very quietly "directed" the head of the Congressional Budget Office to ignore his own professional spending estimates and simply not count $10.473 billion of spending in this bill. The leadership has also directed the CBO to ignore its scoring rules on asset sales as well—ordering them to credit this bill with another $2.6 billion from the expected proceeds from the FCC auction of portions of the frequency spectrum (having little of nothing to do with defense).

We once again have a situation in which this Republican leadership is pronouncing their unabiding support and steadfastness for adhering to the budget caps while they whisper orders to the CBO to ignore those very same caps.

FY 2000 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Budget Resolution Cap (302b for FY 2000)	267.692	259.130
Actual CBO Spending Estimate:		
This bill—	270.291	271.113
Over the cap	+2.599	+11.983
Scorekeeping Gimmickry:		
Changes "directed" by House leadership		−10.473
Asset sale (spectrum auction sale)	−2.600	−2.600
Total scorekeeping changes	(−2.600)	(−13.073)

FY 2000 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Under caps due to "directed scoring"	0.0	−1,090

MILITARY SPENDING AND TAX CUTS

Perhaps the most important decision that Congress will make this year affecting the defense budget over the next decade will be the upcoming vote to cut taxes.

Last week, the House Ways and Means Committee, in correct with the House Republican leadership, approved an $864 billion ten-year tax cut bill. Since the bill will trigger additional debt service of $155 billion, the real cost of this bill is $1.02 trillion.

Tax Cut Crowds Out Defense Increases.—This tax cut dissipates more than the entire non-Social Security surplus projected by CBO, and it leaves no money to extend the solvency of either Social Security or Medicare. This tax cut would make it extremely unlikely that other initiatives including the $150 billion ten-year defense spending (outlays) increase proposed by the President, could be financed without returning to deficit spending.

What's more, the underlying spending assumptions that make up the 10-year budget surplus estimates are fallacious—they assumed deeper cuts in the discretionary spending category (that includes defense) than Congress has ever imposed before.

The implications for all discretionary programs (including defense) are ominous if Congress chooses to endorse these spending assumptions by voting for a massive tax cut. If enacted, this tax cut promises to return us to the dark days of the 1980's—with large deficits and cutthroat competition between domestic and defense programs.

Living Within The Assumed Caps.—The CBO now projects a non-Social Security surplus totaling $964 billion over the next ten years. This projection assumes that appropriations will be capped at designated levels in 2000, 2001, and 2002 (an extremely dubious assumption), in accordance with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Thereafter, the projected surplus assumes that total appropriations will remain at the 2002 funding level in real purchasing power. In addition, the projections assume that there will be no emergencies in the next decade that require federal spending.

Congress has already breached this ten-year "freeze" assumption by providing growth rates above this level for highway and mass transit programs. In addition, the President has called for providing an additional $150 billion (outlays) above a freeze level for defense programs over this period. If only these two deviations are allowed to occur over the next decade, the remaining funds for non-defense/non-transportation domestic programs would have to be reduced by 31 percent (−$750 billion) below their 1999 levels, after adjusting for inflation.

While some may think this could be somewhat acceptable in the abstract, I challenge Members to say whether they would vote for 31 percent reductions (at a minimum) in the following domestic programs:

Veteran's hospitals and medical care
National Institutes of Health (NIH)
NASA
FAA air traffic control system
Education for the disadvantaged
Special education
Community development block grants
Coast Guard
Federal Bureau of Investigation
WIC (nutrition for women, infants, and children)
Customs
Section 8 housing for the elderly and handicapped
National Park Service
Drug Enforcement Agency
INS
FEMA
National Science Foundation
EPA Superfund grants to states
Head Start
Pell Grants
National Weather Service
Agriculture conservation
Flood control
Teacher training
Food and Drug Administration

It is politically and economically naïve and irresponsible to the people whom we represent to think that these programs can sustain a 31% reduction over ten years without threatening public health and safety and the economic prosperity on which the future of American working families depends. America will not be frozen in time for ten years. Our population will continue to grow, our economy and social structures will continue to evolve and become more complex, and our responsibilities as the world's only economic and military superpower will be great.

The Republican tax cut would place into serious jeopardy the President's military spending proposal and sets the chances at zero that any funds could be found to increase the President's defense plan.

DAVE OBEY.

○